



AGENDA

January 18, 2017

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING
HOUSING AUTHORITY MEETING
HOUSING SUCCESSOR AGENCY MEETING**

7:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, California

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. ROLL CALL**

Vice Mayor: Bonnie Gore
Councilmember: Scott Alvord
Councilmember: Tim Herman
Councilmember: John Allard
Mayor: Susan Rohan

- 3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- 4. MEETING PROCEDURES**

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC

All Items on the agenda will be open for the public comment before final action is taken. Speakers are requested to restrict comments to the item as it appears on the agenda and stay within a five (5) - minute time limit. The Mayor has the discretion of limiting the total discussion time for an item.

- 5. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC

Persons may address the City Council on items not on this agenda. Please complete a "Speaker Information Card" and present it to the City Clerk prior to the start of the meeting. Speakers shall restrict their comments to issues that are within the subject

jurisdiction of the City Council and limit their comments to three (3) minutes per person. The total time allocated for Public Comment is 25 minutes. The Brown Act, with certain exceptions, does not permit the City Council to discuss or take action on issues that are not listed on the agenda.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC

All matters listed under Consent Calendar are considered to be routine and all will be passed by one motion. There will be no discussion of these items unless members of the City Council or the public request specific items be removed from the Consent Calendar for separate discussion. Any member of the public may address the City Council on items on the Consent Calendar. Public comments on any item or items on the Consent Calendar are limited to five (5) minutes per speaker

BEGINNING OF CONSENT CALENDAR

Bids / Purchases / Services

6.1. Cummins Vehicle Parts (RFQ 01-3117) - Reject all Bids

Memo from Senior Buyer Joanna Oukrop and Central Services Director Paul Diefenbach recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-07 REJECTING ALL BIDS FOR RFQ 01-3117 CUMMINS VEHICLE PARTS. Staff recommends that all bids received for RFQ 01-3117 for Cummins vehicle parts be rejected. The bids received for this RFQ were deemed non-responsive because they did not meet the bid specifications. Cummins vehicle parts are used to maintain and repair "IS" series Cummins engines, such as the City's buses, refuse trucks, and some of the larger trucks used by the Electric Department. There is no fiscal impact at this time, since there will be no contract award.

CC #: 8190

File #: 0203-21

CONTACT: Joanna Oukrop 916-774-5745 joukrop@roseville.ca.us

6.2. Douglas Substation Rebuild Phase 2 Civil Construction - Award of Contract

Memo from Power Engineer Ozro Corulli and Electric Utility Director Michelle Bertolino recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-08 APPROVING AN AGREEMENT BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND RES SYSTEM 3, LLC, AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE. This item is seeking approval and award of a construction contract to RES System 3 LLC. in the amount of \$847,637.00 for the Douglas Substation Rebuild Phase 2 Civil Construction Project, and authorization for the Electric Utility Director or designee to approve and pay for contract change orders that could increase the contract amount by no more than 10%, or \$84,763.70, for a total of \$932,400.70. The agreement provides for all civil work associated with the installation of the new 60kV equipment including constructing foundations, conduits and grounding. Funds are budgeted for in the Douglas Substation Rebuild Project budget.

CC #: 8192

File #: 0900-03

CONTACT: Ozro Corulli 916-774-5586 ocorulli@roseville.ca.us

6.3. Miscellaneous Waterworks Materials (RFQ 01-3111) - Purchase Order

Memo from Senior Buyer Joanna Oukrop and Central Services Director Paul Diefenbach recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-10 APPROVING A PURCHASE ORDER BETWEEN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND FERGUSON WATERWORKS; and adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-11 APPROVING A PURCHASE ORDER BETWEEN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND PACE SUPPLY CORPORATION. Staff requests Council authorize purchase orders to Ferguson Waterworks and Pace Supply Corporation as the lowest responsive bidders to RFQ 01-3111 for miscellaneous waterworks materials to be purchased on an as needed basis. These materials are primarily used for repairs, upgrades, maintenance, and new service additions to the City's water and sewer lines. The estimated total spend through June 30, 2017 is \$123,000.00, and the estimated spend for FY2017-18 is \$246,000.00 or up to department budgeted amounts. Funding is included in the FY2016-17 budgets for the Water and Sewer Divisions, the Roseville Energy Park, and the Central Stores Inventory Replacement account. Funding will be included in the various departments' FY2017-18 proposed budgets with spending contingent upon Council approval of budgets. Staff requests authorization to renew the bid contract without further Council approval.

CC #: 8197

File #: 0203-09

CONTACT: Joanna Oukrop 916-774-5745 joukrop@roseville.ca.us

6.4. Itron Water Meter 100+ ERT's and Through-Lid Mounting Kits (RFQ 01-3114) - Purchase Order

Memo from Senior Buyer Joanna Oukrop and Central Services Director Paul Diefenbach recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-09 APPROVING A PURCHASE ORDER BETWEEN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND ITRON, INC. Staff recommends Council authorize purchase orders to Itron, Inc. as the lowest responsive bidder to RFQ 01-3114 for Itron Water Meter 100W+ Encoder Receiver Transmitters (ERT's) and through-lid mounting kits. The ERT's allow the Environmental Utilities Water Division personnel to obtain water meter readings via a remote radio read process. The ERT's are used on new water meter installations and to replace ERT's that reach the end of their service life. The estimated cost, including tax, for the initial 18-month contract is approximately \$287,428.13 or not to exceed the department budgeted amount. Funding is included in the Water Division's FY2016-17 budget. Purchases made in subsequent years will be contingent upon Council approval of budgets for each year. Additionally, staff requests authorization to renew the bid contract without further Council approval.

CC #: 8195

File #: 0203-09

CONTACT: Joanna Oukrop 916-774-5745 joukrop@roseville.ca.us

6.5. Calsense Irrigation Controllers (RFQ 01-3116) - Purchase Order

Memo from Buyer Tiffany Valdez and Central Services Director Paul Diefenbach recommending Council authorize a purchase order to Horizon Distributors as the lowest responsive bidder to RFQ 01-3116 for Calsense irrigation controllers. The Parks Operations Division has a requirement to replace four irrigation controllers at Santucci Park as part of their long term plan to replace outdated Motorola equipment that is no longer manufactured or supported. The cost of the controllers is \$25,731.13 plus tax of \$1,929.83 for a grand total of \$27,660.96. Funding is included in the Parks Maintenance Division's FY2016-17 budget.

CC #: 8184

File #: 0203-10

CONTACT: Tiffany Valdez 916-774-5708 tvaldez@roseville.ca.us

6.6. Ford F250 and F350 Trucks with Utility Bodies (RFQ 01-3113) - Purchase Order

Memo from Buyer Tiffany Valdez and Central Services Director Paul Diefenbach recommending Council authorize a purchase order to Harrold Ford as the lowest responsive bidder for RFQ 01-3113 for four ¾ ton Ford F250 4x2 trucks with utility bodies to replace vehicle numbers 08-205 and 07-208, and to provide two new fleet additions. The total cost of the vehicles, including tax and options, is \$170,051.87. Funding is included in the FY2016-17 Auto Replacement budget.

CC #: 8215

File #: 0203-01

CONTACT: Tiffany Valdez 916-774-5708 tvaldez@roseville.ca.us

6.7. Sculpture Park Cosmos Painting (RFQ 01-3109) - Service Agreement

Memo from Buyer Brandon Mendonca and Central Services Director Paul Diefenbach recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-17 APPROVING A SERVICE AGREEMENT BETWEEN CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND HORIZON BROTHERS PAINTING, AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE (S1704315). Horizon Brothers Painting was the lowest responsive bidder for RFQ 01-3109 to paint the Cosmos structure at Roseville's Sculpture Park. The structure is being painted to comply with its maintenance cycle and to repair areas of the structure where the paint is blistering and peeling. The total cost of the painting project is \$24,725.00. Funding is included in the FY2016-17 Parks, Recreation and Libraries Department's budget.

CC #: 8203

File #: 0704-01

CONTACT: Brandon Mendonca 916-774-5724 bmendonca@roseville.ca.us

6.8. Roseville Police Department Roof Repair (RFQ 01-3101) - Service Agreement

Memo from Buyer Babette Owens and Central Services Director Paul Diefenbach recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-16 APPROVING A SERVICE AGREEMENT BETWEEN CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND DK ENTERPRISES, INC. DBA KING'S ROOFING, AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE (S1703515). DK Enterprises, Inc. dba King's Roofing was the lowest responsive

bidder for RFQ 01-3101 for the materials and labor for the Roseville Police Department Roof Repair Project. The total cost for the repairs is \$73,407.00. Funding is included in the Central Services Facilities Rehab Fund FY2016-17 budget.

CC #: 8202

File #: 0900-06

CONTACT: Babbette Owens 916-774-5704 bowens@roseville.ca.us

6.9. General Construction and Repair - Service Agreements

Memo from Facility Manager Dan Allen and Central Services Director Paul Diefenbach recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-22 APPROVING A SERVICE AGREEMENT BETWEEN CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND BULLARD, INC., AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE (S170532A); and adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-23 APPROVING A SERVICE AGREEMENT BETWEEN CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND RUDOLPH AND SLETTEN, INC., AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE (S170533A). Staff recommends Council authorize service agreements with Bullard Construction and Rudolph & Sletten to provide miscellaneous construction services and repairs on an as needed basis throughout the City. The total annual value of each agreement is \$200,000.00, not to exceed annual budgeted amounts. Staff requests authorization to continue utilizing each contract without further Council approval until the contract expires, or until City staff determines that continuing with the same vendor is not in the City's best interest including authorization for the City Manager to sign optional renewal agreements pending Council approval of budgets for that year.

CC #: 8216

File #: 0203-04

CONTACT: Dan Allen 916-774-5741 dallen@roseville.ca.us

6.10. Liquid Cationic Polymer - Service Agreement Amendment

Memo from Principal Engineer Bryan Buchanan and Environmental Utilities Director Richard Plecker recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-39 APPROVING AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO SERVICE AGREEMENT BETWEEN CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND SOLENIS, LLC, AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE (S1503108). Staff recommends Council authorize amendment no. 2 to the service agreement to extend the term of the agreement by 4 months from December 15, 2016 to April 30, 2017; and increase the value of the agreement by \$210,000.00 from \$980,000.00 to \$1,190,000.00. The addition will pay for liquid cationic polymer (Praestol K279FLX) which is used for dewatering biosolids. Funding is included in the approved Wastewater Operations FY2016-17 budget.

CC #: 8232

File #: 0203-03

CONTACT: Bryan Buchanan 916-746-1812 bbuchanan@roseville.ca.us

6.11. Liquid Cationic Polymer - Service Agreement Amendment

Memo from Principal Engineer Bryan Buchanan and Environmental Utilities Director Richard Plecker recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-05 APPROVING AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO SERVICE AGREEMENT BETWEEN CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND SOLENIS, LLC, AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE (S1603141). This service agreement amendment will extend the term of the agreement by 4 months from December 15, 2016 to April 30, 2017, and increase the value of the agreement by \$210,000.00 from \$200,000.00 to \$410,000.00. The addition will pay for liquid cationic polymer which is used for dewatering biosolids. Funding is included in the approved Wastewater Operations FY2016-17 budget.

CC #: 8186

File #: 0203-03

CONTACT: Bryan Buchanan 916-746-1812 bbuchanan@roseville.ca.us

Resolutions

6.12. Westpark Phase 4 Village 18E - Certificate of Completion

Memo from Construction Inspector Keith Litts and Development Services Director Kevin Payne recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-04 OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ACCEPTING THE PUBLIC WORK KNOWN AS WESTPARK - PHASE 4, VILLAGE 18E PROJECT, APPROVING THE "CERTIFICATE OF COMPLETION", AND AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE CITY ENGINEER TO EXECUTE SAID NOTICE ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE, THEREFORE, AND ACCEPTING ALL DEDICATIONS OFFERED ON THE RECORDED MAP OF THE SUBDIVISION. The Engineering Division has made final inspection of the project and has found the roadway infrastructure work complete in accordance with the improvement plans and City Specifications. The Engineering Division recommends that the City Council approve the request for a Certificate of Completion and direct staff to accept these improvements. This action has no impact to the City's General Fund. Construction costs were paid by the developer.

CC #: 8183

File #: 0400-04-09-1

CONTACT: Keith Litts 916-517-7598 klitts@roseville.ca.us

6.13. Parcel 49 Phase 1 Site Improvement Plans - Certificate of Completion

Memo from Construction Inspector Orville Chatterton and Development Services Director Kevin Payne recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-14 OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ACCEPTING THE PUBLIC WORK KNOWN AS PARCEL 49 PHASE I SITE IMPROVEMENT PLANS PROJECT, APPROVING THE "CERTIFICATE OF COMPLETION", AND AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE CITY ENGINEER TO EXECUTE SAID NOTICE ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE, THEREFORE, AND ACCEPTING ALL DEDICATIONS OFFERED ON THE RECORDED MAP OF THE SUBDIVISION. The Engineering Division has made final inspection of the project and has found the roadway infrastructure work complete in accordance with the improvement plans and City specifications. This action has no impact to the

City's General Fund. Construction costs were paid by the developer.

CC #: 9200

File #: 0400-04-04-1

CONTACT: Orville Chatterton 916-774-5339 ochatterton@roseville.ca.us

6.14. Signalization of Intersections - Notice of Completion

Memo from Assistant Engineer Nick Graves and Public Works Director Rhon Herndon recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-18 ACCEPTING THE PUBLIC WORK KNOWN AS THE SIGNALIZATION OF THE FIDDYMENT RD / ANGUS RD AND THE SECRET RAVINE PKWY / ALEXANDRA DR INTERSECTIONS PROJECT, APPROVING THE "NOTICE OF COMPLETION", AND AUTHORIZING THE PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE SAID NOTICE ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE. This project constructed two traffic signals: one at the intersection of Fiddymment Rd, Angus Rd, and Parkland Way; and one at the intersection of Secret Ravine Pkwy and Alexandra Dr. The project also extended and upgraded the communications network with fiber optic cable to provide better traffic data collection and monitoring. Staff recommends City Council accept this project as complete. There is no cost associated with these actions. The construction cost for the project was \$419,798.44 and was funded with developer paid traffic mitigation fees.

CC #: 8204

File #: 0900-04-03

CONTACT: Nick Graves 916-746-1305 ngraves@roseville.ca.us

6.15. 2016 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan - Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and Plan Adoption

Memo from Senior Engineer Carl Walker and Public Works Director Rhon Herndon recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-33 ADOPTING AN INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE 2016 MUTLI-HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN; and adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-34 ADOPTING THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE 2016 MULTI-HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN. Staff recommends Council approve the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the 2016 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan, adopt the City of Roseville 2016 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan, and maintain the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan Steering Committee as an ad-hoc Council-appointed committee. Funding for this \$127,331.00 5-year update is from the General Fund.

CC #: 8227

File #: 03007-02

CONTACT: Carl Walker 916-746-1300 cwalker@roseville.ca.us

6.16. 316 Vernon Office Building - Notice of Completion

Memo from Development Services Manager Mike Isom and Development Services Director Kevin Payne recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-32 ACCEPTING THE PUBLIC WORK KNOWN AS THE 316 VERNON OFFICE BUILDING PROJECT, APPROVING THE "NOTICE OF COMPLETION", AND AUTHORIZING THE DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE SAID NOTICE ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE. The

City's development departments have made a final inspection of the 316 Vernon Street Office Building and have found that all contract work has been completed in accordance with the approved plans and specifications. The project is now ready for acceptance. The project scope of work included construction of a new four-story, ±83,000 square foot City office building with ground floor retail space and related site improvements. The contractor shall guarantee the installation of all improvements for a period of twelve months from December 15, 2016, the date of "Substantial Completion" as defined in the contract terms. The total value of the construction contract awarded to DPR Construction was \$21,839,585, which was funded through a combination of cash from the public facilities and strategic improvement funds, and debt financing in the form of certificates of participation. No General Fund monies were used for the project.

CC #: 8224

File #: 0401-02-02-1

CONTACT: Mike Isom 916-774-5527 misom@roseville.ca.us

6.17.316 Vernon Office Building - Increase in Change Order Authority

Memo from Development Services Manager Mike Isom and Development Services Director Kevin Payne recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-30 AMENDING CHANGE ORDER AUTHORITY FOR 316 VERNON OFFICE BUILDING PROJECT. This item requests an increase in the contingency/change order authority granted to the Development Services Manager from 2% to 3% as it relates to construction of the 316 Vernon Office Building project. Approval of the increase in change order authority is an accounting exercise necessary to reconcile final billings related to the project and does not increase the project's overall budget of \$27 million. The 316 Vernon Office Building project is on track to be completed at a total net cost of approximately \$25.9 million.

CC #: 8222

File #: 0401-02-02-1

CONTACT: Mike Isom 916-774-5527 misom@roseville.ca.us

6.18.Arc Flash Mitigation for the Dry Creek and Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plants Project - Notice of Completion

Memo from EIM Systems Administrator Charles Aycock and Environmental Utilities Director Richard Plecker recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-37 ACCEPTING THE PUBLIC WORK KNOWN AS THE ARC FLASH MITIGATION PROJECT, APPROVING THE "NOTICE OF COMPLETION", AND AUTHORIZING THE ENVIRONMENTAL UTILITIES DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE SAID NOTICE ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE. The Arc Flash Mitigation for the Dry Creek and Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plants project entailed complete modeling of the two wastewater treatment plant electrical systems to determine potential arc flash hazard levels, in accordance with current electrical safety standards. The project was funded from Wastewater Rehabilitation Funds. Since substantial completion for the project has been achieved, staff recommends filing notice of completion for the project.

CC #: 8226

File #: 0900-02-02-1

CONTACT: Charles Aycock 916-746-1887 caycock@roseville.ca.us

6.19. Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant Cogeneration Project – Professional Design Services Agreement Amendment

Memo from Senior Engineer George Hanson and Environmental Utilities Director Richard Plecker recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-15 APPROVING A FIRST AMENDMENT TO PROFESSIONAL DESIGN SERVICES AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND BROWN AND CALDWELL, AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE. This amendment to the Professional Design Services Agreement for detailed design and engineering services during construction for the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant Energy Recovery Project increases the previous contract amount of \$468,908.00 by \$2,276,891.00 for a revised total contract cost of \$2,745,799.00. Funding for this work is provided under the capital improvement projects for the South Placer Wastewater Authority and will be jointly funded between Roseville and the other South Placer Wastewater Authority Regional Partners (Placer County and the South Placer Municipal Utility District).

CC #: 8201

File #: 0900-02-02-2

CONTACT: George Hanson 916-746-1764 ghanson@roseville.ca.us

6.20. Northeast Roseville Specific Plan Parcel 15, Lots 10-14 - Funding Construction and Acquisition Agreement

Memo from Associate Engineer Matthew Todd and Development Services Director Kevin Payne recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-12 APPROVING AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND TAYLOR MORRISON OF CALIFORNIA, LLC., AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE. This item requests the approval of a Funding Construction and Acquisition Agreement for Stone Point Community Facilities District (CFD) No. 5 for the construction of public facilities beyond the scope of this project. This item will allocate \$1,500,000.00 of existing funds from the Stone Point CFD No. 5. This item will have no impact to the City's General Fund.

CC #: 8198

File #: 0400-04-02-1

CONTACT: Matthew Todd 916-774-5562 mtodd@roseville.ca.us

6.21. Recreation Management Software - Professional Services Agreement

Memo from Administrative Analyst Rendi Hodge and Parks, Recreation & Libraries Director Dion Louthan recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-38 APPROVING A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND PERFECTMIND TECHNOLOGY, INC., AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE. This is a professional services agreement between the City and PerfectMind Technology, Inc. to host, implement and maintain new recreation management software in the Parks, Recreation & Libraries Department. The total cost of the agreement is \$490,000.00 over five (5) years, including

implementation, interface development and integration, annual maintenance and equipment purchases. First year costs total \$200,000.00 and are included in the approved FY2016-17 Parks, Recreation & Libraries Capital Improvement budget. The funds for each year's annual maintenance and support costs will be requested in future budgets.

CC #: 8234

File #: 0704

CONTACT: Rendi Hodge 916-774-5240 rhodge@roseville.ca.us

6.22. Cirby School Portable Facility Lease Agreement

Memo from Recreation Superintendent Rob Nakamura and Parks, Recreation & Libraries Director Dion Louthan recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-25 APPROVING A LEASE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND PLACER COMMUNITY ACTION COUNCIL, INC. AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE. This agreement extends an existing lease with Placer County Action Council (PCAC) for three years. The City-owned facility is utilized by the PCAC to operate *Headstart* and *Early Headstart* preschool programs for qualifying families. The City receives a total of \$7,500.00 through the terms of this lease agreement.

CC #: 8214

File #: 1006-01

CONTACT: Rob Nakamura 916-774-5135 makamura@roseville.ca.us

6.23. Park Naming Policy Revisions and Name Recommendation

Memo from Park Planning & Superintendent Tara Gee and Parks, Recreation & Libraries Director Dion Louthan recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-26 APPROVING NAME RECOMMENDATION OF SIERRA CROSSING PARK; and adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-27 APPROVING REVISIONS TO THE PARK NAMING POLICY PROGRAM FOR THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE. Staff recommends Council approve Sierra Crossing Park as the name for W-50A school/park. Also under consideration for approval are revisions to the park naming policy. Park identification signs for the new park will be included in the construction budget. There will be no General Fund impact.

CC #: 8219

File #: 0704 & 0704-01

CONTACT: Tara Gee 916-774-5253 tgee@roseville.ca.us

6.24. HOUSING AUTHORITY- Roseville Housing Authority Administrative Plan Amendment

Memo from Housing Manager and Housing Authority Assistant Director Danielle Foster and Economic Development Director and Housing Authority Director Chris Robles recommending Council adopt HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE RESOLUTION NO. 1-17 APPROVING THE UPDATED ROSEVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY ADMINISTRATIVE PLAN. The item will allow the Housing Authority to attach up to twenty percent of its Housing Choice Vouchers to housing

units rather than tenants who are then required to identify housing. The budget for project-based vouchers already exists within the Housing Authority's existing budget to provide rental assistance within the City of Roseville and the City of Rocklin.

CC #: 8212

File #: 0709

CONTACT: Danielle Foster 916-774-5446 dfoster@roseville.ca.us

6.25. HOUSING SUCCESSOR - FY2015-16 Annual Report - Housing Successor Low and Moderate Income Housing Asset Fund

Memo from Administrative Analyst Melissa Hagan and Economic Development Director Chris Robles recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-28 APPROVING THE ANNUAL REPORT FOR THE LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSING ASSET FUND FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015-16. This item will complete the FY2015-16 annual report of the Housing Successor Low and Moderate Income Asset Fund per SB-341 signed into law in 2014 post the dissolution of the Redevelopment Agency. This report includes information related to the deposits and expenditures of the fund, the total assets, including receivables and land, and the number of deed-restricted rental housing units, including the percentage that are restricted for seniors. Preparation and submittal of the annual report has no impact on the City's General Fund.

CC #: 8220

File #: 0709-01

CONTACT: Melissa Hagan 916-774-5476 mhagan@roseville.ca.us

Ordinances (for introduction and adoption - appropriation/urgency measures)

6.26. CalHome and BEGIN Re-Use Fund - Budget Adjustment

Memo from Administrative Analyst Melissa Hagan and Economic Development Director Chris Robles recommending Council adopt ORDINANCE NO. 5779 OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AUTHORIZING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016-17 BUDGET AND DECLARING THIS ORDINANCE TO BE IMMEDIATELY EFFECTIVE AS AN APPROPRIATION MEASURE. This item will make the necessary budget adjustment in the amount of \$61,000.00 from the CalHome fund for additional Owner-Occupied Rehabilitation Program loans and \$19,900.00 from the Building Equity and Growth in Neighborhoods Re-Use fund for additional Owner-Occupied Rehabilitation Program loans. The source of funds for the CALHOME and BEGIN loans are from loan payoffs and are included in the available resources of each of these funds. This action has no impact on the General Fund.

CC #: 8188

File #: 0709 & 0201-01

CONTACT: Melissa Hagan 916-774-5476 mhagan@roseville.ca.us

6.27. 2016 Sidewalk, Curb and Gutter Repair Project - Notice of Completion and Budget Adjustment

Memo from Assistant Engineer Nick Graves and Public Works Director Rhon Herndon recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-31 ACCEPTING

THE PUBLIC WORK KNOWN AS THE 2016 SIDEWALK, CURB AND GUTTER REPAIR PROJECT, APPROVING THE "NOTICE OF COMPLETION", AND AUTHORIZING THE PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE SAID NOTICE ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE; and adopt ORDINANCE NO. 5788 OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AUTHORIZING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016-17 BUDGET AND DECLARING THIS ORDINANCE TO BE IMMEDIATELY EFFECTIVE AS AN APPROPRIATION MEASURE. The project repaired curb, gutter, sidewalk, and pedestrian access ramps around the City. The final construction cost was \$247,628.80 and was funded with \$159,313.00 of General Liability Insurance Funds for damage caused by Official City Street Trees; \$9,807.40 of North Central Landscape & Lighting District (LLD) sidewalk maintenance funds for work within the LLD; \$4,020.00 of Park Maintenance Funds for the Maidu Park repairs; \$50,488.40 of Street Maintenance Funds available for work along City streets; and \$24,000.00 of Capital Improvement Project Rehab Funds for the Americans with Disabilities Act curb ramps. A budget adjustment is required to transfer funds to the General Fund, and authorize staff to expend funds from the General Fund and the North Central Roseville Community Facilities District.

CC #: 8223

File #: 0900-04-01 & 0201-01

CONTACT: Nick Graves 916-746-1300 ngraves@roseville.ca.us

6.28.316 Vernon Office Building - Budget Adjustments

Memo from Administrative Analyst Jeannine Thrash and Finance Director Monty Hanks recommending Council adopt ORDINANCE NO. 5789 OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AUTHORIZING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016-17 BUDGET AND DECLARING THIS ORDINANCE TO BE IMMEDIATELY EFFECTIVE AS AN APPROPRIATION MEASURE; and adopt ORDINANCE NO. 5790 OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AUTHORIZING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016-17 BUDGET AND DECLARING THIS ORDINANCE TO BE IMMEDIATELY EFFECTIVE AS AN APPROPRIATION MEASURE; and adopt ORDINANCE NO. 5791 OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AUTHORIZING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016-17 BUDGET AND DECLARING THIS ORDINANCE TO BE IMMEDIATELY EFFECTIVE AS AN APPROPRIATION MEASURE. Fund 105, the 316 Vernon Street Fund, was created to track transactions belonging to the 316 Vernon Street Building separately from the General Fund. A decision was made that using a separate fund to track the transactions separately was not necessary, therefore this budget adjustment transfers all transactions to the General Fund and closes out Fund 105. The budget adjustment is a net zero transaction and has no fiscal impact to the City's General Fund.

CC #: 8225

File #: 0401-02-02-1

CONTACT: Jeannine Thrash 916-774-5473 jthrash@roseville.ca.us
Monty Hanks 916-774-5313 mhanks@roseville.ca.us

6.29.Environmental Utilities Department Historical Data Repository System Upgrade -

Professional Design Services Agreement and Budget Adjustment

Memo from EIM Systems Coordinator Charles Aycock and Environmental Utilities Director Richard Plecker recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-29 APPROVING A PROFESSIONAL DESIGN SERVICES AGREEMENT BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND CH2M HILL ENGINEERS, INC., AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE; and adopt ORDINANCE NO. 5786 OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AUTHORIZING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016-17 BUDGET AND DECLARING THIS ORDINANCE TO BE IMMEDIATELY EFFECTIVE AS AN APPROPRIATION MEASURE. The Historical Data Repository is a centralized Oracle data repository which stores Environmental Utilities water and wastewater compliance data, as well as providing complex data reporting support. The Historical Data Repository hardware and software systems require upgrades in order to maintain existing functionality and to meet the requirements of Environmental Utilities regulating entities. The budget adjustment will transfer \$3,800,000.00 from the Water and Wastewater Rehabilitation Funds to the HDR System Upgrade project. If the budget is approved, then staff requests approval of the Professional Design Services Agreement with CH2M Hill Engineers, Inc. Total cost of the agreement is \$324,216.00 which will be funded from the HDR System Upgrade project.

CC #: 8181

File #: 0800-02 & 0201-01

CONTACT: Charles Aycock 916-746-1887 caycock@roseville.ca.us

6.30. Electric Software Application Capital Improvement Project - Budget Adjustment

Memo from Electric Business Analyst Lisa Gist and Electric Utility Director Michelle Bertolino recommending Council adopt ORDINANCE NO. 5780 OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AUTHORIZING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016-17 BUDGET AND DECLARING THIS ORDINANCE TO BE IMMEDIATELY EFFECTIVE AS AN APPROPRIATION MEASURE. This item requests approval of a budget adjustment for the Electric Software Application Capital Improvement Project. This project provides funding for the City's new utility billing system. Total cost of the adjustment is \$151,736.00. Funding is available in the Electric Construction Fund.

CC #: 8193

File #: 0800-03 & 0201-01

CONTACT: Lisa Gist 916-774-5677 lgist@roseville.ca.us

6.31. Vehicle Replacement - Budget Adjustments

Memo from Electric Business Analyst Lisa Gist and Electric Utility Director Michelle Bertolino recommending Council adopt ORDINANCE NO. 5782 OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AUTHORIZING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016-17 BUDGET AND DECLARING THIS ORDINANCE TO BE IMMEDIATELY EFFECTIVE AS AN APPROPRIATION MEASURE; and adopt ORDINANCE NO. 5783 OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AUTHORIZING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016-17 BUDGET AND DECLARING THIS ORDINANCE TO BE IMMEDIATELY EFFECTIVE AS AN APPROPRIATION MEASURE. This item

requests approval of two budget adjustments for ten vehicle replacements. Total cost of the adjustments is \$1,055,695. Funding is available as follows: \$702,511.00 in the Electric Construction Fund, \$32,000.00 in the Automotive Replacement Fund, and \$321,184.00 in the Traffic Signals Capital Fund.

CC #: 8207

File #: 0201-01

CONTACT: Lisa Gist 916-774-5677 lgist@roseville.ca.us

6.32. Vehicle Replacement Fund Transfers - Budget Adjustment

Memo from Controller Jacquelyn Flickinger and Finance Director Monty Hanks recommending Council adopt ORDINANCE NO. 5784 OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AUTHORIZING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016-17 BUDGET AND DECLARING THIS ORDINANCE TO BE IMMEDIATELY EFFECTIVE AS AN APPROPRIATION MEASURE. In FY2017, the Electric Department requested to transfer their funding and vehicles in the Vehicle Replacement Fund to the Electric Construction and the Traffic Signal Funds in order to account for these assets within the Electric Funds and on the separately issued Electric Annual Report. There is no impact to the City's General Fund.

CC #: 8208

File #: 0800-03 & 0201-01

CONTACT: Jacquelyn Flickinger 916-774-5516 jflickinger@roseville.ca.us

6.33. Enterprise Resource Planning and 800 MHz Projects - Budget Adjustment

Memo from Controller Jacquelyn Flickinger and Finance Director Monty Hanks recommending Council adopt ORDINANCE NO. 5792 OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AUTHORIZING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016-17 BUDGET AND DECLARING THIS ORDINANCE TO BE IMMEDIATELY EFFECTIVE AS AN APPROPRIATION MEASURE. Staff requests approval of a budget adjustment to transfer \$5,500,000.00 from the General Fund to the General Capital Improvement Project Rehab Fund to fund the Enterprise Resource Planning (replacement of IFAS; \$1,500,000.00) and the 800MHz (\$4,000,000.00) projects.

CC #: 8229

File #: 0201-01 & 0800-03

CONTACT: Jacquelyn Flickinger 916-774-5516 jflickinger@roseville.ca.us

6.34. Staffing and Salary Schedule Changes

Memo from Human Resources Manager Linda Hampton and Human Resources Director Gayle Satchwell recommending Council adopt ORDINANCE NO. 5795 OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 5769, THE SALARY ORDINANCE FOR MANAGEMENT EMPLOYEES, SALARY SCHEDULES A AND B, AS AMENDED BY APPENDIX "G" TO BE EFFECTIVE JANUARY 21, 2017, AS AN URGENCY MEASURE; and adopt ORDINANCE NO. 5796 OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 5774, THE SALARY ORDINANCE FOR ELECTRIC PERSONNEL REPRESENTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, AFL-CIO, LOCAL NO. 1245 (IBEW-A), SALARY SCHEDULES A AND B, AS AMENDED BY

APPENDIX "D" TO BE EFFECTIVE JANUARY 21, 2017, AS AN URGENCY MEASURE. Staff requests deletion of a Meter Services Supervisor and Electric Retail Services Supervisor, a salary increase for Risk Manager and a new classification Electric Customer Programs Supervisor. In addition, staff is requesting Council approve adding the class Electric Utility Inspection Technician to IBEW A & B salary schedules to meet the Electric Department's business needs. Staff is also recommending Council approve an allocation schedule reflecting the deletion of seven vacant allocations, adding one Human Resources Technician, reclassifying two vacant Electric Line Technician allocations to two Electric Utility Inspection Technician allocations and reclassifying an Electric Retail Services Supervisor allocation to an Electric Customer Programs Supervisor. The proposed allocation changes for the Electric Department will result in a fiscal savings of \$16,468.00 and a fiscal impact to the Human Resources Department of \$59,616.00. The remaining \$59,616.00 impact will be funded through the General Fund Contingency Funds.

CC #: 8233

File #: 0600-01

CONTACT: Linda Hampton 916-774-5215 lhampton@roseville.ca.us

Ordinances (for second reading and adoption)

6.35. Second Reading - Municipal Code Amendment - Urban Stormwater

ORDINANCE NO. 5787 OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AMENDING SECTIONS 14.20.020 THROUGH 14.20.060, SECTIONS 14.20.080 THROUGH 14.20.260, SECTIONS 14.20.290 THROUGH 14.20.430 AND SECTIONS 14.20.450 THROUGH 14.20.540 OF CHAPTER 14.20 OF TITLE 14 AND ADDING SECTION 14.20.560 OF CHAPTER 14.20 OF TITLE 14 OF THE ROSEVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING URBAN STORMWATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT AND DISCHARGE CONTROL, for second reading and adoption.

CC #: 8185

File #: 0800-02

CONTACT: Delyn Ellison-Lloyd 916-746-1748 dellison-Lloyd@roseville.ca.us

Reports / Requests

6.36. Insurance Certificate Tracking Policy Change

Memo from Risk Manager David Rawe and Human Resources Director Gayle Satchwell recommending Council approve a change to the City's current insurance certificate tracking process to eliminate the need to track insurance certificates for all contracts and service agreements under \$21,745.00. Contracts and service agreements over \$21,745.00, as well as all contracts and service agreements involving hazardous activities, will continue to be tracked through Ebix, the City's third party administrator. All insurance requirements will remain the same. There is no cost to implement this change; a cost savings will occur.

CC #: 8218

File #: 0600

CONTACT: Dave Rawe 916-774-5207 drawe@roseville.ca.us

6.37. Legislative and Regulatory Platform for State and Federal Advocacy - 2017

Memo from Government Relations Administrator Mark Wolinski and Public Affairs & Communications Director Megan MacPherson with the State and Federal priorities and legislative platform defined as a result of the City Council's articulation of its goals and priorities during legislative updates and the City Council's Legislative Platform Workshop held December 14, 2016. The costs to implement the legislative advocacy program are included in the City's approved budget. The Legislative Platform has no direct fiscal impact to the City's budget; the platform provides policy direction only.

CC #: 8196

File #: 0103-32-02

CONTACT: Mark Wolinski 916-774-5179 mwolinski@roseville.ca.us

6.38. Out-of-State Travel Request - City Manager's Office

Memo from Government Relations Administrator Mark Wolinski and Public Affairs & Communications Director Megan MacPherson recommending Council approve out-of-state travel for City Manager Rob Jensen, Economic Development Director Chris Robles, and Government Relations Administrator Mark Wolinski to participate in the Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce "Capitol-to-Capitol" legislative advocacy program in Washington D.C. on April 28 - May 3, 2017; and approve out-of-state travel for Mayor Rohan to participate in the Capital Region Executive Leadership Mission trip to Washington D.C. on March 12-15, 2017. The estimated cost for travel, hotel and conference attendance for the Capitol-to-Capitol event for three Council members and three City staff is \$21,500.00 and was approved in the General Fund budget for FY2016-17. Funds are available in the General Fund Contingency Fund for FY2016-17 to cover the costs for Mayor Rohan's participation in the Executive Leadership event. The estimated cost for travel and conference attendance to attend the Executive Leadership Mission is \$3,500.00.

CC #: 8235

File #: 0600-02

CONTACT: Mark Wolinski 916-774-5179 mwolinski@roseville.ca.us

Ceremonial Documents

6.39. Resolution of Acknowledgment 316 Vernon Street Time Capsule

The 316 Vernon Street Time Capsule be acknowledged and opened after 50 years.

CC #: 5795

File #: 0102-10

CONTACT: Heather Blanco 916-774-5265 hblanco@roseville.ca.us

END OF CONSENT CALENDAR

7. APPOINTMENTS

7.1. Board and Commission Bi-Annual Vacancies

Memo from Deputy City Clerk Mary Esquivel and City Clerk Sonia Orozco recommending Council appoint five (5) members to the Board of Appeals with terms ending December 31, 2020, from the following nine (9) individuals who submitted applications for consideration: Samson Badal, Pete Constant, Keith Diederich, Bruce Hagler, Denise Hexom, Linda Lane, Herbert Long, Sherry Rutledge, and Brian Stenklyft; appoint two (2) members to the Library Board with terms ending December 31, 2020, from the following eight (8) individuals who submitted applications for consideration: Matthew Bridge, David Dodds, Mike Leclere, Denise Hexom, Barbara Mortkowitz, Ernest Perez, Judith Pinney, and Laxmi Rao; appoint four (4) members to the Parks & Recreation Commission with terms ending December 31, 2020, from the following seventeen (17) individuals who submitted applications for consideration: Matthew Bridge, David Dodds, Eric Eisenhammer, Mike Esparza, Audrey Huisking, Guriqbal Singh Kang, Kristi Kinzel, Allison Kozel, Mike Leclere, Scott Miller, Cynthia Moore, Denis Nishihara, Judith Pinney, Ryan Schrader, Sarah Shanmugam, Robert Smith, and Crystal Spencer; appoint three (3) members to the Personnel Board with terms ending December 31, 2020, from the following seven (7) individuals who submitted applications for consideration: Ellaison Carroll, Herbert Long, Truda Pauly, Laxmi Rao, Sherry Rutledge, Charles Sandoval, and Jonathan Young; appoint four (4) members to the Senior Commission with terms ending December 31, 2020, from the following seven (7) individuals who submitted applications for consideration: Penny Beingessner, Carol Drebin, Gary Hexom, Guriqbal Singh Kang, Bobbi Knapp, Brian Parry, and Jim Williams; appoint three (3) members to the Transportation Commission, with terms ending December 31, 2020, from the following four (4) individuals who submitted applications for consideration: Gary Hexom, Joseph Horton, Cynthia Moore, and Neil Peacock.

CC #: 8210

File #: 0103 & 0103-41-02 & 0103-04-02 & 0103-05-02 & 0103-06-02 & 0103-12-02 & 0103-13-02

CONTACT: Mary Esquivel 916-774-5266 mesquivel@roseville.ca.us

7.2. Appointment to Planning Commission

Memo from Deputy City Clerk Mary Esquivel and City Clerk Sonia Orozco recommending Council appoint (1) one member to the Planning Commission with a term ending June 30, 2018, from the following (9) nine individuals who submitted applications for consideration: Peter Ashby, Samson Badal, Erich Brashears, Paul Frank, Paige Luben, Cynthia Moore, Neil Peacock, Robert Sanchez, Louise (Sandy) Santiago.

CC #: 8211

File #: 0103 & 0103-07-02

CONTACT: Mary Esquivel 916-774-5266 mesquivel@roseville.ca.us

7.3. City Council Appointments to Auxiliary Positions

Memo from City Clerk Sonia Orozco recommending Council approve the appointment of councilmembers to various auxiliary positions on regional and local agencies, boards, commissions, committees, and joint power authorities.

CC #: 8230

File #: 0102-12

CONTACT: Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 sorozco@roseville.ca.us

8. RESOLUTIONS

8.1. American River Basin Study - Memorandum of Agreement

Memo from Public Affairs Administrator Sean Bigley and Environmental Utilities Director Richard Plecker recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-06 APPROVING AN AMERICAN RIVER BASIN STUDY MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT, AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE. This item approves the City, along with other non-federal partners, to participate in the American River Basin Study (ARBS) with the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation). The total cost of the ARBS is \$2,856,000.00 and Reclamation will provide \$830,000.00 as the Federal cost-share partner. The non-Federal Partners will provide \$2.026 million. The City of Roseville's portion of the non-Federal cost share will include \$24,000.00 worth of staff time as an "in kind" contribution; as well as, \$52,000.00 as a cash contribution for a not to exceed amount of \$76,000.00. The \$76,000.00 of Roseville staff time allocated for Roseville's in-kind non-federal contribution and the cash contribution towards the ARBS is funded partially in FY17 with the balance to be budgeted in FY18 funded by Environmental Utilities Water Operations rate revenue.

CC #: 8187

File #: 0800-02

CONTACT: Sean Bigley 916-774-5513 sbigley@roseville.ca.us

8.2. Sites Reservoir Project - Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement, Cost Share Agreement, and Budget Adjustment

Memo from Public Affairs Administrator Sean Bigley and Environmental Utilities Director Richard Plecker recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-19 SUPPORTING THE SITES RESERVOIR PROJECT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE; adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-20 APPROVING THE FOURTH AMENDED AND RESTATED SITES PROJECT AUTHORITY JOINT EXERCISE OF POWERS AGREEMENT, AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE; and adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-21 APPROVING A COST SHARE AGREEMENT FOR SITES RESERVOIR PLANNING AND COORDINATION, BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND PLACER COUNTY WATER AGENCY, AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE; and adopt ORDINANCE NO. 5781 OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AUTHORIZING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016-17 BUDGET AND DECLARING THIS ORDINANCE TO BE IMMEDIATELY EFFECTIVE AS AN APPROPRIATION MEASURE. Staff requests Council authorize the City, in partnership with the Placer County Water Agency, to join the Sites Reservoir Joint Powers Authority and state the City of Roseville's support for the completion and operation of Sites Reservoir due to its projected benefits to Folsom Reservoir and the region's long-term water supply reliability. Participation in Phase 1 of the Sites Reservoir project will cost the City \$70,000.00 funded

through the Water Operations Fund, as an even cost share split with the Placer County Water Agency.

CC #: 8206

File #: 0800-02

CONTACT: Sean Bigley 916-774-5513 sbigley@roseville.ca.us

8.3. HOUSING SUCCESSOR- 304 Washington Boulevard - Exclusive Right to Negotiate Agreement

Memo from Housing Manager Danielle Foster and Economic Development Director Chris Robles recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-13 APPROVING AN EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO NEGOTIATE AGREEMENT FOR DEVELOPMENT OF A MIXED USE PROJECT AT 304 WASHINGTON BOULEVARD, BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND META HOUSING CORPORATION, AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE. This item will allow staff to negotiate exclusively with Meta Housing Corporation on the development of 304 Washington Boulevard, a site held by the Housing Successor for the purpose of affordable housing, for the completion of a mixed-use project, including 70-80 affordable housing units, approximately 3,000 square feet of commercial space and the associated parking spaces.

CC #: 8199

File #: 0709-03-01

CONTACT: Danielle Foster 916-774-5446 dfoster@Roseville.ca.us

9. **ORDINANCES**

9.1. Department Head Salary Changes

Memo from Human Resources Manager Linda Hampton and City Manager Rob Jensen recommending Council adopt ORDINANCE NO. 5793 OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 5769, THE SALARY ORDINANCE FOR MANAGEMENT EMPLOYEES, SALARY SCHEDULE-A, AS AMENDED BY APPENDIX "H" TO BE EFFECTIVE JANUARY 21, 2017, AS AN URGENCY MEASURE; and adopt ORDINANCE 5794 OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 5769, THE SALARY ORDINANCE FOR MANAGEMENT EMPLOYEES, SALARY SCHEDULE-B, AS AMENDED BY APPENDIX "H" TO BE EFFECTIVE JANUARY 21, 2017, AS AN URGENCY MEASURE; and adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-35 APPROVING THE AMENDED MEMORANDUM OF TERMS, CONDITIONS AND UNDERSTANDINGS REGARDING MANAGEMENT AND CONFIDENTIAL EMPLOYEES; and adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-36 APPROVING A SECOND AMENDED AND RESTATED EMPLOYMENT AND PERSONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND ROBERT R. SCHMITT, AND AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE. Staff recommends the approval of the Management salary schedules to reflect a 7.5% salary increase for Police Chief and a 7.5% salary increase for Electric Utility Director in recognition of services and to support retention. Staff also recommends the approval of an amended Management and Confidential Terms, Conditions and Understanding reflecting a 5% one-time, non-PERSable professional development payment for the Chief Financial

Officer. In addition, it is recommended that City Council approve an amended and restated employment and personal services agreement for City Attorney Robert Schmitt which includes a \$7,500.00 one-time, non-PERSable professional development payment. The Electric Utility Director increase has a fiscal impact of \$13,441.00 and can be absorbed in the current Electric Department budget. The remaining \$31,443.00 impact will be funded through the General Fund Contingency Funds.

CC #: 8228

File #: 0600-01

CONTACT: Linda Hampton 916-774-5215 lhampton@roseville.ca.us

9.2. Real Estate Brokerage Services - Professional Services Agreement and Budget Adjustment

Memo from Associate Planner Wayne Wiley and Economic Development Director Chris Robles recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-24 APPROVING A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND CBRE, INC., AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE; and adopt ORDINANCE NO. 5785 OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AUTHORIZING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016-17 BUDGET AND DECLARING THIS ORDINANCE TO BE IMMEDIATELY EFFECTIVE AS AN APPROPRIATION MEASURE. This agreement authorizes CB Richard Ellis, Inc. to prepare Broker Opinions of Value (BOV) and develop a real estate management plan that assesses the viability of selling, leasing, dedicating, or merging 21 City owned properties currently not being utilized for governmental purposes, and to provide leasing services for 6,405 square feet of commercial space at 316 Vernon Street. The budget adjustment will allocate \$10,500.00 from the Building Improvement Fund to cover the cost of preparing the BOV.

CC #: 8213

File #: 1000 & 0201-01

CONTACT: Wayne Wiley 916-774-5283 wwiley@roseville.ca.us

10. SPECIAL REQUESTS/REPORTS/PRESENTATION

10.1. Development Impact Fee Report for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2016

Memo from Administrative Analyst Jeannine Thrash and Finance Director Monty Hanks recommending Council accept informational report required by the State of California which requires certain legal and procedural parameters for the charging of development impact fees for fiscal year ended June 30, 2016 be made available to the public. There is no impact to the City's General Fund.

CC #: 8191

File #: 0215

CONTACT: Jeannine Thrash 916-774-5473 jthrash@roseville.ca.us
Monty Hanks 916-774-5313 mhanks@roseville.ca.us

10.2. Roseville Community Development Corporation - Annual Corporate Update for

FY2015-16, FY2016-17 Budget, and Appointment of Directors

Memo from Administrative Analyst Melissa Hagan and Economic Development Director Chris Robles with an update to City Council regarding the Roseville Community Development Corporation's (RCDC) FY2015-16 audited financial statement report, the RCDC Board-adopted budget for FY2016-17, report to the City Council related to the RCDC's programs, and appointment of Directors. The RCDC's financial activities have no impact on the City's General Fund.

CC #: 8205

File #: 0103-15-02

CONTACT: Chris Robles 916-774-5421 crobles@roseville.ca.us

11. PUBLIC HEARING

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC

City Council, when considering the matter scheduled for hearing, will take the following actions:

1. Open the Public Hearing
2. Presentation by Staff
3. Presentation by applicant or Appellant
4. Accept Public Testimony
5. Appellant or Applicant Rebuttal Period
6. Close the Public Hearing
7. City Council Comments and Questions
8. City Council Action

In the future, if you wish to challenge in court any of the matters on this agenda for which a public hearing is to be conducted, you may be limited to raising only those issues, which you, or someone else raised orally at the Public Hearing or in written correspondence received by the City or before the hearing

Public Hearings listed for continuance will be continued as noted and posting of this agenda serves as notice of continuation.

11.1. 401 Oak Street and Adjacent Properties Purchase and Sale Agreement

Public Hearing continued to the meeting of February 15, 2017.

CC #: 8236

File #: 1003

CONTACT: Laura Matteoli 916-774-5284 lmatteoli@roseville.ca.us

11.2. Adoption of Master Schedule of User and Regulatory Fees

Memo from Administrative Analyst Jeannine Thrash and Finance Director Monty Hanks recommending Council adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-02 ADOPTING A MASTER SCHEDULE OF USER AND REGULATORY FEES, EFFECTIVE MARCH 20, 2017 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2017; and adopt RESOLUTION NO. 17-03 ADOPTING A MASTER SCHEDULE OF USER AND REGULATORY FEES, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2017 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2018; and introduce for first reading ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

AMENDING SECTION 2.36.030 OF CHAPTER 2.36 AND SECTION 2.40.070 OF CHAPTER 2.40 OF TITLE 2, AMENDING SECTIONS 4.50.020 AND 4.50.040 OF CHAPTER 4.50, REPEALING SECTIONS 4.50.050, 4.50.060, 4.50.080, AND 4.50.100 OF CHAPTER 4.50, AND AMENDING SECTION 4.57.030 OF CHAPTER 4.57 OF TITLE 4, AMENDING SECTIONS 7.16.050, 7.16.100, AND 7.16.110 OF CHAPTER 7.16, AMENDING SECTION 7.20.030 OF CHAPTER 7.20, AMENDING SECTION 7.36.110 OF CHAPTER 7.36, AMENDING SECTION 7.48.035 OF CHAPTER 7.48, AMENDING SECTIONS 7.56.010, 7.56.020, AND 7.56.030 OF CHAPTER 7.56, AND REPEALING SECTION 7.56.040 OF CHAPTER 7.56 OF TITLE 7, AMENDING SECTIONS 8.04.070 AND 8.04.080 OF CHAPTER 8.04 OF TITLE 8, AMENDING SECTION 9.17.030 OF CHAPTER 9.17 OF TITLE 9, AMENDING SECTIONS 10.64.060, 10.64.110, 10.64.160 AND 10.64.180 OF CHAPTER 10.64, AMENDING SECTION 10.65.080 OF CHAPTER 10.65 AND AMENDING SECTION 10.66.080 OF CHAPTER 10.66 OF TITLE 10, AMENDING SECTION 11.20.530 OF CHAPTER 11.20 OF TITLE 11, AMENDING SECTION 13.20.070 OF CHAPTER 13.20, AMENDING SECTION 13.21.030 OF CHAPTER 13.21 AND AMENDING SECTION 13.28.070 OF CHAPTER 13.28 OF TITLE 13, AMENDING SECTIONS 14.04.040, 14.04.060, 14.04.065, 14.04.070 AND 14.04.071 OF CHAPTER 14.04, REPEALING 14.04.200 OF CHAPTER 14.04, AMENDING SECTIONS 14.08.105 AND 14.08.130 OF CHAPTER 14.08, AMENDING SECTIONS 14.10.080 AND 14.10.090 OF CHAPTER 14.10, AMENDING SECTION 14.11.050 OF CHAPTER 14.11, AMENDING SECTIONS 14.14.150, 14.14.180, 14.14.210 AND 14.14.360 OF CHAPTER 14.14, AMENDING SECTIONS 14.17.070 AND 14.17.080 OF CHAPTER 14.17, AMENDING SECTIONS 14.20.220, 14.20.230 AND 14.20.240 OF CHAPTER 14.20, AMENDING SECTIONS 14.26.330 AND 14.26.430 OF CHAPTER 14.26 OF TITLE 14, AND AMENDING SECTION 16.04.120 OF CHAPTER 16.04 OF TITLE 16 REGARDING USER AND REGULATORY FEES. Staff recently completed a study to identify the cost of providing various user and regulatory fee-related services. As part of the study, a consolidated schedule of fees was prepared. The schedule of fees identifies services provided by the City and the amounts charged for providing these services. The fiscal impact for FY2016-17 is proposed to be immaterial (~\$0). The majority of fees are proposed to remain unchanged, and new fees proposed will be implemented in the second half of the year. For FY2017-18 the fiscal impact is proposed to be an increase of roughly \$350,000.00. The majority of fees are proposed to increase two percent (2%). Additionally, the City will have a full fiscal year of collections from the increased parks and recreation capital replacement fee, as well as increased animal license fees, vehicle impound fees, and traffic collision report fees.

CC #: 8182

File #: 0215

CONTACT: Jeannine Thrash 916-774-5473 jthrash@roseville.ca.us
Jay Panzica 916-774-5320 jpanzica@roseville.ca.us

12. COUNCIL / STAFF / REPORTS/ COMMENTS

13. ADJOURNMENT



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8190
File #: 0203-21

Title: Cummins Vehicle Parts (RFQ 01-3117) - Reject all Bids
Contact: Joanna Oukrop 916-774-5745 joukrop@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017
Item #: 6.1.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Recommend that all bids received for RFQ 01-3117 for Cummins vehicle parts be rejected. The bids received for this RFQ were deemed non-responsive because they did not meet the bid specifications.

BACKGROUND

The Fleet Services Division has a requirement for Cummins parts to repair and maintain the Fleet vehicles that have "IS" series Cummins engines, like our City buses, refuse trucks, and some of the larger trucks used by our Electric Department. Bidders were asked to quote a representative sampling of the parts that Fleet Services typically orders on a regular basis, and the bid required bidders to provide their percentage discount off of the manufacturer's list price for any items not listed on the pricing worksheet to allow the City to add new parts to the list or replace discontinued parts. The specifications stated that if a vendor did not provide their percentage discount off of list for those items not specifically listed on the spreadsheet, then those vendors would be deemed non-responsive. Norcal Kenworth Company left this area of their bid blank. The bid also specified that the vehicle parts must be quoted freight on board (FOB) to the City of Roseville with delivery included in the price. The bid from Cummins Pacific quoted shipping via common carrier with freight charges prepaid and added, so their bid is also deemed non-responsive. Fleet Services staff will re-issue a new bid at a later date.

A formal bid was issued with the following three responses:

<u>Vendor</u>	<u>Extended Total</u>
Norcal Kenworth Sacramento, CA	\$27,240.14 (before 1/2/17)
Norcal Kenworth Sacramento, CA	\$28,881.12 (after 1/2/17)
Cummins Pacific, LLC West Sacramento, CA	\$32,289.69

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact at this time, since there will be no contract award.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Not applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not apply to activities that will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines §15061(b)(3)). The purchase of Cummins vehicle parts does not include the potential for a significant environmental effect, and therefore is not subject to CEQA.

Respectfully Submitted,

Joanna Oukrop, Senior Buyer

Paul Diefenbach, Central Services Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution No. 17-07

RESOLUTION NO. 17-07

REJECTING ALL BIDS FOR RFQ 01-3117 CUMMINS VEHICLE PARTS

WHEREAS, the City of Roseville requested bids for Cummins parts to repair and maintain fleet vehicles; and

WHEREAS, the bids received did not meet bid specifications; and

WHEREAS, staff desires to reject all bids for RFQ 01-3117 for Cummins vehicle parts;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that all bids for Cummins vehicle parts are hereby rejected.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8192
File #: 0900-03

Title: Douglas Substation Rebuild Phase 2 Civil Construction - Award of Contract
Contact: Ozro Corulli 916-774-5586 ocorulli@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017
Item #: 6.2.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff recommends that City Council approve and authorize the City Manager to execute the contract with RES System 3 LLC., for the second phase of civil construction for the Douglas Substation Rebuild project in the amount of \$847,637.00.

Staff also requests City Council authorize the Electric Utility Director or designee to approve and pay for contract change orders for this project that increase the contract's not-to-exceed amount by no more than 10%.

BACKGROUND

Douglas Substation was originally constructed in the 1960's and due to the age and condition of the equipment, requires rehabilitation. Roseville Electric Utility recently completed the first phase of the rehabilitation including replacement of the substation's 12kV equipment. The second and final phase includes replacement of 60kV breakers, steel structures, control building, and transformer. The civil construction agreement includes all civil work associated with the installation of the new 60kV equipment including constructing foundations, conduits and grounding. The rehabilitation is scheduled for completion late 2017.

On November 2, 2016, City Council approved plans and specifications for the Douglas Substation Rebuild – Phase 2 Civil Construction Project and authorized the Electric Department to advertise and accept bids. Two bids were received and opened in the City Clerk's office on November 29, 2016. Staff is recommending award to RES System 3 LLC., who was deemed responsive and the lowest bidder at \$847,637.00. The second bid amount was \$989,500.00.

FISCAL IMPACT

The lowest responsive bidder is RES System 3 LLC., with a cost of \$847,637.00. Funds for this service are currently budgeted in Roseville Electric Utility's approved FY2017 budget for the Douglas Substation Rebuild project.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Not applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Project implementation was previously evaluated in the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Douglas Substation Rebuild Project (adopted by the City Council March 5, 2013). The civil construction plans and specifications are consistent with the project evaluated in the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and consequently no additional CEQA action is required.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ozro Corulli, Power Engineer

Michelle Bertolino, Electric Utility Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution No. 17-08

Agreement

Site Map

RESOLUTION NO. 17-08

APPROVING AN AGREEMENT BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND
RES SYSTEM 3, LLC, AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON
BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

WHEREAS, an agreement regarding the second phase of civil construction for the
Douglas Substation Rebuild project, by and between the City of Roseville and RES System 3,
LLC, has been reviewed by the City Council; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that
said agreement is hereby approved and that the City Manager is authorized to execute it on
behalf of the City of Roseville, upon receipt of bonds and insurance which have been approved
by the City Attorney's office; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Electric Utility Director shall be authorized to
approve change orders for the Project, consistent with the contract terms, provided that the net
cost of all change orders shall not exceed ten percent (10%) of the contract price.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of
_____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

A G R E E M E N T

THIS AGREEMENT, is made and entered into this _____ day of _____,
20_____, by and between the City of Roseville, a municipal corporation, ("CITY"), and
RES System 3, LLC, a Corporation,
("CONTRACTOR"),

W I T N E S S E T H:

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Roseville, at a meeting held on the 2nd day
of November, 20 16, approved plans and specifications consisting of the General
Conditions for Buildings and Grounds and Special Conditions for the
Douglas Substation Rebuild - Phase 2 Civil Construction

and directed the City Clerk to advertise for sealed proposals for doing said work and providing
that bids be submitted on the 29th day of November, 20 16, and

WHEREAS, the City Clerk, thereafter duly and regularly caused a notice to be published
in the manner and for the time prescribed by law, and

WHEREAS, CONTRACTOR, pursuant to the provisions of said notice duly filed a bid
with the City Clerk, a true copy of which bid is now on file in the office of the City Clerk, and is
hereby referred to and by this reference made a part hereof as fully as if set forth at length herein,
and

WHEREAS, all bids received pursuant to said notice were opened and examined and publicly declared at the time specified in said advertisement for bids and at a meeting of the City Council held on the _____ day of _____, 20_____, the City Council found and declared the bid of CONTRACTOR to be the lowest responsible bid and thereupon awarded a contract to CONTRACTOR to do the work referred to in accordance with the aforementioned specifications,

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereto as follows:

1. THE WORK. CONTRACTOR agrees:

(a) To do the work and furnish all the labor, materials, tools, equipment and insurance required for the Douglas Substation Rebuild Phase 2 in accordance with the Contract Documents (the "Work").

(b) To do and perform the Work contemplated hereby in a good and workmanlike manner under the direction of and to the satisfaction of the Department for Contract Administration as defined in the Contract Documents.

2. PAYMENT. CITY shall pay CONTRACTOR \$847,637.00 for the Work to be done under this contract in accordance with the Contract Documents.

3. CONTRACT DOCUMENTS. The complete Agreement between the parties hereto consists of all of the documents described in section 1-1.12 of the General Conditions.

All Contract Documents are intended to operate so that any work called for in any one and not mentioned in the other, or vice versa, is to be executed the same as if mentioned in all said documents.

4. LIQUIDATED DAMAGES. In the event CONTRACTOR does not complete the work within the time specified, CONTRACTOR agrees that CITY will suffer damages.

Inasmuch as the actual damages which would result from such breach by CONTRACTOR under this Agreement are uncertain, and would be impractical or extremely difficult to fix, CONTRACTOR agrees that it shall pay, or CITY shall deduct from CONTRACTOR's fee, the amount of \$500.00 per day as liquidated damages, in the event of such delay.

5. TIME OF ESSENCE. Time is of the essence of this Agreement.

6. ATTORNEY'S FEES, VENUE, GOVERNING LAW. If either party commences any legal action against the other party arising out of this Agreement or the performance thereof, the prevailing party in such action shall be entitled to recover its reasonable litigation expenses, including but not limited to, court costs, expert witness fees, discovery expenses, and attorneys' fees. Any action arising out of this Agreement shall be brought in Placer County, California, regardless of where else venue may lie. This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of California.

7. INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR. CONTRACTOR shall act as an independent contractor, and covenants and agrees that it will conduct itself consistent with such status, that it will neither hold itself out as, nor claim to be, an officer or employee of CITY by reason of this Agreement.

8. SUCCESSORS IN INTEREST. This Agreement shall be binding upon the heirs, successors, executors, administrators and assigns of the respective parties hereto.

9. MODIFICATION. This Agreement and each provision contained herein may be waived, amended, supplemented or eliminated only by mutual written agreement of the parties.

10. SEVERABILITY. If any of the provisions contained in this Agreement are for any reason held invalid or unenforceable, such holding shall not affect the remaining provisions or the validity and enforceability of the Agreement as a whole.

11. INTEGRATED AGREEMENT. This is an integrated agreement and contains all of the terms, considerations, understanding and promises of the parties. It shall be read as a whole.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the City of Roseville, a municipal corporation, has authorized the execution of this Agreement in duplicate by its City Manager and attestation by its City Clerk under authority of Resolution No. _____, adopted by the Council of the City of Roseville on the ____ day of _____, 20____, and CONTRACTOR has caused this Agreement to be duly executed.

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
a municipal corporation

By: _____
ROB JENSEN
City Manager

CONTRACTOR: RES System 3, LLC

By: _____
Joel Leineke
its: _____
President

ATTEST:

and

By: _____
SONIA OROZCO
City Clerk

By:  _____
Paul Walker
its: Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Business License #: 1008880

By: _____
ROBERT R. SCHMITT
City Attorney



EXHIBIT 'A'

DOUGLAS SUBSTATION

1		KDA	5/10/10	SPCC UPDATE			SL/PSZ	
REV	BY	DATE	DESCRIPTION			TECH/NOI	APPR.	
				JOB NO. 944005				
				ACCOUNT NO. 40001				
TITLE				DRAWING NO. 310C1-09				
ENG. M. FOK		APPR.	SCALE NONE					
DR. C. MAH		DATE 9-7-94						



CITY OF ROSEVILLE
CALIFORNIA
Roseville Electric





COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8197
File #: 0203-09

Title: Miscellaneous Waterworks Materials (RFQ 01-3111) - Purchase Order
Contact: Joanna Oukrop 916-774-5745 joukrop@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017
Item #: 6.3.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Recommending Council adopt a resolution to authorize purchase orders to Ferguson Waterworks and Pace Supply Corporation as the lowest responsive bidders to RFQ 01-3111 for miscellaneous waterworks materials to be purchased on an as needed basis. The estimated total spend through 6-30-17 is \$123,000.00, and the estimated spend for FY2017-18 is \$246,00.00 or up to department budgeted amounts.

The bid allowed for four optional renewal years at one-year intervals. Staff requests authorization to continue utilizing the remaining optional renewal years of the bid contract without further Council approvals until the contract expires or until City staff determines that continuing with the same vendor is not in the City's best interest.

BACKGROUND

Various citywide departments have ongoing requirements for waterworks materials to maintain City facilities and infrastructure. These materials are primarily used for repairs, upgrades, maintenance, and new service additions to the City's water and sewer lines.

Purchasing staff solicited pricing on approximately 471 items as a sampling of products regularly purchased either directly by the end using departments for specific projects or by Purchasing to stock the Central Stores Warehouse supply of waterworks materials. Bidders were asked to quote a quantity of one each of the products that were supplied to obtain the unit price for each item with the bid being awarded by line item. Bidders were also asked to quote a percentage discount off of manufacturer's list price for broad categories of waterworks items such as polyvinyl chloride (PVC), brass fittings, copper, backflows, and air relief valves to provide pricing for all other waterworks items that were not specifically listed in the bid. Ferguson Waterworks and Pace Supply were the only two vendors that submitted bids, so the award for the percentage discounted items will go to the bidder with the highest percentage discount for each product category.

The initial contract is from the date of contract award through 6-30-18. The estimated total award of \$123,000.00 for the remaining months of FY2016-17 and \$246,000.00 for FY2017-18 is derived from historical data and knowledge of future requirements. Funding will be encumbered

as needed for the open purchase orders, and individual purchase orders will be issued on an as needed basis for Central Stores stock purchases.

FISCAL IMPACT

The estimated total value of the award for FY2016-17 and FY2017-18 is \$369,000.00. Funding is included in the FY2016-17 fiscal year budgets for the Water and Sewer Divisions, the REP, and the Central Stores Inventory Replacement account budget. Additionally, funding will be included in the proposed budgets for the various departments' FY2017-18 with spending contingent upon Council approval of budgets.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Not applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not apply to activities that will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines §15061(b)(3)). The purchase of waterworks materials does not include the potential for a significant environmental effect, and therefore is not subject to CEQA.

Respectfully Submitted,

Joanna Oukrop, Senior Buyer

Paul Diefenbach, Central Services Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution No. 17-10

Resolution No. 17-11

RESOLUTION NO. 17-10

APPROVING A PURCHASE ORDER
BETWEEN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND FERGUSON WATERWORKS

WHEREAS, a purchase order for miscellaneous waterworks materials to be purchased on an as needed basis, between the City of Roseville and Ferguson Waterworks, has been reviewed by the Council; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that said purchase order is approved and staff is authorized to execute four renewals of the purchase order provided that the applicable budget is approved by the City Council.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

RESOLUTION NO. 17-11

APPROVING A PURCHASE ORDER
BETWEEN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND PACE SUPPLY CORPORATION

WHEREAS, a purchase order for miscellaneous waterworks materials to be purchased on an as needed basis, between the City of Roseville and Pace Supply Corporation, has been reviewed by the Council; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that said purchase order is approved and staff is authorized to execute four renewals of the purchase order provided that the applicable budget is approved by the City Council.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8195
File #: 0203-09

Title: Itron Water Meter 100+ ERT's and Through-Lid Mounting Kits (RFQ 01-3114) - Purchase Order
Contact: Joanna Oukrop 916-774-5745 joukrop@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017
Item #: 6.4.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Recommend Council authorize purchase orders to Itron, Inc. as the lowest responsive bidder to RFQ 01-3114 for Itron Water Meter 100W+ Encoder Receiver Transmitters (ERT's) and through-lid mounting kits. The purchase orders will be issued on an as needed basis through the duration of the contract period. The cost of 3,750 ERT's and mounting kits for the initial contract period of approximately 18 months from date of award through 6/30/18 is \$267,375.00 plus tax of \$20,053.13 for a total of \$287,428.13 or not to exceed department budgeted amounts.

The bid allows for approximately five and a half years including the initial contract period plus four optional renewal years at one-year intervals. Staff requests authorization to continue renewing the contract without further Council approvals until the contract expires or until City staff determines that continuing with the same vendor is not in the City's best interest pending Council approval of budgets for each year.

BACKGROUND

The Environmental Utilities Water Division has an ongoing requirement for Itron water meter ERT's. The ERT's are required for a variety of situations. 1) ERT's are needed for new water meter installations on new home constructions. 2) When ERT's currently installed on residential water meters are nearing the end of their battery life expectancy of approximately ten years, then the ERT's are replaced as the batteries fail. 3) When existing older technology touch read water meters fail, they are converted to radio read meters that require ERT's. The ERT's are purchased throughout the year and stored as a Central Stores stock item. The estimated quantities to be purchased each year are approximately 2,500 based on historical data and knowledge of future requirements. The initial contract is for approximately 18 months from date of award through 6-30-18.

A formal bid was issued with two vendors responding as follows:

<u>Vendor</u>	<u>ERT Unit Price</u>	<u>Mounting Kit Unit Price</u>	<u>Pre-tax Total</u>
---------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------

Mueller Systems Cleveland, NC	No bid	No bid	No bid
Ittron, Inc. Liberty Lake, WA	\$68.30	\$3.00	\$71.30

FISCAL IMPACT

The estimated cost of the ERT's and mounting kits through 6-30-18 is \$267,375.00 plus tax of \$20,053.13 for a total of \$287,428.13. The purchases are initially made utilizing the Central Stores inventory replacement account with funding ultimately coming from the Water Division's water meter replacement/repair account and the new water meter account. Funding is included in the Water Division's FY2016-17 budget. Purchases made in subsequent years will be contingent upon Council approval of budgets for each year.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Not applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not apply to activities that will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines §15061(b)(3)). The purchase of water meter ERT's does not include the potential for a significant environmental effect, and therefore is not subject to CEQA.

Respectfully Submitted,

Joanna Oukrop, Senior Buyer

Paul Diefenbach, Central Services Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution No. 17-09

RESOLUTION NO. 17-09

APPROVING A PURCHASE ORDER
BETWEEN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND ITRON, INC.

WHEREAS, a purchase order for Itron Water Meter Encoder Receiver Transmitters and through-lid mounting kits, between the City of Roseville and Itron, Inc., has been reviewed by the Council; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that said purchase order is approved and staff is authorized to execute four renewals of the purchase order provided that the applicable budget is approved by the City Council.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8184
File #: 0203-10

Title: Calsense Irrigation Controllers (RFQ 01-3116) - Purchase Order
Contact: Tiffany Valdez 916-774-5708 tvaldez@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017
Item #: 6.5.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Recommend Council authorize a purchase order to Horizon Distributors as the lowest responsive bidder to RFQ 01-3116 for Calsense irrigation controllers. The cost of the controllers is \$25,731.13 plus tax of \$1,929.83 for a grand total of \$27,660.96.

BACKGROUND

In FY2008-09, the Park Operations Division was informed by Motorola that they would no longer be supporting or manufacturing their current irrigation controller hardware and software. If we decide to install new Motorola products, the structural changes will require massive upgrades to continue operating the City's system. With this in mind, Park Operations Division staff performed research to find a new irrigation control system. Staff determined that the Calsense Central Control System was the best fit for our needs and adopted the system as the standard for new construction, as well as replacement to the old operating system.

It's the goal of the Park Operations Division to eventually replace all Motorola controllers within the City. As part of this long-term plan, Park Operations is replacing four irrigation controllers at Santucci Park. Installation will be completed by City staff.

A formal bid was issued where vendors were asked to quote four controllers and meters with three vendors responding as follows:

<u>Vendors</u>	<u>Total Price (quantity 4)</u>
Horizon Distributors Roseville, CA	\$25,731.13
SiteOne Landscape Supply Cleveland, OH	\$26,792.00
Ewing Irrigation Roseville, CA	\$29,434.02

FISCAL IMPACT

The cost of the controllers is \$25,731.13 plus tax of \$1,929.83 for a grand total of \$27,660.96. Funding is included in the Parks Maintenance Division's FY2016-17 budget.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Not applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not apply to activities that will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines §15061(b)(3)). The purchase of irrigation controllers does not include the potential for a significant environmental effect, and therefore is not subject to CEQA.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tiffany Valdez, Buyer

Paul Diefenbach, Central Services Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8215
File #: 0203-01

Title: Ford F250 and F350 Trucks with Utility Bodies (RFQ 01-3113) - Purchase Order
Contact: Tiffany Valdez 916-774-5708 tvaldez@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017
Item #: 6.6.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Recommend Council authorize a purchase order to Harrold Ford as the lowest responsive bidder for RFQ 01-3113 for four $\frac{3}{4}$ ton Ford F250 4x2 trucks with utility bodies to replace vehicle numbers 08-205 and 07-208, and to provide two new fleet additions. The total cost of the vehicles, including tax and options, is \$170,051.87. Funding is included in the FY2016-17 Auto Replacement Budget.

BACKGROUND

The Public Works Street Maintenance Division is purchasing one Ford F250 Utility Body as a replacement for vehicle 08-205. The replacement vehicle is essential for transporting personnel, materials, and tools to various jobsite locations throughout the City. This truck is shared by all sections in Street Maintenance Division including, paving, drainage, signs, markings crews and sweeping.

A second vehicle included in the RFQ was for a Ford F350 Utility Body to replace vehicle 03-381 for the Public Works Street Signs Division. However, the bid came in over budget, so the vehicle will not be purchased in FY2016-17.

The Environmental Utilities Water Distribution Division is purchasing one Ford F250 Utility Body to replace vehicle 07-208 and requests the addition of two Ford F250 Utility Body trucks. These two vehicles are being requested for newly added Water Distribution Worker II positions. The Water Distribution group is responsible for meeting state regulatory requirements such as weekly water sample collections, testing prevention devices, as well as the maintenance of water meters and the City's emergency back-up ground water pumping facilities. Each group requires one additional F250 to meet these requirements.

The F250 truck type "A" was included in the RFQ, but will be purchased later in the fiscal year.

Bidders were asked to quote Ford 250 and Ford350 trucks using four different diamond truck bodies with the following model numbers: 16-42-96-OT-B49, 19-42-96-OT-B43, 16-33-96-CT-B49, 19-38-108-OT-B-56. The bid specified that the contract would be awarded by line item

according to each truck type.

A formal bid was issued with two vendors responding as follows:

<u>Vendor</u>	<u>F250 "A"</u> Quantity 1	<u>F250 "B"</u> Quantity 3	<u>F250 "C"</u> Quantity 1	<u>F350 "D"</u> Quantity 1
Harrold Ford Sacramento, CA	\$35,362.12	\$121,937.25	\$31,298.62	\$46,193.35
Downtown Ford Sales Sacramento, CA	\$39,823.00	\$134,937.00	\$32,943.00	\$49,986.00

Vehicle replacements are based on the Fleet Scoring System which considers factors such as age, miles, reliability, prior maintenance and repair costs, and current condition. Below are the vehicle replacement scores.

Vehicle ID	Replacement Score	Vehicle Condition
08-205	27	Meets City replacement criteria
07-208	25	Meets City replacement criteria

FISCAL IMPACT

The total cost of the vehicles, including tax and options, is \$170,051.87. Funding is included in the FY2016-17 Auto Replacement Budget.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Not applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not apply to activities that will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines §15061(b)(3)). The purchase of vehicles does not include the potential for a significant environmental effect, and therefore is not subject to CEQA.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tiffany Valdez, Buyer

Paul Diefenbach, Central Services Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8203

File #: 0704-01

Title: Sculpture Park Cosmos Painting (RFQ 01-3109) - Service Agreement

Contact: Brandon Mendonca 916-774-5724 bmendonca@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 6.7.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Recommend Council authorize a service agreement to Horizon Brothers Painting as the lowest responsive bidder for RFQ 01-3109 to paint the Cosmos structure at Roseville's Sculpture Park. The total cost of the painting project is \$24,725.00. Additionally, adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to sign the agreement.

BACKGROUND

The Parks, Recreation and Libraries Department has a requirement to paint the City's Cosmos structure at Sculpture Park. The structure is being painted to stay on target with its maintenance cycle and to repair areas of the structure where the paint is blistering and peeling. The new paint coating is designed to last longer and will make graffiti abatement easier.

A formal bid was issued with seven vendors responding as follows:

<u>Vendor</u>	<u>Total</u>
Anchor Singh Painting Sacramento, CA	\$125,000.00
A Plus Painting Roseville, CA	\$94,350.00
JPB Design Inc. Sacramento, CA	\$68,700.00
River City Painting Inc. Sacramento, CA	\$42,222.00
D & H Painting Sacramento, CA	\$37,086.00
Quality Painting & Construction Inc.	\$33,950.00

San Francisco, CA

**Horizon Brothers Painting
Rio Linda, CA**

\$24,725.00

FISCAL IMPACT

The total cost of the painting services is \$24,725.00. Funding is included in the FY2016-17 Parks, Recreation and Libraries Department's budget.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Not applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The proposed project involves the maintenance of an existing facility. This activity is categorically exempt from CEQA as a Class 1 Exemption (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15301). The Exemption has been prepared and no further CEQA action is required.

Respectfully Submitted,

Brandon Mendonca, Buyer

Paul Diefenbach, Central Services Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution No. 17-17

Signed SA

RESOLUTION NO. 17-17

APPROVING A SERVICE AGREEMENT
BETWEEN CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND HORIZON BROTHERS PAINTING, AND
AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF
ROSEVILLE

WHEREAS, a service agreement (Service Agreement No. S1704315) between City of Roseville and Horizon Brothers Painting, for Sculpture Park Cosmos Painting, has been reviewed by the City Council; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that said service agreement is approved and that the City Manager is authorized to execute it on behalf of the City of Roseville.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:


NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk



PURCHASING
CITY OF ROSEVILLE

2005 HILLTOP CIRCLE, ROSEVILLE, CA 95747
(916) 774-5720 • TDD (916) 774-5220 • FAX (916) 774-5736

SERVICE AGREEMENT

SERVICE AGREEMENT

No: **S1704315**

SERVICE LOCATION: AS DIRECTED

REQ. NO.: R1714634 DATE: 11/30/2016

SUBMIT ALL INVOICES TO:

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
Finance Department
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

Department: PARK MAINTENANCE

Acct. Code: 00680-5341

Buyer: BRANDON MENDONCA
Phone: 916.774.5724

Contractor No.: V41192
Telephone No.: 916.991-3439 Fax:
Email address: hbptg.c33@gmail.com
Contractor: HORIZON BROTHERS PAINTING
ATTN: EMMANUEL ROZAKIS
5915 26TH STREET
RIO LINDA, CA 95673

Start Date	Terms	Completion Date	Insurance Limits	Contact
EXECUTED AGREEMENT	NET 30	FINAL PAYMENT	Approved by Risk Mgt.	DAVE SALTER

The contractor shall furnish all labor, equipment and materials necessary to accomplish the following:
VENDOR SHALL PROVIDE MATERIALS AND LABOR TO PAINT THE DESIGNATED MONUMENT STRUCTURE "COSMOS" AT SCULPTURE PARK 350 NORTH SUNRISE AVE. IN ACCORDANCE WITH ALL SPECIFICATIONS, TERMS, CONDITIONS AND ATTACHMENTS OF RFQ 01-3109.

PLEASE CONTACT DAVE SALTER AT (916) 746 1783 FOR QUESTIONS REGARDING THIS AGREEMENT.

Total Cost of Service: \$ **24,725.00**

ATTENTION: Total cost of service not to exceed the agreement amount without prior approval of the Purchasing Office.

The Contractor named hereon by the acceptance of this order agrees to the provisions of this document titled "Service Agreement" and Attachment "A".

Business License No.: _____ Contractor License No.: 977168 DIR Registration No.: 1000005362

☐ SOLE PROPRIETOR

☒ PARTNERSHIP

☐ CORPORATION

CONTRACTOR:


SIGNATURE

Dimitrios P. Rozakis
PRINT NAME

Co-owner.
TITLE

CONTRACTOR:

SIGNATURE

PRINT NAME

TITLE

By: _____

Rob Jensen, City Manager
CITY OF ROSEVILLE, A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8202
File #: 0900-06

Title: Roseville Police Department Roof Repair (RFQ 01-3101) - Service Agreement
Contact: Babette Owens 916-774-5704 bowens@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017
Item #: 6.8.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Recommend Council authorize a service agreement with DK Enterprises, Inc. dba King's Roofing as the lowest responsive bidder for RFQ 01-3101 for the materials and labor for the Roseville Police Department roof repair. The total cost of service is \$73,407.00. In addition, adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to sign the attached service agreement.

BACKGROUND

The Roseville Police Department's roof is failing at the parking garage deck, second floor balcony, and the generator landing deck which has resulted in secondary issues, such as water damage within the parking garage. In order to mitigate future issues and correct existing problems, staff has determined that these areas need to be repaired to new condition. The bid included three separate areas, however, because the lowest bid received was over the department approved budget, staff decided to eliminate the second floor balcony from the bid since it is not critical to the operations or integrity of the building.

A formal bid was issued where vendors were asked to quote the price to repair the roof at (3) separate locations at the police department. The bid amounts are based on the lowest responsive bidder for the combined total of Area A and Area C.

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Area A</u>	<u>Area C</u>
Brazos Urethane Fresno, CA	\$65,395.00	\$34,360.00
Waterproofing Associates, Inc. Mountain View, CA	\$77,800.00	\$22,400.00
Madsen Roofing & Waterproofing, Inc. Sacramento, CA	\$67,995.00	\$19,726.00
Kings Roofing Sacramento, CA	\$56,307.00	\$17,100.00

FISCAL IMPACT

The total cost of the roof repairs is \$73,407.00. Funding is included in the Central Services Facilities Rehab Fund FY2016-17 budget.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Not applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The proposed project involves the repair of an existing facility. This activity is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as a Class 1 Exemption (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15301). The exemption has been prepared and no further CEQA action is required.

Respectfully Submitted,

Babette Owens, Buyer

Paul Diefenbach, Central Services Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution No. 17-16

Signed Service Agreement

RESOLUTION NO. 17-16

APPROVING A SERVICE AGREEMENT
BETWEEN CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND DK ENTERPRISES, INC. DBA KING'S
ROOFING, AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF
OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

WHEREAS, a service agreement (Service Agreement No. S1703515) between City of DK Enterprises, Inc. dba King's Roofing, for Roseville Police Department roof repair, has been reviewed by the City Council; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that said service agreement is approved and that the City Manager is authorized to execute it on behalf of the City of Roseville.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:


NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk



PURCHASING
CITY OF ROSEVILLE

2005 HILLTOP CIRCLE, ROSEVILLE, CA 95747
(916) 774-5720 • TDD (916) 774-5220 • FAX (916) 774-5736

SERVICE AGREEMENT

SERVICE AGREEMENT

No: **S1703515**

SERVICE LOCATION: ROSEVILLE POLICE DEPT.
1051 JUNCTION BLVD.
ROSEVILLE, CA 95678

REQ. NO.: R1714582 DATE: 10/25/16

SUBMIT ALL INVOICES TO:

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
Finance Department
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

Contractor No.:
Telephone No.: (209) 595-9902 Fax:
Email address: daryl@kingsroofing.net
Contractor: DK ENTERPRISES, INC.
DBA KING'S ROOFING
ATTN: DARYL PARADISO
6963 POWER INN ROAD
SACRAMENTO, CA 95828

Department: BUILDING MAINTENANCE

Acct. Code: 91021-6130/179406-45

Buyer: BABETTE OWENS
Phone: (916) 774-5704

Start Date	Terms	Completion Date	Insurance Limits	Contact
UPON COUNCIL APPROVAL	NET 30	Upon Payment of Final Invoice	Approved by Risk Mgt.	CHARLIE FRALICK

The contractor shall furnish all labor, equipment and materials necessary to accomplish the following:
VENDOR SHALL PROVIDE MATERIALS AND LABOR TO REPAIR/REPLACE THE DESIGNATED ROOF AREAS (ROOF AREA "A"
PARKING GARAGE DECK AND ROOF AREA "C" GENERATOR LANDING DECK) AT THE ROSEVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT
IN ACCORDANCE WITH ALL SPECIFICATIONS, TERMS, CONDITIONS, AND ATTACHMENTS OF RFQ 01-3101.

PLEASE CONTACT CHARLIE FRALICK AT (916)774-5706 FOR QUESTIONS REGARDING THIS AGREEMENT.

Total Cost of Service: \$ **73,407.00**

ATTENTION: Total cost of service not to exceed the agreement amount without prior approval of the Purchasing Office.

The Contractor named hereon by the acceptance of this order agrees to the provisions of this document titled "Service Agreement" and Attachment "A".

Business License No.: 00823902 Contractor License No.: 576154 DIR Registration No.: 1000000711

☐ SOLE PROPRIETOR

☐ PARTNERSHIP

☒ CORPORATION

CONTRACTOR:

SIGNATURE

David King

PRINT NAME

President

TITLE



CONTRACTOR:

SIGNATURE

PRINT NAME

TITLE

By: _____
Rob Jensen, City Manager
CITY OF ROSEVILLE, A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8216
File #: 0203-04

Title: General Construction and Repair - Service Agreements
Contact: Dan Allen 916-774-5741 dallen@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017
Item #: 6.9.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Recommend Council adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to sign a service agreement (S170532A) with Bullard Construction in the amount of \$200,000 and a service agreement (S170533A) with Rudolph & Sletten in the amount of \$200,000 to provide miscellaneous construction services and repairs on an as needed basis. Funding for these agreements are included in the Building Maintenance Division, Environmental Utilities, Electric, and Parks Maintenance fiscal year budget a FY2016-17 and proposed FY2017-18 Budgets.

BACKGROUND

The Central Services Department released an RFP to provide the City with miscellaneous construction services and repairs on a as needed basis throughout the city. Three companies submitted proposals and the proposals were evaluated on overall proposal, cost, qualifications and experience. Rudolph & Sletten and Bullard Construction were rated the highest and staff is recommending each be awarded a service agreement to increase responsiveness.

FISCAL IMPACT

The combined value of the two service agreements is \$400,000.00, not to exceed annual budgeted amounts. Funding for these agreements are included in the Building Maintenance Division, Environmental Utilities, Electric, and Parks Maintenance fiscal year budget a FY2016-17 and proposed FY2017-18 Budgets.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Not applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The purchase of construction services is not considered a "project" as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (CEQA Guidelines §15378). Consequently no CEQA action is

required.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dan Allen, Facility Manager

Paul Diefenbach, Central Services Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution No. 17-22

Bullard Service Agreement

Resolution No. 17-23

Rudolph & Sletten Service Agreement

RESOLUTION NO. 17-22

APPROVING A SERVICE AGREEMENT
BETWEEN CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND BULLARD, INC., AND AUTHORIZING THE
CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

WHEREAS, a service agreement (Service Agreement No. S170532A) between City of Roseville and Bullard, Inc., for general construction services, has been reviewed by the City Council; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that said service agreement is approved and that the City Manager is authorized to execute it on behalf of the City of Roseville.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk



Attached is a copy of a service agreement for your review and acceptance. Please review the company name, address, and contact information and notify me via email if any corrections need to be made. I will update the agreement prior to you signing the document.

Sign the agreement using the below signature guidelines. Alterations or modifications to the agreement are not allowed. Mail **two signed original** copies of the agreement to the address noted below. Faxes, photocopies, and electronic transmittals will not be accepted. Upon receipt of all necessary documents, the City will sign the agreements and return a fully executed original copy to you. Receipt of the signed copy will be your notice to proceed with the work in accordance with the terms and conditions of the service agreement. Work must not begin until the contract has been fully executed.

The following guidelines must be followed for the signature block on the Service Agreement:

Sole proprietorship - By owner

Partnership - Any general partner

Corporation - Two options:

(1) A signature from the President and the corporate seal; or


(2) One signature from the Chairman of the Board, President, or any Vice President AND one signature from the Secretary, any Assistant Secretary, Chief Financial Officer, Treasurer, or any Assistant Treasurer of the corporation

*General Manager, Office Manager and/or Sales Manager are **not** Corporate officer titles. The service agreement will be rejected if not signed in accordance with these guidelines.

Insurance requirements:

The City's insurance requirements are referenced on Attachment A in this service agreement packet. The service agreement will not be considered active or valid until the necessary insurance documents have been received by Roseville's insurance compliance contractor, EBIX. Please contact EBIX customer service at (951) 652-4239 or roseville@ebix.com for any insurance related questions.

**Service Agreement Return Address:
Purchasing, Joanna Oukrop
2005 Hilltop Circle
Roseville, CA 95747-9704**



PURCHASING
CITY OF ROSEVILLE

2005 HILLTOP CIRCLE, ROSEVILLE, CA 95747
(916) 774-5720 • TDD (916) 774-5220 • FAX (916) 774-5736

SERVICE AGREEMENT

SERVICE AGREEMENT

No: **S170532A**

SERVICE LOCATION: AS DIRECTED

REQ. NO.: R1714974 DATE: 12/2/16

SUBMIT ALL INVOICES TO:

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
Finance Department
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

Contractor No.: V30539
Telephone No.: (916)486-3641 Fax: (916)485-4388
Email address: paul@bullardinc.net
Contractor: BULLARD, INC.
ATTN: MATT KARTCHNER
3132 AUBURN BLVD.
SACRAMENTO, CA 95821

Department: CENTRAL SERVICES

Acct. Code: 03331-5100
VARIOUS

Buyer: JOANNA OUKROP
Phone: (916)774-5745

Start Date	Terms	Completion Date	Insurance Limits	Contact
Executed Agreement	NET 30	1/18/18	Approved by Risk Mgt.	TISHA CHINN/CHARLIE FRALICK

The contractor shall furnish all labor, equipment and materials necessary to accomplish the following:

THE VENDOR SHALL PROVIDE GENERAL CONSTRUCTION SERVICES ON AN AS NEEDED BASIS IN ACCORDANCE WITH ALL SPECIFICATIONS, TERMS, CONDITIONS AND ATTACHMENTS OF THE CITY'S REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NUMBER 01-011 AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ATTACHED BULLARD, INC. PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL DATED 11/7/16. ALL WORK MUST BE QUOTED AND APPROVED IN ADVANCE BY AN AUTHORIZED MEMBER OF THE CITY'S BUILDING MAINTENANCE DIVISION.

PLEASE CONTACT CHARLIE FRALICK AT (916)774-5706 OR TISHA CHINN AT (916)774-5702 FOR QUESTIONS REGARDING THIS AGREEMENT.

Note: The total cost of service below is an approximate value only. The City does not guarantee whatsoever the actual amount to be spent.

Total Cost of Service: \$ **200,000.00**

ATTENTION: Total cost of service not to exceed the agreement amount without prior approval of the Purchasing Office.

The Contractor named hereon by the acceptance of this order agrees to the provisions of this document titled "Service Agreement" and Attachment "A".

Business License No.: 008071479 Contractor License No.: 1002120 DIR Registration No.: 1000024551

☐ SOLE PROPRIETOR ☐ PARTNERSHIP ☒ CORPORATION

CONTRACTOR: [Signature] PAUL D. LINSTEDT SECRETARY
SIGNATURE PRINT NAME TITLE

CONTRACTOR: [Signature] MATTHEW KARTCHNER V.P.
SIGNATURE PRINT NAME TITLE

By: _____
Rob Jensen, City Manager

1. To the fullest extent allowed by law, Contractor shall defend, indemnify, and save and hold harmless the City, its officers, agents, employees and volunteers from any claims, suits or actions of every name, kind and description brought forth, or on account of, injuries to or death of any person (including but not limited to workers and the public), or damage to property, resulting from or arising out of Contractor's willful misconduct or negligent act or omission while engaged in the performance of obligations or exercise of rights created by this Agreement, except those matters arising from City's sole or active negligence or willful misconduct. The parties intend that this provision shall be broadly construed. Contractor's responsibility for such defense and indemnity obligations shall survive the termination or completion of this Agreement for the full period of time allowed by law. The defense and indemnity obligations of this Agreement are undertaken in addition to, and shall not in any way be limited by, the insurance obligations contained in this Agreement.
2. Contractor is an independent contractor, and shall not be considered an officer, agent or employee of the City.
3. Without the written consent of the City, this Agreement is not assignable by Contractor either in whole or in part.
4. Time is of the essence of this Agreement.
5. At any time during the term of this Agreement, the City has the right to terminate this Agreement provided Contractor is given a thirty (30) day notice.
6. This Agreement may only be amended or modified in writing. It is integrated and contains the complete understanding of the parties.
7. All equipment, supplies and services sold to the City of Roseville shall conform to the general safety orders of the State of California.
8. Unless notified to the contrary, in writing, the City assumes that the Contractor has accepted the work in accordance with the plans and specifications (if any) and agrees to do the work in compliance with this Agreement.
9. All prevailing wages and fair employment practices must be adhered to. For prevailing wage contracts over \$25,000, copies of certified payroll must be submitted with invoices. Prevailing wage rates may be obtained from the State Department of Industrial Relations and/or the following website address: <http://www.dir.ca.gov/dlsr/DPreWageDetermination.htm>.
- 10a. Unless otherwise specified, the Contractor shall maintain the policies of insurance outlined in Attachment A, incorporated herein by this reference, in full force and effect during the term of this Agreement. The City of Roseville retains sole discretion in determining the types and proper levels of insurance coverage.
- 10b. Form. Contractor shall submit a certificate evidencing such coverage for the period covered by this Agreement in a form satisfactory to Risk Management and the City Attorney, prior to undertaking any work hereunder. Any insurance written on a claims made basis is subject to the approval of Risk Management and the City Attorney.
- 10c. Additional Insureds. Contractor shall also provide a separate endorsement or section of the policy showing City, its officers, agents, employees, and volunteers as additional insureds for each type of coverage (except Workers' Compensation) and for ongoing and completed operations. Such insurance shall specifically cover the contractual liability of Contractor. The additional insured coverage under the Contractor's policy shall be primary and noncontributory, as evidenced by a separate endorsement or section of the policy, and shall not seek contribution from City's insurance or self-insurance. In addition, the additional insured coverage shall be at least as broad as the Insurance Services Office ("ISO") CG 20 01 Endorsement. Any available insurance proceeds in excess of the specified minimum insurance coverage requirements and limits shall be available to the additional insureds. Furthermore, the requirements for coverage and limits shall be: (1) the minimum coverage and limits specified in this Agreement; or (2) the full coverage and maximum limits of any insurance proceeds available to the named insureds, whichever is greater.
- 10d. Cancellation/Modification. Contractor shall provide ten (10) days written notice to City prior to cancellation or modification of any insurance required by this Agreement.
- 10e. Umbrella/Excess Insurance. The limits of insurance required in this Agreement may be satisfied by a combination of primary and excess insurance. Any excess insurance shall contain or be endorsed to contain a provision that such coverage shall also apply on a primary and noncontributory basis for the benefit of City (if agreed to in a written contract) before City's own insurance shall be called upon to protect it as a named insured.
- 10f. Subcontractors. Contractor agrees to include in its contracts with all subcontractors the same requirements and provisions of this Agreement, including the indemnity and insurance requirements, to the extent they apply to the scope of the subcontractor's work. Furthermore, Contractor shall require its subcontractors to agree to be bound to Contractor and City in the same manner and to the same extent as Contractor is bound to City under this Agreement. Additionally, Contractor shall obligate its subcontractors to comply with these same provisions with respect to any tertiary subcontractor, regardless of tier. A copy of City's indemnity and insurance provisions will be furnished to the subcontractor or tertiary subcontractor upon request.
- 10g. Self-Insured Retentions. All self-insured retentions ("SIR") must be disclosed to Risk Management for approval and shall not reduce the limits of liability. Policies containing any SIR provision shall provide or be endorsed to provide that the SIR may be satisfied by either the named insured or City. City reserves the right to obtain a full certified copy of any insurance policy and endorsements. The failure to exercise this right shall not constitute a waiver of such right.
- 10h. Waiver of Subrogation. Contractor hereby agrees to waive subrogation which any insurer of Contractor may acquire from Contractor by virtue of the payment of any loss under a Workers Compensation, Commercial General Liability or Automobile Liability policy. All Workers Compensation, Commercial General Liability and Automobile Liability policies shall be endorsed with a waiver of subrogation in favor of City, its officers, agents, employees and volunteers for all work performed by Contractor, its employees, agents and subcontractors.
- 10i. Liability/Remedies. Insurance coverage in the minimum amounts set forth herein shall not be construed to relieve Contractor of liability in excess of such coverage, nor shall it preclude City from taking such other actions as are available to it under any other provisions of this Agreement or law.
11. Contractor shall comply with all federal, state and local laws and ordinances, including but not limited to the City's storm water regulations, as may be applicable to the performance of services under this Agreement. Failure to comply with local ordinances

may result in monetary fines and cancellation of this Agreement. Refer to www.roseville.ca.us/stormwater for links to more information on the City's storm water regulations.

12. In the event that the terms of any attachment or exhibit conflict with any terms of this Service Agreement, the terms of this Service Agreement shall control.
13. This Agreement may be executed in one or more counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, but all of which together shall constitute one and the same instrument. In the event that any signature is delivered by facsimile transmission or by e-mail delivery of a ".pdf" format data file, such signature shall create a valid and binding obligation of the party executing (or on whose behalf such signature is executed) with the same force and effect as if such facsimile or ".pdf" signature page were an original thereof.
14. If either party commences any legal action against the other party arising out of this Agreement or the performance thereof, the prevailing party in such action shall be entitled to recover its reasonable litigation expenses, including but not limited to, court costs, expert witness fees, discovery expenses, and attorneys' fees. Any action arising out of this Agreement shall be brought in Placer County, California, regardless of where else venue may lie. This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of California.
15. This Agreement shall be binding upon the heirs, successors, executors, administrators and assigns of the respective parties hereto.
16. If any of the provisions contained in this Agreement are for any reason held invalid or unenforceable, such holding shall not affect the remaining provisions or the validity and enforceability of the Agreement as a whole.
17. No contractor or subcontractor may work on a public works project unless registered with the Department of Industrial Relations pursuant to Labor Code section 1725.5. During the performance of this agreement, Contractor and its subcontractors shall have a continuing legal obligation to maintain current registration with the Department of Industrial Relations. Contractor is hereby notified that this project is subject to compliance monitoring and enforcement by the Department of Industrial Relations.

<i>City reserves the right to withhold any payments to Contractor in the event of noncompliance with insurance requirements or if required by law.</i>
--



ATTACHMENT A
HUMAN RESOURCES/RISK MANAGEMENT DIVISION
INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS
SERVICE AGREEMENT

General - Required Coverage/Documentation

- General Liability: \$1 Million per occurrence
\$2 Million aggregate
- Automobile Liability: \$1 Million combined single limit
- Workers' Compensation: Statutory *Must provide a Waiver of subrogation
- Additional Insured Endorsement (AIE) - General Liability policy: CG 20 38 04 13 or an equivalent, blanket endorsement or section of the policy. Endorsement shall cover the City of Roseville, its officers, agents, employees and volunteers as additional insured
- Policies must be primary and non-contributory
- A 30 day notice of cancellation must be provided
- List certificate holder as: The City of Roseville -Insurance Compliance
PO Box 12010-R1
Hemet, CA 92546-8010

Additional Liability Requirements if required by Agreement (and marked below):

Construction	Design Professional	Chemical/Environmental
General Liability: \$2 Million/occurrence \$4 Million aggregate	General Liability: \$2 Million/occurrence \$4 Million aggregate Professional Liability \$2 Million/occurrence	General Liability: \$3 Million/occurrence \$6 Million aggregate, Pollution – \$2 Million/Occurrence Auto - \$2 Million/Occurrence
IT Services	Professional Consultant	Hazardous Materials
Professional Liability: \$1 Million/occurrence No auto required	Professional Liability: \$1 Million/occurrence	Pollution Liability: \$1 Million/occurrence
Special Events/Caterers/Vendors	Professional Counseling/Psychological	Pyrotechnics
No auto required No workers' comp required	Professional Liability: \$1 Million/occurrence No auto required	General Liability: \$5 Million/occurrence \$10 Million aggregate Auto - \$2 Million/Occurrence

Insurance Submission Process

The City of Roseville Human Resources/Risk Management Department uses a service called EBIX to manage our insurance certificate tracking.

How It Works

- The vendor's contact information is entered into EBIX. EBIX will contact the vendor to request proof of insurance.
- The Vendor can forward the request to their Insurance Agent(s) if necessary.
- Vendor/Insurance Agent submits insurance to EBIX by email to roseville@ebix.com or by fax to (770) 325-5727. After faxing or emailing the certificate, please **DO NOT** send the certificate by mail to EBIX. Please do not mail, email or fax any certificates to the City of Roseville.
- Once submitted, EBIX reviews the insurance documentation. If there are deficiencies, EBIX will send a follow up letter or email requesting additional information.

Questions Regarding Insurance Submission: Contact EBIX at (951) 652-4239
Questions Regarding Insurance Requirements Contact Risk Management at (916) 774-5202

Asbestos-Containing Materials in City-Owned Buildings

California Health and Safety Code Section 25915 requires that all City of Roseville employees, contractors and lessees be notified annually of the presence of asbestos in City-owned buildings constructed prior to 1979. Please post this notice in an area(s) accessible to all employees, contractors and lessees. Contact Facility Maintenance & Operations at (916) 774-5740 for more information about Asbestos Containing Materials (ACMs) in specific City-owned buildings. For more information about asbestos refer to the OSHA website.

The City of Roseville is committed to maintaining a safe and healthy work environment. The City's Facility Maintenance & Operations staff conducts ongoing inspections to identify and safely manage previously installed asbestos-containing products. Renovation of City-owned buildings **MUST** be reviewed in advance by Facility Maintenance & Operations to ensure the City is in compliance with building codes, Americans with Disabilities Act and that no ACMs are disturbed without proper safeguards. Work that requires removal or repair of ACMs is restricted to trained and qualified persons only. **Facility Maintenance & Operations will need to approve the qualified contractors.**

Use the following measures to protect you and others from exposure to airborne asbestos:

- Presume all building materials contain asbestos until determined otherwise by Facility Maintenance & Operations.
- Do not install walls, closets, cabinets, ceilings.
- Do not remove, cut, drill, sand, grind or otherwise disturb any material in the buildings, including carpet and tile.
- Do not paint (this includes any walls, ceilings, floors and electrostatic painting of office furniture).
- Do not remove any items nailed or screwed to the walls (this includes pictures, cabinets, electrical, etc.).
- Do not go above ceilings, behind walls or into building spaces such as attics and crawlspaces unless these areas have been inspected and cleared by Facility Maintenance & Operations.
- Do not pull cable or wiring through above-ceiling spaces with asbestos.
- Do not install screws, pins, nails or hangers into asbestos ceiling or wall plaster.
- Be careful not to damage walls, ceilings or floors when moving furniture or equipment. It is recommended that Facility Maintenance & Operations be contacted prior to moving furniture or equipment.
- Do not brush, sweep or vacuum textured asbestos ceiling plaster or plaster debris.
- Immediately report any damage or deterioration of suspect building materials to Facility Maintenance & Operations or Risk Management.

It is important to note that the presence of asbestos does not mean you have been exposed. Exposure results when friable asbestos particles are inhaled or ingested. Asbestos becomes friable when material containing asbestos is drilled, sanded or disturbed by remodeling or demolition work or when the ACM has deteriorated. Intact, bonded, sealed or undisturbed asbestos does not pose a hazard.

Employees may review the asbestos survey reports, results of bulk sampling or air monitoring conducted in City-owned buildings. All asbestos data will be available by appointment with Facility Maintenance & Operations.

Facilities Built Pre 1979 That May Contain Asbestos	Year Built
Downtown Library - 225 Taylor Street 95678	1974
Carnegie Museum - 557 Lincoln Street 95678	1912
Tower Theatre - 415 Vernon Street 95678	1940
*401 Oak Street 95678	1974
Fire Station #3 - 1300 Cirby Way 95661	1963
Old Corp Yard - 100 Old Corp Yard Road 95678	1940
Water Treatment Plant Operations Bldg.- 9595 Barton Road 95746	1965
Waste Water Treatment Plant Operations Bldg. - 1800 Booth Road 95747	1962
Royer Recreation Bldg. - 190 Park Drive 95678	1950
Fire Museum - 400 Lincoln Street 95678	1930
Diamond Oaks Golf - 349 Diamond Oaks Road 95678	1965
Johnson Pool, 4th & D Street	1950
330 Vernon Street	1940
107 Sutter Avenue	1962

* Indicates facility has known asbestos

Sign to acknowledge receipt of asbestos notification		
SIGNATURE	COMPANY NAME	DATE



Response to RFP: General Construction Services #01-011

City of Roseville
Attn: City Clerk Dept.
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA
95678



November 7, 2016

Mr. Dan Allen
City of Roseville
2005 Hilltop Circle
Roseville, CA 95747

RE: **REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS: General Construction Services # 01-011.**

Dear Mr. Allen:

Bullard Construction is very appreciative of the opportunity to present this proposal for **General Construction Services**.

To assist the City in the successful delivery of this project, we have identified a group of outstanding professionals to support the project team's efforts. Highlights of our staff and proposal are summarized below.

Preconstruction and Construction Management - **Matt Kartchner** will serve as Project Manager for Bullard Construction. Matt will be committed to providing a quick response to each of the City's requests for services. Once a work order is defined and improvements are scheduled, we anticipate that our **Jon Coffman** will be our field superintendent.

Commitment – We appreciate the confidence you have shown in our abilities by inviting us to submit this proposal. Our reputation is based on professional integrity and a commitment to quality service and total satisfaction. Our commitment to our clients is evidenced by the high number of project we build for repeat clients.

We have reviewed the RFP and have responded to all issues. We are prepared to begin any work immediately, and are looking forward to your selection decision. During the selection process, please direct all questions to my attention.

Thank you,
Bullard, Inc.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Paul D. Linsteadt', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Paul D. Linsteadt
paul@bullardinc.net
(916) 485-4370 office
(916) 485-4388 fax

TAB A: Firm's Qualifications

Bullard Inc. has serviced the City of Roseville's construction and facility services needs for the past fifteen years. Our familiarity with City administrative procedures, and our understanding of the expectations of City personnel, is a clear advantage in comparison to other general contractors.

We have identified the subcontractors we would expect to use in Attachment C, List of Subcontractors.

Why does your firm best fit the City's needs?

As mentioned above, we feel that our firm best fits the needs of the City because of our extensive experience with the City's administrative procedures and personnel, and the various needs and sensitivities of the City's various departments.

What distinguishes your company's service from that of your competition?

We at **Bullard Inc.** have always thought of ourselves as a "client-based" company; rather than identifying ourselves as "tenant improvement contractors" or "metal building contractors," etc., we focus on each of our clients and then endeavor to continually meet all of their construction needs. In this way, we have managed to keep strong relationships with each of our clients. In fact, we still work for Bryan Bullard's first client – a relationship that has lasted for almost thirty years.

What plan of action would your firm take to get started working with the City to achieve a successful business relationship?

Over the past fifteen years, we have developed a very successful business relationship with the City of Roseville. If we are awarded a contract based on this RFP, our goal will be to continue with, and improve upon, our existing relationship.

Are customer service performance measurements monitored and reported?

All current projects are reviewed by **Bullard Inc.** staff and management on a weekly basis. Scheduled progress, customer satisfaction, and specific potential challenges are discussed and reviewed.

If there are no current projects for a particular client, the discussion then centers around the customer's available work load, identification of future opportunities with the customer, and what can be done to improve our relationship with that particular customer.

TAB B: Experience and References

Cal Trans OES Office and Conference Remodeling: (July-November 2016)

Bullard Inc. remodeled a total of 5 offices, and added a 1200 sq. foot high-tech operations center and conference room.

Client: Cal Trans
Contact: Phoebe Hsu
(916)-653-3103
phoebe.hsu@dot.ca.gov

Cal Trans Canopy Replacement (March-July 2016)

Bullard Inc. replaced the roof with associated roof deck over the loading dock and walkway. Scope items included roofing, carpentry, paint, and electrical.

Client: Cal Trans
Contact: Ralph Goulding
(916)-227-7136
ralph.goulding@dot.ca.gov

City of Roseville Service Contract (2003-2016)

Roseville Fire Station #2 Kitchen Remodel

Contact: Dan Allen
(916) 774-5741

Roseville Fire Station #4 Kitchen Remodel

Contact: Dan Allen
(916) 774-5741

Barton Road WWTP Plant Employee Sleeping Quarters

Contact: Dan Allen
(916) 774-5741

Royer Park Children's Art Center Remodel

Contact: Dan Allen
(916) 774-5741

Various Small Projects throughout city facilities

TAB C: Qualifications of Team

Proposed Staff Members

Team Member	Experience
Matt Kartchner (Project Manager)	15 years
John Coffman (Lead Carpenter)	25 years

Matt Kartchner has worked for 15 years as a Construction Project Manager, Estimator, Superintendent, and CAD design manager in Northern California, Nevada and Utah. He has extensive experience and education in the construction operations of both project and job site management of large scale site development projects and vertical construction elements. He has extensive public sector experience, including projects for Cal-Trans, City of Roseville, DGS, and Administrative Office of the Courts. For the city of Roseville, Matt will provide estimates and cost feasibility for potential projects, oversight of field personnel, coordination of work, and contract administration.

John Coffman has over 25 years experience as a carpenter and superintendent. He has worked on projects for the City of Roseville on behalf of **Bullard Inc.** for numerous years, and is familiar with the procedures and requirements.

TAB D: Cost Proposal

Our Cost Proposal for hourly labor rates, etc. is attached hereto as Attachment F.

How do you calculate your travel fee?

The Cost Proposal includes a Travel/Fuel charge per visit. This is our estimated average cost per visit (including an allowance for field labor or staff time) for our designated team members to travel to and from an unspecified site in Roseville, from our main office in Sacramento, or from the employee's home.

Example Project:

As part of Attachment D, we have attached our estimated cost for the Example Project, presented in the format of our standard invoice.

TAB E: Required Statements and Documentation

Assurance of Non-Substitution for Designated Team Members:

Bullard Inc.'s designated project team, including sub-consultants and sub-contractors, shall be used for this project. Departure or reassignment of, or substitution for, any member of the designated project team, sub-consultants or subcontractors shall not be made without the prior written approval of the City.

No Conflict of Interest:

Bullard Inc. hereby warrants that no official or employee of the City has an interest in or has been employed or retained to solicit or aid in the procuring of the resulting contract; nor will any such person be employed in the performance of such contract without immediate divulgence of such fact to the City.

Indemnification, Bonding, and Insurance Requirements:

Bullard Inc. agrees to fulfill the indemnification, bonding, and insurance requirements contained in the Sample Contract that was included as part of the Request for Proposals.

No Proprietary Information:

Bullard Inc. affirms that nothing contained in this proposal is proprietary.

TAB F: Exceptions

Bullard Inc. hereby affirms that no exceptions, alterations or amendments to the Scope of Services, Sample Contract, or other requirements of this Request for Proposals will be requested or required by our firm.

TAB G: Competancy of Proposer

Bullard Inc. has no pending bankruptcies, liens, stop payment notices, judgments, lawsuits, arbitrations, mediations, or foreclosures on any of our past or current projects, with the following exception:

We very recently completed mediation on an outstanding debt for work performed for Mr. Richard Merryman, a private citizen, at his property in Amador County. Bullard Inc. was terminated for convenience by Merryman in August of 2014. In October of 2016, we successfully completed mediation with Merryman for outstanding payment.

This is the only example in our company's thirty year history of any lien, judgment, mediation, or other legal action taken by us or against us by any client, sub-contractor, or other party, whatsoever.

Attachment A

PROPOSER'S CERTIFICATION

I hereby propose to furnish the goods or services specified in the Request for Proposals ("RFP"). I agree that my proposal will remain firm for a period of up to ninety (90) days in order to allow the City of Roseville ("City") adequate time to evaluate the qualifications submitted.

I have carefully examined the Request for Proposals and any other documents accompanying or made a part of this RFP. The information contained in this proposal is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and is signed under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California. I further certify that I am duly authorized to submit this proposal on behalf of the firm as its authorized agent and that the firm is ready, willing and able to perform if awarded the contract.

I further certify that this proposal is made without prior understanding, agreement, connection, discussion, or conspiracy with any other person, firm or corporation submitting a proposal for the same product or service; that this proposal is fair and made without outside control, collusion, fraud or illegal action; that no officer, employee or agent of the City or any other proposer is financially interested in said proposal; that no undue influence or pressure was used against or in concert with any officer, employee or agent of the City in connection with the award or terms of the contract that will be executed as a result of this RFP; and that the undersigned executed this Proposer's Certification with full knowledge and understanding of the matters therein contained and was duly authorized to do so.

BULLARD INC.
NAME OF BUSINESS


SIGNATURE

PAUL D. LINGSTEADT, SECRETARY.
NAME & TITLE, TYPED OR PRINTED

3132 AUBURN BL., SACRAMENTO 95821
MAILING ADDRESS

(916) 485-4376
TELEPHONE NUMBER

paul@bullardinc.net
EMAIL

Type of Organization:

☐ Sole Proprietorship ☒ Corporation CA State of Incorporation
☐ Partnership ☐ Limited Liability Company

Attachment B

CONTRACTOR LICENSES

List the licenses held by your company and/or employees. The following representations are made under penalty of perjury:

CA State Lic No.	Name on License	Class/Type	Expiration Date
<u>1002120</u>	<u>Bullard Inc</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>3/31/17</u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

Do you have a City of Roseville Business License? Yes ☒ No ☐

License # 00807479

***For Public Works Projects (SB854):** Contractors must register with the Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) pursuant to Labor Code section 1725.5. The Contractor shall provide proof of current registration with the Department of Industrial Relations for both itself and all listed subcontractors with their proposal. Contractors may register at: <http://www.dir.ca.gov/public-works/publicworks.html>

DIR contractor registration number and expiration date:

* 1000024551

Attachment C

SUBCONTRACTOR LIST

If subcontractors will not be used, proposer must write "NONE". For construction contracts, in accordance with the Public Contract Code, Part 1, Chapter 4, Subletting and Subcontracting, Contractors must list the name and business address of each subcontractor who will perform work or labor or render service to the prime contractor in or about the construction of the work or improvement, or who will specially fabricate and install a portion of the work or improvement according to detailed drawings contained in the plans and specifications, in an amount in excess of one-half of one percent (0.5%) of the prime contractor's total bid, or in the case of bids or offers for the construction of streets and highways, including bridges, in excess of one-half of one percent (0.5%) of the prime contractor's total bid or ten thousand dollars (\$10,000) whichever is greater.

Company Name B.M. LYNN PAINTING
Principal BRAD LYNN
Address 4327 PINELL ST.
City SACRAMENTO, CA 95838
Phone (916) 220-4000
Job capacity PAINTING SUBCONTRACTOR.
Percentage of total work TBD
Licenses and numbers CA #627085
DIR Contractor Registration Number & Expiration Date 1000018159

Company Name CHECKMATE PAINTING
Principal RON EARLS
Address 7705 NORTH RIDGE DR.
City CITRUS HEIGHTS, CA 95610
Phone (916) 726-0643
Job capacity PAINTING SUBCONTRACTOR
Percentage of total work TBD
Licenses and numbers CA #825055
DIR Contractor Registration Number & Expiration Date _____

Company Name B-12 DRYWALL
Principal MARC PERLIN
Address 11467 SUNRISE GOLD CIR.
City RANCHO CORDOVA, CA 95742
Phone DRYWALL
Job capacity (916) 699-5960
Percentage of total work TBD
Licenses and numbers CA # 1011937
DIR Contractor Registration Number & Expiration Date 1000036851

Company Name DYNAMIC FLOORING
Principal JOHN CHAPMAN
Address 3308 ORANGE GROVE AVE.
City NORTH HIGHLANDS, CA 95660
Phone (916) 830-1030
Job capacity Finish Floors
Percentage of total work TBD
Licenses and numbers CA # 853649
DIR Contractor Registration Number & Expiration Date 1000005593

Company Name CAL ACOUSTICS
Principal MARK DEFAZIO
Address P.O. Box 506
City RANCHO CORDOVA, CA
Phone (916) 989-1852
Job capacity ACOUSTIC CEILING
Percentage of total work TBD
Licenses and numbers CA C57810
DIR Contractor Registration Number & Expiration Date _____

Company Name SYSTEMS TECH
Principal MIKE MARTIN
Address 4426 YANKEE HILL RD
City ROCKLIN CA 95677
Phone (916) 332-1266
Job capacity FIRE PROTECTION
Percentage of total work TBD.
Licenses and numbers CA # 947274
DIR Contractor Registration Number & Expiration Date 1000000037

Company Name DVORACK PLUMBING
Principal PERRY DVORACK
Address PO BOX 828
City SHINGLE SPRINGS, CA 9582-0828
Phone (530) 677-4753
Job capacity PLUMBING
Percentage of total work TBD.
Licenses and numbers CA # 498425
DIR Contractor Registration Number & Expiration Date 1000005419

Company Name CARVER'S CONCRETE
Principal MICHAEL CARVER
Address PO BOX 4502
City EL DORADO HILLS, CA 95762
Phone (530) 667-1682
Job capacity CONCRETE WORK
Percentage of total work TBD
Licenses and numbers CA 783115
DIR Contractor Registration Number & Expiration Date _____

Attachment E

NONCOLLUSION DECLARATION TO BE EXECUTED BY
BIDDER AND SUBMITTED WITH BID


The undersigned declares:

I am the SECRETARY of BULLARD INC., the party making the foregoing bid.

The bid is not made in the interest of, or on behalf of, any undisclosed person, partnership, company, association, organization, or corporation. The bid is genuine and not collusive or sham. The bidder has not directly or indirectly induced or solicited any other bidder to put in a false or sham bid. The bidder has not directly or indirectly colluded, conspired, connived, or agreed with any bidder or anyone else to put in a sham bid, or to refrain from bidding. The bidder has not in any manner, directly or indirectly, sought by agreement, communication, or conference with anyone to fix the bid price of the bidder or any other bidder, or to fix any overhead, profit, or cost element of the bid price, or of that of any other bidder. All statements contained in the bid are true. The bidder has not, directly or indirectly, submitted his or her bid price or any breakdown thereof, or the contents thereof, or divulged information or data relative thereto, to any corporation, partnership, company, association, organization, bid depository, or to any member or agent thereof, to effectuate a collusive or sham bid, and has not paid, and will not pay, any person or entity for such purpose.

Any person executing this declaration on behalf of a bidder that is a corporation, partnership, joint venture, limited liability company, limited liability partnership, or any other entity, hereby represents that he or she has full power to execute, and does execute, this declaration on behalf of the bidder.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration is executed on NOV. 7, 2016 [date], at SACRAMENTO [city], CALIFORNIA [state].



(Signature of Declarant)

Attachment F

COST PROPOSAL

Labor charge per hour (straight time):	\$ <u>90⁰⁰</u>
Labor charge per hour (overtime):	\$ <u>125⁰⁰</u>
Labor charge per hour (emergency):	\$ <u>125⁰⁰</u>
Travel/Fuel charge per visit:	\$ <u>45⁰⁰</u>
Materials Mark-up:	% <u>10.</u>
Subcontractor Mark-up:	% <u>10.</u>
Response time from initial call (standard)	<u>24 hrs.</u>
Response time from initial call (emergency)	<u>4 hrs.</u>
Number of qualified local service technicians:	<u>12</u>
Number of local service vehicles:	<u>8</u>

1) How do you calculate your travel fee? *REFER TO TAB D.*

2) **To be able to better evaluate your proposal and capabilities please furnish a cost per the following example. Quote should be provided on your standard invoice and invoices should include a breakdown of labor hours and rate, materials cost plus mark-up, travel/fuel charge, etc.:**

Supply and installation of a new room of 10' x 10' with 12' wall. Use 4' x 8' - 5/8" type X new drywall with all necessary framing anchors necessary taping, priming, skim coat and two coats of finish Sherwin Williams and 4-1/2" Rubber Base Board, 100 SQFT of Patcraft carpet tiles, style – Intrinsic EW24. Install two 2' x 4' LED drop in fixtures to existing power circuits. Also include all labor, material for 10' x 10' of drop ceiling with a ceiling height of 9' using USG Radar 2410 at 10' A. installation of a 3' x 7' x 1-3/4" HMD/HMF and 1 Storeroom ND80PD Rhodes 626 LO4 SCHLAGE.

PLEASE SEE NEXT PAGE.



Bill To:

Attn: Tisha Chinn
City of Roseville
311 Vernon Street,
Roseville, CA 95678-2649

Project:

B-17-0XX City of Roseville
RFP - Sample Project Quote
Charlie Fralick
Roseville, CA

Invoice #: B-17-0XX-XX

Invoice Date: 11/4/2016

Terms: Net 30

Payment Due: 12/4/2016

Send all correspondence to:
Bullard, Inc.
3132 Auburn Blvd.,
Sacramento, CA 95821
(916) 485-4370 Fax (916) 485-4388

Authorized by Matt Kartchner

Date 11/4/2016

Attachment G

CONTRACTOR TYPE OF WORK

Please place a check next to the appropriate types of work that your company performs, or contracts out:

- ☒ Tile setting/repair
- ☒ Carpet install/repair
- ☒ Linoleum install/repair
- ☒ Masonry
- ☒ Welding
- ☒ Windows
- ☒ Electrical
- ☒ Plumbing
- ☒ Finishes
- ☒ Carpentry
- ☒ Locksmith & Security
- ☒ Painting
- ☒ Cabinet, Millwork & Finish Carpentry
- ☒ Concrete
- ☒ Drywall
- ☒ Doors and frames
- ☒ Electrical Sign
- ☒ Fencing
- ☒ Fire Protection
- ☒ Landscaping
- ☐ Sanitation System
- ☒ Roofing
- ☐ Asbestos Certification
- ☐ Hazardous Substance Removal Certification
- ☒ Mechanical
- ☒ Fire Damage Repair
- ☒ Site Work
- ☒ General Conditions
- ☒ Moisture Protection
- ☒ Demolition

RESOLUTION NO. 17-23

APPROVING A SERVICE AGREEMENT
BETWEEN CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND RUDOLPH AND SLETTEN, INC., AND
AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF
ROSEVILLE

WHEREAS, a service agreement (Service Agreement No. S170533A) between City of Roseville and Rudolph and Sletten, Inc., for general construction services, has been reviewed by the City Council; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that said service agreement is approved and that the City Manager is authorized to execute it on behalf of the City of Roseville.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk



Attached is a copy of a service agreement for your review and acceptance. Please review the company name, address, and contact information and notify me via email if any corrections need to be made. I will update the agreement prior to you signing the document.

Sign the agreement using the below signature guidelines. Alterations or modifications to the agreement are not allowed. Mail **two signed original** copies of the agreement to the address noted below. Faxes, photocopies, and electronic transmittals will not be accepted. Upon receipt of all necessary documents, the City will sign the agreements and return a fully executed original copy to you. Receipt of the signed copy will be your notice to proceed with the work in accordance with the terms and conditions of the service agreement. Work must not begin until the contract has been fully executed.

The following guidelines must be followed for the signature block on the Service Agreement:

- | | | |
|--|---|----------------------------|
| Sole proprietorship | - | By owner |
| Partnership | - | Any general partner |
| Corporation | - | Two options: |
| (1) A signature from the President and the corporate seal; or | | |
| (2) One signature from the Chairman of the Board, President, or any Vice President AND one signature from the Secretary, any Assistant Secretary, Chief Financial Officer, Treasurer, or any Assistant Treasurer of the corporation | | |

*General Manager, Office Manager and/or Sales Manager are **not** Corporate officer titles. The service agreement will be rejected if not signed in accordance with these guidelines.

Insurance requirements:

The City's insurance requirements are referenced on Attachment A in this service agreement packet. The service agreement will not be considered active or valid until the necessary insurance documents have been received by Roseville's insurance compliance contractor, EBIX. Please contact EBIX customer service at (951) 652-4239 or roseville@ebix.com for any insurance related questions.

Service Agreement Return Address:
Purchasing, Joanna Oukrop
2005 Hilltop Circle
Roseville, CA 95747-9704



PURCHASING
CITY OF ROSEVILLE

2005 HILLTOP CIRCLE, ROSEVILLE, CA 95747
(916) 774-5720 • TDD (916) 774-5220 • FAX (916) 774-5736

SERVICE AGREEMENT

SERVICE AGREEMENT

No: **S170533A**

SERVICE LOCATION: AS DIRECTED

REQ. NO.: R1714975 DATE: 12/12/16

SUBMIT ALL INVOICES TO:

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
Finance Department
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

Contractor No.: V24573
Telephone No.: (916)781-8001 Fax: (916)781-8003
Email address: ryan.ainsworth@rsconst.com
Contractor: RUDOLPH AND SLETTEN, INC.
ATTN: RYAN AINSWORTH
1504 EUREKA RD., STE. 200
ROSEVILLE, CA 95661

Department: CENTRAL SERVICES

Acct. Code: 03331-5100
VARIOUS

Buyer: JOANNA OUKROP
Phone: (916)774-5745

Start Date	Terms	Completion Date	Insurance Limits	Contact
Executed Agreement	NET 30	1/18/18	Approved by Risk Mgt.	TISHA CHINN/CHARLIE FRALICK

The contractor shall furnish all labor, equipment and materials necessary to accomplish the following:

THE VENDOR SHALL PROVIDE GENERAL CONSTRUCTION SERVICES ON AN AS NEEDED BASIS IN ACCORDANCE WITH ALL SPECIFICATIONS, TERMS, CONDITIONS, AND ATTACHMENTS OF THE CITY'S REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NUMBER 01-011 AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ATTACHED RUDOLPH AND SLETTEN, INC. PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL DATED 11/7/16. ALL WORK MUST BE QUOTED AND APPROVED IN ADVANCE BY AN AUTHORIZED MEMBER OF THE CITY'S BUILDING MAINTENANCE DIVISION.

PLEASE CONTACT CHARLIE FRALICK AT (916)774-5706 OR TISHA CHINN AT (916)774-5702 FOR QUESTIONS REGARDING THIS AGREEMENT.

Note: The total cost of service below is an approximate value only. The City does not guarantee whatsoever the actual amount to be spent.

Total Cost of Service: \$ **200,000.00**

ATTENTION: Total cost of service not to exceed the agreement amount without prior approval of the Purchasing Office.

The Contractor named hereon by the acceptance of this order agrees to the provisions of this document titled "Service Agreement" and Attachment "A".

Business License No.: 00801255 Contractor License No.: 198069 DIR Registration No.: 1000000658

☐ SOLE PROPRIETOR

☐ PARTNERSHIP

☒ CORPORATION

CONTRACTOR: Martin Sisemore President and CEO
SIGNATURE PRINT NAME TITLE

CONTRACTOR: _____
SIGNATURE PRINT NAME TITLE

By: Rob Jensen, City Manager

1. To the fullest extent allowed by law, Contractor shall defend, indemnify, and save and hold harmless the City, its officers, agents, employees and volunteers from any claims, suits or actions of every name, kind and description brought forth, or on account of, injuries to or death of any person (including but not limited to workers and the public), or damage to property, resulting from or arising out of Contractor's willful misconduct or negligent act or omission while engaged in the performance of obligations or exercise of rights created by this Agreement, except those matters arising from City's sole or active negligence or willful misconduct. The parties intend that this provision shall be broadly construed. Contractor's responsibility for such defense and indemnity obligations shall survive the termination or completion of this Agreement for the full period of time allowed by law. The defense and indemnity obligations of this Agreement are undertaken in addition to, and shall not in any way be limited by, the insurance obligations contained in this Agreement.
2. Contractor is an independent contractor, and shall not be considered an officer, agent or employee of the City.
3. Without the written consent of the City, this Agreement is not assignable by Contractor either in whole or in part.
4. Time is of the essence of this Agreement.
5. At any time during the term of this Agreement, the City has the right to terminate this Agreement provided Contractor is given a thirty (30) day notice.
6. This Agreement may only be amended or modified in writing. It is integrated and contains the complete understanding of the parties.
7. All equipment, supplies and services sold to the City of Roseville shall conform to the general safety orders of the State of California.
8. Unless notified to the contrary, in writing, the City assumes that the Contractor has accepted the work in accordance with the plans and specifications (if any) and agrees to do the work in compliance with this Agreement.
9. All prevailing wages and fair employment practices must be adhered to. For prevailing wage contracts over \$25,000, copies of certified payroll must be submitted with invoices. Prevailing wage rates may be obtained from the State Department of Industrial Relations and/or the following website address: <http://www.dir.ca.gov/dlsr/DPreWageDetermination.htm>.
- 10a. Unless otherwise specified, the Contractor shall maintain the policies of insurance outlined in Attachment A, incorporated herein by this reference, in full force and effect during the term of this Agreement. The City of Roseville retains sole discretion in determining the types and proper levels of insurance coverage.
- 10b. Form. Contractor shall submit a certificate evidencing such coverage for the period covered by this Agreement in a form satisfactory to Risk Management and the City Attorney, prior to undertaking any work hereunder. Any insurance written on a claims made basis is subject to the approval of Risk Management and the City Attorney.
- 10c. Additional Insureds. Contractor shall also provide a separate endorsement or section of the policy showing City, its officers, agents, employees, and volunteers as additional insureds for each type of coverage (except Workers' Compensation) and for ongoing and completed operations. Such insurance shall specifically cover the contractual liability of Contractor. The additional insured coverage under the Contractor's policy shall be primary and noncontributory, as evidenced by a separate endorsement or section of the policy, and shall not seek contribution from City's insurance or self-insurance. In addition, the additional insured coverage shall be at least as broad as the Insurance Services Office ("ISO") CG 20 01 Endorsement. Any available insurance proceeds in excess of the specified minimum insurance coverage requirements and limits shall be available to the additional insureds. Furthermore, the requirements for coverage and limits shall be: (1) the minimum coverage and limits specified in this Agreement; or (2) the full coverage and maximum limits of any insurance proceeds available to the named insureds, whichever is greater.
- 10d. Cancellation/Modification. Contractor shall provide ten (10) days written notice to City prior to cancellation or modification of any insurance required by this Agreement.
- 10e. Umbrella/Excess Insurance. The limits of insurance required in this Agreement may be satisfied by a combination of primary and excess insurance. Any excess insurance shall contain or be endorsed to contain a provision that such coverage shall also apply on a primary and noncontributory basis for the benefit of City (if agreed to in a written contract) before City's own insurance shall be called upon to protect it as a named insured.
- 10f. Subcontractors. Contractor agrees to include in its contracts with all subcontractors the same requirements and provisions of this Agreement, including the indemnity and insurance requirements, to the extent they apply to the scope of the subcontractor's work. Furthermore, Contractor shall require its subcontractors to agree to be bound to Contractor and City in the same manner and to the same extent as Contractor is bound to City under this Agreement. Additionally, Contractor shall obligate its subcontractors to comply with these same provisions with respect to any tertiary subcontractor, regardless of tier. A copy of City's indemnity and insurance provisions will be furnished to the subcontractor or tertiary subcontractor upon request.
- 10g. Self-Insured Retentions. All self-insured retentions ("SIR") must be disclosed to Risk Management for approval and shall not reduce the limits of liability. Policies containing any SIR provision shall provide or be endorsed to provide that the SIR may be satisfied by either the named insured or City. City reserves the right to obtain a full certified copy of any insurance policy and endorsements. The failure to exercise this right shall not constitute a waiver of such right.
- 10h. Waiver of Subrogation. Contractor hereby agrees to waive subrogation which any insurer of Contractor may acquire from Contractor by virtue of the payment of any loss under a Workers Compensation, Commercial General Liability or Automobile Liability policy. All Workers Compensation, Commercial General Liability and Automobile Liability policies shall be endorsed with a waiver of subrogation in favor of City, its officers, agents, employees and volunteers for all work performed by Contractor, its employees, agents and subcontractors.
- 10i. Liability/Remedies. Insurance coverage in the minimum amounts set forth herein shall not be construed to relieve Contractor of liability in excess of such coverage, nor shall it preclude City from taking such other actions as are available to it under any other provisions of this Agreement or law.
11. Contractor shall comply with all federal, state and local laws and ordinances, including but not limited to the City's storm water regulations, as may be applicable to the performance of services under this Agreement. Failure to comply with local ordinances

may result in monetary fines and cancellation of this Agreement. Refer to www.roseville.ca.us/stormwater for links to more information on the City's storm water regulations.

12. In the event that the terms of any attachment or exhibit conflict with any terms of this Service Agreement, the terms of this Service Agreement shall control.
13. This Agreement may be executed in one or more counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, but all of which together shall constitute one and the same instrument. In the event that any signature is delivered by facsimile transmission or by e-mail delivery of a ".pdf" format data file, such signature shall create a valid and binding obligation of the party executing (or on whose behalf such signature is executed) with the same force and effect as if such facsimile or ".pdf" signature page were an original thereof.
14. If either party commences any legal action against the other party arising out of this Agreement or the performance thereof, the prevailing party in such action shall be entitled to recover its reasonable litigation expenses, including but not limited to, court costs, expert witness fees, discovery expenses, and attorneys' fees. Any action arising out of this Agreement shall be brought in Placer County, California, regardless of where else venue may lie. This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of California.
15. This Agreement shall be binding upon the heirs, successors, executors, administrators and assigns of the respective parties hereto.
16. If any of the provisions contained in this Agreement are for any reason held invalid or unenforceable, such holding shall not affect the remaining provisions or the validity and enforceability of the Agreement as a whole.
17. No contractor or subcontractor may work on a public works project unless registered with the Department of Industrial Relations pursuant to Labor Code section 1725.5. During the performance of this agreement, Contractor and its subcontractors shall have a continuing legal obligation to maintain current registration with the Department of Industrial Relations. Contractor is hereby notified that this project is subject to compliance monitoring and enforcement by the Department of Industrial Relations.

City reserves the right to withhold any payments to Contractor in the event of noncompliance with insurance requirements or if required by law.



ATTACHMENT A
HUMAN RESOURCES/RISK MANAGEMENT DIVISION
INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS
SERVICE AGREEMENT

General - Required Coverage/Documentation

- General Liability: \$1 Million per occurrence
\$2 Million aggregate
- Automobile Liability: \$1 Million combined single limit
- Workers' Compensation: Statutory *Must provide a Waiver of subrogation
- Additional Insured Endorsement (AIE) - General Liability policy: CG 20 38 04 13 or an equivalent, blanket endorsement or section of the policy. Endorsement shall cover the City of Roseville, its officers, agents, employees and volunteers as additional insured
- Policies must be primary and non-contributory
- A 30 day notice of cancellation must be provided
- List certificate holder as: The City of Roseville -Insurance Compliance
PO Box 12010-R1
Hemet, CA 92546-8010

Additional Liability Requirements if required by Agreement (and marked below):

☒ Construction	☐ Design Professional	☐ Chemical/Environmental
General Liability: \$2 Million/occurrence \$4 Million aggregate	General Liability: \$2 Million/occurrence \$4 Million aggregate Professional Liability \$2 Million/occurrence	General Liability: \$3 Million/occurrence \$6 Million aggregate, Pollution – \$2 Million/Occurrence Auto - \$2 Million/Occurrence
☐ IT Services	☐ Professional Consultant	☐ Hazardous Materials
Professional Liability: \$1 Million/occurrence No auto required	Professional Liability: \$1 Million/occurrence	Pollution Liability: \$1 Million/occurrence
☐ Special Events/Caterers/Vendors	☐ Professional Counseling/Psychological	☐ Pyrotechnics
No auto required No workers' comp required	Professional Liability: \$1 Million/occurrence No auto required	General Liability: \$5 Million/occurrence \$10 Million aggregate Auto - \$2 Million/Occurrence

Insurance Submission Process

The City of Roseville Human Resources/Risk Management Department uses a service called EBIX to manage our insurance certificate tracking.

How It Works

- The vendor's contact information is entered into EBIX. EBIX will contact the vendor to request proof of insurance.
- The Vendor can forward the request to their Insurance Agent(s) if necessary.
- Vendor/Insurance Agent submits insurance to EBIX by email to roseville@ebix.com or by fax to (770) 325-5727. After faxing or emailing the certificate, please **DO NOT** send the certificate by mail to EBIX. Please do not mail, email or fax any certificates to the City of Roseville.
- Once submitted, EBIX reviews the insurance documentation. If there are deficiencies, EBIX will send a follow up letter or email requesting additional information.

Questions Regarding Insurance Submission: Contact EBIX at (951) 652-4239
Questions Regarding Insurance Requirements Contact Risk Management at (916) 774-5202

Asbestos-Containing Materials in City-Owned Buildings

California Health and Safety Code Section 25915 requires that all City of Roseville employees, contractors and lessees be notified annually of the presence of asbestos in City-owned buildings constructed prior to 1979. Please post this notice in an area(s) accessible to all employees, contractors and lessees. Contact Facility Maintenance & Operations at (916) 774-5740 for more information about Asbestos Containing Materials (ACMs) in specific City-owned buildings. For more information about asbestos refer to the OSHA website.

The City of Roseville is committed to maintaining a safe and healthy work environment. The City's Facility Maintenance & Operations staff conducts ongoing inspections to identify and safely manage previously installed asbestos-containing products. Renovation of City-owned buildings **MUST** be reviewed in advance by Facility Maintenance & Operations to ensure the City is in compliance with building codes, Americans with Disabilities Act and that no ACMs are disturbed without proper safeguards. Work that requires removal or repair of ACMs is restricted to trained and qualified persons only. **Facility Maintenance & Operations will need to approve the qualified contractors.**

Use the following measures to protect you and others from exposure to airborne asbestos:


- Presume all building materials contain asbestos until determined otherwise by Facility Maintenance & Operations.
- Do not install walls, closets, cabinets, ceilings.
- Do not remove, cut, drill, sand, grind or otherwise disturb any material in the buildings, including carpet and tile.
- Do not paint (this includes any walls, ceilings, floors and electrostatic painting of office furniture).
- Do not remove any items nailed or screwed to the walls (this includes pictures, cabinets, electrical, etc.).
- Do not go above ceilings, behind walls or into building spaces such as attics and crawlspaces unless these areas have been inspected and cleared by Facility Maintenance & Operations.
- Do not pull cable or wiring through above-ceiling spaces with asbestos.
- Do not install screws, pins, nails or hangers into asbestos ceiling or wall plaster.
- Be careful not to damage walls, ceilings or floors when moving furniture or equipment. It is recommended that Facility Maintenance & Operations be contacted prior to moving furniture or equipment.
- Do not brush, sweep or vacuum textured asbestos ceiling plaster or plaster debris.
- Immediately report any damage or deterioration of suspect building materials to Facility Maintenance & Operations or Risk Management.

It is important to note that the presence of asbestos does not mean you have been exposed. Exposure results when friable asbestos particles are inhaled or ingested. Asbestos becomes friable when material containing asbestos is drilled, sanded or disturbed by remodeling or demolition work or when the ACM has deteriorated. Intact, bonded, sealed or undisturbed asbestos does not pose a hazard.

Employees may review the asbestos survey reports, results of bulk sampling or air monitoring conducted in City-owned buildings. All asbestos data will be available by appointment with Facility Maintenance & Operations.

Facilities Built Pre 1979 That May Contain Asbestos	Year Built
Downtown Library - 225 Taylor Street 95678	1974
Carnegie Museum - 557 Lincoln Street 95678	1912
Tower Theatre - 415 Vernon Street 95678	1940
*401 Oak Street 95678	1974
Fire Station #3 - 1300 Cirby Way 95661	1963
Old Corp Yard - 100 Old Corp Yard Road 95678	1940
Water Treatment Plant Operations Bldg.- 9595 Barton Road 95746	1965
Waste Water Treatment Plant Operations Bldg. - 1800 Booth Road 95747	1962
Royer Recreation Bldg. - 190 Park Drive 95678	1950
Fire Museum - 400 Lincoln Street 95678	1930
Diamond Oaks Golf - 349 Diamond Oaks Road 95678	1965
Johnson Pool, 4th & D Street	1950
330 Vernon Street	1940
107 Sutter Avenue	1962

* Indicates facility has known asbestos

Sign to acknowledge receipt of asbestos notification		
SIGNATURE	COMPANY NAME	DATE
	Rudolph and Sletten Inc.	12/19/16



CITY OF ROSEVILLE
**GENERAL
CONSTRUCTION
SERVICES #01-011**

PROPOSAL | NOVEMBER 7, 2016



November 7, 2016

Mr. Dan Allen, Facilities Manager
Office of the City Clerk, Civic Center
City of Roseville
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95687

**RE: General Construction Services #01-011
Request for Proposals**

Dear Mr. Allen,

We are pleased to respond to your Request for Proposal for consideration as an On-Call General Contractor. The following is our company information:

Rudolph and Sletten, Inc.
1504 Eureka Road, Suite 200
Roseville, CA 95661
(916) 781-8001

Contact Person: Ryan Ainsworth, Project Manager
ph. (916) 871-2242 / fax (916) 781-8003 / email ryan.ainsworth@rsconst.com

We agree to perform the services and adhere to the requirements described in this RFP.

Sincerely,

Rudolph and Sletten, Inc.

Jon Foad
Senior Vice President, Operations

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONTENTS



Cover Letter

TAB A. Firm's Qualifications

TAB B. Experience and References

TAB C. Qualifications of Team

TAB D. Cost Proposal

TAB E. Required Statements/
Documents

TAB F. Exceptions

TAB G. Competency of Proposers

Above (clockwise from Left) Oracle, Rocklin Expansion; HP, R3L CalWIN Tenant Improvements; City of Sacramento, Intermodal Transit Facility

On the cover Fremont School. E. Claire Raley Studios for the Performing Arts

A. FIRM'S QUALIFICATIONS

FIRM'S QUALIFICATIONS

TAB A

Preconstruction Staff

POSITION	CORPORATE RESOURCES
Preconstruction Executive	6
Project Estimator	11
Cost Engineer	4
Mechanical Estimator	3
Electrical Estimator	4
Virtual Design & Const. / BIM	5

Construction Staff

POSITION	CORPORATE RESOURCES
Project Executive	17
Project Manager	44
Superintendent	82
Project Engineer	70
Quality Control Manager	10
Virtual Design & Const. / BIM	10
Safety Manager	6
Safety Coordinator	30
Field Office Coordinator	30

We employ over 900 people; this includes personnel based in our headquarter office, our divisional offices, and those assigned to managerial and supervisory positions at various project jobsites.

FIVE OFFICES

Located throughout California, Rudolph and Sletten's five office locations are staffed for projects large and small.

For more than 55 years, Rudolph and Sletten has passionately delivered best-in-class construction services for some of the biggest names in California.

Rudolph and Sletten excels at building projects that are complex and innovative. We have successfully completed a multitude of office building projects for many notable names, such as the Judicial Council of California, Hewlett Packard, Microsoft, and UC San Francisco to name a few. Our personnel are excellent collaborators and positive thinkers, and they will challenge conventional wisdom to produce the most cost-effective solutions to any project challenge.

In addition, we have strived to become a "full-service" provider to our clients. From project inception to closeout and beyond, our services include: Preconstruction, Construction (including self-performance), BIM/VDC, Lean Practices, LEED Services, Safety, Start-Up/Testing, and Commissioning.

Rudolph and Sletten's proposed subcontractors (Attachment C) are listed in our Cost Proposal.

Our number of employees have remained consistent over the last three years. With a permanent staff of over 900 employees, our current total backlog is below the amount required to sustain our annual volume, allowing us to easily incorporate your projects into our workload.

We can assure you that we will have the necessary, experienced and professional, resources available to staff your project.

\$3.1

BILLION+ IN
TENANT IMPROVEMENT
PROJECTS OVER THE
PAST 10 YEARS

IDENTIFY THE SERVICES THAT WOULD BE COMPLETED BY YOUR FIRM'S STAFF AND THOSE THAT WOULD BE PROVIDED BY SUB CONSULTANTS OR SUBCONTRACTORS.

Rudolph and Sletten's Special Projects team is capable of managing any project that the City of Roseville General Services contract would include. Our management team is uniquely qualified for this contract, and does not need to be augmented by outside services. Rudolph and Sletten's Special Projects team directly employs a variety of tradesman including carpenters, laborers, and cement masons. All carpentry/laborer related tasks including framing, drywall, millwork, doors, painting, finishes, concrete, demolition, landscaping, etc. can be self-performed by our own forces. Specialty contracting items such as electrical, plumbing, mechanical, fire protection, abatement, roofing, and welding are subcontracted to a variety of qualified subcontractors.

IDENTIFY ANY SUB-CONSULTANTS OR SUBCONTRACTORS TO SUPPLEMENT STAFF.

We've attached a list with Attachment C of qualified/recommended subcontractors that R&S would solicit proposals from for each specific projects under the Roseville General Services Contract.

WHY DOES YOUR FIRM BEST FIT THE CITY'S NEEDS?

We best fit the City's needs for a number of reasons.

- With our office being located in Roseville for more than 10 years, we know the Roseville construction industry. Our office is less than three miles from City Hall.
- Our Special Projects group specializes in small projects ranging from hanging a door to large tenant improvement projects. We specialize in all aspects of general construction so we can be a single source vendor to our corporate clients and trusted clientele. We manage projects honestly and effectively and put the client's needs at the front of every project.

WHAT DISTINGUISHES YOUR COMPANY'S SERVICE FROM THAT OF YOUR COMPETITION?

Our team stands alone from our competition because of our experience. With over 100 years of combined project management experience, the Rudolph and Sletten Special Projects team can adequately and effectively manage

any type of general services project. Each team member carries a minimum of 10 years of industry experience. The team's experience includes a variety of skillsets. Our project management team is comprised of only college graduates with bachelor's degrees from four-year universities. Our field superintendents each have 30+ years of industry experience that started with craft work and have earned their place as superintendents. No other team presented will be as qualified or experienced to manage the Roseville General Services Contract.

IF SELECTED AS THE CITY'S VENDOR, WHAT PLAN OF ACTION WOULD YOUR FIRM TAKE TO GET STARTED WORKING WITH THE CITY TO ACHIEVE A SUCCESSFUL BUSINESS RELATIONSHIP?

Our plan of attack would be to meet with the City personnel to immediately review goals and objectives and also to set up Rules of Engagement. The rules of engagement would be a starting place to get processes figured out early on to alleviate stress and minimize surprises along the way. At this meeting we will start the conversation regarding timelines to identify any important schedule deliverables that the City has. Clear and effective communication will be the key to success in building a successful business relationship.

ARE CUSTOMER SERVICE PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS MONITORED AND REPORTED?

- Client satisfaction is the single most important part of our business operation. Over 85% of Rudolph and Sletten's annual volume comes from repeat clientele. Customer service starts with the type of people that Rudolph and Sletten employs and the training they undergo. Our people are trained on multiple aspects of customer service and are often referred to as the best in the industry.
- Throughout the course of each project, our senior management will check in with the client to confirm that they are satisfied with their Rudolph and Sletten team, and that teams' performance meets their needs. If adjustments need to be made to ensure client satisfaction, our management team responds accordingly.
- As an example of client satisfaction, we've attached a letter received 11/3/2016 for the same Special Projects team that is proposed for the Roseville General Services projects.

B. EXPERIENCE AND REFERENCES

EXPERIENCE AND REFERENCES

TAB B

Rudolph and Sletten's Special Projects Group is ideally suited for on-call general services. When we started the special projects group in 1981, our vision was to create a separate division specifically designed to service the needs of smaller projects while drawing on the extensive resources of our entire company. We scaled the division to handle jobs such as tenant improvements, renovations, critical infrastructure and service type projects. The Special Projects Group carries Rudolph and Sletten's core values: honest pricing, realistic schedules, uncompromising quality and a clean, safe work environment.

With every project we take on, our clients get the satisfaction of knowing they are getting a team of dedicated people who know how to work in fast-paced environments, solve challenges and do everything it takes for project success.

Our Senior Project Manager leading our efforts, Ryan Ainsworth, runs our Special Projects Group and has successfully delivered hundreds of projects throughout the Sacramento area. Ryan and his capable management team, with a deep bench of tradespersons, foremen, carpenters and laborers, want to continue on with our relationship in delivering on-call projects with expediency, excellent communication and thoroughness.

The following pages outline a few of the numerous successful projects that the Special Projects Group has recently completed in the Roseville region. Each of those projects can be called a success.

ROCKLIN EXPANSION

ORACLE CORPORATION | ROCKLIN, CA



SQUARE FOOTAGE // 29,000sf

TOTAL COST OF WORK // \$2,500,625

COMPLETION DATE // November 2015

ARCHITECT // NELSON

SELF-PERFORMED WORK //

Demolition

Doors, Frames & Hardware

Temporary Protection/Barriers

Final Cleanup

OWNER REFERENCE //

Ms. Katie Allen

Real Estate Project Manager

(303) 334-4135



The Oracle Rocklin Expansion project is creating approximately 29,000sf of office space in an occupied commercial building. The project was awarded in August 2015, with construction starting in August 2015 and completed November 2015. While a short preconstruction duration ensued following award, the R&S team competitively bid and assembled a GMP within two weeks following award.

Three existing office suites were demolished back to the building core/shell to create one office suite. A new modern commercial office space is being constructed with open floor plans, natural lighting and a combination of exposed ceilings and acoustical "cloud" ceilings. An emphasis was put on sourcing local materials, including reclaimed redwood lumber for exposed architectural accent walls and soffits.

The project was completed in November 2015, and delivered under budget with savings being returned to Oracle.

STAFF ASSIGNED

- John Home, Senior Project Executive
- Ryan Ainsworth, Special Projects Division Manager
- Mike Ratajczak, Senior Project Engineer
- Fred West, Superintendent

R3L CalWIN TENANT IMPROVEMENTS

HEWLETT PACKARD | ROSEVILLE, CA



SQUARE FOOTAGE // 60,000sf

TOTAL COST OF WORK // \$6,083,559

COMPLETION DATE // July 2015

ARCHITECT // Cooper Preuit Engineers Inc.

SELF-PERFORMED WORK //

Demolition
Doors, Frames & Hardware
Temporary Protection/Barriers
Final Cleanup

OWNER REFERENCE //

Mr. Dave Arnold
Senior Project Manager
(916) 786-8000



60,000sf complete interior demolition and new tenant buildout for tenant CalWIN on the first floor of a fully occupied building. Complete demolition of all architectural finishes and utilities on the first floor back to core shell. The new buildout is a modernized architectural design with natural lighting, exposed ceiling elements, open office space, large and small conference rooms, and break areas.

Project timeline was critical for the client and was completed in 16 weeks. Due to the tight project timeline and high level of finishes, a significant amount of effort went into early procurement of lead time materials to align with field installation. The project was delivered in two tenant occupancy move-ins which was heavily coordinated with the furniture vendor, data cabling vendor, and the City of Roseville. The project was delivered on schedule and under the GMP construction budget.

STAFF ASSIGNED

- John Home, Senior Project Executive
- Ryan Ainsworth, Special Projects Division Manager
- Mike Ratajczak, Senior Project Engineer
- Trace McMahon, Assistant Superintendent

R3U PILOT TENANT IMPROVEMENTS

HEWLETT PACKARD | ROSEVILLE, CA



SQUARE FOOTAGE // 23,000sf

TOTAL COST OF WORK // \$3,189,645

COMPLETION DATE // October 2016

ARCHITECT // IA Interior Architects

SELF-PERFORMED WORK //

Demolition
Doors, Frames & Hardware
Temporary Protection/Barriers
Final Cleanup
Wood Panelling

OWNER REFERENCE //

Mr. Dave Arnold
Senior Project Manager
(916) 786-8000



The HP Pilot TI consisted of demolition of existing 23,000sf office area for the addition of new collaborative work space. New construction consisted of building out a central hub housing collaborative meeting space, E-club breakroom with suspended wood ceilings, remodel of existing restrooms and addition of exterior windows at new conference rooms. Additionally, MEP work consisted of additional HVAC zones, addition of DDC controls, electrical reconfiguration of existing panels and coordinated shutdowns with the facility, new lighting and lighting controls throughout.

The Pilot space is the first of its kind at HP Roseville, utilizing mainly free address space to increase the use of the floor while providing the employee with more meeting space that includes four huddle rooms, five large conference rooms utilizing Skype for business and 84-inch touch displays, six phone rooms, and collaboration space.

STAFF ASSIGNED

- John Home, Senior Project Executive
- Ryan Ainsworth, Special Projects Division Manager
- Mike Ratajczak, Senior Project Engineer
- Fred West, Superintendent

CITY OF SACRAMENTO GENERAL SERVICES PROJECTS

PROJECT NAME	VALUE	COMPLETION DATE	REFERENCES
On-Call Services, Fire Station 13 Generator	\$109,257	4/1/2016	Tony Alexander, Operations General Supervisor
On-Call Services, Fire Station 11 Generator	\$57,995	3/13/2015	City of Sacramento (916) 808-6360
Lot G, K1 and K3 Parking Garage Repairs	\$16,950	4/30/2013	talexander@cityofsacramento.org
On-Call Services, Crocker Transducer Replacement	\$24,618	2/28/2013	James Christensen
On-Call Services, Crocker Visqueen Tenting	\$24,618	2/28/2013	Supervising Engineer (916) 808-5863
300 Richards Boulevard Waterproofing	\$289,169	9/30/2012	jchristensen@cityofsacramento.org
Crocker Art Museum Prop 40 Work	\$2,000,000	2/1/2007	Joseph Gluvers Associate Engineer (916) 808-8427 jgluvers@cityofsacramento.org Pete Kroger Building Inspector (916) 808-5597 pkroger@cityofsacramento.org
E. Claire Raley Studios for the Performing Arts	\$5,000,000	5/1/2015	Richard Rich, Principal Mosaic Partners, LLC (916) 367-1723 rrich@mosaicdevelopment.com
Macy's Atrium Removal and Storage	\$23,698	5/15/2014	Yadi Kavakebi, Facilities & Real Property Superintendent City of Sacramento (916) 808-8432 ykavakebi@cityofsacramento.org
Intermodal Transit Facility	\$4,000,000	7/11/2011	Kirk Thompson, General Services City of Sacramento (916) 808-8431 kthompson@cityofsacramento.org

ADDITIONAL REFERENCE

HEWLETT PACKARD

Thomas Sherer
Delivery Manager
(916) 540-2682
Thomas.Sherer@hpe.com

Please also see individual resumes for personal team references.

From: Sherer, Thomas
To: Jon Foad
Cc: Michael Ratajczak; Ryan Ainsworth
Subject: Note Of Appreciation for R&S Team From Hewlett Packard Enterprise Roseville

Jon,

Hello, hope this email finds you well. By way of introduction, I am the Delivery Manager for the Roseville HPE site (as well as several others scattered across the Western US). This means that I am the face, and the accountable party, for every project we deliver.

I wanted to take a moment to acknowledge and recognize the work that Mike, Ryan, Fritz, and the rest of the R&S team do for Hewlett Packard Enterprise. We have been working together for the past 3 years, and have a number of huge wins for HPE, with an equal number of stressful days, nights, and weekends in bringing projects to a close.

What makes this R&S team such a great partner to work with is that they act not only as a general contractor, but as an **advocate for HPE, and for our specific business outcomes.** This means that Ryan and Mike look at items of “typical” concern to a GC (schedule, pricing for subs, available savings) but also at the **less tangible areas that can make or break a project for us:** impact to existing customers, how decisions will play with the local corporate politics, and how other business units need to be interfaced (IT, Security).

Furthermore, **Mike and Ryan never fail to act as our advocates with other vendors on projects** – I think of the relationship similar to an attorney/client relationship where the attorney acts as the client’s fiduciary in representing their interests. Neither myself, nor the HPE construction PM, can be everywhere at all times keeping track of every decision an architect, AV consultant, or other vendor makes. What we can do is trust and know that the R&S team is going to have a solid understanding of our desired business outcomes, and push back as our representative on decision that do not align to those outcomes. On numerous occasions Mike and Ryan have pulled us aside and asked “Is this really the right thing to do? Does this make sense?” **That type of advocacy and understanding cannot be overrated.**

Lastly, the amount of effort the team goes through to make our projects happen on time and on budget, even when we throw wrenches and changes into the plan, shows their commitment. I have a photo somewhere of an icemaker being installed at 9:00 at night so we could hit our date. **Though we don’t always get everything done on time, I NEVER second guess whether R&S is doing everything in their power to make it so.**

Please accept my appreciation for the team, and my thanks for enabling their continued work with HPE. We have a huge year or two coming up, and I’m that much less worried knowing that we’re continuing to tackle these projects together.

Thomas L. Sherer, Esq.
Service Delivery Manager

Thomas.Sherer@hpe.com
916-540-2682 Office
916-303-0977 Mobile

Roseville, CA
hpe.com

C. QUALIFICATIONS OF TEAM

QUALIFICATIONS OF THE TEAM

TAB C

The Special Projects team selected for this proposal has worked together for many years, completing numerous successful construction projects similar to the type of work anticipated for the City's On-Call General Contractor Services contract. On the following pages, we have included our project organization chart and resumes of our key team members.

Senior Project Manager Ryan Ainsworth began his career with Rudolph and Sletten 10 years ago in the Special Projects division. During this time he has worked with all of the proposed Superintendents and Lead Carpenters. As shown in his resume, Ryan's talents have been displayed in the tenant improvement arena, including projects for CalPERS, Colliers, Oracle, Pride Industries, Verizon and VSP, as well as on highly technical, fast track projects like Hewlett Packard's data center renovations. As the lead Project Manager for the City of Roseville's On-Call General Contractor Services projects, Ryan will ensure there is clear communication between the City, the subcontractors and tradesmen. He will be the main point of contact for the City's on-call projects and will provide consistent and thorough feedback during the course of construction.

Both our Superintendents, Fred West and Trace McMahon, have many years of experience in the construction trades. Trace has worked for Rudolph and Sletten for over eight years, and his background in rough and finish carpentry make Trace an excellent, well rounded tenant improvement Superintendent. Trace spent 10 years as a construction Superintendent bringing buildings out of the ground. Trace's experience provides the client with an clean, orderly, and professional project. He spent 15 years fabricating and installing custom wood casework, millwork and specialty wood veneers. His attention to detail provides the client with a beautiful finished product of the finest quality.

Fred West is our lead tenant improvement Superintendent, with extensive knowledge and experience from his early days with Rudolph and Sletten, during which he mastered the concrete and formwork trades. With more than 23 years of experience with our firm, Fred is a detailed Carpenter and Craftsman who has completed some of the most intricate and challenging tenant improvement projects on our company's resume, Fred also has a deep insight into the intricacies of

earthwork, demolition, underground piping, foundations and substructure. His long term work for Rudolph and Sletten has ingrained in Fred our company culture of quality, safety and customer service. Over the last few years, Fred has led the Sacramento Special Projects teams as the field lead, excelling on projects for notable clients such as CalPERS and Kaiser Permanente.

Both Fred and Trace have excellent communication skills. They understand the essential need to always keep the client informed of a project's progress on a daily basis. They both excel at keeping subcontractors and tradespeople on task to finish the job on schedule and within budget. In addition to our Project Superintendent leads, Rudolph and Sletten is proud of our numerous in-house trained Foremen and Lead Carpenters who support the field team and manage individual smaller projects, maximizing efficiency and ensuring quality and safety on every project we construct. The Lead Carpenters we have hand-picked for the City's on-call projects all have extensive experience working on smaller projects and an exemplary willingness to address all client needs while getting the job done within the given timeline. They are punctual, polite, hard working individuals who thrive on working "in the trenches" and they maintain a positive outlook to see the job through until the end.

Project Manager Michael Ratajczak provides the required field/office support system to ensure a successful outcome for each project. He is the preconstruction lead and works closely with clients to develop project estimates from the planned scopes of work. He develops early project schedules in conjunction with the lead Superintendent. Mike will take a project from inception to permit, working with our Estimating staff to develop the Instructions to Bidders and oversee the bid and cost estimate development. Once a project is bid and procured, his main responsibilities include submitting RFIs, procuring permits and preparing submittals for the client's approval. He, along with Senior Project Manager Ryan Ainsworth, will run the project owner meetings during construction, manage the project schedule and costs and oversee the subcontractor payment applications and billings. Upon completion, Mike will oversee the closeout of documentation, including the as-builts, warranties and any lien releases that may be required for each project. Mike has


more than eight years of experience managing projects in our Special Projects division alongside Ryan, Fred and Trace. He has been the direct client interface for Rudolph and Sletten for such notable repeat clients as CalPERS, Verizon Wireless, HP, AKT Development and Drexel University.

This Special Projects team is not new to working together. Each member is from the professional Rudolph and Sletten - Sacramento Special Projects team that, over the last seven years, has completed 50-75 projects annually. Ryan, Mike, Fred and Trace are a true team in every sense of the word. They support, develop, mentor and collaborate on projects of all repeat clients of Rudolph and Sletten and on new

opportunities for future long-term clients that we are looking to partner with. With a proven track record in occupied, fast-paced work environments, our team enjoys the challenges the on-call project type presents. Our excellent working relationships with many in the local subcontractor community and our great rapport with the City of Roseville Building and Fire Departments further qualifies our team to complete the City's projects efficiently and successfully. Whether it is a kitchen remodel at the CalPERS Building or hanging a chandelier at the Crocker Art Museum, we approach each job with the same sense of ownership and diligence that ensures a successful completed project within the budget and schedule parameters.

ORGANIZATION CHART

ON-CALL GENERAL CONSTRUCTION SERVICES



JOHN HOME, LEED AP

SENIOR PROJECT EXECUTIVE



As senior project executive, Mr. Home is the key contact for your project and will be responsible for the day to day interface with the owner to ensure their needs are being addressed and project goals such as schedule, cost, quality and safety are achieved. He will also be the bridge between the preconstruction effort and the on-site construction team to ensure all required information is passed on timely and completely. After completion of the preconstruction phase and during construction, he will be supporting the on-site construction team in all areas to allow them to deliver on the project schedule and budget committed to by Rudolph and Sletten.

YEARS EXPERIENCE //

22 years

RUDOLPH AND SLETTEN TENURE //

22 years

EDUCATION //

University of California, Davis
Bachelor of Science, Civil
Engineering

REFERENCES //

City of Sacramento

Mr. Greg Taylor, Urban Design
Manager
(916) 808-5268

Crocker Art Museum Association

Ms. Lial Jones, Mort & Marcy
Friedman Museum Director &
CEO
(916) 808-1054

GT Consulting

Mr. George Traugh, Principal
(415) 505-3968

Urban Resources, Inc.

Mr. Randy Boehm, Project
Manager
(503) 807-0073

Tahoe Truckee Unified School District

Ms. Anna Klovstad, Project
Manager
(530) 582-2548

RELEVANT PROJECT EXPERIENCE

ORACLE CORPORATION ROCKLIN EXPANSION, ROCKLIN

29,000sf suite buildout on the second floor of an existing commercial office building. Scope includes demolition of non-structural interior elements and construction of new offices, conference rooms, open offices, and breakrooms. \$2,500,625/ completed November 2015

HEWLETT PACKARD R3U PILOT TENANT IMPROVEMENTS, ROSEVILLE

23,000sf demolition of existing office area for the addition of new collaborative work space. New construction consisted of building out a central hub housing collaborative meeting space, E-club breakroom with suspended wood ceilings, remodel of existing restrooms, addition of exterior windows at new conference rooms and MEP work. \$3,189,645/completed October 2016

CITY OF SACRAMENTO INTERMODAL PHASE 2, SACRAMENTO VALLEY STATION HISTORIC RESTORATION, SACRAMENTO

60,000sf LEED Gold CS historic restoration and rehabilitation of the 1926 Sacramento Valley Station. Work includes exterior and interior refurbishment, 1926 John MacQuarrie mural restoration, structural upgrades, timber pile foundation repairs and a complete upgrade of the MEP building systems. The building includes future lease space, new Amtrak offices and restored central waiting and ticketing areas. \$32,000,000/ completion November 2016

CITY OF SACRAMENTO INTERMODAL TRANSIT FACILITY, SACRAMENTO

13,000sf new Greyhound Bus Station with associated sitework and 7,000sf canopy structure. Design-assist delivery. \$4,000,000/completed July 2011

CITY OF SACRAMENTO CROCKER ART MUSEUM EXPANSION & RENOVATION, SACRAMENTO

132,995sf new state-of-the-art museum facility, joined to the existing structure built in 1885 via a cantilevered bridge. The Crocker Art Museum Expansion more than tripled the museum's size and quadrupled its temporary exhibition space. The new facility includes several spacious art galleries equipped with skylights and solid wood flooring, a 267-seat auditorium, administrative offices, conference rooms, museum store, catering kitchen and café, art and sculpture storage facilities, 2-story atrium reception area with black terrazzo flooring, courtyard with water feature and a new central utility plant that serves both new and existing facilities. Also included was the demolition of the existing Herold Wing building, historic, structural and seismic upgrades to the existing Crocker Art Museum facility and several sitework improvements including the refurbishment of historic site lighting. The gallery building is a California Historical Landmark and listed in the National Register of Historic Places. \$78,000,000/ completed October 2010

CITY OF SACRAMENTO MACY'S ATRIUM REMOVAL AND STORAGE, SACRAMENTO

Dismantle existing decorative metal art atrium from third floor roof deck of Macy's mens store and relocate to City north corporate yard. \$23,698/ completed May 2014

CITY OF SACRAMENTO ON-CALL SERVICES, CROCKER TRANSDUCER REPLACEMENT, SACRAMENTO

Replacement of 302 humidifier tray transducers. \$24,618/completed February 2013

CITY OF SACRAMENTO ON-CALL SERVICES, CROCKER VISQUEEN TENTING, SACRAMENTO

Install visqueen tenting in select rooms for testing of humidifiers. \$24,618/completed February 2013

RYAN AINSWORTH, LEED AP

SENIOR PROJECT MANAGER



As senior project manager, Mr. Ainsworth is directly responsible for negotiating and administering contracts, supervising project superintendents and engineers, monitoring job costs and schedules, and working closely with the architect and owner to ensure the project is completed on time and within budget. If preconstruction services are required, Mr. Ainsworth will attend design meetings, perform value analyses, and assist the estimating staff with budgeting and scheduling.

YEARS EXPERIENCE //
10 years

RUDOLPH AND SLETTEN TENURE //
10 years

EDUCATION //
Chico State University
Bachelor of Science,
Construction Management

REFERENCES //
Hewlett Packard
Mr. Dave Arnold, Senior
Project Manager
(916) 785-9735

McCuen Properties
Mr. Dave Nystrom
Director of Development
(916) 481-6300

Verizon Wireless
Mr. Bryan Kent, VSO Design
and Construction
(925) 279-6216

Verizon Wireless
Mr. Joe Barwick, Sr. Analyst,
Real Estate Operations
(916) 589-5758

SureWest Communications
Mr. David Sprunk, Facilities
Manager
(916) 786-4544

Northern California Valley
Sheet Metal Industry
Mr. Robert Verdugo, Director
(916) 922-9381

RELEVANT PROJECT EXPERIENCE

HEWLETT PACKARD
R3U PILOT TENANT IMPROVEMENTS,
ROSEVILLE
23,000sf demolition of existing office area for
the addition of new collaborative work space.
New construction consisted of building out a
central hub housing collaborative meeting space,
E-club breakroom with suspended wood ceilings,
remodel of existing restrooms, addition of exterior
windows at new conference rooms and MEP work.
\$3,189,645/completed October 2016

ORACLE CORPORATION
ROCKLIN EXPANSION, ROCKLIN
29,000sf suite buildout on the second floor of an
existing commercial office building. Scope includes
demolition of non-structural interior elements and
construction of new offices, conference rooms,
open offices, and breakrooms. \$2,500,625/
completed November 2015

HEWLETT PACKARD
R3L CALWIN TENANT IMPROVEMENTS,
ROSEVILLE
60,000sf demolition and refeed existing overhead
bus duct electrical distribution and installation
of three new distribution boards and refeed from
boards to existing transformers, panels, and
equipment. \$6,083,559/completed July 2015

CITY OF SACRAMENTO
MACY'S ATRIUM REMOVAL AND STORAGE,
SACRAMENTO
Dismantle existing decorative metal art atrium
from third floor roof deck of Macy's mens store
and relocate to City north corporate yard. \$23,698/
completed May 2014

VERIZON WIRELESS
FREEPORT COMPUTER ROOM B, SACRAMENTO
Replacement of (8) existing CRAC units with (7)
new CRAC units. CRAC units will be upgraded with
Vigilant controls. \$296,795/completed July 2013

VERIZON WIRELESS
FREEPORT UPS ROOM 2, SACRAMENTO
Replace three existing CRAC units with four new
Liebert CRAC units. New units to have ICOM
control panels and will be connected via Sitelink
12e. Furnish and install six new Square D power
logic electrical meters with panel. \$192,922/
completed May 2015

KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN, INC.
MOTT BUILDING INFILL PROJECT, ROSEVILLE
4,000sf remodel of existing conference and
miscellaneous rooms into cubicle open office
spaces. Includes demolition, wood framing, all
finishes and minor MEP work. \$224,419/completed
September 2013

VERIZON WIRELESS
FREEPORT CONDENSER WATER TREATMENT
SYSTEM, SACRAMENTO
Installation of owner furnished water treatment
system for condenser water loop. WCTI system
will be installed on two central utility plants, soften
condenser water eliminating scale buildup, and
decrease amount of water usage. \$348,702/
completed August 2013

UC DAVIS HEALTH SYSTEM
LOBBY VIDEO DISPLAY INSTALLATION,
SACRAMENTO
Installation of multiple flat screen monitors on
custom metal brackets for use as a new video
display wall. Scope includes sheet rock, paint,
electrical and rough in for data. \$68,842/completed
December 2011

SUREWEST COMMUNICATIONS
BUILDING 242 CANOPIES, SACRAMENTO
50sf furnish and installation of three painted
structural steel canopies above exterior doors.
\$11,233/completed July 2011

FRED WEST

SUPERINTENDENT



YEARS EXPERIENCE //

31 years

RUDOLPH AND SLETTEN TENURE //

24 years

EDUCATION //

Meadowdale High School
High School Diploma, General
Coursework

REFERENCES //

Kaiser Foundation Health Plan
Mr. Chang Yi, Senior Project
Manager
(916) 784-5428

Kaiser Foundation Health Plan
Mr. Russ Palchak, Assistant
Facility Services Director
(916) 784-5925

Inspection Services
Mr. David Neitzel, Inspector of
Record
(916) 708-3350

Kaiser Foundation Health Plan,
Mr. David Lockhart, Assistant
Facility Services Director
(916) 784-5606

Lionakis
Mr. Muhsin Lihony, Principal,
Healthcare
(916) 558-1900

Nacht & Lewis Architects, Inc.
Ms. DeAnn Splinter, Associate
Architect
(916) 329-4000

RELEVANT PROJECT EXPERIENCE

HEWLETT PACKARD
R3U PILOT TENANT IMPROVEMENTS,
ROSEVILLE
23,000sf demolition of existing office area for
the addition of new collaborative work space.
New construction consisted of building out a
central hub housing collaborative meeting space,
E-club breakroom with suspended wood ceilings,
remodel of existing restrooms, addition of exterior
windows at new conference rooms and MEP work.
\$3,189,645/completed October 2016

ORACLE CORPORATION
ROCKLIN EXPANSION, ROCKLIN
29,000sf suite buildout on the second floor of an
existing commercial office building. Scope includes
demolition of non-structural interior elements and
construction of new offices, conference rooms,
open offices, and breakrooms. \$2,500,625/
completed November 2015

HEWLETT PACKARD
R3L CALWIN TENANT IMPROVEMENTS,
ROSEVILLE
60,000sf demolition and refeed existing overhead
bus duct electrical distribution and installation
of three new distribution boards and refeed from
boards to existing transformers, panels, and
equipment. \$6,083,559/completed July 2015

HEWLETT PACKARD
BUILDING R5 CYBER SECURITY WORK AREA,
ROSEVILLE
9,000sf convert existing cubicle space into the
Cyber Security area. Includes demo, electrical,
HVAC, metal stud framing/drywall, acoustical
ceiling, glass storefront, doors, tile, carpet, stained
concrete, and painting. \$626,913/completed
February 2014

KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN, INC.
ROSEVILLE HOSPITAL ADDRESS SIGN
INSTALLATION, ROSEVILLE
Install electrical and new exterior address signs.
\$106,664/completed January 2012

RED HAWK CASINO
ENTERTAINMENT LOUNGE REMODEL,
PLACERVILLE
5,000sf entertainment lounge remodel. Demolition
of existing stage bar and construction of the new
entertainment lounge complete with new island
bar and new entertainment stage. Work included
relocating utilities from the existing buffet on the
floor below. \$1,117,778/completed December
2012

KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN, INC.
ROSEVILLE OPERATING ROOM SURGICAL LIGHT
SURVEY AND INSTALLATION, ROSEVILLE
3,000sf conducted MEP survey in eight existing
operating rooms and provided infection control /
modifications to existing structural plates to allow
for the replacement of 8 surgical lights. \$151,639/
completed November 2012

KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN, INC.
ROSEVILLE CENTRAL UTILITY PLANT BOILER
REPLACEMENT, ROSEVILLE
11,000sf removal of two existing steam boilers and
replacement with new steam boilers. \$300,000/
completed January 2012

KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN, INC.
ROSEVILLE MOB 1 ADDRESS SIGN
INSTALLATION, ROSEVILLE
Install electrical and new exterior address sign.
\$66,687/completed January 2012

KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN, INC.
(NORTHERN CALIFORNIA)
WOMEN & CHILDREN CENTER TENANT
IMPROVEMENTS, ROSEVILLE
Added casework in existing spaces. \$1,254,636/
completed January 2012

VERIZON WIRELESS
ROCKLIN UPA BATTERY INCREASE, ROCKLIN
2,000sf make ready work inside existing battery
room to prepare for new UPS battery racks being
installed by Verizon's vendor. \$115,347/completed
December 2011

TRACE MCMAHON

ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT



As assistant superintendent, Mr. McMahon has direct responsibility for safety, quality workmanship, on time scheduling, and keeping within the budget on each project. He initiates, coordinates, and supervises all field operations from the beginning of the project until completion and acceptance by the owner.

YEARS EXPERIENCE //

30 years

RUDOLPH AND SLETTEN TENURE //

10 years

EDUCATION //

Mission College, Santa Clara

REFERENCES //

Bogle Vineyards

Mr. Garrett Lamberti, Facility Director
(916) 580-5240

Northern California Valley Sheet Metal Industry

Mr. Robert Verdugo, Director
(916) 922-9381

Pride Industries

Mr. George Neidhardt, Chief of Facilities
(916) 802-2303

McCuen Properties

Mr. Dave Nystrom, Director of Development
(916) 481-6300

ISS / HP

Mr. Steve Wilber, Project Manager
(916) 517-9357

Bogle Vineyards

Mr. Ryan Bogle, Vice President
(916) 744-1139

RELEVANT PROJECT EXPERIENCE

HEWLETT PACKARD

R3U PILOT TENANT IMPROVEMENTS, ROSEVILLE

23,000sf demolition of existing office area for the addition of new collaborative work space. New construction consisted of building out a central hub housing collaborative meeting space, E-club breakroom with suspended wood ceilings, remodel of existing restrooms, addition of exterior windows at new conference rooms and MEP work. \$3,189,645/completed October 2016

UC DAVIS HEALTH SYSTEM

DAVIS TOWER PHASE 5, PEDIATRIC ICU, SACRAMENTO

25,250sf complete OSHPD-regulated buildout of the 10th floor shell space of an existing 14-story hospital tower, converting the space into a state-of-the-art 24-bed Pediatric Intensive Care Unit (PICU) with associated support staff. Includes work on four other occupied floors. \$10,578,408/completed September 2011

MCCUEN PROPERTIES

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY TENANT IMPROVEMENTS, RANCHO CORDOVA

13,000sf new secured space for the Department of Homeland Security within the existing office of emergency services tenant space. Improvements include new full height demising security walls, emergency power, construction of secured network IT closet, STC 52 walls, vault doors and standard wall finishes. \$1,422,836/completed April 2016

HEWLETT PACKARD

R3L CALWIN TENANT IMPROVEMENTS, ROSEVILLE

60,000sf demolition and refeed existing overhead bus duct electrical distribution and installation of three new distribution boards and refeed from boards to existing transformers, panels, and equipment. \$6,083,559/completed July 2015

AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES

FOLSOM SITE EXPANSION, FOLSOM

26,000sf design-build project consisted of 13,000sf of new building space and 13,000sf of tenant improvements, including disconnection, relocation and reconnection of hundreds of pieces of existing equipment from Lake Forest, CA. Both facilities were occupied and in various stages of production during the project. The new space houses an existing production process (sample preparation production), which was relocated from Lake Forest. \$10,952,148/completed January 2015

BOGLE VINEYARDS

DELTA WINERY PHASE II EXPANSION & CENTRAL PLANT, CLARKSBURG

Expansion of the Bogle Delta Winery Facility, which included improvements to the existing Central Plant, Grape Press Processing, Wine Tank Storage Farm, Sugar Shack and Barrel Building. \$18,500,000/completed August 2013

BOGLE VINEYARDS

DELTA WINERY PHASE 1B, CLARKSBURG

5,000sf addition to add 38 additional wine storage and wine fermentation tanks to existing tank farm, including new plumbing, electrical, refrigeration, controls, and process piping distribution system. Tenant improvement of approximately 2,000sf shell space, and caltrans and county required road upgrades. Includes widening of existing intersection, re-routing existing irrigation canals, lime treating existing subgrade, and new asphalt and paving. \$8,791,787/completed May 2013

BOGLE VINEYARDS

DELTA WINERY, CLARKSBURG

270,000sf winery including a barrel warehouse, cased goods storage, bottling facility, receiving area, tank farm, storm water retention and processed waste ponds. \$36,948,202/completed August 2011

MICHAEL RATAJCZAK, LEED AP BD+C

PROJECT MANAGER



As project manager, Mr. Ratajczak is directly responsible for negotiating and administering contracts, supervising project superintendents and engineers, monitoring job costs and schedules, and working closely with the architect and owner to ensure the project is completed on time and within budget. If preconstruction services are required, Mr. Ratajczak will attend design meetings, perform value analyses, and assist the estimating staff with budgeting and scheduling.

YEARS EXPERIENCE //

9 years

RUDOLPH AND SLETTEN TENURE //

8 years

EDUCATION //

Chico State University
Bachelor of Science,
Mechanical Engineering

REFERENCES //

City of Sacramento

Mr. Sean Burke, Program
Coordinator
(916) 808-5337

Kaiser Foundation Health Plan

Ms. Rose Thornton, Project
Manager
(916) 972-0904

Hewlett Packard

Mr. Dave Arnold, Senior
Project Manager
(916) 785-9735

Tahoe Truckee Unified School District

Mr. Rob Koster, Project
Manager
(530) 582-2542

Lionakis

Mr. Brian Bell, Project
Architect
(916) 558-1900

RELEVANT PROJECT EXPERIENCE

HEWLETT PACKARD

R3U PILOT TENANT IMPROVEMENTS, ROSEVILLE

23,000sf demolition of existing office area for the addition of new collaborative work space. New construction consisted of building out a central hub housing collaborative meeting space, E-club breakroom with suspended wood ceilings, remodel of existing restrooms, addition of exterior windows at new conference rooms and MEP work. \$3,189,645/completed October 2016

ORACLE CORPORATION

ROCKLIN EXPANSION, ROCKLIN

29,000sf suite buildout on the second floor of an existing commercial office building. Scope includes demolition of non-structural interior elements and construction of new offices, conference rooms, open offices, and breakrooms. \$2,500,625/completed November 2015

HEWLETT PACKARD

R3L CALWIN TENANT IMPROVEMENTS, ROSEVILLE

60,000sf demolition and refeed existing overhead bus duct electrical distribution and installation of three new distribution boards and refeed from boards to existing transformers, panels, and equipment. \$6,083,559/completed July 2015

TSAKOPOULOS INVESTMENTS

6TH FLOOR SPEC SPACE TENANT IMPROVEMENT AT 500 CAPITOL MALL, SACRAMENTO

1,500sf buildout of 6th floor to accommodate a new Spec Space for building. Includes new demising walls, new finishes, and new breakroom. \$106,657/completed October 2011

RAINFORTH GRAU ARCHITECTS

TENANT IMPROVEMENTS, SACRAMENTO

800sf addition to the current office for RGA architects including misc framing and drywall, added electrical outlets, minor casework, doors/frames/hardware and painting. \$33,804/completed June 2009

TSAKOPOULOS INVESTMENTS

LOCKE LORD LAW OFFICE TENANT IMPROVEMENTS AT 500 CAPITOL MALL, SACRAMENTO

11,500sf remodel the 18th floor to accommodate the law firm Locke Lord. Includes demolition and reconfiguration of the suite, full height demising walls, new finishes, new breakroom, and new MDF server room. \$524,633/completed August 2011

TSAKOPOULOS INVESTMENTS

STRADLING, ROCA, CARLSON & RAUTH, 500 CAPITOL MALL TENANT IMPROVEMENTS, 11TH FLOOR, SACRAMENTO

1,761sf tenant improvements for Stradling, Roca, Carlson & Rauth on the 11th floor. Includes the construction of various offices, conference room, and break/copy room. \$127,390/completed July 2011

KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN, INC.

POINT WEST TRAVEL CLINIC, SACRAMENTO

1,752sf remodel of existing Pediatric Pharmacy Department to buildout new Travel Clinic and Pharmacy MTM. New walls and modifications to electrical, mechanical, fire alarm and fire suppression systems. \$214,170/completed October 2009

TSAKOPOULOS INVESTMENTS

SOMACH SIMMONS AND DUNN LAW OFFICE TENANT IMPROVEMENTS, SACRAMENTO

13,625sf first generation tenant improvements for the law firm in the 10th floor of the Bank of the West Tower at 500 Capitol Mall, also built by Rudolph and Sletten. Includes office space, a server room and a breakroom. \$989,890/completed August 2009

TSAKOPOULOS INVESTMENTS

HANSON BRIDGETT LAW OFFICE TENANT IMPROVEMENTS, SACRAMENTO

10,904sf buildout for the law firm in the 15th floor of the Bank of the West Tower at 500 Capitol Mall. Includes office space, server room and break room. \$697,337/completed April 2009

D. COST PROPOSAL

COST PROPOSAL

TAB D

Attachment F

COST PROPOSAL

Labor charge per hour (straight time):	\$ <u>See attached labor rates</u>
Labor charge per hour (overtime):	\$ <u>See attached labor rates</u>
Labor charge per hour (emergency):	\$ <u>See attached labor rates</u>
Travel/Fuel charge per visit:	\$ <u>\$50.00</u>
Materials Mark-up:	% <u>10%</u>
Subcontractor Mark-up:	% <u>10%</u>
Response time from initial call (standard)	<u>24 hours</u>
Response time from initial call (emergency)	<u>4 hours</u>
Number of qualified local service technicians:	<u>20</u>
Number of local service vehicles:	<u>12</u>

1) How do you calculate your travel fee?

For field/craft employees, travel is calculated based on distance of travel from our Roseville Office. Standard daily charge of \$50 is applied to each project estimate/invoice for local projects within 30 miles of office.

Travel for Management employees is included in our standard management rates.

2) **To be able to better evaluate your proposal and capabilities please furnish a cost per the following example. Quote should be provided on your standard invoice and invoices should include a breakdown of labor hours and rate, materials cost plus mark-up, travel/fuel charge, etc.:**

Supply and installation of a new room of 10' x 10' with 12' wall. Use 4'x 8'- 5/8" type X new drywall with all necessary framing anchors necessary taping, priming, skim coat and two coats of finish Sherwin Williams and 4-1/2" Rubber Base Board, 100 SQFT of Patcraft carpet tiles, style – Intrinsic EW24.

Install two 2' x 4' LED drop in fixtures to existing power circuits. Also include all labor, material for 10' x 10' of drop ceiling with a ceiling height of 9' using USG Radar 2410 at 10' A. installation of a 3' x 7' x 1-3/4" HMD/HMF and 1 Storeroom ND80PD Rhodes 626 LO4 SCHLAGE.

See estimate sheet following the labor rates for sample project estimate.

STANDARD MANAGEMENT BILLING RATES: JULY 1, 2016 – JUNE 30, 2017

RUDOLPH AND SLETTEN	RATE/HOUR
Preconstruction	
Senior Vice President, Preconstruction	255.00
Senior Preconstruction Executive	225.00
Preconstruction Executive	195.00
Senior Estimator	150.00
Project Estimator	120.00
Director of VDC/BIM Services	175.00
VDC/BIM Manager	115.00
Senior VDC/BIM Specialist	80.00
VDC/BIM Specialist	70.00
VDC/BIM MEP Group Manager	140.00
Senior VDC/BIM MEP Coordinator	110.00
VDC/BIM MEP Coordinator	100.00
VDC/BIM MEP Specialist	75.00
Senior Cost Engineer	100.00
Cost Engineer	80.00
Cost Engineer Intern	45.00
Mechanical and Electrical Estimator	180.00
Subcontractor Prequalification Specialist	80.00
Administrative Assistant	65.00

RUDOLPH AND SLETTEN	RATE/HOUR
Construction	
Senior Vice President, Operations	255.00
Senior Project Executive	225.00
Project Executive	195.00
Senior Project Manager	150.00
Project Manager	120.00
Senior Project Engineer	100.00
Project Engineer	80.00
Project Engineer – Intern	45.00
Senior Superintendent – Type 1	205.00
Senior Superintendent – Type 2	175.00
Superintendent	145.00
Assistant Superintendent	125.00
Senior Field Office Coordinator	75.00
Field Office Coordinator	65.00
Senior Project Accountant	90.00
Project Accountant	70.00
Mechanical Group Manager	150.00
Senior Mechanical Coordinator	140.00
Mechanical Coordinator	110.00
Technical Development Director	150.00
Senior Scheduling Manager	170.00
Administrative Assistant	65.00
Safety Director	155.00
Regional Safety Manager	140.00
Regional Safety Coordinator	130.00
Document Control Clerk	55.00
IS Technical Field Specialist	90.00

ALL RATES ARE FIXED AND NON-AUDITABLE, BASED ON 40 HOURS PER WEEK. MANAGEMENT RATES INCLUDE CELL PHONES, PERSONAL COMPUTERS AND VEHICLES AS APPLICABLE. IF ACTUAL MANAGEMENT LABOR COSTS ARE USED, THE LABOR BURDEN RATE IS 41%.

STANDARD FIELD LABOR BILLING RATES: JULY 1, 2016 – JUNE 30, 2017

ROSEVILLE	1.0X	1.5X	2.0X
Carpenters			
Foreman	86.00	111.00	135.00
Journeyman	81.00	104.00	126.00
Apprentice	77.00	87.00	117.00
Senior JSC - Carpenter	88.00	113.00	137.00
JSC L2 - Carpenter	85.00	110.00	133.00
JSC - Carpenter	83.00	107.00	129.00
Laborers			
Foreman	68.00	82.00	100.00
Journeyman	66.00	79.00	95.00
Apprentice	61.00	72.00	87.00
Sr. JSC - Laborer	72.00	89.00	106.00
JSC L2 - Laborer	70.00	84.00	101.00
JSC - Laborer	68.00	81.00	98.00
Cement Masons			
Foreman	75.00	96.00	116.00
Journeyman	70.00	89.00	107.00
Apprentice	68.00	86.00	104.00
Operating Engineers			
Operator	90.00	114.00	138.00
Crane Operator	91.00	116.00	140.00
Apprentice	77.00	96.00	115.00

ALL RATES ARE FIXED AND NON-AUDITABLE, BASED UPON 40 HOURS PER WEEK. FIELD RATES EXCLUDE EQUIPMENT, VEHICLES, FUEL AND OTHER VEHICLE-RELATED COSTS. FIELD RATES CANNOT BE BILLED AT COST PLUS BURDEN.

RUDOLPH AND SLETTEN

RUDOLPH & SLETTEN, INC.

LINE ITEM 1A -- MANAGEMENT LABOR

PROJECT NAME: City of Roseville
ESTIMATED BY: Ryan Alnsworth

DATE: 04-Nov-16
Job No:

											TOTAL COSTS		
DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY		UNIT COST				LABOR	MATER.	EQUIP.	OTHER	TOTAL		
	AMOUNT	UNIT	L	M	E	O							
110 PROJECT MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL (A GENERAL CODE)													
111 PROJECT MANAGER/EXECUTIVE	20	hr	120	0	0	0	\$2,400	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,400		
112 FIELD SUPERVISOR		hr	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
113 PROJ. ASSIST. SUPT/FOREMAN		hr	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
114 SENIOR PROJECT ENGINEER		hr	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
115 FOC		hr	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
116 PROJECT ENGINEER		hr	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
117 MECHANICAL COORDINATOR		hr	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
118 ADMIN. ASSISTANT		hr	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
119 RUNNER/SHOP TO JOB DELIVERIES			0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
	AMOUNT	UNIT	L	M	E	O	LABOR	MATER.	EQUIP.	OTHER	TOTAL		
140 FIELD OFFICE EXPENSE (A GENERAL CODE)													
141 JOBSITE OFF.-SET-UP/RENT		wks	100	0	100	30	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
142 JANITORIAL SERVICES - JOBSITE OFFICE			0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
143 GUARD SERVICE& SONTROL - JOBSITE OFFICE			0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
147 JOBSITE OFFICE FURNITURE - EQUIPMENT			0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
	AMOUNT	UNIT	L	M	E	O	LABOR	MATER.	EQUIP.	OTHER	TOTAL		
150 SCHEDULING SERVICES (A GENERAL CODE)													
156 SCHEDULING CONSULTANTS							\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
157 SCHEDULING - IN HOUSE							\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
	AMOUNT	UNIT	L	M	E	O	LABOR	MATER.	EQUIP.	OTHER	TOTAL		
160 GENERAL ADMINISTRATION (A GENERAL CODE)													
161 OFFICE SUPPLIES - PETTY CASH	1	ls	0	0	0	100	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100	\$100		
162 COMPUTERS,MODEM,FAX MACHINE+XEROX MACH		mos	0	0	0	270	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
163 POSTAGE, FEDERAL EXPRESS, ETC.		mos	0	0	0	50	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
165 TELE.INSTALL.&SERV.(/MO)	1	mos	0	0	0	100	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100	\$100		
166 REPRO COSTS/BLUEPRINT	0	ls	0	0	0	100	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
167 DRINKING WATER & ICE - JOBSITE OFFICE	1	mos	0	0	0	80	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$80	\$80		
168 TRAVEL EXPENSES, TOLLS	15	days	0	0	0	50	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$750	\$750		
169 SUBSISTANCE			0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
179 PROJECT CLOSEOUT/START-UP	15	ls	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
	AMOUNT	UNIT	L	M	E	O	LABOR	MATER.	EQUIP.	OTHER	TOTAL		
180 MANAGEMENT VEHICLES (A GENERAL CODE)													
183 PICK-UP TRUCKS/CARS	0	mos	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
186 GAS OIL,DIESEL FUEL,LUBRICANTS,ETC.-MGMT.VEH.	0.0	mos	0	0	0	650	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
	MANAGEMENT LABOR TOTALS	0					\$2,400	\$0	\$0	\$1,030	\$3,430		
	LINE ITEM 1A -- MANAGEMENT LABOR						\$2,400	\$0	\$0	\$1,030	\$3,430		
	LINE ITEM 1B -- SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS						\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
	GENERAL CONDITIONS TOTALS						\$2,400	\$0	\$0	\$1,030	\$3,430		

RUDOLPH AND SLETTEN, INC.
SUMMARY SHEET

Project: **City of Roseville** Date: **04-Nov-16** Page #: **1**
Estimated By: **Ryan Ainsworth** Lab Burden: **0%**

001 Framing / Drywall		QUANTITY		UNIT COSTS				TOTAL COSTS				
Code	DESCRIPTION	AMT	UNIT	L	M	E	O	LABOR	MATERIAL	EQUIP	OTHER	TOTAL
	12' 25ga framing (2 guys/2 days)	32	mh	\$81				\$2,592	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,592
	Framing Material	40	ea		11	5	4	\$0	\$440	\$200	\$160	\$800
	Drywall 5/8" USG (40x12=480SF)	17	ea		13	5	4	\$0	\$221	\$85	\$68	\$374
	Hang Sheetrock	16	mh	\$81				\$1,296	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,296
	Tape / Finish	24	mh	\$81				\$1,944	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,944
				DIRECT COST TOTALS:				\$5,832	\$661	\$285	\$228	\$7,006
				LABOR BURDEN				0%	\$0			\$0
				DIRECT COST TOTALS:				\$5,832	\$661	\$285	\$228	\$7,006
002 Painting		QUANTITY		UNIT COSTS				TOTAL COSTS				
Code	DESCRIPTION	AMT	UNIT	L	M	E	O	LABOR	MATERIAL	EQUIP	OTHER	TOTAL
	Labor	12	mh	\$81				\$972	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$972
	Material	1	ls		100.00	50		\$0	\$100	\$50	\$0	\$150
				DIRECT COST TOTALS:				\$972	\$100	\$50	\$0	\$1,122
				LABOR BURDEN				0%	\$0			\$0
				DIRECT COST TOTALS:				\$972	\$100	\$50	\$0	\$1,122
003 New Ceiling Grid / Tile		QUANTITY		UNIT COSTS				TOTAL COSTS				
Code	DESCRIPTION	AMT	UNIT	L	M	E	O	LABOR	MATERIAL	EQUIP	OTHER	TOTAL
	Labor (2 guys/8hr)	12	mh	\$81				\$972	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$972
	Material (\$65/box USG 2410 tile)	1	ls		250.00	50		\$0	\$250	\$50	\$0	\$300
				DIRECT COST TOTALS:				\$972	\$250	\$50	\$0	\$1,272
				LABOR BURDEN				0%	\$0			\$0
				DIRECT COST TOTALS:				\$972	\$250	\$50	\$0	\$1,272
004 Flooring		QUANTITY		UNIT COSTS				TOTAL COSTS				
Code	DESCRIPTION	AMT	UNIT	L	M	E	O	LABOR	MATERIAL	EQUIP	OTHER	TOTAL
	Material - Patcraft Intrisic EW24 (\$1.34/sf online)	100	SF		1.5			\$0	\$150	\$0	\$0	\$150
	Labor	4	mh	\$81				\$324	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$324
	Rubber Base	0.5	LF		90			\$0	\$45	\$0	\$0	\$45
	Base Install	2	mh	\$81			100	\$162	\$0	\$0	\$200	\$362
	Glue, Misc	3	mh	\$81				\$243	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$243
				DIRECT COST TOTALS:				\$729	\$195	\$0	\$200	\$1,124
				LABOR BURDEN				0%	\$0			\$0
				DIRECT COST TOTALS:				\$729	\$195	\$0	\$200	\$1,124
005 New HMD / HMF & ND80PD Lockset		QUANTITY		UNIT COSTS				TOTAL COSTS				
Code	DESCRIPTION	AMT	UNIT	L	M	E	O	LABOR	MATERIAL	EQUIP	OTHER	TOTAL
	Labor	8	mh	\$81				\$648	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$648
	Material (HM Door = \$375, Frame = \$225, Lockset/Misc = \$225)	1	ls		850	100		\$0	\$850	\$100	\$0	\$950
				DIRECT COST TOTALS:				\$648	\$850	\$100	\$0	\$1,598
				LABOR BURDEN				\$0				\$0
				DIRECT COST TOTALS:				\$648	\$850	\$100	\$0	\$1,598
006 Waste Management / Disposal		QUANTITY		UNIT COSTS				TOTAL COSTS				
Code	DESCRIPTION	AMT	UNIT	L	M	E	O	LABOR	MATERIAL	EQUIP	OTHER	TOTAL
	Labor	8	mh	\$81				\$648	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$648
	Material	1	ls		\$0			\$0	\$50	\$0	\$0	\$50
	Disposal Fees	1	ea				150	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$150	\$150
				DIRECT COST TOTALS:				\$648	\$50	\$0	\$150	\$848
				LABOR BURDEN				0%	\$0			\$0
				DIRECT COST TOTALS:				\$648	\$50	\$0	\$150	\$848
007 Ongoing / Final Cleanup		QUANTITY		UNIT COSTS				TOTAL COSTS				
Code	DESCRIPTION	AMT	UNIT	L	M	E	O	LABOR	MATERIAL	EQUIP	OTHER	TOTAL
	Labor	16	mh	\$81				\$1,296	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,296
	Material	1	ls		125		25	\$0	\$125	\$0	\$25	\$150
				DIRECT COST TOTALS:				\$1,296	\$125	\$0	\$25	\$1,446
				LABOR BURDEN				\$0				\$0
				DIRECT COST TOTALS:				\$1,296	\$125	\$0	\$25	\$1,446

PROPOSAL
GENERAL CONSTRUCTION SERVICES #01-011
CITY OF ROSEVILLE

E. REQUIRED STATEMENTS/ DOCUMENTS

LEFT'S BUILD

REQUIRED STATEMENTS/ DOCUMENTS

TAB E

Rudolph and Sletten confirms our compliance with the following requirements:

- Non-substitution for the designated members of the team without approval by City staff (Section 4.0)
- The absence of a conflict of interest (Section 9.4)
- Ability and agreement to fulfill the indemnification and insurance requirements contained in the sample contract (Section 9.7)
- Nothing contained in the submitted proposal will be proprietary (Section 9.23)

We have also submitted Attachments A-C, E and G following in this section. Attachment F can be found in ***Tab D - Cost Proposal***.

Attachment A

PROPOSER'S CERTIFICATION

I hereby propose to furnish the goods or services specified in the Request for Proposals ("RFP"). I agree that my proposal will remain firm for a period of up to ninety (90) days in order to allow the City of Roseville ("City") adequate time to evaluate the qualifications submitted.

I have carefully examined the Request for Proposals and any other documents accompanying or made a part of this RFP. The information contained in this proposal is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and is signed under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California. I further certify that I am duly authorized to submit this proposal on behalf of the firm as its authorized agent and that the firm is ready, willing and able to perform if awarded the contract.

I further certify that this proposal is made without prior understanding, agreement, connection, discussion, or conspiracy with any other person, firm or corporation submitting a proposal for the same product or service; that this proposal is fair and made without outside control, collusion, fraud or illegal action; that no officer, employee or agent of the City or any other proposer is financially interested in said proposal; that no undue influence or pressure was used against or in concert with any officer, employee or agent of the City in connection with the award or terms of the contract that will be executed as a result of this RFP; and that the undersigned executed this Proposer's Certification with full knowledge and understanding of the matters therein contained and was duly authorized to do so.

Rudolph and Sletten, Inc.

NAME OF BUSINESS



SIGNATURE

Michael P. Mohrman, Senior Vice President and Chief Estimator

NAME & TITLE, TYPED OR PRINTED

1504 Eureka Road, Suite 200, Roseville, CA 92561

MAILING ADDRESS

(916) 781-8001

TELEPHONE NUMBER

mike.mohrman@rsconst.com

EMAIL

Type of Organization:

☐ Sole Proprietorship

☒ Corporation

☐ State of Incorporation

☐ Partnership

☐ Limited Liability Company

Attachment C

SUBCONTRACTOR LIST

If subcontractors will not be used, proposer must write "NONE". For construction contracts, in accordance with the Public Contract Code, Part 1, Chapter 4, Subletting and Subcontracting, Contractors must list the name and business address of each subcontractor who will perform work or labor or render service to the prime contractor in or about the construction of the work or improvement, or who will specially fabricate and install a portion of the work or improvement according to detailed drawings contained in the plans and specifications, in an amount in excess of one-half of one percent (0.5%) of the prime contractor's total bid, or in the case of bids or offers for the construction of streets and highways, including bridges, in excess of one-half of one percent (0.5%) of the prime contractor's total bid or ten thousand dollars (\$10,000) whichever is greater.

Company Name Please reference attached list of proposed on-call subcontractors.

Principal _____

Address _____

City _____

Phone _____

Job capacity _____

Percentage of total work _____

Licenses and numbers _____

DIR Contractor Registration Number & Expiration Date _____

Company Name _____

Principal _____

Address _____

City _____

Phone _____

Job capacity _____

Percentage of total work _____

Licenses and numbers _____

DIR Contractor Registration Number & Expiration Date _____

For on-call services projects, our Special Projects Group is capable of self-performing or subcontracting all scopes of work. As projects come up under the on-call contract, Rudolph and Sletten will competitively solicit bids for subcontracted scopes of work. Below is a partial listing of our preferred subcontractors we would propose soliciting bids from and utilizing for on-call services projects.

ACOUSTICAL CEILINGS	
PAT BAIRD ACOUSTICS	Rocklin
PERFORMANCE CONTRACTING	North Highlands
SPACETONE ACOUSTICS	Pleasanton
CAST-IN-PLACE CONCRETE	
CONCRETE NORTH	Galt
CONCRETE SERVICES	Sacramento
URATA & SONS CEMENT	Rancho Cordova
CERAMIC TILE	
CAPITAL COMMERCIAL FLOORING	Sacramento
FISCHER TILE AND MARBLE	Sacramento
PROSPECTRA CONTRACT FLOORING	Rancho Cordova
SHERMAN-LOEHR CUSTOM TILE WORKS	Sacramento
CONCRETE REINFORCEMENT	
ALAMILLO REBAR	Benicia
CAMBLIN STEEL SERVICE	Sacramento
SACRAMENTO REBAR	El Dorado Hills
DOORS, FRAMES & HARDWARE	
CAPITOL BUILDERS	Sacramento
ISEC INCORPORATED	Dixon
MIDSTATE SPECIALTIES	Sacramento
DRYWALL	
COFFEY BUILDING GRP	Placerville
PERFORMANCE CONTRACTING	North Highlands
W F HAYWARD CO	Placerville
ELECTRICAL	
REDWOOD ELECTRIC	Roseville
REX MOORE GROUP	Sacramento
ROSENDIN ELECTRIC	Sacramento
SCHETTER ELECTRIC	Sacramento

FINISH CARPENTRY / MILLWORK / CASEWORK	
BOYETT CONSTRUCTION	Hayward
BURNETT & SONS	Sacramento
DOW DIVERSIFIED	Vacaville
ALLEN'S CABINET & FIXTURE	Lincoln
FIRE PROTECTION	
ALLIED FIRE PROTECTION	Oakland
CEN-CAL FIRE SYSTEMS	Lodi
COSCO FIRE	Rocklin
WESTERN STATES FIRE	Sacramento
FLOORING	
B T MANCINI CO	Sacramento
CAPITAL COMMERCIAL FLOORING	Sacramento
DYNAMIC COMMERCIAL FLOORING SYSTEMS	North Highlands
PROSPECTRA CONTRACT FLOORING	Rancho Cordova
SHERMAN-LOEHR CUSTOM TILE WORKS	Sacramento
GLAZING	
ALCAL SPECIALTY CONTRACTING	Sacramento
BAGATELOS	Sacramento
HORIZON CONTRACT GLAZING	West Sacramento
U S GLASS	Sacramento
WEST COAST GLAZING	Sacramento
GRADING, UTILITY & PAVING	
BEEBE DIVERSIFIED LP	Rancho Cordova
GRANITE CONSTRUCTION	Sacramento
MC GUIRE AND HESTER	Oakland
PRESTON PIPELINES	Sacramento

MECHANICAL	
ACCO ENGINEERED SYSTEMS	Sacramento
AIRCO MECHANICAL	Sacramento
JOHNSON CONTROLS	Folsom
FRANK M BOOTH	Granite Bay
INTECH MECHANICAL	Roseville
J W MCCLENAHAN CO	Sacramento
LAWSON MECHANICAL	Sacramento
MARK III CONSTRUCTION	Sacramento
RAY L HELLWIG	Roseville
LANDSCAPE AND IRRIGATION	
AERCO PACIFIC	Rancho Cordova
CLEARWATER LANDSCAPE SERVICES	Cameron Park
JENSEN CORPORATION	Roseville
VALLEYCREST	Sacramento
MISCELLANEOUS METALS	
JD2 INCORPORATED	Auburn
S & H METALS	Sacramento
VIKING STEEL	Sacramento
PAINTING	
GLP PAINTING	Sacramento
JAMES L HARRIS'	Auburn
VALDEZ PAINTING	Sacramento
TOILET SPECIALTIES & PARTITIONS	
AMERICAN SHEET METAL	Sacramento
ISEC INCORPORATED	Dixon/California
UNIT MASONRY	
FISCHER TILE AND MARBLE	Sacramento
JOHN JACKSON	Sacramento
TOWNSEND & SCHMIDT	Sacramento

Attachment E

**NONCOLLUSION DECLARATION TO BE EXECUTED BY
BIDDER AND SUBMITTED WITH BID**

The undersigned declares:

I am the Senior Vice President of Rudolph and Sletten, Inc., the party making the foregoing bid.

The bid is not made in the interest of, or on behalf of, any undisclosed person, partnership, company, association, organization, or corporation. The bid is genuine and not collusive or sham. The bidder has not directly or indirectly induced or solicited any other bidder to put in a false or sham bid. The bidder has not directly or indirectly colluded, conspired, connived, or agreed with any bidder or anyone else to put in a sham bid, or to refrain from bidding. The bidder has not in any manner, directly or indirectly, sought by agreement, communication, or conference with anyone to fix the bid price of the bidder or any other bidder, or to fix any overhead, profit, or cost element of the bid price, or of that of any other bidder. All statements contained in the bid are true. The bidder has not, directly or indirectly, submitted his or her bid price or any breakdown thereof, or the contents thereof, or divulged information or data relative thereto, to any corporation, partnership, company, association, organization, bid depository, or to any member or agent thereof, to effectuate a collusive or sham bid, and has not paid, and will not pay, any person or entity for such purpose.

Any person executing this declaration on behalf of a bidder that is a corporation, partnership, joint venture, limited liability company, limited liability partnership, or any other entity, hereby represents that he or she has full power to execute, and does execute, this declaration on behalf of the bidder.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration is executed on November 2, 2016 [date], at Redwood City [city], California [state].


Michael Mohrman, Senior Vice President
(Signature of Declarant)

Attachment G**CONTRACTOR TYPE OF WORK**

Please place a check next to the appropriate types of work that your company performs, or contracts out:

- ☒ Tile setting/repair
- ☒ Carpet install/repair
- ☒ Linoleum install/repair
- ☒ Masonry
- ☒ Welding
- ☒ Windows
- ☒ Electrical
- ☒ Plumbing
- ☒ Finishes
- ☒ Carpentry
- ☒ Locksmith & Security
- ☒ Painting
- ☒ Cabinet, Millwork & Finish Carpentry
- ☒ Concrete
- ☒ Drywall
- ☒ Doors and frames
- ☒ Electrical Sign
- ☒ Fencing
- ☒ Fire Protection
- ☒ Landscaping
- ☒ Sanitation System
- ☒ Roofing
- ☒ Asbestos Certification
- ☒ Hazardous Substance Removal Certification
- ☒ Mechanical
- ☒ Fire Damage Repair
- ☒ Site Work
- ☒ General Conditions
- ☒ Moisture Protection
- ☒ Demolition

F. EXCEPTIONS

EXCEPTIONS

TAB F

Rudolph and Sletten has no proposed exceptions, alterations or amendments to the Scope of Services or other requirements of this RFP, including the Sample Contract (Attachment D).

G. COMPETENCY OF PROPOSERS

COMPETENCY OF PROPOSERS

Rudolph and Sletten has never had any bankruptcies, liens, stop payment notices or foreclosures.

As a general contractor, Rudolph and Sletten is occasionally named in a suit that is actually a product liability or personal injury suit involving a subcontractor. These suits are usually settled in mediation with the subcontractor's insurance company. R&S works in cooperation with the owner to assure the owner's satisfaction.

We have provided a list of current, settled, arbitrated, and litigated disputes with a client over the past seven years below:

Project Name:	La Jolla Laboratory Replacement
Project Location:	La Jolla, CA
Owner/Client Name:	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)
Nature of Claim:	Contract dispute: There have been delays in the completion of the project which are the owner's responsibility under the contract and under the applicable FAR regulations. R&S has submitted requests for time extensions and corresponding costs.
Initial Claim Amount:	Amount owed to R&S has not been finalized.
Year Resolved:	Currently awaiting result of claim, as well as the opportunity to negotiate a resolution with the owner.
Project Name:	Otay Ranch High School
Project Location:	Chula Vista, CA
Owner/Client Name:	Sweetwater Union High School District
Nature of Claim:	R&S was a construction manager on the construction of a new high school facility. Approximately 10 years after project completion, the school district filed a law suit against the prime trade contractors, architect, and R&S as construction manager for alleged deficiencies in the construction of some of the roofs on the project.
Initial Claim Amount:	Approximately \$4 million.
Date Resolved:	October 15, 2015
Final Status:	R&S successfully resolved the matter through a motion for summary judgment (R&S dropped from the lawsuit).
Project Name:	Project Lotus – Luxury Condos
Project Location:	Beverly Hills, CA
Owner/Client Name:	Candy & Candy Limited, Candy & Candy Inc. & Project Lotus LLC
Nature of Claim:	R&S was the plaintiff in an action to recover funds due for services performed under the contract. Matter has been resolved pursuant to a confidential settlement agreement.
Initial Claim Amount:	\$1.45 million
Date Resolved:	October 2011
Final Status:	Negotiated a confidential settlement out of court with the owner.
Project Name:	The Bishop's School Expansion
Project Location:	La Jolla, CA
Owner/Client Name:	The Bishop's School
Nature of Claim:	R&S and the architect were defendants in this case. It was filed by the owner for alleged defects associated with water intrusion.
Initial Claim Amount:	Confidential
Date Resolved:	3/29/11
Final Status:	Negotiated a confidential settlement out of court between R&S, the subcontractors and their insurance carriers, and the owner.

Project Name: Palomar Medical Center West
Project Location: Escondido, CA
Owner/Client Name: Palomar Pomerado Health (PPH)
Nature of Claim: R&S was the defendant on a claim by the owner over disputed billing rates that had been previously agreed upon.
Initial Claim Amount: \$2.5 million
Date Resolved: Dismissal entered 9/20/10 (claim withdrawn)
Final Status: Negotiated a confidential settlement out of court. PPH subsequently sent R&S a letter withdrawing all claims against R&S in connection with this project and "would recommend R&S unequivocally and without reservation for its construction management and construction services for any size project."

Rudolph and Sletten has never been terminated from a contract.



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8232
File #: 0203-03

Title: Liquid Cationic Polymer - Service Agreement Amendment
Contact: Bryan Buchanan 916-746-1812 bbuchanan@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017
Item #: 6.10.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff recommends Council adopt a resolution to authorize an amendment no. 2 to service agreement S1503108 with Solenis, LLC to extend the term of the agreement by 4 months from December 15, 2016 to April 30, 2017 and increase the value of the agreement by \$210,000.00 from \$980,000.00 to \$1,190,000.00. The addition will pay for liquid cationic polymer (Praestol K279FLX) which is used for dewatering biosolids. Funding is included in the approved Wastewater Operations FY2016/17 budget. In addition, adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to sign the attached service agreement amendment.

BACKGROUND

The Environmental Utilities Department Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant has an ongoing requirement for liquid cationic polymer. This chemical is used to dewater biosolids generated by the wastewater treatment process. Biosolids at the Pleasant Grove Plant are dewatered to reduce the overall weight, thus allowing for transportation for disposal at a considerably lower cost. This chemical will be purchased through April 30, 2017.

The original service agreement was based on a competitively bid contract that was awarded to Solenis, LLC by the Bay Area Chemical Consortium (BACC). Extending the term and increasing the total dollar amount of the agreement is necessary so that the City can continue to purchase liquid cationic polymer through the end of April 2017, which allows time for a new bid to be issued.

The bid process for polymer requires a minimum of three months because each wastewater treatment plant has a specific polymer blend and dose. The bid process requires extensive time for potential vendors to perform a benchtop test, deliver polymer test drums, and complete field trials in order to pre-qualify to participate in the bid. Due to the intensive staff participation necessary to perform trial, only one plant can perform trials at a time. With a recent rejection of all polymer bids, the timeline for polymer testing has been delayed by three months.

FISCAL IMPACT

The total cost of this amendment is \$210,000.00. Funding is included the approved Wastewater Operations FY2016/17 budget.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Not applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not apply to activities that will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines §15061(b)(3)). The hauling and delivery of hazardous substances is regulated by the State. Hazardous material transport consistent with applicable safety regulations should not result in a significant environmental effect. Therefore, the proposed Service Agreement does not include the potential for significant environmental effect and is not subject to CEQA.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bryan Buchanan, Principal Engineer

Richard Plecker, Environmental Utilities Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution No. 17-39

SAAmendment S1503108

RESOLUTION NO. 17-39

APPROVING AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO SERVICE AGREEMENT
BETWEEN CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND SOLENIS, LLC, AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY
MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

WHEREAS, Amendment No. 2 to Service Agreement (S1503108) for liquid cationic polymer, between the City of Roseville and Solenis, LLC, has been prepared and reviewed by the Council; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that said second amendment to service agreement is approved and that the City Manager is authorized to execute it on behalf of the City of Roseville.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk



PURCHASING
CITY OF ROSEVILLE

2005 HILLTOP CIRCLE, ROSEVILLE, CA 95747
(916) 774-5720 • TDD (916) 774-5220 • FAX (916) 774-5736

**SERVICE AGREEMENT
AMENDMENT**

SERVICE AGREEMENT No: S1503108
AMENDMENT No.: 2

SERVICE LOCATION: PLEASANT GROVE WWTP
5051 WESTPARK DRIVE
ROSEVILLE, CA 95747

Contractor No.: V40217

Contractor License No.:
Business License No.:

SUBMIT ALL INVOICES TO:
CITY OF ROSEVILLE
Finance Department
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

Telephone No.: 302-502-0830 Fax:

Department: ENVIRONMENTAL UTILITIES

Contractor: SOLENIS, LLC
bidders@solenis.com
ATTN: SUZANNE BROWN
3 BEAVER VALLEY ROAD, SUITE 500
WILMINGTON, DE 19803

Acct. Code: 08427-5015

Buyer: BABETTE OWENS
Phone: 916-774-5704

Service Agreement Number S1503108 ("Agreement"), which was executed on 2/18/15, is hereby modified as follows:

Select all provisions that apply:

- ☐ The Contractor name is hereby changed from
- ☐ The term of the Agreement is reduced by (days/months/years) and the expiration date of the Agreement is changed from to
- X The Total Cost of Service payable under this Agreement is increased from \$980,000.00 to \$1,190,000.00; and to extend the term of the contract by 4 months – from 12/30/16 to 4/30/17. The purpose of this modification is to continue to provide Praestol K279FLX Polymer to the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Plant.
- ☐ The original scope of work under the Agreement is hereby increased and the following services have been added from the original Agreement.

All other provisions of the Agreement shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

CONTRACTOR:

By: [Signature]
Title: _____

By: _____

Title: _____

CITY OF ROSEVILLE,
A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION:

By: _____
Rob Jensen
City Manager

Distribution: 1- Purchasing, 1 - Contractor, 1 - Originating Dept



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8186
File #: 0203-03

Title: Liquid Cationic Polymer - Service Agreement Amendment
Contact: Bryan Buchanan 916-746-1812 bbuchanan@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017
Item #: 6.11.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff recommends Council authorize an amendment to service agreement S1603141 with Solenis, LLC to extend the term of the agreement by 4 months from December 15, 2016 to April 30, 2017; and increase the value of the agreement by \$210,000.00 from \$200,000.00 to \$410,000.00. The addition will pay for liquid cationic polymer (Praestol K275FLX) which is used for dewatering biosolids. Funding is included in the approved Wastewater Operations FY2016/17 budget. In addition, adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to sign the attached service agreement amendment.

BACKGROUND

The Environmental Utilities Department Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant has an ongoing requirement for liquid cationic polymer. This chemical is used to dewater biosolids generated by the wastewater treatment process. Biosolids at the Dry Creek Plant are dewatered to reduce the overall weight, thus allowing for transportation for land application at a considerable lower cost. This chemical will be purchased through April 30, 2017.

The original service agreement was based on a competitively bid contract that was awarded to Solenis, LLC by the Bay Area Chemical Consortium (BACC). Extending the term and increasing the total dollar amount of the agreement is necessary so that the City can continue to purchase liquid cationic polymer through the end of April 2017, which allows time for a new bid to be issued. The bid process for polymer requires a minimum of three months because each wastewater treatment plant has a specific polymer blend and dose.

The bid process requires extensive time for potential vendors to perform a benchtop test, deliver polymer test drums, and complete field trials in order to pre-qualify to participate in the bid. Due to the intensive staff participation necessary to perform trial, only one plant can perform trials at a time. With a recent delay and retrieval of polymer at the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant, the timeline for the Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant polymer testing has been delayed by three months.

FISCAL IMPACT

The total cost of this amendment is \$210,000.00. Funding is included the approved Wastewater Operations FY2016/17 budget.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Not applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not apply to activities that will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines §15061(b)(3)). The hauling and delivery of hazardous substances is regulated by the State. Hazardous material transport consistent with applicable safety regulations should not result in a significant environmental effect. Therefore, the proposed Service Agreement does not include the potential for significant environmental effect and is not subject to CEQA.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bryan Buchanan, Principal Engineer

Richard Plecker, Environmental Utilities Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution No. 17-05

SAAmendment S1603141

RESOLUTION NO. 17-05

APPROVING AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO SERVICE AGREEMENT
BETWEEN CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND SOLENIS, LLC, AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY
MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

WHEREAS, Amendment No. 1 to Service Agreement (S1603141) for liquid cationic polymer, between the City of Roseville and Solenis, LLC, has been prepared and reviewed by the Council; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that said first amendment to service agreement is approved and that the City Manager is authorized to execute it on behalf of the City of Roseville.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk



PURCHASING
CITY OF ROSEVILLE

2005 HILLTOP CIRCLE, ROSEVILLE, CA 95747
(916) 774-5720 • TDD (916) 774-5220 • FAX (916) 774-5736

**SERVICE AGREEMENT
AMENDMENT**

SERVICE AGREEMENT No: S1603141
AMENDMENT No.: 1

SERVICE LOCATION: DRY CREEK WWTP
1800 BOOTH ROAD
ROSEVILLE, CA 95747

Contractor No.: V40217

SUBMIT ALL INVOICES TO:
CITY OF ROSEVILLE
Finance Department
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

Contractor License No.:
Business License No.:

Department: ENVIRONMENTAL UTILITIES

Telephone No.: 302-502-0830 Fax:

Contractor: SOLENIS, LLC
bidders@solenis.com
ATTN: SUZANNE BROWN
3 BEAVER VALLEY ROAD, SUITE 500
WILMINGTON, DE 19803

Acct. Code: 08422-5015

Buyer: BABETTE OWENS
Phone: 916-774-5704


Service Agreement Number S1603141 ("Agreement"), which was executed on 12/16/15, is hereby modified as follows:

Select all provisions that apply:

- ☐ The Contractor name is hereby changed from
- ☐ The term of the Agreement is reduced by _____ (days/months/years) and the expiration date of the Agreement is changed from _____ to _____
- X The Total Cost of Service payable under this Agreement is increased from \$200,000.00 to \$410,000.00; and to extend the term of the contract by 4 months – from 12/15/16 to 4/30/17. The purpose of this modification is to continue to provide Praestol K275FLX Polymer to the Dry Creek Wastewater Plant.
- ☐ The original scope of work under the Agreement is hereby increased and the following services have been added from the original Agreement.

All other provisions of the Agreement shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

CONTRACTOR:

By: 

Title: _____

By: _____

Title: _____

CITY OF ROSEVILLE,
A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION:

By: _____
Rob Jensen
City Manager

Distribution: 1- Purchasing, 1 - Contractor, 1 - Originating Dept



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8183

File #: 0400-04-09-1

Title: Westpark Phase 4 Village 18E - Certificate of Completion

Contact: Keith Litts 916-517-7598 klitts@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 6.12.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff recommends that the City Council take the following action:

1. Adopt the attached resolution accepting WESTPARK - PHASE 4, VILLAGE 18E, CWJ# 150153, as complete.
2. Authorize the City Engineer to execute the Certificate of Completion.

BACKGROUND

The Engineering Division has made a final inspection of the above project and has found the roadway infrastructure work complete in accordance with the improvement plans and City Specifications.

FISCAL IMPACT

The actions requested as part of this action have no impact to the City's General Fund. Construction costs were paid by the developer.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Accepting the project as complete will not directly create jobs but rather maintain current employee levels of the developer until such a time the project is fully built out.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The Council action of accepting WESTPARK - PHASE 4, VILLAGE 18E as complete will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guideline 15060(c)(2)). Adoption of this project does not include the potential for a significant environmental effect and therefore is not subject to CEQA.

Respectfully Submitted,

Keith Litts, Construction Inspector

Kevin Payne, Development Services Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution No. 17-04

COC

Vicinity Map

RESOLUTION NO. 17-04

RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ACCEPTING THE PUBLIC WORK KNOWN AS **WESTPARK - PHASE 4, VILLAGE 18E** PROJECT, APPROVING THE "CERTIFICATE OF COMPLETION", AND AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE CITY ENGINEER TO EXECUTE SAID NOTICE ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE, THEREFORE, AND ACCEPTING ALL DEDICATIONS OFFERED ON THE RECORDED MAP OF THE SUBDIVISION.

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville as follows:

1. The "Certificate of Completion" on file in the City Clerk's Department relative to that public work known as the **WESTPARK - PHASE 4, VILLAGE 18E** is hereby approved and the public work accepted.
2. All rights of way and easements as offered on the final map of recorded with Placer County Recorder's Office Book DD of Maps, Page 48 is hereby accepted.
3. The City Engineer is hereby authorized and directed to execute said Notice on behalf of the City of Roseville.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville, this ____ day of _____, 2017, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK

AFTER RECORDING RETURN TO:
CITY CLERK
311 VERNON STREET
ROSEVILLE, CA 95678

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLETION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the public work known as **WESTPARK - PHASE 4, VILLAGE 18E**. Project was completed and accepted by the City of Roseville on _____. The _____ location is indicated on the attached map, marked as Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein by this reference.

The general contractor on said project was **LUND CONSTRUCTION COMPANY**

The surety on said project was **THE CONTINENTAL INSURANCE COMPANY, BOND NO. 929620288-M**.

MARC STOUT
City Engineer
City of Roseville

ATTEST:

SONIA OROZCO, CITY CLERK

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF PLACER)

I, MARC STOUT, being first duly sworn, depose and say: I am the City Engineer of the City of Roseville, a municipal corporation in the State of California, owner of the property described in the above Notice. I am duly authorized to make this verification for and on behalf of the City of Roseville. I have read the Certificate of Completion and know its contents and the facts stated therein are true.

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

MARC STOUT
City Engineer
City of Roseville


State of California)
County of Placer)

Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on this ____ day of _____, 2017, by _____ proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) who appeared before me.

Notary Public in and for said County and State

EXHIBIT A

City of Roseville Westpark Phase 4 Village 18E





COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 9200

File #: 0400-04-04-1

Title: Parcel 49 Phase 1 Site Improvement Plans - Certificate of Completion

Contact: Orville Chatterton 916-774-5339 ochatterton@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 6.13.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff recommends that the City Council take the following action:

1. Adopt the attached resolution accepting Parcel 49 Phase 1 Site Improvement Plans, CWJ#150117, as complete.
2. Authorize the City Engineer to execute the Certificate of Completion.

BACKGROUND

The Engineering Division has made a final inspection of the above project and has found the roadway infrastructure work complete in accordance with the improvement plans and City specifications.

FISCAL IMPACT

The actions requested as part of this action have no impact to the City's General Fund. Construction and inspection costs were paid by the developer.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Accepting the project as complete is not expected to result in measurable economic impact or job creation.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The Council action of accepting Parcel 49 Phase 1 Site Improvement Plans as complete will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guideline 15060(c)(2)). Acceptance of this project does not include the potential for a significant environmental effect and therefore is not subject to CEQA.

Respectfully Submitted,

Orville Chatterton, Construction Inspector

Kevin Payne, Development Services Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution No. 17-14

COC

Exhibit A

RESOLUTION NO. 17-14

RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ACCEPTING THE PUBLIC WORK KNOWN AS PARCEL 49 PHASE 1 SITE IMPROVEMENT PLANS PROJECT, APPROVING THE "CERTIFICATE OF COMPLETION", AND AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE CITY ENGINEER TO EXECUTE SAID NOTICE ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE, THEREFORE, AND ACCEPTING ALL DEDICATIONS OFFERED ON THE RECORDED MAP OF THE SUBDIVISION.

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville as follows:

1. The "Certificate of Completion" on file in the City Clerk's Department relative to that public work known as the PARCEL 49 PHASE 1 SITE IMPROVEMENT PLANS is hereby approved and the public work accepted.
2. All rights of way and easements as offered on the final map of recorded with Placer County Recorder's Office Book DD of Maps, Page 34 is hereby accepted.
3. The City Engineer is hereby authorized and directed to execute said Notice on behalf of the City of Roseville.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville, this 18th day of January, 2017, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK

AFTER RECORDING RETURN TO:
CITY CLERK
311 VERNON STREET
ROSEVILLE, CA 95678

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLETION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the public work known as Parcel 49 Phase 1 Site Improvement Plans was completed and accepted by the City of Roseville on _____. The location is indicated on the attached map, marked as Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein by this reference.

The general contractor on said project was **TEICHERT & SON INC. DBA TEICHERT CONSTRUCTION.**

The surety on said project was **A SUBDIVISION MAINTENANCE BOND GUARANTEE AND WARRANTY, SECURITY BOND NUMBER 070019182, FROM LIBERTY MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY, A CORPORATION.**

MARC STOUT
City Engineer
City of Roseville

ATTEST:

SONIA OROZCO, CITY CLERK

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF PLACER)

I, MARC STOUT, being first duly sworn, depose and say: I am the City Engineer of the City of Roseville, a municipal corporation in the State of California, owner of the property described in the above Notice. I am duly authorized to make this verification for and on behalf of the City of Roseville. I have read the Certificate of Completion and know its contents and the facts stated therein are true.

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document, to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

MARC STOUT
City Engineer
City of Roseville


STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF PLACER)

Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on this 18th day of __January__, 2017, by _____ proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) who appeared before me.

Notary Public in and for said County and State

EXHIBIT A

City of Roseville NCRSP Parcel 49 Phase 1 Improvement Plans





COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8204

File #: 0900-04-03

Title: Signalization of Intersections - Notice of Completion
Contact: Nick Graves 916-746-1305 ngraves@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 6.14.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff recommends that the City Council accept the Signalization of the Fiddymment Rd/Angus Rd and the Secret Ravine Pkwy/Alexandra Dr Intersections Project as complete and adopt a resolution authorizing the Public Works Director to execute the Notice of Completion.

BACKGROUND

A construction contract for this project was awarded to M&M Electric at the August 19, 2015 council meeting. The project constructed two traffic signals: one at the intersection of Fiddymment Rd, Angus Rd, and Parkland Way; and one at the intersection of Secret Ravine Pkwy and Alexandra Dr. The project also extended and upgraded the communications network with fiber optic cable to provide better traffic data collection and monitoring.

The project took longer to construct than expected due to several construction issues. One of these issues was a discrepancy in the bid documents. The discrepancy was whether to use the 2006 edition or the 2010 edition of the Caltrans Standard Specifications for the signal poles and their foundations. Poles compliant with the 2010 edition have larger foundations, anchor bolts, base plates, and connections than poles compliant with the 2006 edition. It was determined that the 2010 edition should be used for safety reasons. However, the contractor had originally ordered poles based on the 2006 edition. Unfortunately, this discrepancy was not discovered until after the poles had been ordered. Due to the lengthy manufacturing and shipping process, re-ordering new poles compliant with the 2010 edition added approximately 10 weeks to the project schedule.

A second issue was the result of a conflict with PG&E underground facilities at the Secret Ravine Pkwy and Alexandra Dr intersection. Despite multiple requests made by the design engineer during the design process, horizontal clearance requirements were not provided by PG&E until the contractor was preparing to excavate for the pole foundations. This resulted in the need to reevaluate the pole locations to provide the adequate clearance from PG&E facilities which further delayed completion of the project.

The Engineering Division has made the final inspection of the project and has found the work to

be completed in accordance with the improvement plans and City specifications and it is now ready for acceptance. In accordance with the specifications and the Faithful Performance Bond, the contractor shall guarantee the installations of the improvements for a period of twelve months from the date of notice of completion.

FISCAL IMPACT

The project was awarded at the August 19, 2015 council meeting for \$389,400 and the final construction costs was \$419,798.44. The additional cost of \$30,398.44 fit within the project's Council approved 10% construction contingency and was a result of the additional cost for requiring that the signal poles comply with the 2010 edition of the Caltrans Standard Specifications. 2010 edition poles are more costly than poles that comply with the 2006 edition. To avoid a potential claim, staff and the contractor agreed to split the increased cost.

The project was fully funded by developer paid Traffic Mitigation Fees. No General Funds were used for this project.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Based on Federal guidelines, there is one job created for every \$92,000.00 in direct government spending. Based on that figure, this project created 4.6 jobs.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The Council action of accepting the Signalization of the Fiddymment Rd/ Angus Rd and the Secret Ravine Pkwy/Alexandra Dr Intersections Project as complete will not result in a direct physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines §15060(c)(2). Adoption of the Signalization of the Fiddymment Rd/ Angus Rd and the Secret Ravine Pkwy/Alexandra Dr Intersections Project Notice of Completion does not include the potential for a significant environmental effect, and therefore is not subject to CEQA.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nick Graves, Assistant Engineer

Rhon Herndon, Public Works Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:**Description**

Resolution No. 17-18

Notice of Completion

Exhibit A - Location Map

RESOLUTION NO. 17-18

ACCEPTING THE PUBLIC WORK KNOWN AS THE SIGNALIZATION OF THE FIDDYMENT RD / ANGUS RD AND THE SECRET RAVINE PKWY / ALEXANDRA DR INTERSECTIONS PROJECT, APPROVING THE “NOTICE OF COMPLETION”, AND AUTHORIZING THE PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE SAID NOTICE ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Roseville as follows:

1. The “Notice of Completion” on file in the City Clerk’s Department relative to that public work known as the Signalization of the Fiddymment Rd / Angus Rd and the Secret Ravine Pkwy / Alexandra Dr Intersections Project has been approved and the public work accepted.
2. The Public Works Director is hereby authorized and directed to execute said Notice on behalf of the City of Roseville.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20____, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

AFTER RECORDING RETURN TO:
CITY CLERK
311 VERNON STREET
ROSEVILLE, CA 95678

NOTICE OF COMPLETION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the public work known as Signalization of the Fiddymment Rd / Angus Rd and the Secret Ravine Pkwy / Alexandra Dr Intersections Project, was completed and accepted by the City of Roseville on 1/18/2017. The location is indicated on the attached map, marked as Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein by this reference.

The general contractor on said project was May-Han Electric, Inc. dba M&M Electric.

The surety on said project was Liberty Mutual Surety.

ATTEST:

RHON L. HERNDON
Public Works Director
City of Roseville

SONIA OROZCO, CITY CLERK

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF PLACER)

I, Rhon L. Herndon, being first duly sworn, depose and say: I am the Public Works Director of the City of Roseville, a municipal corporation in the State of California, owner of the property described in the above Notice. I am duly authorized to make this verification for and on behalf of the City of Roseville. I have read the Notice of Completion and know its contents and the facts stated therein are true.

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

RHON L. HERNDON
Public Works Director
City of Roseville

State of California)
County of Placer)

Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on this ____ day of _____, 2017,
by RHON L. HERNDON proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s)
who appeared before me.

Notary Public in and for said County and State



Exhibit A

Location Map

Signalization of the Fiddymnt Rd /
Angus Rd and Secret Ravine Pkwy /
Alexander Dr Intersections Project



New Signal Locations





COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8227

File #: 03007-02

Title: 2016 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan - Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and Plan Adoption

Contact: Carl Walker 916-746-1300 cwalker@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 6.15.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff recommends the City Council:

1. Adopt a resolution adopting the Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration for the 2016 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan;
2. Adopt a resolution adopting the 2016 City of Roseville Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan; and
3. Maintain the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan Steering Committee as an ad-hoc Council-appointed Committee meeting annually to review progress on the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan with findings reported to the City Council in the fall of each year.

BACKGROUND

The Federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA 2000) requires all local agencies to submit a Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan (MHMP) to receive pre-disaster mitigation funds. The City adopted its initial hazard mitigation plan in 2005, and is required by DMA 2000 to update the Plan every five years. Each Plan update requires coordination with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the State Office of Emergency Services (the agency that is responsible for writing California's mitigation plan), Placer County, and several city department experts to prepare a comprehensive plan for submittal.

Consistent with the initial MHMP adopted in 2005, the 2016 Plan Update was developed with the following objectives:

- Meet or exceed program requirements specified under DMA 2000, thereby enabling the City of Roseville to continue using federal grant funding to reduce risk through mitigation.
- Meet not only state and federal requirements but also the needs of the City (this Plan addresses human-caused hazards, which are not required to be addressed under the DMA).
- Develop the Plan according to FEMA's Community Rating System (CRS) guidelines so that Roseville can continue to retain the nation's first CRS Class 1 community rating.

The City's Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan Update differs from the 2011 Plan in a variety of ways. While a few changes are attributed to new state and federal regulations, other changes reflect the dynamic nature of the types of hazards facing our community and the City's growth. The most significant changes within the 2016 MHMP Update include:

Climate Change Impacts - The most recent version of the California hazard mitigation plan noted specific hazards that are created or augmented by the environmental impacts of climate change. Additionally, the recent passage of Senate Bill 379 brings the effects of climate change into focus as it relates to mitigation and general planning. As a result, instead of briefly reviewing the impact of climate change in each individual hazard profile, this 2016 MHMP Update dedicates a comprehensive chapter to the issue of climate change and its effects on the state-identified climate-related hazards.

Drought Chapter Enhancements - Enhancements to the drought Chapter were made to reflect the current and historic drought conditions of the state, region, and city. This information was supplemented with new information provided by the City's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) update.

Public Engagement Enhancements through Social Media - Social media platforms not available (Facebook, Twitter, Nextdoor) during the previous planning initiative were used to enhance public outreach capabilities.

Planning Area Changes - The City adopted three new Specific Plans since the previous Plan update. As such, all development and demographic information within the 2016 MHMP Update includes data pertaining to the Sierra Vista, Creekview, and Amoruso Ranch Specific Plans.

Human-Caused Hazards - The human-caused hazards noted in the 2011 effort were updated for the 2016 Plan. The cyber threat was included as a new human-caused hazard, due to the increase in connectivity, technological advances, and emergence of "hacktivist" groups.

Human Health Hazards - The human health hazards noted in the 2011 effort were also updated for the 2016 Plan. Ebola was included as a new human health hazard due to the 2014 West Africa Ebola outbreak that threatened the United States. The Zika virus is also included in the discussion.

Disabilities, Access and Functional Need Language Revision - The entire Plan was updated to reflect appropriate references when discussing individuals with disabilities and others with access and functional needs. This includes person-first language and references to individuals instead of the more general term of populations.

PUBLIC OUTREACH

A key component of the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan review process is FEMA's evaluation of the City's community outreach efforts. With guidance from City staff, the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan Steering Committee formulated a comprehensive public involvement strategy using multiple media sources. This strategy included the use of public meetings, a survey to assess the public's perception of risk, and the use of various social media platforms. Examples of the outreach activities include:

Steering Committee Meetings – The MHMP Steering Committee conducted six public meetings during the course of the Plan update process. Each meeting agenda was posted by the City

Clerk's Office along with the City's other board and commission hearing notices. The meeting agendas and minutes were also posted on the City's Hazard Mitigation Plan website.

Community Event Participation – Members of the MHMP Steering Committee participated in the City's Earth Day event on Saturday, April 16, 2016. The purpose of participating in Earth Day was to share results of the MHMP's revised risk assessment with the public in an open workshop environment while fulfilling one of the federal requirements for preparation of the MHMP. City staff was available to speak with residents and answer questions about the MHMP process and their exposure to risk from natural and human-caused hazards in our community.

Public Survey – The Steering Committee elected to use a survey to collect new information from the public about household preparedness for hazards, the level of knowledge about tools and techniques for reducing loss from hazards, and areas of public concern about hazards. Over 670 surveys were completed during the course of the Plan update process.

Social Media & Internet – The Steering Committee and City staff used social media outlets such as Twitter, Facebook, and Nextdoor to distribute information during the MHMP Update process. These outlets, along with the City's website, provided information regarding upcoming meetings, surveys, and announcements.

Multi-Hazard Steering Committee Members

To meet the requirements of the federal legislation, the Roseville City Council appointed a Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Steering Committee in July 2004. The 2016 Steering Committee consisted of 14 members of the community representing the public, private industry, and government.

2016 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan Steering Committee

Grace Keller, Citizen	Community Emergency Response Team
Wayne Wiley, Associate Planner	City of Roseville Development Services Department
Rob Jensen, City Manager	City of Roseville City Manager's Office
Jason Rizzi, Emergency Preparedness Manager	City of Roseville Fire Department
Carl Walker, Senior Civil Engineer	City of Roseville Public Works Department
Helen Dyda, Public Information Specialist	City of Roseville Public Works Department
Jaime Garrett, Fire Department Public Information Officer	City of Roseville Fire Department
Erik Angle, Emergency Preparedness Manager	Sutter Roseville Medical Center
Brenette Macintosh, Safety Officer	Consolidated Communications
Mark Lacher, Risk Manager	Consolidated Communications
Jim Williams, Citizen	Meadow Oaks Neighborhood Association
Joseph Van Zant, Citizen/Hazardous Materials Consultant	Roseville Coalition of Neighborhood Associations
Rod Rodriguez, Senior Emergency Services Specialist	Placer County Office of Emergency Services

Rick Stalker, Stalker & Burnett RE Group	Placer County Association of Realtors
Michael Algots, Hazardous Materials Manager	Union Pacific Railroad

FISCAL IMPACT

The total cost of the Professional Services Agreement with Tetra Tech, Inc. to prepare the MHMP on behalf of the City was \$127,331. This cost includes funding for two related tasks: \$10,000 from the Fire Department for review of the City's Emergency Operations Plan and \$34,083 from the Environmental Utilities Department for preparation of the City's Debris Management Plan. Funding for the 2016 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan preparation is included in the City's Fiscal Year 2016-17 Budget within the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan Update CIP account.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

No new jobs were created as a part of this planning project.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

An Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared to satisfy the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Attachment 1). The CEQA document was circulated for a 20-day public review and comment period between September 2, 2016 and September 22, 2016. After the public review and comment period had closed, the City of Roseville received an email from the United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) requesting specific mitigation measures to be included within the IS/MND. Since the MHMP is not a "project level" document, the proposed mitigation measures are not required at this time and any applicable mitigation measures for future projects developed from the action items listed within the MHMP will be incorporated at the time of project approval. In addition, the City has assured the UAIC that we will continue to keep UAIC notified on all of our projects and provide them with opportunities for input. Staff recommends adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration as part of this action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Carl Walker, Senior Engineer

Rhon Herndon, Public Works Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution No. 17-33

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

Resolution No. 17-34

2016 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan

RESOLUTION NO. 17-33

ADOPTING AN INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE 2016
MULTI-HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

WHEREAS, the City of Roseville, pursuant to the City of Roseville Procedures for the Preparation, Processing and Review of Environmental Documents (“the Procedures”), has submitted to the City Council, acting as Approving Authority pursuant to said Procedures, an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the 2016 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Council has considered the recommendation of staff and the Proposed Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, together with all public comments received during the public review process; and

WHEREAS, the City Clerk’s Department is the custodian of record of the record of proceedings and such documents are on file with the City Clerk’s Department; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Roseville that it finds on the basis of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, and the whole record, including public comments and other documents, that if the 2016 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan is conditioned with mitigation measures as proposed, there is no substantial evidence that the Project will have a significant effect on the environment; the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City of Roseville, and the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration is hereby adopted.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20 ____, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

INITIAL STUDY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Project Title/File Number	Multi Hazard Mitigation Plan Update 2016; PL16-0053
Project Location	Citywide
Project Description	The City of Roseville proposes to update the City's Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan (MHMP) consistent with the Federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA2000) which requires all local agencies to submit and receive approval of a MHMP by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) in order to receive post-disaster mitigation funds. Consistent with the Stafford Act, the City's MHMP is required to be updated every five years. The last update occurred in 2011, and the City is currently amending the Plan as part of the required five year update. With this update, the MHMP will incorporate a standalone chapter addressing climate change, update the Human-Caused Hazards and Human Health Hazards Sections, include additional demographic information, and update references related to individuals with disabilities. In addition, a guiding principle has been incorporated into the MHMP.
Project Applicant	City of Roseville
Lead Agency Contact	Wayne Wiley, Associate Planner; Phone: (916) 774-5276

This initial study has been prepared to identify and assess the anticipated environmental impacts of the above-described project. The document relies on project-specific studies prepared to address in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project. Where documents were submitted by consultants working for the City, City staff reviewed such documents in order to determine whether, based on their own professional judgment and expertise, staff found such documents to be credible and persuasive. Staff has relied on documents that reflect their independent judgment, and has not accepted at face value representations made by consultants for the City.

This document has been prepared to satisfy the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.). CEQA requires that all state and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before acting on those projects.

The initial study is a public document used by the decision-making lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the lead agency finds substantial evidence that any aspect of the project, either individually or cumulatively, may have a significant effect on the environment, regardless of whether the overall effect of the project is adverse or beneficial, the lead agency is required to prepare an EIR, use a previously prepared EIR and supplement that EIR, or prepare a subsequent EIR to analyze the project at hand. If the agency finds no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment, a negative declaration shall be prepared. If in the course of analysis, the agency recognizes that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, but that by incorporating specific mitigation measures the impact will be reduced to a less than significant effect, a mitigated negative declaration shall be prepared.

In reviewing the project-specific information, the City of Roseville Planning Division has analyzed the potential environmental impacts created by this project and determined that with mitigation the impacts are considered to be less than significant. As demonstrated in the initial study checklist, there are no "project specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or site" that cannot be reduced to less than significant effects through mitigation (CEQA Section 15183) and therefore an EIR is **not** required. Therefore, **on the basis of the following initial evaluation**, we find that the proposed project **could not** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **Mitigated Negative Declaration** will be prepared.

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____
Wayne Wiley, Associate Planner

BACKGROUND

The Federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA2000) requires all local agencies to submit and receive approval of a Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan (MHMP) by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) in order to receive post-disaster mitigation funds. Communities without a MHMP in place will not be eligible to receive disaster assistance under the Stafford Act, which is the federal law governing disaster recovery funds. The purpose of the federal mandate is to encourage local agencies to plan in advance for any type of hazards or disasters for which the community is at risk and to have programs and projects in place to mitigate the disaster should one ever occur. As required, the City of Roseville's MHMP includes the following components: (1) Planning Process and Community Profile - which outlines the process by which the Plan was updated and outreach efforts undertaken to update demographic information; (2) Risk Assessment - which provides the basis for activities proposed to reduce losses from identified hazards, describes potential natural hazards in Roseville (including historical information on previous hazard events and probability of future events), and assesses Roseville's vulnerability and exposure to hazards; and (3) Mitigation Strategy - which includes mitigation goals for citizens, businesses, and the City of Roseville to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities and exposure to the identified hazards.

Currency of the MHMP is also integral to the City maintaining its Community Rating System "Class 1" rating (Roseville is currently the only community in the nation with this designation). The City has coordinated the preparation of the Plan with the FEMA, the State Office of Emergency Services (the agency that is responsible for writing California's mitigation plan), Placer County, and has incorporated the expertise of several city departments. A copy of the City of Roseville MHMP is included for reference as Attachment 1 of this checklist.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project will update the City's MHMP consistent with the Stafford Act (Public Law 100-707), which requires local agencies to update their MHMP on a five year basis in order to address changes affecting the planning area since the previous performance period. The proposed update will comprehensively revise the City's 2011 MHMP as noted below. However, due to the success of the initial Plan, no major changes were made to the Plan's approach and function and as a result no changes were made to the Action Plan recommendations outlined in MHMP Table 19-1. Accordingly, the Plan will continue to provide a viable planning framework for all foreseeable natural hazards and will identify resources, information, and strategies for reducing risk from natural hazards, similar to the base format of the 2011 plan.

To further ensure the comprehensiveness of the MHMP, the 2016 update provides additional analysis related to climate change impacts, human-caused hazards, human health hazards, demographic information, language revisions, and establishes a guiding principle for the Plan. These updates and revisions have been incorporated into Chapters 4 through 18 of the Plan and are summarized below:

- **Climate Change Impacts** - The most recent version of the California hazard mitigation plan noted specific hazards that are created or augmented by the environmental impacts of climate change. Additionally, the recent passage of Senate Bill 379 brings the effects of climate change into focus as it relates to mitigation and general planning. As a result, instead of briefly reviewing the impact of climate change in each individual hazard profile, the 2016 plan update dedicates a comprehensive chapter to the issue of climate change and its effects on the state-identified climate-related hazards.
- **Human-Caused Hazards** - The human-caused hazards noted in the 2011 effort were updated for the 2016 plan. These human-caused hazards were moved within the document to after the natural hazards due to the difference in assessing risk. Cyber threat was included as a new human-caused hazard, due to the increase in connectivity, technological advances, and emergence of "hacktivist" groups.
- **Human Health Hazards** - The human health hazards noted in the 2011 effort were updated for the 2016 plan. These human health hazards were moved within the document to after the natural hazards due to the difference in assessing risk. Ebola was included as a new human health hazard due to the 2014 West Africa Ebola outbreak that threatened the United States. Zika virus was included in the discussion, as well.
- **Additional Demographic Information** - Additional demographic data are included (beyond age and disability/access and function need) addressing Roseville's industry, business and institutional footprint. In addition, employment trends and occupations are included to develop a fuller understanding of the

population of Roseville.

- **Disabilities, Access and Functional Need Language Revision** - The entire plan was updated to reflect appropriate references when discussing individuals with disabilities and others with access and functional needs. This includes person-first language and references to individuals instead of the more general term of populations.
- **Guiding Principle** - A guiding principle for the hazard mitigation plan was developed. The goals and objectives of the plan support the guiding principle.

The updated sections of the Plan were selected because they meet a program requirement and because they best meet the needs of the community by helping to guide and coordinate mitigation activities throughout the City of Roseville. It also will meet the planning requirements of the CRS, allowing the City of Roseville to maintain its CRS Class 1 rating.


Based on the scope of the proposed project, the initial study checklist evaluates potential impacts of the Plan update at a program level. Given that the details of individual projects are still to be developed, examining specific project-level impacts would be speculative at this time. Sections 15145 and 15146 of the State CEQA Guidelines specifically state that impacts which are too speculative should not be discussed, and that an environmental document on a policy-level project need not be as detailed as the environmental document for the specific construction projects which may follow. The majority of action plan recommendations address the ongoing need for inspections and information gathering. They also recommend development of vulnerability assessments, feasibility studies, enhanced emergency response capability, and continued implementation of certain City policies, programs, and activities.

Should the City decide to approve one of the individual projects or actions contained in the MHMP, a supplemental project level Initial Study would be prepared to confirm that related environmental impacts would remain within the scope of this Initial Study. Should the project level Initial Study find the project would result in significant unavoidable impacts, a project level EIR would be required.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The City of Roseville lies in the western foothills of the Sierra Nevada Range, about 16 miles northeast of downtown Sacramento. It is the largest city in Placer County and includes 43.39 square miles of incorporated lands and an additional 796 acres making up the City's sphere of influence. The City's area is characterized by gently sloping terrain with areas of steep ravines in the northeast. It is segmented by topographical and physical features, including streams, natural parkways, open space, Interstate 80 and Highway 65, the Southern Pacific railroad, and industrial facilities. The City is primarily built out, with the greatest area of undeveloped property located in the western portion of the city (including the remainder of the developing West Roseville Specific Plan, and the undeveloped specific plan areas consisting of Sierra Vista, Creekview and Amoruso Ranch).

Figure 1: Roseville MHMP Planning Area



UNIFORMLY APPLIED POLICIES AND STANDARDS

For projects that are consistent with the development densities established by existing zoning, community plan, or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified, CEQA Guidelines section 15183 allows a lead agency to rely on previously-adopted development policies or standards as mitigation for the environmental effects, when the standards have been adopted by the City, with findings based on substantial evidence that the policies or standards will substantially mitigate environmental effects, unless substantial new information shows otherwise (CEQA Guidelines §1583(f)). The City of Roseville adopted CEQA Implementing Procedures (Implementing Procedures) which are consistent with the CEQA Guidelines. The current version of the Implementing Procedures were adopted in April 2008, along with Findings of Fact, as Resolution 08-172. The regulations and ordinances listed below were found to provide uniform mitigating policies and standards, and are applicable to development projects. The City's Mitigating Policies and Standards are referenced, where applicable, in the Initial Study Checklist.

- City of Roseville CEQA Implementing Procedures
- City of Roseville General Plan Policies
- City of Roseville Zoning Ordinance (RMC Title 19)
- Noise Regulation (RMC Ch.9.24)
- Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (RMC Ch.9.80)
- Traffic Mitigation Fee (RMC Ch.4.44)
- Highway 65 Joint Powers Authority Improvement Fee (Resolution 2008-02)
- South Placer Regional Transportation Authority Transportation and Air Quality Mitigation Fee (Resolution 09-05)
- Drainage Fees (Dry Creek [RMC Ch.4.49] and Pleasant Grove Creek [RMC Ch.4.48])
- City of Roseville Improvement Standards (Resolution 02-37)
- City of Roseville Construction Standards (Resolution 01-208)
- Tree Preservation Ordinance (RMC Ch.19.66)
- Subdivision Ordinance (RMC Title 18)
- Community Design Guidelines (Resolution 95-347)
- Specific Plans and associated Design Guidelines
 - o Development Guidelines Del Webb Specific Plan (Resolution 96-330)
 - o Landscape Design Guidelines for North Central Roseville Specific Plan (Resolution 90-170)
 - o North Roseville Specific Plan and Design Guidelines (Resolution 00-432)
 - o Northeast Roseville Specific Plan (Olympus Pointe) Signage Guidelines (Resolution 89-42)
 - o North Roseville Area Design Guidelines (Resolution 92-226)
 - o Northeast Roseville Specific Plan Landscape Design Guidelines (Resolution 87-31)
 - o Southeast Roseville Specific Plan Landscape Design Guidelines (Resolution 88-51)
 - o Stoneridge Specific Plan and Design Guidelines (Resolution 98-53)
 - o Highland Reserve North Specific Plan and Design Guidelines (Resolution 97-128)
 - o West Roseville Specific Plan and Design Guidelines (Resolution 04-40)
 - o Sierra Vista Specific Plan and Design Guidelines (Resolution 10-215)
 - o Creekview Specific Plan and Design Guidelines (Resolution 12-318)

OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS RELIED UPON

- Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report

The Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan (ARSP) project included an overall Amendment of the City of Roseville General Plan, including updates to policy text. The Final Environmental Impact Report prepared for the ARSP included an analysis of the updated General Plan land use designations and policies, including amending the General Plan from a 2025 to a 2035 horizon year. This analysis included some updated city-wide analysis. When applicable, the topical sections within the Initial Study summarize the findings within the ARSP EIR. The analysis, supporting technical materials, and findings of the environmental document are incorporated by reference, and are available for review at the Civic Center, 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA.

EXPLANATION OF INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines recommend that lead agencies use an Initial Study Checklist to determine potential impacts of the proposed project to the physical environment. The Initial Study Checklist provides a list of questions concerning a comprehensive array of environmental issue areas potentially affected by this project. This section of the Initial Study incorporates a portion of Appendix “G” Environmental Checklist Form, contained in the CEQA Guidelines.

There are four (4) possible answers to the Environmental Impacts Checklist on the following pages. Each possible answer is explained herein:

- 1) A “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is enough relevant information and reasonable inferences from the information that a fair argument based on substantial evidence can be made to support a conclusion that a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change may occur to any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project. When one or more “Potentially significant Impact” entries are made, and EIR is required.
- 2) A “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated” answer is appropriate where the applicant has agreed to incorporate a mitigation measure to reduce an impact from “Potentially Significant” to a “Less than Significant.” For instance, impacts to flood waters could be reduced from a “potentially significant impact” to a “less than significant impact” by relocating a building to an area outside of the floodway. The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures are identified as MM followed by a number.
- 3) A “Less Than significant Impact” answer is appropriate if there is evidence that one or more environmental impacts may occur, but the impacts are determined to be less than significant, or that the application of development policies and standards to the project will reduce the impact(s) to a less than significant level. For instance, the application of the City’s Improvement Standards reduces potential erosion impacts to a less than significant impact.
- 4) A “No Impact” answer is appropriate where it can be clearly seen that the impact at hand does not have the potential to adversely affect the environment. For instance, a project in the center of an urbanized area will clearly not have an adverse effect on agricultural resources or operations.

All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers, provided they are adequately supported by the information sources cited in the applicable section. A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as generous standards.

The Initial Study checklist recommended by the CEQA Guidelines is used to describe the potential impacts of the proposed project on the physical environment.

I. Aesthetics

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				X
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X

- a-c. The MHMP does not include specific proposals for new development, or identify physical modifications to existing development, beyond a general recommendation for the retrofit of existing structures and infrastructure. Therefore, no aesthetic impacts will occur as a result of the proposed MHMP. Globally, the strategies incorporated in the plan propose consideration of elements of broad scale land development criteria that would be incorporated into the design of future development and promotion of open space land use in high risk areas. These policy-level changes would be consistent with the General Plan, and other applicable City standards in the Subdivision Ordinance (RMC Title 18), Community Design Guidelines (Resolution 95-347), and Specific Plan Design Guidelines. In addition, any changes to these policy documents or ordinances to further comply with the MHMP would require additional environmental review at the time such changes are proposed. Therefore, no impact will occur at this time.
- d. The plan does not propose any actions that would introduce a new source of light or glare.

II. Agricultural Resources

The State Department of Conservation oversees the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, which was established to document the location, quality, and quantity of agricultural lands, and the conversion of those lands over time. The primary land use classifications on the maps generated through this program are: Urban and Built Up Land, Grazing Land, Farmland of Local Importance, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Prime Farmland. Only the latter three categories are called out as protected farmland categories within CEQA Guidelines Appendix G.

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X

- a–c) According to the California Department of Conservation Placer County Important Farmland Map (2010), the majority of the City of Roseville is designated as Urban and Built Up Land, most of the open space areas of the City are designated as Grazing Land, and there is one area designated as Farmland of Local Importance. None of the land within the City boundaries is designated as a protected farmland category. The current Williamson Act Contract map (2013/2014) produced by the Department of Conservation shows that there are no Williamson Act contracts within the City, and only one (on PFE Road) that is adjacent to the City. In addition, none of the land within the City is considered forest land by the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection. The proposed updates to the MHMP will not impact agricultural activities or agricultural operations. Given the foregoing, the proposed project will have no impact on agricultural resources.

III. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	
f) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
g) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	

- a–d) The City of Roseville, along with the south Placer County area, is located in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB). The SVAB is within the Sacramento Federal Ozone Non-Attainment Area. Under the Clean Air Act, Placer County has been designated a "serious non-attainment" area for the federal 8-hour ozone standard, "non-attainment" for the state ozone standard, and a "non-attainment" area for the federal and state PM₁₀ standard (particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter). Within Placer County, the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) is responsible for ensuring that emission standards are not violated. Project-related air emissions would have a significant effect if they would result in concentrations that either violate an ambient air quality standard or contribute to an existing air quality violation.

The discussions below focus on emissions of ROG (reactive organic gases), NO_x (nitrogen oxides), PM, and CO (carbon monoxide). Analyses are not included for sulfur dioxide, lead, and other constituents because there are no mass emission thresholds; these are concentration-based limits in the Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards which require substantial, point-source emissions (e.g. refineries, concrete plants, etc.) before exceedance will occur; the SVAB is in attainment for these constituents. Analysis of toxic air contaminants (TAC) is likewise excluded, because they are typically generated by stationary sources like gas stations, facilities using solvents, and heavy industrial operations, and the project neither directly nor indirectly involves such uses.

The indirect effects of the MHMP related to construction activities is the potential for minor increases in emissions of ROG, NO_x, PM, and CO as a result of implementing certain building code and/or other design related improvements that reduce potential hazard impacts. However it's expected that such increases would not in and of themselves significantly alter a project's overall construction emissions. Rather, it's expected that MHMP recommendations implemented during construction would be combined with other routine construction tasks and therefore would not individually generate substantial emissions. The related impact is considered less than significant. It should be noted that future project level CEQA analysis will confirm that any incremental addition of construction related criteria emissions generated as a result of MHMP implementation would not cause a project to exceed applicable thresholds of significance. Should future project level analysis show that criteria pollutant thresholds would be exceeded, all feasible mitigation would be applied. Should the impact remain significant, a project level EIR would be required.

- e) Diesel fumes from construction equipment and delivery trucks are often found to be objectionable; however, construction is temporary and diesel emissions are minimal and regulated. Typical urban projects related to residences and retail businesses generally do not result in substantial objectionable odors when operated in compliance with City Ordinances. Any impacts associated with the recommendations of the MHMP are anticipated to be similar to any other typical urban development that lacks any characteristics that would cause the generation of substantial unpleasant odors. Thus, the implementation of the Plan's mitigation measures are not expected to result in the creation of objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts related to odors are less than significant.
- f–g) Emissions generated by projects associated with the Plan would be primarily limited to temporary construction activity, and therefore would result in minor or no operational emissions of greenhouse gases or air pollutants. As described in section a–d, above, the project may result in very slight changes to construction profiles which would only slightly increase mass construction emissions. In addition, construction emissions contribute only a fractional amount of annual emissions and a much smaller subset of these emissions can be attributed to building retrofit projects. Future project level CEQA analysis will confirm that any incremental addition of greenhouse gas emissions generated as a result of MHMP implementation remain below applicable thresholds of significance. Should future project level analysis show that greenhouse gas thresholds would be exceeded, a project level EIR would be required.

IV. Biological Resources

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X	
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

- a-d. The MHMP proposes actions that would reduce the threat of wildfires through nondescript methods (i.e. regular mowing, using fire retardant materials, incorporating fire resistant landscaping, etc.). In addition, the Plan does not identify specific locations where these actions would be proposed. Therefore, no impact is associated with approving the updated MHMP and future project-specific environmental review will be required to identify the presence of biologically sensitive species or habitat, and identify any necessary project-specific measures to mitigate any potential impacts of projects undertaken pursuant to the MHMP.

- e. It is not anticipated that projects associated with the Plan would impact protected tree resources. However, should that be the case, the determination of the City's adopted Findings for Mitigating Policies and Standards is that oak tree impacts are effectively mitigated by on-site plantings or in-lieu mitigation fees required by the City of Roseville Tree Preservation Ordinance (RMC Chapter 19.66). The Tree Preservation Ordinance establishes an in-lieu fee to be distributed into two funds: the Native Oak Tree Propagation Fund to be used to propagate and protect native oak trees within Roseville; and the Non-Native Tree Fund to be used to purchase and plant non-native trees within Roseville. The requirements of the City's Tree Preservation Ordinance preclude the need for additional mitigation. Therefore, impacts to tree resources would be less than significant based on the City's adopted Findings for Mitigating Policies and Standards.
- f. Presently, there are no Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Conservation Community Plans in the City of Roseville. Therefore, the project will not result in any impact to any local conservation plan.

V. Cultural Resources

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource as defined in Section 15064.5?		X		
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?		X		
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				
e) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource as defined in §21074?				X

- a-b. There are no mitigation strategies outlined within the MHMP that includes proposals for new development, or physical modification to existing development, beyond a general recommendation for retrofit of existing structures and infrastructure to reduce risks associated with seismic activity (earthquake). The Plan does not identify specific retrofit projects that would require groundbreaking or construction activities. However because the potential exists that older buildings could be considered historically or archaeologically

significant structures, or contain historically significant resources, the following mitigation measure would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level:

CR-1: *Prior to seismic retrofit older buildings shall be evaluated by a qualified architectural historian to determine eligibility as an historic resource. Should a building subject to retrofit be determined to be eligible, impacts will be mitigated in accordance with applicable regulations to the extent feasible.*

- c-d The proposed Plan recommends retrofit of structures built prior to UBC requirements for seismic safety. Such structures would be located in existing developed, urbanized areas, and therefore does not include the potential for disturbance of areas identified as having paleontological resources unique geologic features, or human remains. There would be no impact.
- e. The City of Roseville has received three (3) letters from California Native American Tribes that request tribal consultation under AB52. Therefore the City of Roseville is responsible for compliance with all applicable requirements under this statute. The City is unaware of the existence of any known Tribal Cultural Resources (as defined in Section §21074) within the City.

The City sent a subsequent consultation request letter dated July 18, 2016 to each tribe that requested consultation. No response has been received to date and therefore the City's consultation requirements for the project under AB52 have been fulfilled. No Impact would occur.

VI. Geology and Soils

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				X
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)				X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X
c) Be located in a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				X
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X

- a.-e. The mitigation strategies outlined within the MHMP include measures intended to educate residents and reduce risks associated with seismic activity, and would likely result in the beneficial impact of retrofitting existing facilities to increase safety, and increasing public awareness regarding appropriate actions to take in the event of an earthquake. This information would be provided as recommendations and would not be mandated. Therefore, no impact will occur as a result of implementation of the MHMP. However, when such projects are implemented, compliance with the City of Roseville's Grading Ordinance, Construction Standards, and Improvement Standards will ensure that any project impacts are less than significant.

VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area?				X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X

- a.-d. The purpose of the MHMP and the associated mitigation strategies, is to identify, assess, and mitigate the potential for hazards and hazardous materials. Therefore, no adverse impact would occur.
- e, f. The City of Roseville is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.
- g. The purpose of the Plan is to increase preparedness and reduce risks associated with emergency response and evacuation procedures. Therefore, no adverse impact would occur.
- h. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) is the state agency responsible for wildland fire protection and management. As part of that task, CAL FIRE maintains maps designating Wildland Fire Hazard Severity zones. The City is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Furthermore, the MHMP identify measures to reduce the risks and potential losses associated with wildland fires. Therefore, the proposed Plan will not increase the risk of wildland fires.

IX. Hydrology and Water Quality

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				X
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				X
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or				X

	provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

- a,e,f. The MHMP's mitigation strategies propose rehabilitation and retrofit programs to reduce local flooding, and would reduce the potential for uncontrolled runoff that could result in violations of water quality standards during severe storm events. Flood control projects generally necessitate permits from state and federal agencies with jurisdiction over creeks and other waterways (i.e., the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and National Marine Fisheries Service). Mitigation is typically required as conditions of permits issued by those agencies and no adverse impacts would be anticipated from implementation of the proposed Plan. However, future projects would be subject to further environmental review and applicable regulatory permits.
- b. The proposed mitigation strategy does not include proposals for new development, or physical modification to existing development, beyond general recommendations for retrofit/hardening of infrastructure and older structures. No impacts associated with groundwater depletion would occur.
- c,d,g,h. The MHMP, and associated mitigation strategies, identify measures to reduce the risks and potential losses associated with flooding. The mitigation strategies propose rehabilitation and retrofit programs to facilitate proper drainage, reduce local flooding, and would reduce the potential for uncontrolled runoff that could result in violations of water quality standards during severe storm events. Flood control projects generally necessitate permits from state and federal agencies with jurisdiction over creeks and other waterways (i.e., the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and National Marine Fisheries Service). Mitigation is typically required as conditions of permits issued by those agencies. No adverse impacts would be anticipated from implementation of the proposed Plan.
- i,j. The MMHMP, and the associated mitigation strategies, identify measures to reduce the risks and potential losses associated with flooding, or natural hazards such as mudflow. In addition, the MHMP recommends the purchase of three repetitive loss structures located within the floodplain in order to minimize the risk associated with these structures. No adverse impact would occur.

X. Land Use and Planning

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

- The proposed Plan does not include any components that would divide an existing community.
- The proposed Plan has been prepared consistent with the elements of the City's General Plan.
- No habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans have been adopted by the City of Roseville. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any habitat conservation plans and no impact would occur.

XI. Mineral Resources

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X

- The California Divisions of Mines and Geology (CDMG) published Open File Report 95-10, which provides the mineral classification map for Placer County. A detailed evaluation of mineral resources has not been conducted within the City limits, but Mineral Resource Zones (MRZ's) have been identified. There are four broad MRZ categories (MRZ-1 through MRZ-4), and only MRZ-2 represents an area of known significant mineral resources. The City of Roseville General Plan EIR included Exhibit 4.1-3, depicting the location of

MRZ's in the City limits. There is only one small MRZ-2 designation area located at the far eastern edge of the City, which will not be impacted by approval of the MHMP. Therefore, no impact would occur.

XII. Noise

Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

- a-d. The MHMP includes mitigation strategies for retrofitting existing structures and infrastructure. This work would be temporary in nature and is not anticipated to result in a permanent increase in ambient noise levels. In addition, construction activities will be subject to the requirements of the City of Roseville Noise Ordinance (RMC Chapter 9.24). The City's Findings for Mitigating Policies and Standards find that projects constructed or operated in compliance with the City of Roseville Noise Ordinance would prevent exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of established noise standards. The Ordinance establishes maximum noise exposure standards that apply to construction and operational activities for private development projects. The thresholds provide for the protection of noise-sensitive receptors. Based on the discussion above, noise impacts would be less than significant.
- e.f. The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport, or with in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, implementation of the MHMP would not expose people residing or working in the area to aircraft-generated noise; therefore, no impact would occur.

XIII. Population and Housing

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X	
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X	

- a. The MHMP does not propose construction of additional homes or businesses, or expansion of infrastructure that would accommodate population growth. Therefore, no impact will occur.
- b, c. The MHMP does not propose removal of existing housing or require relocation of people, other than repetitive loss structures within the City's regulatory floodplain. There are only three identified repetitive loss structures within the City, which would be acquired on a "willing-seller" basis as funds become available. The potential removal of these three structures is insignificant in comparison to the 50,777 dwelling units constructed citywide, and will result in less than significant impacts to population and housing.

XIV. Public Services

Fire protection, police protection, and park services are provided by City agencies. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Fire protection?				X
b) Police protection?				X
c) Schools?				X
d) Parks?				X
e) Other public services?				X

- a-e. The purpose of the MHMP, and the associated mitigation strategies, is to identify, assess, and mitigate the potential for natural and technological hazards. As such, the proposed Plan does not include components

that would adversely affect public services, including Fire, Police, Schools, Parks, or other facilities. Therefore, no adverse impacts would occur.

XV. Recreation

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

- a. - b. Implementation of the MHMP mitigation strategies would not require additional recreation facilities or cause existing facilities to degrade. The proposed Plan does not include components that would affect the use or demand for recreational facilities.

XVI. Transportation/Traffic

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?			X	
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X	
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				X

- a.–b. The only traffic which could be generated by the project would be a slight increase in the amount of construction trips which may result from retrofitting existing structures and infrastructure. However, vehicle related construction impacts would result in only a minor increase in the number of trips that occur to complete the project. As such, the project will not conflict with the City's Level of Service standards or any congestion management programs, because it will not significantly increase congestion on a long term basis.
- c. The proposed project would not introduce air traffic to the area or in any way alter existing air traffic patterns. No impact on air traffic patterns would occur.
- d. The proposed Plan does not include measures that would increase hazards. No impact would occur.

- e. The proposed Plan is intended to facilitate and improve emergency access and response. No impact would occur.
- f. The proposed Plan does not include measures that would impact parking capacity. No impact would occur.
- g. The proposed Plan does not include any measures that would affect alternative transportation programs. No impact would occur.

XVII. Utilities and Service Systems

Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition of the provider's existing commitments?				X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

- a.-e. The proposed Plan includes measures intended to upgrade existing drainage facilities, which would result in a beneficial impact to stormwater drainage and water quality. Construction impacts related to the individual projects, would be subject to environmental review to identify and mitigate potential project-specific impacts. No adverse impacts would occur as a result of MHMP implementation.
- f, g. The proposed MHMP does not include any measures that would affect the generation of solid waste.

XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X	
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			X	
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	

- a-e. The proposed MHMP is consistent with and implements policies in the adopted General Plan, for which an EIR was certified. The impacts of the proposed MHMP that have potential to adversely affect historic resources will be mitigated to less than significant levels by mitigation measure CR-1. Any other impacts that may occur would be evaluated and mitigated to the extent feasible in future project level CEQA documents. Adoption of the MHMP will not have any direct or indirect substantial adverse effects on human beings.

Attachment

- Multi Hazard Mitigation Plan

RESOLUTION NO. 17-34

ADOPTING THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE 2016 MULTI-HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

WHEREAS, the City of Roseville has exposure to natural and human-caused hazards that increase the vulnerability of life, property, environment and the City's economy; and

WHEREAS, The Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 requires all local agencies to submit a Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan to receive post-disaster mitigation funds; and

WHEREAS, the Act also requires local agencies to update their Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plans on a five-year cycle; and

WHEREAS, the 2016 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan was prepared to meet FEMA's specifications for a comprehensive floodplain management document, which allows the City to maintain the nation's first Class 1 Community Rating System designation; and

WHEREAS, this rating allows residents who live in the Special Flood Hazard Areas a 45% reduction in their flood insurance premiums; and

WHEREAS, the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan Steering Committee was reconvened and met regularly to develop the 2016 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan update; and

WHEREAS, the City of Roseville coordinated its planning efforts with local, regional, state and federal entities with interest or impacts in this planning effort; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has reviewed the 2016 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan and complied with applicable public hearing requirements; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Roseville that it hereby adopts in its entirety the City of Roseville Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan (MHMP) dated September 2016.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk



2016 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan



September 2016

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	xvi
Plan Update.....	xvi
Plan Update Methodology	xvii
Phase 1—Organize Resources.....	xvii
Phase 2 —Update the Risk Assessment.....	xviii
Phase 3—Engage the Public.....	xviii
Phase 4—Assemble the Updated Plan	xviii
Phase 5—Plan Adoption/Implementation	xviii
Mitigation Guiding Principle, Goals, and Objectives	xix
Guiding Principle	xix
Goals.....	xix
Objectives.....	xix
Mitigation Action Plan.....	xx
Implementation	xx
1. Introduction to Hazard Mitigation Planning	1-1
1.1 Why Prepare This Plan?.....	1-1
1.1.1 The Big Picture.....	1-1
1.1.2 Roseville’s Response to the DMA	1-1
1.2 Who Will Benefit From This Plan?	1-2
1.3 Contents of This Plan.....	1-2
2. Plan Update—What Has Changed.....	2-1
2.1 The Previous Plan	2-1
2.2 Mitigation Success Stories	2-1
2.3 Why Update?	2-2
2.3.1 Federal Eligibility.....	2-2
2.3.2 Changes in Development.....	2-2
2.4 The Updated Plan—What Is Different?.....	2-2
3. Plan Update Approach	3-1
3.1 Planning Resource Organization.....	3-1
3.1.1 Internal Funding	3-1
3.1.2 Formation of the Planning Team	3-1
3.1.3 The Steering Committee.....	3-2
3.1.4 Coordination with Other Agencies.....	3-2
3.1.5 Review of Existing Programs	3-3
3.2 Risk Assessment Update	3-4
3.3 Public Involvement	3-4
3.3.1 Strategy.....	3-4
3.3.2 Public Involvement Results.....	3-7
3.4 Assemble the Updated Plan	3-9
3.5 Plan Development Chronology/Milestones	3-10
4. City of Roseville Profile.....	4-1
4.1 Geographic Profile	4-1
4.2 Historical Overview	4-3

4.2.1 Pre-Development.....	4-3
4.2.2 Founding of the Community	4-3
4.2.3 Post-Incorporation Development.....	4-3
4.2.4 Current Conditions	4-4
4.3 Major Past Hazard Events.....	4-4
4.4 Physical Setting.....	4-4
4.4.1 Geology	4-4
4.4.2 Soils	4-4
4.4.3 Climate	4-5
4.5 Development Profile	4-5
4.5.1 Land Use Policies.....	4-5
4.5.2 Residential Development.....	4-8
4.5.3 Non-Residential Development	4-8
4.5.4 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure.....	4-10
4.5.5 Future Trends in Development.....	4-14
4.6 Open Space and Habitat.....	4-14
4.6.1 Grasslands	4-14
4.6.2 Oak Woodlands and Riparian Areas	4-14
4.6.3 Seasonal Wetlands.....	4-15
4.6.4 Sensitive Species	4-15
4.7 Demographics	4-16
4.7.1 Population Trends.....	4-16
4.7.2 Age Distribution.....	4-17
4.7.3 Race, Ethnicity and Language.....	4-19
4.7.4 Individuals with Disabilities and Others with Access and Functional Needs	4-20
4.8 Economy	4-20
4.8.1 Income	4-20
4.8.2 Industry, Businesses and Institutions	4-21
4.8.3 Employment Trends and Occupations.....	4-22
4.9 Laws and Ordinances	4-23
4.9.1 Federal	4-23
4.9.2 State	4-28
4.9.3 City Plans and Programs	4-32
4.10 Capability Assessment.....	4-36
5. Identified Hazards of Concern and Risk Assessment Methodology.....	5-1
5.1 Identified Hazards of Concern	5-1
5.2 Methodology	5-2
5.3 Risk Assessment Tools	5-2
5.3.1 Dam Failure, Earthquake and Flood—Hazard-MH.....	5-2
5.3.2 Landslide, Severe Weather, and Wildfire.....	5-3
5.3.3 Drought.....	5-3
5.3.4 Climate Change	5-4
5.3.5 Health Hazards and Human-Caused Hazards.....	5-4
5.4 Mapping.....	5-4
5.4.1 Building and Cost Data	5-4
5.4.2 Hazard-MH Data Inputs.....	5-4
5.4.3 Other Local Hazard Data.....	5-5
5.4.4 Data Source Summary	5-5
5.4.5 Limitations.....	5-5

6. Climate Change Considerations for Hazard Mitigation	6-1
6.1 California Senate Bill No. 379	6-1
6.2 What is Climate Change?	6-2
6.3 How Climate Change Affects Hazard Mitigation	6-3
6.4 Current Indications of Climate Change	6-3
6.5 Projected Future Impacts	6-4
6.5.1 Precipitation	6-4
6.5.2 Temperature	6-5
6.5.3 Snow Pack	6-5
6.5.4 Wildfire	6-5
6.6 Responses to Climate Change	6-6
6.6.1 Mitigation and Adaptation	6-6
6.6.2 Ecosystem-Based Adaptation	6-6
6.6.3 City of Roseville Sustainability Efforts	6-6
6.7 Climate Change Impacts on Hazards	6-7
6.7.1 Drought	6-7
6.7.2 Earthquake	6-8
6.7.3 Flood	6-8
6.7.4 Landslide	6-9
6.7.5 Severe Weather	6-10
6.7.6 Wildfire	6-11
7. Dam Failure	7-1
7.1 General Background	7-1
7.1.1 Causes of Dam Failure	7-1
7.1.2 Regulatory Oversight	7-2
7.2 Hazard Profile	7-3
7.2.1 Past Events	7-3
7.2.2 Location	7-4
7.2.3 Frequency	7-4
7.2.4 Severity	7-4
7.2.5 Warning Time	7-4
7.2.6 Folsom Dam Containment Dike Failure Risk Assessment	7-5
7.3 Secondary Hazards	7-6
7.4 Exposure	7-8
7.4.1 Population	7-8
7.4.2 Property	7-8
7.4.3 Critical Facilities	7-8
7.4.4 Environment	7-8
7.5 Vulnerability	7-9
7.5.1 Population	7-9
7.5.2 Property	7-9
7.5.3 Critical Facilities	7-9
7.5.4 Environment	7-10
7.6 Future Trends in Development	7-10
7.7 Review of Existing Ordinances, Programs and Plans	7-10
7.8 Scenario	7-10
7.9 Issues	7-11
8. Drought	8-1

8.1 General Background	8-1
8.1.1 Water Supply Strategy	8-1
8.1.2 Water Supply Infrastructure	8-2
8.1.3 The Water Forum	8-3
8.1.4 Local Water Contracts—Definition of Drought	8-3
8.2 Hazard Profile	8-4
8.2.1 Past Events	8-4
8.2.2 Location	8-5
8.2.3 Frequency	8-9
8.2.4 Severity	8-9
8.2.5 Warning Time	8-9
8.3 Secondary Hazards	8-10
8.4 Exposure	8-10
8.5 Vulnerability	8-10
8.5.1 Population	8-10
8.5.2 Property	8-10
8.5.3 Critical Facilities	8-10
8.5.4 Environment	8-11
8.5.5 Economic Impact	8-11
8.6 Future Trends in Development	8-11
8.7 Review of Existing Ordinances, Programs and Plans	8-12
8.8 Scenario	8-13
8.9 Issues	8-13
9. Earthquake	9-1
9.1 General Background	9-1
9.1.1 Damage from Earthquakes	9-1
9.1.2 Earthquake Classifications	9-1
9.1.3 Ground Motion	9-3
9.1.4 Effect of Soil Types	9-3
9.2 Hazard Profile	9-4
9.2.1 Past Events	9-4
9.2.2 Location	9-5
9.2.3 Frequency	9-12
9.2.4 Severity	9-12
9.2.5 Warning Time	9-12
9.3 Secondary Hazards	9-13
9.4 Exposure	9-13
9.4.1 Population	9-13
9.4.2 Property	9-13
9.4.3 Critical Facilities	9-13
9.4.4 Environment	9-14
9.5 Vulnerability	9-15
9.5.1 Population	9-15
9.5.2 Property	9-15
9.5.3 Critical Facilities	9-18
9.5.4 Environment	9-18
9.6 Future Trends in Development	9-19
9.7 Review of Existing Ordinances, Programs and Plans	9-19
9.7.1 International Building Codes	9-19

9.7.2 Improvement Standards	9-20
9.7.3 Geotechnical Studies	9-20
9.8 Scenario.....	9-20
9.9 Issues.....	9-20
10. Flooding	10-1
10.1 General Background	10-1
10.1.1 Measuring Floods and Floodplains	10-1
10.1.2 Effects of Human Activities	10-1
10.1.3 Floodplain Ecosystems	10-1
10.1.4 Federal Flood Programs	10-2
10.2 Hazard Profile	10-3
10.2.1 Flooding Types.....	10-3
10.2.2 Past Events	10-4
10.2.3 Location.....	10-7
10.2.4 Frequency	10-8
10.2.5 Severity.....	10-10
10.2.6 Warning Time.....	10-10
10.3 Secondary Hazards.....	10-12
10.4 Exposure	10-12
10.4.1 Population.....	10-12
10.4.2 Property	10-12
10.4.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure	10-14
10.4.4 Environment	10-15
10.5 Vulnerability	10-15
10.5.1 Population.....	10-15
10.5.2 Property	10-16
10.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure	10-19
10.5.4 Environment	10-19
10.6 Future Trends in Development	10-19
10.7 Review of Existing Ordinances, Programs, and Plans.....	10-21
10.7.1 Structural Mitigation	10-21
10.7.2 Non-Structural Mitigation	10-22
10.7.3 Regulations	10-22
10.7.4 Stormwater Management.....	10-26
10.7.5 Outreach and Public Education	10-28
10.8 Scenario.....	10-28
10.9 Issues.....	10-28
11. Landslide.....	11-1
11.1 General Background	11-1
11.1.1 Landslide Types	11-1
11.1.2 Landslide Modeling.....	11-3
11.2 Hazard Profile	11-3
11.2.1 Past Events	11-3
11.2.2 Location.....	11-3
11.2.3 Frequency	11-4
11.2.4 Severity.....	11-4
11.2.5 Warning Time.....	11-6
11.3 Secondary Hazards.....	11-6

11.4 Exposure	11-6
11.4.1 Population.....	11-6
11.4.2 Property	11-6
11.4.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure	11-7
11.4.4 Environment	11-7
11.5 Vulnerability	11-7
11.5.1 Population.....	11-7
11.5.2 Property	11-8
11.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure	11-8
11.5.4 Environment	11-8
11.6 Future Trends in Development	11-8
11.7 Review of Existing Ordinances, Programs, and Plans	11-8
11.8 Scenario.....	11-10
11.9 Issues.....	11-10
12. Severe Weather.....	12-1
12.1 General Background	12-1
12.1.1 Tornadoes	12-2
12.1.2 Windstorms	12-2
12.1.3 Fog.....	12-5
12.1.4 Heavy Rains, Thunderstorms and Lightning.....	12-6
12.1.5 Ice and Freezing Rain	12-7
12.2 Hazard Profile	12-7
12.2.1 Past Events	12-7
12.2.2 Location.....	12-7
12.2.3 Frequency	12-7
12.2.4 Severity.....	12-9
12.2.5 Warning Time.....	12-9
12.3 Secondary Hazards.....	12-9
12.4 Exposure	12-9
12.4.1 Population.....	12-9
12.4.2 Property	12-9
12.4.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure	12-9
12.4.4 Environment	12-10
12.5 Vulnerability	12-10
12.5.1 Population.....	12-10
12.5.2 Property	12-10
12.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure	12-11
12.5.4 Environment	12-11
12.6 Future Trends in Development	12-11
12.7 Review of Existing Ordinances, Programs, and Policies.....	12-11
12.8 Scenario.....	12-11
12.9 Issues.....	12-12
13. Wildfire	13-1
13.1 General Background	13-1
13.1.1 Contributing Factors.....	13-1
13.1.2 Local Conditions Related to Wildfire Hazard	13-1
13.2 Hazard Profile	13-3
13.2.1 Past Events	13-3

13.2.2 Location.....	13-4
13.2.3 Frequency	13-8
13.2.4 Severity.....	13-9
13.2.5 Warning Time.....	13-11
13.3 Secondary Hazards.....	13-11
13.4 Exposure	13-11
13.4.1 Population.....	13-11
13.4.2 Property	13-11
13.4.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure	13-11
13.4.4 Environment	13-12
13.5 Vulnerability	13-12
13.5.1 Population.....	13-12
13.5.2 Property	13-13
13.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure	13-13
13.6 Future Trends in Development	13-13
13.7 Review of Existing Programs, Plans and Ordinances	13-14
13.7.1 Fire Prevention Programs and Standards.....	13-14
13.7.2 Adopted Service Levels for Response Time	13-15
13.7.3 Annual Monitoring of Fire Department Service Levels	13-16
13.7.4 Personnel Training.....	13-17
13.7.5 Fire Investigation.....	13-17
13.7.6 Comprehensive Emergency Medical Services	13-18
13.7.7 Accreditation Recommendation	13-17
13.8 Scenario.....	13-18
13.9 Issues.....	13-19
14. Human Health Hazards.....	14-1
14.1 General Background	14-1
14.1.1 Influenza	14-1
14.1.2 Smallpox.....	14-3
14.1.3 Viral Hemorrhagic Fevers	14-3
14.1.4 Plague	14-5
14.1.5 Tick-Borne Disease	14-5
14.1.6 Mosquito-Borne Disease	14-7
14.1.7 Anthrax.....	14-10
14.1.8 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome.....	14-10
14.1.9 Extreme Weather	14-11
14.2 Hazard Profile	14-12
14.2.1 Past Events	14-13
14.2.2 Location.....	14-13
14.2.3 Frequency	14-14
14.2.4 Severity.....	14-14
14.3 Secondary Hazards.....	14-14
14.4 Exposure and Vulnerability	14-14
14.4.1 Population.....	14-14
14.4.2 Property	14-15
14.4.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure	14-15
14.4.4 Environment	14-15
14.4.5 Economy.....	14-15
14.5 Future Trends in Development	14-15

14.6 Review of Existing Ordinances, Programs and Plans	14-15
14.6.1 Hospital Expansions to Care for Growing Populations.....	14-15
14.6.2 Memorandums of Agreement.....	14-16
14.6.3 Integrated Emergency Response	14-17
14.7 Scenario.....	14-17
14.8 Issues.....	14-17
15. Human-Caused Hazards	15-1
15.1 General Background	15-1
15.1.1 Man-Made Hazards	15-2
15.1.2 Technological Hazards	15-7
15.1.3 Civil Disorder	15-10
15.2 Hazard Profile	15-10
15.2.1 Past Events	15-10
15.2.2 Location.....	15-16
15.2.3 Frequency	15-20
15.2.4 Severity.....	15-20
15.2.5 Warning Time.....	15-21
15.3 Secondary Hazards.....	15-21
15.4 Exposure	15-21
15.4.1 Population.....	15-22
15.4.2 Property	15-23
15.4.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure	15-23
15.4.4 Environment	15-24
15.5 Vulnerability	15-25
15.5.1 Population.....	15-25
15.5.2 Property	15-25
15.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure	15-25
15.5.4 Environment	15-25
15.5.5 Economic impacts	15-25
15.6 Future Trends in Development	15-26
15.7 Review of Existing Ordinances, Programs, and Plans.....	15-26
15.7.1 City of Roseville Emergency Response Plan	15-26
15.7.2 City of Roseville Terrorism Contingency Plan	15-26
15.7.3 City of Roseville Hazardous Materials Contingency Plan	15-27
15.7.4 State of California Certified Unified Program Agency	15-27
15.7.5 Roseville Police Department	15-28
15.7.6 Roseville Public Safety Communications	15-28
15.7.7 Roseville Fire Department.....	15-28
15.8 Scenario.....	15-31
15.9 Issues.....	15-31
16. Planning Area Risk Ranking	16-1
16.1 Probability of Occurrence	16-1
16.2 Impact	16-1
16.3 Risk Rating and Ranking	16-3
17. Guiding Principle, Goals and Objectives.....	17-1
17.1 Guiding Principle	17-1
17.2 Goals	17-1

17.3 Objectives	17-2
18. Mitigation Alternatives	18-1
19. Action Plan and Implementation	19-1
19.1 Hazard Mitigation Action Plan	19-1
19.1.1 Benefit-Cost Review	19-7
19.1.2 Action Plan Prioritization	19-8
19.1.3 Analysis of Mitigation Actions	19-8
19.2 Adoption	19-8
19.3 Plan Maintenance Strategy.....	19-13
19.3.1 Plan Implementation.....	19-14
19.3.2 Steering Committee	19-14
19.3.3 Annual Progress Report.....	19-15
19.3.4 Plan Update	19-15
19.3.5 Continuing Public Involvement.....	19-16
19.3.6 Incorporation into Other Planning Mechanisms.....	19-16

References

Glossary

Appendices

Appendix A. Public Outreach Materials
 Appendix B. 2015 Progress Report
 Appendix C. Steering Committee Participation Documentation

Tables

Table 2-1. Plan Changes Crosswalk.....	2-3
Table 3-1. Steering Committee Members.....	3-2
Table 3-2. Summary of Public Meetings.....	3-7
Table 3-3. Plan Development Chronology/Milestones	3-11
Table 4-1. Presidential Major Disaster, Emergency, and Fire Management Assistance Declarations.....	4-5
Table 4-2. Roseville Climate	4-6
Table 4-3. Non-Residential Land Uses.....	4-9
Table 4-4. Non-Residential Development Profile as of July 2016.....	4-10
Table 4-5. Planning Area Critical Facilities	4-10
Table 4-6. Planning Area Critical Infrastructure	4-10
Table 4-7. General Plan Projections of Residential Units and Population by Specific Plan Area	4-18
Table 4-8. Status of Non-Institutionalized Population with Disabilities	4-20
Table 4-9. Population Under the Poverty Level	4-21
Table 4-10. Legal and Regulatory Capability	4-37
Table 4-11. Administrative and Technical Capability.....	4-39
Table 4-12. Fiscal Capability	4-39
Table 4-13. National Flood Insurance Program Compliance	4-40

Table 4-14. Education and Outreach	4-40
Table 4-15. Community Classifications	4-41
Table 5-1. Hazus-MH Model Data Documentation	5-6
Table 7-1. Dams in Placer and Sacramento Counties With Potential to impact Roseville	7-4
Table 7-2. Hazard Potential Classification	7-5
Table 7-3. Value of Property Exposed to Dam Failure	7-8
Table 7-4. Critical Facilities in Dam Failure Inundation Areas in Roseville	7-8
Table 7-5. Loss Estimates for Dam Failure	7-9
Table 8-1. City of Roseville Water Supply Contracts and Resources	8-2
Table 8-2. Dry Year Flows into Folsom Lake	8-3
Table 8-3. Water Supply Reliability by 2040	8-11
Table 8-4. City of Roseville Past, Current, and Projected Water Use	8-12
Table 9-1. Richter Magnitude Scale	9-2
Table 9-2. Moment Magnitude Scale	9-2
Table 9-3. Mercalli Scale and Peak Ground Acceleration Comparison	9-3
Table 9-4. NEHRP Soil Classification System	9-4
Table 9-5. Recent Earthquakes Magnitude 5.0 or Larger Within 100-mile radius	9-4
Table 9-6. Critical Facilities Exposed to the Earthquake Hazard	9-13
Table 9-7. Critical Infrastructure Exposed to the Earthquake Hazard	9-13
Table 9-8. Age of Structures in the City of Roseville	9-16
Table 9-9. Building Type	9-16
Table 9-10. Damage Probability (Vulnerability) of Critical Facilities from a 100-Year Earthquake Event	9-18
Table 9-11. Damage Probability (Vulnerability) of Critical Facilities from the Great Valley 3 Scenario	9-18
Table 9-12. Functionality of Critical Facilities, 100-Year Earthquake	9-19
Table 9-13. Functionality of Critical Facilities, Great Valley 3 Scenario	9-19
Table 10-1. Reported Damage from Major Flooding in Roseville (1973 to 2009)	10-4
Table 10-2. Observed Characteristics of Flooding	10-10
Table 10-3. Structures Within the SFHA and the Roseville Regulatory Floodplain	10-12
Table 10-4. Value of Exposed Buildings Within the FEMA SFHA	10-13
Table 10-5. Value of Exposed Buildings Within the Roseville Regulatory Floodplain	10-13
Table 10-6. Critical Facilities in Flood Area	10-14
Table 10-7. Critical Infrastructure in Flood Areas	10-14
Table 10-8. Flood Insurance Statistics for the City of Roseville	10-16
Table 10-9. Estimated Flood Loss for the 10-Year Flood Event (Preliminary FIRM)	10-17
Table 10-10. Estimated Flood Loss for the 100-Year and 500-Year Flood Events (Preliminary FIRM)	10-18
Table 10-11. Estimated Flood Loss for the Regulatory Floodplain	10-18
Table 11-1. Loss Estimates for Buildings Vulnerable to High Landslide Hazard	11-8
Table 11-2. Loss Estimates for Buildings Vulnerable to Moderate Landslide Risk Hazard	11-8
Table 12-1. Monthly Wind Records for Sacramento, California	12-5
Table 12-2. Monthly Dense Fog Occurrence	12-6
Table 12-3. Frequency of Thunderstorms in Sacramento, California, 1948 – 2008	12-6
Table 12-4. Severe Weather Events in Placer County since 1958 (NOAA 2015)	12-8
Table 12-5. Loss Potential for Roseville Buildings Vulnerable to Severe Weather Hazard	12-10
Table 13-1. Wildfire Incident Counts—2011 to 2015	13-8
Table 13-2. Critical Facilities and Infrastructure Adjacent to Potential Wildfire Areas	13-12
Table 13-3. Potential Loss Estimates for the Wildfire Hazard	13-13
Table 15-1. Event Profiles for Terrorism	15-3
Table 15-2. Common Mechanisms for Cyber Attacks	15-6
Table 15-3. Accidents Responded to by McClellan Fire Department, 1950-1980s	15-11

Table 15-4. Traffic Accident Counts—2009 to 2014.....	15-16
Table 15-7. Criticality Factors.....	15-21
Table 15-8. Vulnerability Criteria	15-22
Table 15-9. Residential Dwelling Units in the City of Roseville as of 2012	15-23
Table 16-1. Probability of Hazards.....	16-1
Table 16-2. Impact on People from Hazards	16-2
Table 16-3. Impact on Property from Hazards	16-3
Table 16-4. Impact on Economy from Hazards	16-3
Table 16-5. Hazard Risk Rating	16-3
Table 16-6. Hazard Risk Ranking	16-4
Table 17-1. Objectives for 2011 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan	17-2
Table 18-1. Alternatives to Mitigate the Dam Failure Hazard	18-2
Table 18-2. Alternatives to Mitigate the Drought Hazard.....	18-3
Table 18-3. Alternatives to Mitigate the Earthquake Hazard	18-4
Table 18-4. Alternatives to Mitigate the Flooding Hazard.....	18-5
Table 18-5. Alternatives to Mitigate the Landslide Hazard	18-6
Table 18-6. Alternatives to Mitigate the Severe Weather Hazard.....	18-7
Table 18-7. Alternatives to Mitigate the Wildfire Hazard.....	18-8
Table 18-8. Alternatives to Mitigate Health Hazards.....	18-9
Table 18-9. Alternatives to Mitigate Human-Cause Hazards.....	18-9
Table 19-1. Action Plan.....	19-2
Table 19-2. Prioritization of Mitigation Actions	19-9
Table 19-3. Analysis of Mitigation Actions	19-11

Figures

Figure 3-1. Hazard Mitigation Booth	3-6
Figure 3-2. City of Roseville Earth Day Festival	3-6
Figure 3-3. Hazus-MH Work Station	3-6
Figure 3-4. Sample Printout from Work Station	3-6
Figure 3-5. Twitter Survey Announcement.....	3-8
Figure 3-6. Facebook Survey Announcement	3-8
Figure 3-7. Nextdoor Survey Announcement.....	3-8
Figure 3-8. Sample Page from Hazard Mitigation Plan Website	3-9
Figure 4-1. Roseville Planning Area	4-2
Figure 4-2. Total Land Use Allocation in Roseville.....	4-7
Figure 4-3. Critical Facilities in the Planning Area.....	4-11
Figure 4-4. Critical Infrastructure in the Planning Area—Transportation	4-12
Figure 4-5. Critical Infrastructure in the Planning Area—Utilities	4-13
Figure 4-6. Placer County and Roseville Population Growth	4-17
Figure 4-7. Planning Area Age Distribution	4-18
Figure 4-8. Planning Area Race Distribution	4-19
Figure 4-9. Industry in the Planning Area	4-21
Figure 4-10. California and Roseville Unemployment Rate (U.S. Census, 2009 – 2014)	4-22
Figure 4-11. Occupations in the Planning Area	4-23
Figure 6-1. Global Carbon Dioxide Concentrations Over Time	6-2

Figure 6-2. Observed and Projected Average Temperatures in the Roseville Area	6-5
Figure 6-3. Projected Future Fire Risk in Placer County Relative to 2010 Levels	6-5
Figure 7-1. Folsom Dam and Folsom Lake on the American River, Looking Northeast	7-6
Figure 7-2. Folsom Dam Containment Dike Failure Flow Direction and Evacuation Routes	7-7
Figure 8-1. Palmer Crop Moisture Index for Week Ending January 30, 2016.....	8-6
Figure 8-2. Palmer Z Index Short-Term Drought Conditions (December 2015).....	8-6
Figure 8-3. Palmer Drought Severity Index (December 2015)	8-7
Figure 8-4. Palmer Hydrological Drought Index Long-Term Hydrologic Conditions (December 2015).....	8-8
Figure 8-5. 24-Month Standardized Precipitation Index (January 2013 – December 2015).....	8-8
Figure 9-1. Location of Recent Earthquakes in Roseville Vicinity	9-5
Figure 9-2. 100-Year Probabilistic PGA	9-8
Figure 9-3. Concord-Green Valley Fault Scenario PGA.....	9-9
Figure 9-4. Great Valley 3 Fault Scenario PGA.....	9-10
Figure 9-5. National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program Soil Classification	9-11
Figure 9-6. Age of Construction of Structures in Roseville	9-17
Figure 10-1. CRS Communities by Class as of May 1, 2016.....	10-3
Figure 10-2. Dry Creek Flooding, January 1995.....	10-6
Figure 10-3. Business Flooding, February 1998	10-7
Figure 10-4. Floodplains	10-9
Figure 10-5. Example of Stream Gauge Graphic Display.....	10-11
Figure 10-6. Repetitive Loss Area.....	10-20
Figure 10-7. Floodplain Designation Cross-Sections for Infill Areas	10-23
Figure 10-8. Floodplain Designation Cross-Sections for Areas Other Than Infill Areas	10-23
Figure 10-9. Updated Floodplain Mapping	10-26
Figure 11-1. Deep Seated Slide	11-2
Figure 11-2. Shallow Colluvial Slide	11-2
Figure 11-3. Bench Slide.....	11-2
Figure 11-4. Large Slide.....	11-2
Figure 11-5. Typical Debris Avalanche Scar and Track	11-2
Figure 11-6. Roseville Area Landslide Hazard Map	11-5
Figure 12-1. Roseville Regional Surface Elevation	12-1
Figure 12-2. Potential Impact and Damage from a Tornado	12-3
Figure 12-3. Tornado Risk Areas in the Coterminous United States	12-4
Figure 13-1. CAL FIRE FRAP Map for Placer County	13-5
Figure 13-2. View of Ravine, Tree Canopy and Stoneridge Development.....	13-6
Figure 13-3. Stoneridge Specific Plan Wildfire Threat Areas.....	13-8
Figure 13-4. Fire Hazard Severity Zones in the Planning Area	13-10
Figure 13-5. City of Roseville Fire Training Center	13-17
Figure 14-1. Areas with Confirmed H5N1 2003-2013.....	14-2
Figure 14-2. 2014 Distribution of Ebola Virus Outbreaks in Humans and Animals.....	14-4
Figure 14-3. California 2014 <i>Yersinia Pestis</i> Results in Tested Mammals by County	14-6
Figure 15-1. Pop-Up Message Indicating Ransomware Infection.....	15-6
Figure 15-2. February 12, 2006 Aircraft Crash into Residence	15-12
Figure 15-3. October 21, 2010 Arson Fire at Galleria Mall	15-13
Figure 15-4. 1973 Roseville Rail Yard Disaster.....	15-14

Figure 15-5. 1997 Bomb Discovery 15-15

Figure 15-6. The J.R. Davis Yard in Roseville, the Largest Train Yard West of the Mississippi..... 15-17

Figure 15-7. Roseville Truck Routes with High Potential for Hazardous Materials Incidents 15-18

Figure 15-8. Kinder Morgan National Pipeline Map 15-19

Figure 15-9. Roseville Civic Center 15-24

Figure 19-1. Resolution Adopting the Roseville Hazard Mitigation Plan..... 19-12

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

City of Roseville

Rob Jensen, City Manager
Wayne Wiley, Associate Planner
Jason Rizzi, Roseville Fire Department
Carl Walker, Senior Civil Engineer
Helen Dyda, Marketing & Communications Analyst

Consultants

Rob Flaner, CFM, Lead Project Planner, Tetra Tech, Inc.
Carol Baumann, Hazus/GIS lead, Tetra Tech, Inc.
Jessica Cerutti, CFM, Planner, Tetra Tech, Inc.
Stephen Veith, GIS Analyst, Tetra Tech, Inc.

Stakeholders

Erik Angle, Sutter Roseville Medical Center
Michael Algots, Union Pacific Railroad
Rick Stalker, Placer County Association of Realtors

Special Acknowledgments

The development of this Plan would not have been possible without the dedication and commitment to this process by the Roseville Hazard Mitigation Plan Steering Committee. The dedication of this volunteer committee to allocate their time to this process is greatly appreciated. Also, the citizens of Roseville are commended for their participation in the outreach strategy identified by the Steering Committee. This outreach success will set the course to the successful implementation of this Plan during its next performance period.

- | | | |
|----------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| • Grace Keller | • Helen Dyda | • Joseph Van Zant |
| • Wayne Wiley | • Erik Angle | • Rod Rodriguez |
| • Rob Jensen | • Brenette Macintosh | • Rick Stalker |
| • Jason Rizzi | • Mark Lacher | • Michael Algots |
| • Carl Walker | • Jaime Garrett | • Jim Williams |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Disaster Mitigation Act (DMA; Public Law 106-390) is the latest federal legislation enacted to encourage and promote proactive, pre-disaster planning as a condition of receiving financial assistance under the Robert T. Stafford Act. The DMA emphasizes planning for disasters before they occur. Under the DMA, a pre-disaster hazard mitigation program and new requirements for the national post-disaster hazard mitigation grant program were established.

The DMA encourages state and local authorities to work together on pre-disaster planning and it promotes sustainability as a strategy for disaster resistance. The intent is three-fold:

- To gather hazard, vulnerability, and mitigation information at the local level for use in state-level planning
- To ensure that state and local hazard mitigation planning is coordinated to the greatest extent practical
- To ensure that local jurisdictions are made aware of the hazards and vulnerabilities within their jurisdiction and to develop strategies to reduce those vulnerabilities.

This process ensures that mitigation actions are based on sound planning processes that account for the risks and capabilities of California communities. “Sustainable hazard mitigation” includes the sound management of natural resources, local economic and social resiliency, and the recognition that hazards and mitigation must be understood in the largest possible social and economic context. The enhanced planning network called for by the DMA helps local governments articulate accurate needs for mitigation, resulting in faster allocation of funding and more cost-effective risk reduction projects.

Using this initiative as a foundation for proactive planning, the City of Roseville has developed and maintained a hazard mitigation plan in an effort to reduce future loss of life and property resulting from disasters. It is impossible to predict exactly when and where disasters will occur or the extent to which they will impact the City. However, with careful planning and collaboration among public agencies, stakeholders, and citizens, it is possible to minimize losses that can occur from disasters.

Hazard mitigation is a way to reduce or alleviate the loss of life, personal injury, and property damage that can result from a disaster through long- and short-term strategies. It involves strategies such as planning, policy changes, programs, projects, and other activities that can mitigate the impacts of hazards on the City of Roseville. The responsibility for hazard mitigation lies with many, including private property owners; business and industry; and local, state, and federal government.

PLAN UPDATE

Federal regulations stipulate that hazard mitigation plans must describe the method and schedule for monitoring, evaluating, and updating the Plan. Prescribing an update schedule establishes an opportunity to reevaluate recommendations, monitor the impacts of actions that have been accomplished, and determine if there is a need to change the focus of mitigation strategies. DMA compliance is contingent on meeting the plan update requirement. A jurisdiction covered by a plan that has expired is not able to pursue elements of federal funding afforded under the Robert T. Stafford Act for which a current hazard mitigation plan is a prerequisite. The California Office of

Emergency Services (Cal OES) reviews all local hazard mitigation plans in accordance with DMA 2000 regulations and coordinates with local jurisdictions to ensure compliance with state requirements and the Code of Federal Regulations (Title 44 Section 201.6). Once Cal OES planning staff find the local hazard mitigation plan to be approvable, the Plan is forwarded to mitigation planning staff at Region IX of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). FEMA performs final review and designates compliant plans as “approved pending adoption.”

The City of Roseville used the plan update process to comprehensively revise its initial hazard mitigation plan, which was adopted in 2005. Due to the success of the initial plan, no major changes were made to the plan’s approach and function. The subsequent 2011 Plan was enhanced using recent best available data and technology, especially in the risk assessment. For this 2016 planning effort, the enhanced format of the 2011 Plan has been retained in order to ensure the consistency of discussion points on each hazard of concern and address required elements for plan updates. The Plan update followed the same basic planning process as was followed under the initial effort and subsequent update. A Steering Committee was once again the critical component in the process. The Steering Committee consisted of 14 members of the community representing the public, private industry, and government. The Steering Committee met six times between November 2015 and August 2016 to provide recommendations and support throughout the planning process.

PLAN UPDATE METHODOLOGY

Development of the hazard mitigation plan included five phases:

- Phase 1—Organize resources
- Phase 2—Update the risk assessment
- Phase 3—Engage the public
- Phase 4—Assemble the updated Plan
- Phase 5—Plan adoption

Phase 1—Organize Resources

The City hired Tetra Tech, Inc. as a consultant to assist with development and implementation of the 2016 Plan. The Tetra Tech project manager assumed the role of the lead project planner and reported directly to a City project manager. Once the technical assistance was secured, a planning team was formed to lead the planning effort. The Steering Committee that oversaw the development of the initial plan remained intact during the initial performance period of the Plan and then provided oversight for the 2016 Plan. For the update process, some new members were added and some previous members left the committee. The planning team facilitated each Steering Committee meeting, which addressed a set of objectives based on the work plan established for the update. The Steering Committee met six times from November 2015 through August 2016. Coordination with other local, state and federal agencies involved in hazard mitigation in the region helped to ensure consistency with other ongoing efforts.

One of the Steering Committee’s first action items was to review the State of California Hazard Mitigation Plan, the Roseville 2011 Hazard Mitigation Plan and all of the progress reports completed since the 2011 Plan. The Steering Committee identified hazards listed in the state plan to which Roseville is susceptible, in order to determine if there was a need to expand the scope of the risk assessment. Each annual progress report for the initial plan contains a section that recommends changes or enhancements to the Plan or plan development process. These reports effectively completed a key step of the plan update process before the update process began—identifying needs for changes or enhancements.

Phase 2 —Update the Risk Assessment

Federal planning guidance specifies comprehensive updates to the risk assessment portion of local hazard mitigation plans if there have been new technical data pertaining to a hazard developed by a creditable source since the Plan's previous development. Updated risk assessment efforts for the 2016 Plan included the following:

- The latest version of the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Hazus-MH risk assessment software was used to enhance the risk assessments for flood, dam failure and earthquake.
- All hazards of concern were updated with new relevant data.
- The Hazus default general building stock was updated using current address point, building footprint, parcel and tax assessor data.

Phase 3—Engage the Public

The Steering Committee drafted a comprehensive public involvement strategy for this update using multiple media sources. This strategy was built upon the Steering Committee's previous public engagement strategy and enhanced with social media and non-traditional outreach initiatives not regularly employed during the previous planning processes. The planning team identified stakeholders to target through the multi-disciplinary public involvement strategy.

Phase 4—Assemble the Updated Plan

The base format of the 2011 Plan was maintained in the 2016 Plan. However, enhancements were made to include the following components:

- The update describes the process used to review and analyze each section of the Plan.
- The update provides a discussion on how the public was kept apprised of the Plan's actions during the initial performance period.
- The update describes the need for changes to the risk assessment and what changes were made from the previous update.
- The update describes changes to risk exposure due to either of the following:
 - Successful mitigation projects
 - Changes in land use due to annexation or new development.
- The update describes changes to the action plan and the reasons for them.
- The update identifies completed, deleted, or deferred actions or activities from the previously approved plan as a benchmark for progress in the form of the 2015 Progress Report located in Appendix B. It also includes in its evaluation and prioritization new mitigation actions identified since the previous plan

Phase 5—Plan Adoption/Implementation

This Plan details a formal process for implementing and maintaining the Plan so that it remains an active and relevant document. The plan maintenance process includes a schedule for monitoring and evaluating the Plan's progress annually and producing a plan revision every five years. This process seeks to keep a steering body that meets the criteria of the original steering committee intact to perform this annual review. This phase includes strategies for continued public involvement and incorporation of the recommendations of this Plan into other planning mechanisms of the City, such as the comprehensive plan, capital improvement plan, building code, and development design guidelines.

MITIGATION GUIDING PRINCIPLE, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES

Guiding Principle

The following guiding principle was identified for this hazard mitigation plan:

Through community partnerships, establish a plan to reduce vulnerability to hazards in order to protect the health, safety, welfare, and economy of the City.

Goals

The Steering Committee established the following goals for the Plan update:

- G-1: Protect lives and reduce injury.
- G-2: Promote hazard mitigation as an integrated policy.
- G-3: Protect the continuity of local government to ensure no significant disruption of services during or due to a disaster.
- G-4: Improve community emergency management preparedness, collaboration and outreach.
- G-5: Minimize or reduce damage to property, including critical facilities.
- G-6: Develop and implement mitigation strategies that optimize public funds in an efficient and cost-effective way.
- G-7: Monitor and support the natural environment's capacity to deal with the impacts of natural hazards, taking into account the potential impacts of global climate change.

Objectives

Plan objectives were developed via a facilitated exercise that focused on finding objectives that meet multiple goals. During this exercise, Steering Committee members were requested to review the 2011 objectives in addition to newly proposed objectives. The selected objectives are listed in Table ES-1.

Table ES-1. Objectives for 2016 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan

Objective Number	Objective Statement	Goals for which it can be applied
O-1	Consider the impacts of hazards on future land uses in the City of Roseville by coordinating with other planning mechanisms such as the General Plan and land-use code development.	1, 2, 5, 7
O-2	Protect and sustain reliable local emergency operations and communication facilities during and after disasters.	1, 3, 4
O-3	Develop new or enhance existing early warning response systems and plans.	1, 3, 4, 5
O-4	Seek to enhance emergency response capabilities through improvements to infrastructure and City programs.	1, 4, 5
O-5	Enhance the understanding of all present and future hazards that impact the City of Roseville and the risk they pose.	1, 3, 4, 5, 7
O-6	Seek mitigation projects that provide the highest degree of hazard protection at the least cost.	1, 5, 6
O-7	Seek to update information on natural, environmental, and human-caused hazards, vulnerabilities, and mitigation measures by coordinating planning efforts and creating partnerships with appropriate local, private, county, state, and federal agencies.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7
O-8	Seek to implement codes, standards, and policies that will protect life and property, including natural habitat, from the impacts of hazards within the City of Roseville.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6
O-9	Educate the public on preparedness for and mitigation of potential impacts of hazards on the City of Roseville.	1, 2, 4
O-10	Support efforts to retrofit, purchase, or relocate structures in high hazard areas, including those known to be repetitively damaged.	3, 5, 6

MITIGATION ACTION PLAN

The hazard mitigation action plan is a key element of this Plan. It is through the implementation of this action plan that the City of Roseville can strive to become disaster-resilient through sustainable hazard mitigation. This action plan includes an assessment of the capabilities of the City to implement hazard mitigation actions, a review of alternatives, a prioritization schedule, and a mitigation strategy matrix that identifies the following:

- Description of recommended actions
- Hazards addressed
- Objectives addressed
- Lead implementation agency (or agencies)
- Estimated benefits
- Estimated costs
- Timeframe for implementation
- Funding sources

For the purposes of this document, mitigation actions are defined as activities designed to reduce or eliminate losses resulting from the impacts of natural hazards of concern. Table ES-2 summarizes the hazard mitigation actions identified by this Plan update.

IMPLEMENTATION

Full implementation of the recommendations of this Plan will require time and resources. This Plan reflects an adaptive management approach in that specific recommendations and plan review protocols are provided to evaluate changes in vulnerability and action plan prioritization after the Plan is adopted. Funding resources are always evolving, as are requirements under state or federal mandates, and the true measure of the Plan's success will be its ability to adapt to the ever-changing climate of hazard mitigation.

Roseville has a long-standing tradition of progressive, proactive response to issues that may impact its citizens. This tradition is reflected in the development of this Plan. The Roseville City Council will assume responsibility for adopting the recommendations of this Plan and committing City resources toward its implementation. The City's track record in the mitigation of hazards impacting its citizens is exemplary. The framework established by this Plan will help maintain this tradition in that it identifies a strategy to maximize the potential for implementation based on available and potential resources. It commits the City to pursue actions when the benefits of a project exceed its costs. Most important, the City developed this Plan with extensive public input, which sets the stage for acceptance of the actions recommended for implementation in this Plan.

Table ES-2. Hazard Mitigation Action Plan Matrix

Action Number and Description	Timeframe
DAM FAILURE	
DF-1—Create a dam failure element for the City's emergency response plan that includes a phased warning protocol in response to the findings of the Folsom Dam Containment Dike Risk Assessment.	Short-term
DROUGHT	
D-1—Perform a groundwater recharge feasibility study to determine the most cost-effective way to replenish groundwater resources within Roseville.	Ongoing
D-2—Implement aquifer storage and recovery program that uses direct injection technique in areas identified as appropriate.	Ongoing
D-3—Continue to implement the Environmental Utility Department's recycled water program and seek all opportunities to expand its coverage, focusing first on the Sunset Industrial area. The City pumps recycled water through a system of purple pipes completely separate from potable (drinking water) pipes. The City pumps the recycled water to customers such as streetscapes, golf courses and parks, where it irrigates turf and shrubs. Using recycled water for uses such as landscape irrigation reduces demand on the potable water system, creating a more reliable water supply for the entire City. Recycled water is not subject to the effects of drought.	Ongoing
D-4—Promote active water conservation techniques and strategies to private property owners through Roseville-sponsored outreach projects such as printed media and the City's website.	Ongoing
EARTHQUAKE	
EQ-1—Perform building-specific, structural seismic vulnerability assessment of City-owned critical facilities constructed prior to 1980 (including infrastructure). Included in this assessment will be recommended mitigation alternatives that meet goals and objectives of this Plan.	Short-term; Ongoing
EQ-2—Incorporate earthquake mitigation measures for private property into existing City-sponsored outreach programs such as printed media and the City's website.	Short-term
EQ-3—Reassess the overall vulnerability to the earthquake hazard using the best available science and technology as it becomes available. State-sponsored programs, Seismic Hazards Mapping Act, and future FEMA-sponsored initiatives are anticipated to create a wealth of knowledge regarding this hazard that did not exist during the preparation of this Plan update	Short-term; Ongoing
FLOOD	
F-1—The City shall designate all areas identified as the 100-year floodplain. The boundaries of the 100-year floodplain shall be as specified in the floodplain designations section of this component of the City's general plan. Floodplain areas shall be preserved as specified in the open space and conservation element. Such preservation may include required dedication to the City. If needed, modify the City's ordinances to include floodplain use regulations consistent with the goals, policies, and implementation measures of the safety, land use, open space and conservation, and parks and recreation elements of the City's general plan.	Ongoing
F-2—Refer any development proposal that has a direct or indirect impact on flood protection to Public Works for comment. In addition, forward such proposals to other agencies as applicable, including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, California Reclamation Board, FEMA, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Placer County Resource Conservation District, and Placer County Flood Control District. Consider the comments of the agencies during the development review process.	Ongoing
F-3—Continue City participation in the National Flood Insurance Program and the Community Rating System (CRS). Maintain the City's current CRS status as the nation's only Class 1 CRS community.	Ongoing
F-4—Maintain Roseville's compliance and good standing under the National Flood Insurance program	Ongoing
F-5—Continue the City's outreach program to flood-prone property owners and the citizens of Roseville to program is to help make them aware of the flood threat and how best to deal with them.	Ongoing
F-6—Continue to pursue a regional approach to flood issues by remaining actively involved in the Placer Co Flood Control District. This involvement includes cooperation in the development of a comprehensive regional database. Continue to participate in regional flooding studies, including the Auburn Creek/Coon Creek/Pleasant Grove Creek flood mitigation plan and the Dry Creek watershed flood control plan.	Ongoing

Action Number and Description	Timeframe
F 7—Continue City coordination with other agencies on issues of flood control. Coordination between the City and adjacent jurisdictions occurs through several mechanisms, including distribution of development proposals for review and comment. Continue City cooperation with federal, state, and local agencies, including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, California Reclamation Board, FEMA, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Placer County Resource Conservation District, and Placer County Flood Control District.	Ongoing
F 8—Continue to develop, implement, and expand the Flood Alert and Early Warning Program systems and integrate the systems with other local jurisdictions to form a regional warning program.	Ongoing
F 9—Ensure that future specific plans and specific plan amendments are consistent with the goals and policies of the general plan. The specific plans shall include the designation and preservation of floodplain areas and adjacent habitat. Provisions shall be incorporated to ensure that public infrastructure, utilities, and emergency services remain functional during flood conditions. Such infrastructure and facilities include water, sewer and gas mains, telephone and electric lines, streets and bridges, hospitals, and fire and police stations. Financing mechanisms shall be explored to fund necessary flood protection improvements and maintenance. Development agreements may be used to secure implementation and funding provisions. (Specific plans have 100% cost recovery by developers).	Short -term
F 10—Monitor and regularly update City flood studies, modeling, and associated land use, zoning, and other development regulations at a minimum of every 5 years or whenever information becomes available that would significantly modify previous data. New information could include new studies, change in City policy, consideration of a major development project or specific plan, or implementation of a flood control project.	Short-term; Ongoing
F 11—Require a master drainage plan as part of the approval process for all specific plans and large development projects as determined by the Public Works director. The master drainage plan should consider cumulative regional drainage and flooding mitigation. The plan's intent is to ensure that the overall rate of runoff from a project does not exceed predevelopment levels. If necessary, this objective shall be achieved by incorporating run-off control measures to minimize peak flows and/or assistance in financing or otherwise implementing comprehensive drainage plans.	Short-term
F-12—Continue the Department of Parks, Recreation and Libraries' regular creek maintenance program within the City's creeks and floodplain areas. This program clears and removes debris that could contribute to blockage and flooding and may include the removal of silt. This is only done in areas of high risk to flood damage or where property or facilities are threatened by flooding.	Ongoing
F 13—Continue annual inspection and maintenance program of City storm drain systems. Review after every major storm system function and performance. This program removes debris that could contribute to blockage of the storm drain system.	Ongoing
F 14—Complete the final two phases of the Cirby/Linda/Dry Creek flood control project (Phase 1 and 2). Five of the seven phases of this project have been completed at a cost of about \$18,000,000. The basis for determining viability of this project will be a benefit /cost analysis to determine if project meets federal grant eligibility requirements.	Long-term
F 15—Analyze alternative improvements to the Cirby/Linda/Dry Creek flood control project that may be cost effective in the flood-prone areas of Roseville: • Dry Creek from Darling Way to Riverside Avenue • Area on Dry Creek upstream of Folsom Road in the Columbia Avenue/Marilyn Avenue/Bonita Street area • Linda Creek near Samoa Way/Hurst Way area • Cirby Creek in the Trimble Way/Zien Court area	Long -term; depends on funding
F 16—Replace the Huntington Drive/Cirby Creek culvert with a bridge to protect Queens Court/Huntington Drive area. This project is overseen by Public Works department.	Long-term; depends on funding
F 17—Divert the main drainage storm drain system down Crestmont Avenue to Cirby Way and then into Dry Creek so that the existing system will not exceed capacity. If system capacity is exceeded, the intersection on Cirby Way and Crestmont Avenue and nearby homes will flood during major flood events.	Short-term
F 18—Continue to promote and sponsor programs to buy out, relocate, and flood-proof existing flood-prone structures within Roseville.	Long-term; depends on funding
F-19—Implement recommendation of Downtown Roseville Specific Plan to relocate the Public safety Building.	Long-term
F-20—Retrofit the City's Downtown library by sealing the exterior and installing a flood door to protect against flood damage should Dry Creek overspill the existing floodwall.	Short-term; Ongoing

Action Number and Description	Timeframe
F-21—Continue the Tree Mitigation Fund program administered by the Open Space Division in conjunction with non-profit organizations. The planting of oak trees in the open spaces adjacent to riparian zones increases infiltration and slows storm water surges.	Ongoing
F-22—Manage beaver dam sites for flood control protection and habitat restoration after dam removal. One primary issue is impacts to floodwater capacity of creeks. Part of the desired comprehensive approach to beaver management includes establishment of quantitative and qualitative “carrying capacity,” including acre-feet of flood capacity lost. Implement a standard monitoring and reporting process to track beaver dam locations, population, and impacts. Gain regulatory approval for beaver management techniques such as biological control and habitat manipulation using the most benign options first.	Ongoing
F-23 – Develop the City’s multi-use, multi-benefit stormwater retention project within the Pleasant Grove Creek Watershed, the Reason Farms Stormwater Retention Project.	Long-term
LANDSLIDE	
LS-1—Once California Geological Survey completes soils mapping for the Roseville vicinity under the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act, reassess landslide hazard using best available data to gauge the true vulnerability to this hazard.	Long-term
LS-2—Continue to implement policies adopted by the general plan that promote open space land uses within identified steep slope areas of Roseville. The City of Roseville Northeast Roseville Specific Plan and Stoneridge Specific Plans include the identified steep slope areas within Roseville. Both Plan Areas have continuing development. When individual projects are submitted,	Ongoing
SEVERE WEATHER	
SW-1—Continue the Shade Tree Program, an energy conservation rebate program provided by Roseville Electric	Ongoing
SW-2—Continue ongoing line clearing and weed abatement of electrical utilities to reduce exposure to severe weather hazards.	Ongoing
SW-3—Continue education/outreach programs to improve winter preparedness and minimize loss of life or injury.	Short-term, ongoing
SW-4—Enhance and implement strategies for debris management and removal during severe weather events.	Ongoing
SW 5—Continue to operate the Roseville Energy Park to support the City’s electrical requirements and maintain service continuity during severe weather events.	Ongoing
SW 6—Take over ownership and operation of the Roseville Combustion Turbines from Northern CA Power Agency to support the City’s electrical requirements and maintain service continuity during severe weather events.	Ongoing
WILDFIRE	
WF-1—Continue “Goat Grazing” program for removal of grassland in areas of Roseville potentially vulnerable to wildfire. Implement goat grazing in City open space and preserve areas for fire and invasive plant species management and native plant restoration.	Ongoing
WF-2—Enhance existing City public outreach programs to include information on fire safety, defensible spaces, and areas of concern.	Short-term; Ongoing
MULTIPLE HAZARDS	
MH-1—Continue to maintain Cal OES certification of all City inspectors for post-disaster damage assessment.	Ongoing
MH-2—Continue to maintain the hazard mitigation page on City website that provides following types of information: • The Hazard Management Plan and its progress reports • Hazard-specific information • Mitigation information by hazard, with specific emphasis on private property • Emergency response and warning information • Links to county, state, and federal related agencies	Ongoing

Action Number and Description	Timeframe
MH-3—Establish/maintain a post-disaster action plan to be part of the City Emergency operations plan that will include following elements: • Procedures for public information • Post-disaster damage assessment • Grant writing • Code enforcement • Redundant operations	Ongoing
MH-4—Implement an “Adopt an Open Space” program in coordination with the open space management program. Develop “adoption contracts” with neighborhoods, organizations, businesses, etc., describing the level of stewardship and the terms of the “adoption.” Publicize these activities through online resource directory and other media to encourage participation.	Long-term
MH-5—Develop and disseminate best practices information to private property owners whose land is adjacent to open space areas describing stewardship opportunities and owners’ role in preserving beneficial uses of open space areas (including vernal pool grassland and creek or riparian uses). Offer classes to provide in-depth information, such as demonstration projects, techniques for ecologically friendly weed abatement and vegetation control, and creating a backyard habitat compatible with open space areas.	Short-term; Ongoing
MH-6—Work with the Roseville City School District, local high school districts, and non-profit organizations to promote ecology-oriented curricula and stewardship activities. Identify resource and administrative barriers that may be limiting schools’ abilities to more actively participate in stewardship, and work collaboratively to identify solutions.	Short-term; Ongoing
MH 7—Strive to maintain high availability of essential communication services	Ongoing
MH 8—Secure the City’s physical locations that contain technology infrastructure	Ongoing
HUMAN-CAUSED	
HC 1—Commit support to initiatives within the Sacramento-Roseville-Arden-Arcade Metropolitan Statistical Area; continue to seek funding from other federal sources to fund its initiatives	Short-term
HC-2—Enhance emergency response capability of City by contingency planning for specific events based on identified vulnerabilities.	Short-term, ongoing
HC-3— Seek to establish appropriate staffing levels of public safety personnel to address vulnerabilities identified through an incremental targeted study that provides immediate needs as well as anticipated needs in 1 year, 5 years, and 10 years.	Short Term; depends on funding
HC-4—Prepare a site-specific vulnerability assessment of City-owned critical facilities that use the best available science and technology with regards human-caused hazards.	Long-term
HC-5—Address vulnerabilities identified in vulnerability assessment of water facilities performed by Environmental Utilities Department in response to EPA initiative.	Long-term
HC 6—Maintain compliance with California Energy Commission license conditions for the operations of the Roseville Energy Park with respect to Hazardous Material Management	Ongoing
HC 7—Establish and maintain compliance with state and local laws and regulations for the operation of the Roseville Combustion Turbines upon transfer of ownership from Northern CA Power Agency to City.	Ongoing
HC-8—Maintain compliance with North American Electric Reliability Corporation mandatory reliability standards related to plant operation, sabotage reporting and critical infrastructure protection (cyber security).	Ongoing
HC 9—Protect the City’s data, technology infrastructure and staff against Cyber terrorism such as but not limited to: • Identity Theft • Virus/Malware/Ransomware/Spyware/Spam/Phishing • Network and system attacks • Web site hacking	Short Term; depends on funding
HC-10: Improve evacuation transportation routes within the City of Roseville by removing traffic constrictions.	Long-term
HUMAN HEALTH	
HH-1—Continue to collaborate with the Placer County Health Department to ensure the health and welfare of the community	Ongoing

Action Number and Description	Timeframe
HH-2—Support the public education efforts of the Placer County Health Department and the Placer Mosquito Abatement District	Ongoing
HH-3—Collaborate with the Placer County Mosquito Abatement District to review resource protection policies that conflict with human health protection in the City of Roseville and work to resolve these policy issues	Short-term; Ongoing

Part 1. Planning Process and Community Profile

1. INTRODUCTION TO HAZARD MITIGATION PLANNING

1.1 WHY PREPARE THIS PLAN?

1.1.1 The Big Picture

Hazard mitigation is defined as any action taken to reduce or alleviate the loss of life, personal injury, and property damage that can result from a disaster. It involves long- and short-term actions implemented before, during and after disasters. Hazard mitigation activities include planning efforts, policy changes, programs, studies, improvement projects, and other steps to reduce the impacts of hazards.

For many years, federal disaster funding focused on relief and recovery after disasters occurred, with limited funding for hazard mitigation planning in advance. The Disaster Mitigation Act (DMA; Public Law 106-390), passed in 2000, shifted the federal emphasis toward planning for disasters before they occur. The DMA requires state and local governments to develop hazard mitigation plans as a condition for federal disaster grant assistance. Regulations developed to fulfill the DMA's requirements are included in Title 44 of the Code of Federal Regulations (44 CFR).

The responsibility for hazard mitigation lies with many, including private property owners, commercial interests, and local, state and federal governments. The DMA encourages cooperation among state and local authorities in pre-disaster planning. The enhanced planning network called for by the DMA helps local governments articulate accurate needs for mitigation, resulting in faster allocation of funding and more cost-effective risk-reduction projects.

The DMA also promotes sustainability in hazard mitigation. To be sustainable, hazard mitigation needs to incorporate sound management of natural resources and address hazards and mitigation in the largest possible social and economic context.

1.1.2 Roseville's Response to the DMA

Roseville has a long-standing reputation as a national leader in risk reduction through proactive mitigation. This reputation has been built through innovative planning and a commitment to protecting its citizens from the impacts of natural disasters. Embracing the goals of the DMA, Roseville created an initial hazard mitigation plan that became a model nationally and has been touted by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) as a "mitigation success story." The *City of Roseville Hazard Mitigation Plan* was adopted by the Roseville City Council on July 20, 2005, and was formally approved by FEMA Region IX on August 10, 2005. The initial plan was developed with the following objectives:

- Meet or exceed program requirements specified under the DMA, thereby enabling the City of Roseville to continue using federal grant funding to reduce risk through mitigation.
- Meet not only state and federal requirements but also the needs of the City (this Plan addresses human-caused hazards, which are not required to be addressed under the DMA).
- Develop the Plan according to FEMA's Community Rating System (CRS) guidelines so that Roseville can meet requirements to become the nation's first CRS Class 1 community.

- Create a risk assessment that focuses on the City of Roseville hazards of concern.
- Coordinate existing plans and programs so that high-priority actions and projects to mitigate possible disaster impacts are funded and implemented.

The initial plan was developed according to the requirements of 44 CFR, qualifying the City to pursue funding under the Robert T. Stafford Act. The City has achieved numerous objectives identified in the Plan. Local hazard mitigation plans must be regularly updated to comply with the DMA. The City responded to this requirement with a plan update process that resulted in the 2011 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan, and now this 2016 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan.

This hazard mitigation plan update identifies resources, information, and strategies for reducing risk from natural hazards. Elements and strategies in the Plan were selected because they meet a program requirement and because they best meet the needs City residents. The Plan will help guide and coordinate mitigation activities throughout the planning area. It also will meet the planning requirements of the CRS, allowing the City of Roseville to maintain its CRS Class 1 rating.

1.2 WHO WILL BENEFIT FROM THIS PLAN?

All residents and businesses of the City of Roseville are the ultimate beneficiaries of this hazard mitigation plan update. The Plan reduces risk for those who live in, work in, and visit the City. It provides a viable planning framework for all foreseeable natural hazards. Participation in development of the Plan by key stakeholders helped ensure that outcomes will be mutually beneficial. The Plan's goals and recommendations can lay groundwork for the development and implementation of local mitigation activities and partnerships.

1.3 CONTENTS OF THIS PLAN

This hazard mitigation plan is organized into three primary parts:

- Part 1—Planning Process and Community Profile
- Part 2—Risk Assessment
- Part 3—Mitigation Strategy.

Each part includes elements required under federal guidelines. DMA compliance requirements are cited at the beginning of subsections as appropriate to illustrate compliance.

The following appendices provided at the end of the Plan include information or explanations to support the main content of the Plan:

- Appendix A—Public outreach information used in preparation of this update
- Appendix B—The 2015 Progress Report.

2. PLAN UPDATE—WHAT HAS CHANGED

2.1 THE PREVIOUS PLAN

Several factors initiated the first hazard mitigation planning effort for the City of Roseville:

- The Roseville area has significant exposure to numerous natural hazards that have caused millions of dollars in past damage.
- Limited local resources make it difficult to be pre-emptive in risk reduction actions. Being able to leverage federal financial assistance is paramount to successful hazard mitigation in the area.
- The City wanted to be proactive in its preparedness for natural hazards.

With these factors in mind, the City of Roseville committed to the preparation of its initial plan by attaining grant funding for the effort and then securing technical assistance to complete a planning process that complied with all requirements. Five years later, the City followed a similar process to update the Plan.

Due to the success of the 2005 effort, no major changes were made to the Plan's approach and function during the 2011 planning process. The 2011 update enhanced the 2005 effort but remained consistent on discussion points for each hazard of concern. The 2011 Plan format changed to address required elements for plan updates. A major addition to the 2011 Plan, per recommendations from FEMA Region IX, was the inclusion of dam failure as a hazard of concern.

The 2011 Plan update followed a phased approach to planning per FEMA's July 2008 *Local Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance*.

2.2 MITIGATION SUCCESS STORIES

One of the principal objectives of the initial plan was to create a plan that would help the City achieve the highest possible rating under FEMA's Community Rating System (CRS) program. The CRS program has stringent requirements for Classes 4 or better, and especially for Class 1. Several of these requirements are related to planning, and the initial plan was developed to meet these requirements. The Insurance Services Office (ISO), which performs classification reviews for the CRS, determined that the initial plan met the Class 1 requirements. In December 2005, the City was verified with sufficient credit to become the nation's first and only CRS Class 1 community. This classification went into effect on October 1, 2006, and was confirmed again during the re-verification process in 2008, and most recently in 2014. As of the writing of this Plan, the City of Roseville maintains its status as the nation's only CRS Class 1 community.

Detailed accounts of other successful mitigation actions completed by the City during each reporting period are included in the progress reports on the previous hazard mitigation plan, including the 2015 Progress Report contained in Appendix B of this Plan.

2.3 WHY UPDATE?

2.3.1 Federal Eligibility

Under 44 CFR, hazard mitigation plans must present a schedule for monitoring, evaluating, and updating the Plan. This provides an opportunity to reevaluate recommendations, monitor the impacts of actions that have been accomplished, and determine if there is a need to change the focus of mitigation strategies. A jurisdiction covered by a plan that has expired is not able to pursue elements of federal funding under the Robert T. Stafford Act for which a current hazard mitigation plan is a prerequisite.

2.3.2 Changes in Development

Hazard mitigation plan updates must be revised to reflect changes in development within the planning area during the previous performance period of the Plan (44 CFR Section 201.6(d)(3)). The Plan must describe changes in development in hazard-prone areas that increased or decreased vulnerability since the last plan was approved. If no changes in development impacted the jurisdiction's overall vulnerability, then plan updates may validate the information in the previously approved plan. The intent of this requirement is to ensure that the mitigation strategy continues to address the risk and vulnerability of existing and potential development and takes into consideration possible future conditions that could impact vulnerability.

The Roseville planning area experienced a 31-percent increase in population between 2003 and 2013, an average annual growth rate of 3.1 percent per year (Placer County Office of Economic Development, 2014). The City has adopted a comprehensive plan that governs land-use decisions and policy-making, as well as a building code and specialty ordinances based on state and federal mandates. This Plan update assumes that some new development triggered by the increase in population occurred in hazard areas. Because all such new development would have been regulated pursuant to local programs and codes, it is assumed that vulnerability did not increase even if exposure did.

2.4 THE UPDATED PLAN—WHAT IS DIFFERENT?

The updated Plan differs from the initial plan in a variety of ways:

- **Climate Change Impacts**—The most recent version of the California hazard mitigation plan noted specific hazards that are created or augmented by the environmental impacts of climate change. Additionally, the recent passage of Senate Bill 379 brings the effects of climate change into focus as it relates to mitigation and general planning. As a result, instead of briefly reviewing the impact of climate change in each individual hazard profile, this 2016 Plan update dedicates a comprehensive chapter to the issue of climate change and its effects on the state-identified climate-related hazards.
- **Drought Chapter Enhancements**—Enhancements to the drought Chapter were made to reflect current, historic drought conditions of the state, region, and city. This information was supplemented with new information provided by the City's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) update.
- **Public Engagement Enhancements through Social Media**—Social media platforms not available during the previous planning initiative were used to enhance public outreach capabilities.
- **Planning Area Changes**—The City adopted 3 new Specific Plans since the previous plan update. As such, all development and demographic information will include data pertaining to these new Specific Plan Areas of Sierra Vista, Creekview, and Amarus Ranch.
- **Separation of Natural from Non-natural Hazards**—In an effort to draw distinction from the natural hazards from the non-natural hazards, the non-natural hazards (Human Caused and Human Health Hazards) are placed after the natural hazards instead of listed alphabetically with the natural hazards.

- **Human-Caused Hazards**—The human-caused hazards noted in the 2011 effort were updated for the 2016 Plan. These human-caused hazards were moved within the document to after the natural hazards due to the difference in assessing risk. Cyber threat was included as a new human-caused hazard, due to the increase in connectivity, technological advances, and emergence of “hacktivist” groups.
- **Human Health Hazards**—The human health hazards noted in the 2011 effort were updated for the 2016 Plan. These human health hazards were moved within the document to after the natural hazards due to the difference in assessing risk. Ebola was included as a new human health hazard due to the 2014 West Africa Ebola outbreak that threatened the United States, though that threat never fully materialized. Zika virus is included in the discussion, as well.
- **Additional Demographic Information**—Additional demographic data are included—beyond age and disability/access and function need—addressing Roseville’s industry, business and institutional footprint. Employment trends and occupations are included to develop a fuller understanding of the population of Roseville.
- **Disabilities, Access and Functional Need Language Revision**—The entire Plan was updated to reflect appropriate references when discussing individuals with disabilities and others with access and functional needs. This includes person-first language and references to individuals instead of the more general term of populations.
- **Guiding Principle**—A guiding principle for the hazard mitigation plan was developed. The goals and objectives of the Plan support the guiding principle.

Table 2-1 indicates the major changes between the 2011 and 2016 plans as they relate to 44 CFR planning requirements.

Table 2-1. Plan Changes Crosswalk

44 CFR Requirement	Previous Plan (2011)	Updated Plan (2016)
§201.6(b): In order to develop a more comprehensive approach to reducing the effects of natural disasters, the planning process shall include: • An opportunity for the public to comment on the Plan during the drafting stage and prior to Plan approval; • An opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, and agencies that have the authority to regulate development, as well as businesses, academia and other private and non-profit interests to be involved in the planning process; and • Review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information.	The plan development process deployed under this update was similar to the 2005 Plan. Chapters 1, 2, and 3 describe the planning process for the 2011 updated Plan.	The plan development process deployed under this update was similar to the 2011 Plan; however, additional public outreach initiatives were conducted through new social media platforms. Chapters 1, 2, and 3 describe the planning process for the 2016 updated Plan.

44 CFR Requirement	Previous Plan (2011)	Updated Plan (2016)
§201.6(c)(2): The Plan shall include a risk assessment that provides the factual basis for activities proposed in the strategy to reduce losses from identified hazards. Local risk assessments must provide sufficient information to enable the jurisdiction to identify and prioritize appropriate mitigation actions to reduce losses from identified hazards.	Chapters 6 through 15 presents a risk assessment of eight hazards of concern: Climate change, dam failure, drought, earthquake, flood, landslide, severe weather, and wildfire. These hazards are profiled as they impact Roseville. Additionally, human-caused and health hazards were qualitatively assessed to develop a more complete picture of the hazards facing the county.	The 2016 Plan presents a risk assessment of the same hazards as the 2011 Plan—in Chapters 6 through 16. Each hazard was updated with new occurrence information from 2011 through 2015 where applicable, and a new comprehensive risk assessment was conducted using updated building stock, demographics, and land use information.
§201.6(c)(2)(i): [The risk assessment shall include a] description of the ... location and extent of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction. The Plan shall include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events.	Chapters 6 through 15 presents a risk assessment of each hazard of concern. Each chapter includes the following components: • Hazard profile-including maps of extent and location, historical occurrences, frequency, severity and warning time. • Secondary hazards • Climate change impacts • Exposure of people, property, critical facilities and environment. • Vulnerability of people, property, critical facilities and environment. • Future trends in development • Scenarios • Issues	The 2016 Plan presents a risk assessment of the same hazards as the 2011 Plan—from Chapters 6 through 16. Each hazard was updated with new occurrence information from 2011 through 2015 where applicable, and a new comprehensive risk assessment was conducted using updated building stock, demographics, and land use information. Climate change impacts were omitted from the individual hazards of concern, as the new climate change chapter provides a more detailed and comprehensive overview of climate change impacts for identified hazards.
§201.6(c)(2)(ii): [The risk assessment shall include a] description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to the hazards described in paragraph (c)(2)(i). This description shall include an overall summary of each hazard and its impact on the community	Vulnerability was assessed for all hazards of concern. The Hazus-MH computer model was used for the dam failure, earthquake and flood hazards. These were Level 2 user-defined analyses using City data. Site-specific data on City-identified critical facilities was entered into the Hazus model. Hazus outputs were generated for other hazards by applying an estimated damage function to an asset inventory was extracted from Hazus-MH.	Vulnerability was again assessed for all hazards of concern using the Hazus-MH computer model for dam failure, earthquake, and flood hazards. Level 2 analysis was again conducted for these hazards. Site-specific data on City-identified critical facilities was entered into the Hazus model. Hazus outputs were generated for other hazards by applying an estimated damage function to an asset inventory extracted from Hazus-MH. All assets were updated using current available data.
§201.6(c)(2)(ii): [The risk assessment] must also address National Flood Insurance Program insured structures that have been repetitively damaged floods	The Plan includes a comprehensive analysis of repetitive loss areas that includes an inventory of the number and types of structures in the repetitive loss area. Repetitive loss areas are delineated, causes of repetitive flooding are cited, and these areas are reflected on maps	The Plan includes a comprehensive analysis of repetitive loss areas that includes an inventory of the number and types of structures in the repetitive loss area. Repetitive loss areas are delineated, causes of repetitive flooding are cited, and these areas are reflected on maps.

44 CFR Requirement	Previous Plan (2011)	Updated Plan (2016)
§201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A): The plan should describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of existing and future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard area.	A complete inventory of the numbers and types of buildings exposed was generated for each hazard of concern. The Steering Committee defined “critical facilities” for the planning area, and these were inventoried by exposure. Each hazard chapter provides a discussion on future development trends.	Building inventory was updated and the Steering Committee revised the critical facilities definition to reflect 2016 priorities. Each hazard chapter again provides a discussion on future development trends.
§201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B): [The plan should describe vulnerability in terms of an] estimate of the potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures identified in paragraph (c)(2)(i)(A) and a description of the methodology used to prepare the estimate.	Loss estimations in terms of dollar loss were generated for all hazards of concern. These were generated by Hazus-MH for the dam failure, earthquake and flood hazards. For the other hazards, loss estimates were generated by applying a regionally relevant damage function to the exposed inventory. In all cases, a damage function was applied to an asset inventory. The asset inventory was the same for all hazards and was generated in Hazus.	Loss estimates were recalculated using new data and the new asset inventory.
§201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C): [The plan should describe vulnerability in terms of] providing a general description of land uses and development trends within the community so that mitigation options can be considered in future land use decisions.	There is a discussion on future development trends as they pertain to each hazard of concern. This discussion looks predominantly at the existing land use and the current regulatory environment that dictates this land use.	The Plan contains a discussion on development trends from the previous planning period, through future trends anticipated in the next five years as they pertain to each hazard.
§201.6(c)(3): The plan shall include a mitigation strategy that provides the jurisdiction’s blueprint for reducing the potential losses identified in the risk assessment, based on existing authorities, policies, programs and resources, and its ability to expand on and improve these existing tools.	The Plan contains a guiding principal, goals, objectives and actions. The actions strive to meet multiple objectives. The objectives are broad and overarching; each meets multiple goals and stands alone as a component of the Plan. The City of Roseville completed a capability assessment that looks at its regulatory, technical and financial capabilities.	The Steering Committee reviewed the 2011 guiding principle, goals, objectives, and actions and made minor adjustments to reflect 2016 priorities. The City of Roseville updated its capability assessment to reflect regulatory revisions and new initiatives.
§201.6(c)(3)(i): [The hazard mitigation strategy shall include a] description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards.	The Steering Committee identified a guiding principal, goals and objectives.	The Steering Committee reviewed the 2011 guiding principle, goals, objectives, and actions and made minor adjustments to reflect 2016 priorities.
§201.6(c)(3)(ii): [The mitigation strategy shall include a] section that identifies and analyzes a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects being considered to reduce the effects of each hazard, with particular emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure.	Chapter 18 includes a hazard mitigation catalog that was developed through a facilitated process. This catalog identifies actions that manipulate the hazard, reduce exposure to the hazard, reduce vulnerability, or increase mitigation capability. The catalog further segregates actions by scale of implementation. A table in the action plan section analyzes each action by mitigation type to illustrate the range of actions selected.	The hazard mitigation catalog developed in 2011 was enhanced with results of the 2016 planning effort focusing on updated program capabilities and the dam failure and cyber threat hazards.
§201.6(c)(3)(ii): [The mitigation strategy] must also address the jurisdiction’s participation in the National Flood Insurance Program, and continued compliance with the program’s requirements, as appropriate.	The City of Roseville has identified an action stating its commitment to maintain compliance and good standing under the National Flood Insurance Program. Additionally, the City identified multiple actions to maintain its Class 1 standing under the CRS program.	The City of Roseville has identified an action stating its commitment to maintain compliance and good standing under the National Flood Insurance Program. Additionally, the City identified multiple actions to maintain its Class 1 standing under the CRS program.

44 CFR Requirement	Previous Plan (2011)	Updated Plan (2016)
§201.6(c)(3)(iii): [The mitigation strategy shall describe] how the actions identified in Section (c)(3)(ii) will be prioritized, implemented, and administered by the local jurisdiction. Prioritization shall include a special emphasis on the extent to which benefits are maximized according to a cost benefit review of the proposed projects and their associated costs.	Each recommended initiative is prioritized using a qualitative methodology that looked at the objectives the project will meet, the timeline for completion, how the project will be funded, the impact of the project, the benefits of the project and the costs of the project. This prioritization scheme is detailed in Chapter 19.	The updated Plan uses the same qualitative approach to prioritization as used for the 2011 Plan.
§201.6(c)(4)(i): [The plan maintenance process shall include a] section describing the method and schedule of monitoring, evaluating, and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle.	Chapter 7 details a plan maintenance strategy	Chapter 19 retains the plan maintenance strategy developed in 2011.
§201.6(c)(4)(ii): [The plan shall include a] process by which local governments incorporate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate.	Chapter 7 details recommendations for incorporating the Plan into other planning mechanisms such as: • General plan • Emergency response plan • Capital improvement programs • Municipal code • Stormwater Master Plan This chapter additionally discusses current and future integration opportunities.	Recommendations are provided for incorporating the Plan into other planning mechanisms. This update additionally discusses current and future integration opportunities.
§201.6(c)(4)(iii): [The plan maintenance process shall include a] discussion on how the community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.	Chapter 7 details a comprehensive strategy for continuing public involvement.	A comprehensive strategy is provided for continuing public involvement with additional information regarding social media.
§201.6(c)(5): [The local hazard mitigation plan shall include] documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan (e.g., City Council, County Commission, Tribal Council).	Chapter 6 contains the resolution for adoption of this Plan.	The implementation chapter for this update contains the resolution of adoption.

3. PLAN UPDATE APPROACH

Local governments are required to review and revise their hazard mitigation plans and resubmit them for approval within five years in order to remain eligible for mitigation project grant funding (44 CFR §201.6(d)(3)). FEMA's July 2008 *Local Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance* outlines five phases for updates:

- Phase 1—Organize resources
- Phase 2—Update the risk assessment
- Phase 3—Engage the public
- Phase 4—Assemble the updated Plan
- Phase 5—Plan adoption/implementation.

Phases 1 through 4 are discussed in the following sections. The elements of Phase 5 are described in Chapter 19.

3.1 PLANNING RESOURCE ORGANIZATION

The first phase of planning was to organize needed resources. This phase had the following primary objectives:

- Secure grant funding
- Form a planning team
- Confirm political support for the process
- Establish a steering committee
- Coordinate with other agencies
- Review existing programs.

3.1.1 Internal Funding

The planning effort was made possible through local funds for the City of Roseville.

3.1.2 Formation of the Planning Team

The City hired Tetra Tech, Inc. as a consultant to assist with the 2016 Plan update. The Tetra Tech project manager acted as lead project planner, reporting directly to a City project manager. Once the technical assistance was secured, a planning team made up of the following members was formed to lead the planning effort:

- Rob Jensen (Roseville City Manager's Office)—City Manager, project oversight
- Carl Walker (City of Roseville Department of Public Works)—Floodplain management
- Jason Rizzi (City of Roseville Fire Department)—Emergency preparedness
- Wayne Wiley (City of Roseville Development Services Department)—City planning lead
- Rob Flaner (Tetra Tech)—Lead project planner
- Carol Baumann (Tetra Tech)—Hazardus-MH/GIS lead
- Jessica Cerutti (Tetra Tech)—Hazard Identification and profiling
- Dan Portman (Tetra Tech)—Lead editor.

3.1.3 The Steering Committee

Hazard mitigation planning is one of the best ways to enhance collaboration and gain support among the parties whose interests might be affected by hazard losses. By working together, a broad range of stakeholders can identify and create partnerships that pool resources to achieve a common vision for the community. The Steering Committee that oversaw development of the initial plan remained intact during the performance period of that plan and subsequently provided oversight for the 2011 Plan. For this 2016 update process, some new members were added and some previous members left the committee. Table 3-1 lists the 2016 Steering Committee members.

Table 3-1. Steering Committee Members

Name	Title	Jurisdiction/Agency
Grace Keller^a	Citizen	Community Emergency Response Team
Wayne Wiley^b	Associate Planner	The City of Roseville Development Services
Rob Jensen	City Manager	The City of Roseville City Manager's Office
Jason Rizzi	Emergency Preparedness Manager	City of Roseville Fire Department
Carl Walker	Senior Civil Engineer	The City of Roseville Public Works
Helen Dyda	Public Information Specialist	City of Roseville Communications
Jaime Garrett	Fire Department Public Information Officer	City of Roseville Fire Department
Erik Angle	Emergency Preparedness Manager	Sutter Roseville Medical Center
Brenette Macintosh	Safety Officer	Consolidated Communications
Mark Lacher	Risk Manager	Consolidated Communications
Jim Williams	Citizen	Meadow Oaks Neighborhood Association
Joseph Van Zant	Citizen/Hazardous Materials Consultant	Roseville Coalition of Neighborhood Associations
Rod Rodriguez	Senior Emergency Services Specialist	Placer County Office of Emergency Services
Rick Stalker	Stalker & Burnett RE Group	Placer County Association of Realtors
Michael Algots	Manager, Hazardous Materials	Union Pacific Railroad

a. Steering Committee Chairperson

b. Steering Committee Vice Chairperson

Leadership roles and ground rules were reconfirmed during the Steering Committee's initial meeting for the plan update on November 3, 2015. The Steering Committee agreed to meet on the first Tuesday of every month as needed throughout the course of the 2016 Plan's development. The planning team facilitated each Steering Committee meeting, which addressed a set of objectives based on the work plan established for the update. The Steering Committee met six times from November 2015 through June 2016. Meeting agendas, minutes and attendance logs are available for review. All Steering Committee meetings were open to the public, and agendas and meeting minutes were posted to the internet.

3.1.4 Coordination with Other Agencies

Coordination with other local, state and federal agencies involved in hazard mitigation in the region helped to ensure consistency with other ongoing efforts. 44 CFR requires that opportunities for involvement in the planning process be provided to neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation, agencies with authority to regulate development, businesses, academia, and other interests (Section 201.6.b.2). Agency coordination was accomplished as follows:

- **Steering Committee Involvement**—Agency representatives were invited to participate on the Steering Committee.

- **Coordination with Placer County**—Placer County had recently finished updating its multi-jurisdictional hazard mitigation plan and was invited to join the Steering Committee. County staff were able to provide insight into lessons learned through the County’s update process. The County’s involvement also allowed for integration between the two plan updates.
- **Agency Notification**—The following agencies were invited to participate in the process and were kept apprised of plan development milestones:
 - FEMA Region IX
 - California Governor’s Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES)
 - California Department of Water Resources
 - Placer County Office of Emergency Services
 - Placer County Flood Control District
 - Placer County Office of Education
 - Sacramento County Department of Water Resources
 - City of Rocklin
 - City of Citrus Heights
 - Roseville City School District
 - Eureka School District
 - Dry Creek School District
 - Center School Districts
 - Roseville Joint Union High School District
 - U.S. Bureau of Reclamation

All of these agencies received meeting announcements, meeting agendas, and meeting minutes by e-mail throughout the plan development process. This approach proved to be beneficial when these agencies supported the effort by attending meetings or providing feedback on issues. All of these agencies were also informed about the plan update web page for up-to-date information.

- **Pre-Adoption Review**—All the agencies listed above were provided means to review and comment on the mitigation action plan for the 2016 Plan. The predominant means for this review was through the project web page. Each agency was sent an e-mail informing them that draft portions of the update were available for review. In addition, the complete draft plan was sent for a pre-adoption review to FEMA Region IX, the ISO, and the Placer County Office of Emergency Services. No immediate comments were received from these agencies during the pre-adoption public review period.

3.1.5 Review of Existing Programs

Hazard mitigation planning must include review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports and technical information (44 CFR Section 201.6.b(3)). Chapter 4 of this Plan provides a review of laws and ordinances in effect within the planning area that can affect hazard mitigation actions, as well as an assessment of the City’s regulatory, technical and financial capabilities to implement hazard mitigation actions.

Of particular interest for the plan update effort are the City of Roseville General Plan, the City of Roseville Emergency Response Plan (an emergency support function-based plan that directs emergency response actions in the planning area), and the State of California 2013 Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan.

One of the Steering Committee’s first action items was to review the State of California Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan and all of the progress reports completed during the performance period for the initial plan. The Steering Committee identified hazards listed in the state plan to which the Roseville area is susceptible, in order to determine if there was a need to expand the scope of the risk assessment. The committee also reviewed the goals, objectives and strategies of the state plan in order to select goals, objectives, and actions for the City’s Plan that are consistent with those of the state.

Each annual progress report for the initial plan contains a section that recommends changes or enhancements to the Plan or plan development process. These reports effectively completed a key step of the plan update process before the update process began—identifying needs for changes or enhancements.

3.2 RISK ASSESSMENT UPDATE

Local hazard mitigation plans must provide sufficient hazard and risk information to identify and prioritize appropriate actions to reduce hazard-related losses. This includes detailed descriptions of all the hazards that could affect the jurisdiction, along with an analysis of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to those hazards. The update of the risk assessment is typically the most involved part of the plan update process.

FEMA planning guidance specifies comprehensive updates to the risk assessment portion of local hazard mitigation plans if there have been new technical data pertaining to a hazard developed by a creditable source since the plan's initial development or previously completed update. Updated risk assessment efforts for the 2016 Plan included the following:

- The latest version (2.2) of FEMA's Hazus-MH risk assessment software was used to enhance the risk assessments for the flood, dam and earthquake hazards.
- All hazards of concern were updated with new relevant data.
- The Hazus default general building stock was updated using current address point, building footprint, parcel and tax assessor data.

A detailed description of the methodology deployed in the update of the risk assessment is provided in Chapter 5.

3.3 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Broad public participation in the planning process helps ensure that diverse points of view about the planning area's needs are considered and addressed. The public must have opportunities to comment on disaster mitigation plans during the drafting stages and prior to plan approval (44 CFR, Section 201.6(b)(1)). The Community Rating System expands on these requirements by making CRS credits available for optional public involvement activities.

3.3.1 Strategy

The Steering Committee drafted a comprehensive public involvement strategy for this update using multiple media sources. This strategy was built upon the Steering Committee's perception of what was effective during development of the update, in addition to the use of social media as a major message distribution vehicle. The planning team identified stakeholders to target through the multi-disciplinary public involvement strategy. The strategy for involving the public in the development of the Plan emphasized the following elements:

- Include members of the public on the Steering Committee.
- As was done for the previous update, use a survey to reassess the public's perception of risk and support of hazard mitigation and to get direction on alternatives.
- Hold public meetings to describe the plan update process and progress and to collect input from a wide range of the public.
- Develop a unified message for distribution on social media platforms.
- Attempt to reach as many citizens in the planning area as possible through the use of multiple media, including websites and brochures.

Steering Committee

Eleven of the fourteen members of the Steering Committee live or work in the City of Roseville. This body has provided a mechanism for continuing public involvement in the maintenance of the Plan by meeting annually to monitor the progress of the plan implementation and creating annual progress reports. The ongoing participation of some members from the time that the initial plan was developed provided a valuable historical perspective for

the committee during the update process. All Steering Committee meetings were open to the public and advertised on the City's hazard mitigation plan website. The Steering Committee met six times during the course of the plan update process. One of the meetings was attended by two members of the public. Steering Committee documentation can be found in Appendix C.

Survey

The Steering Committee elected to use a survey for the update process to collect new information from the public about household preparedness for hazards, the level of knowledge about tools and techniques for reducing loss from hazards, and areas of public concern about hazards.

The Steering Committee reviewed the previous survey and requested a simplification of the process to keep residents engaged while ensuring the collection of useful information. The survey asked 26 quantifiable questions and provided opportunities for written comment. The final survey used some of the same questions asked on the initial survey, which helped to show whether citizens' perception of risk and vulnerability has changed over the last five years. The survey also revised some questions to support the plan update process and fulfill the Steering Committee's request for simplification.

The web-based survey tool "Survey Monkey" was used to set up and deploy the survey. The survey was made available to all citizens of Roseville via a web-link posted on the City's website, advertised via press releases, sent via e-mail to community residents, and linked through various forms of social media, including Nextdoor, a geographically based social media website. Over 670 surveys were completed during the course of the plan update process. These results were distributed to the Steering Committee during the strengths, weaknesses, obstacles and opportunities session to inform the Steering Committee of public concerns and opportunities for new public engagement strategies. Multiple survey respondents indicated concern about radon, which the Steering Committee will consider adding as a hazard of concern during the next plan update. The survey and a summary of its findings are provided in Appendix A.

Public Meetings

Participation in a well-attended community event was used as the vehicle to introduce the plan update process, to share the results of the revised risk assessment, and to gauge the public's perception of risk. A final public hearing was held at the end of the process to provide the public an opportunity to comment on the draft Plan.

Community Event Participation—Public Meeting

A public meeting was held as part of the City of Roseville's Earth Day celebration on Saturday, April 16, 2016 from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. at the Utility Exploration Center, 1501 Pleasant Grove Boulevard (see Figure 3-1 through Figure 3-4). The public meeting was an open-house-format meeting, allowing citizens to come and go as they pleased during the meeting time frame.

The principal objective of the meeting was to share the results of the revised risk assessment with the public, then gauge their perception of risk by having them complete a survey. Multiple members of the Steering Committee and planning team were present to speak with residents and answer questions about the process and their risk. Hazus-MH work stations were set up, allowing citizens to see information on their property, including exposure and damage estimates for earthquake and flood events. The 20 property owners who elected to receive a risk assessment were provided printouts of this information for their properties. This tool was highly effective in illustrating risk to the public. This Earth Day event was well attended, with thousands in attendance. During this event, the planning team recorded direct contact and discussion regarding the Plan with 50 event attendees. One resident, a local veterinarian, requested additional information to share with her clients which was later provided to her in electronic form by the City.



Figure 3-1. Hazard Mitigation Booth



Figure 3-2. City of Roseville Earth Day Festival



Figure 3-3. Hazus-MH Work Station



Figure 3-4. Sample Printout from Work Station

Public Comment Period

Once the draft updated Plan was assembled, a comment period for public input was open from August 2, 2016 through August 19, 2016. The public comment period was advertised via the City website, a press-release, and through the use of social media. A public comment link was established on the City's Hazard Mitigation Plan website. During this public comment period, the City received one comment from the public on the Draft Plan regarding the dam failure chapter. This comment requested additional information regarding exposure and vulnerability to the hazard. The City of Roseville decided to address the comment directly with the individual with no change to the plan for dam facility operational security and safety. A copy of the exchange is available upon request.

Use of Media

Press Releases

Press releases were distributed over the course of the 2016 Plan's development as key milestones were achieved and prior to each public meeting.

Social Media

Social media was identified by the Steering Committee as an appropriate method for spreading public messages. The Steering Committee decided to use multiple platforms to reach a variety of audiences:

- Twitter is a messaging platform that allows users to send brief messages to followers (Figure 3-5).
- Facebook is a social network that connects friends, businesses, and governments. The City of Roseville shared messages on its Public Safety Facebook page, allowing other government pages to share (Figure 3-6).
- Nextdoor is a neighborhood social network launched in 2013. On this platform, users must be confirmed members of a community. Once verified, neighbors can receive community updates from local government, share or sell unused goods, or coordinate community events. The City's public information specialists regularly used Nextdoor to engage Roseville's neighborhoods (Figure 3-7).

Internet

The City used its web-based capabilities to keep the public apprised of the plan update process. Upon completion of the initial Plan, a permanent hazard mitigation plan website was established on the Roseville website (see Figure 3-8):

www.roseville.ca.us/HazardPlan

This page can be accessed from the City's home page using the site's search engine. This page housed all pertinent information on the hazard mitigation plan, its progress, and its implementation status. This site has proven to be a highly effective measure for ongoing public access to the Plan. The update scope of work was posted on the website during the update process, along with announcements of all key milestones of the plan update development. Steering Committee meeting announcements, agendas and meeting minutes were also made available on the site. This website also was the principal means of disseminating the survey for the 2016 Plan.

3.3.2 Public Involvement Results

The public involvement strategy used for the plan update introduced the concept of mitigation to the public and provided the Steering Committee with feedback to use in developing the Plan. All citizens of Roseville were provided ample opportunities to provide comment during all phases of this plan update process. Details of attendance and comments received from the public meeting are provided in Appendix A and summarized in Table 3-2. Detailed analysis of the survey findings from the 671 electronically submitted surveys is presented in Appendix A.

Table 3-2. Summary of Public Meetings

Date	Location	Number of Citizens in Attendance	Number of Contacts Made
April 16, 2016	City of Roseville Earth Day	5,000	Over 50
August 2, 2016	Steering Committee Meeting – Public Draft	1	1



Figure 3-5. Twitter Survey Announcement




Figure 3-6. Facebook Survey Announcement




Figure 3-7. Nextdoor Survey Announcement




Figure 3-8. Sample Page from Hazard Mitigation Plan Website

3.4 ASSEMBLE THE UPDATED PLAN

The base format of the 2011 Plan was retained for the 2016 Plan. Enhancements were made to include the following components:

- The 2016 update provides a discussion on new mediums used to keep the public apprised of the Plan's actions during the project performance period.
- The 2016 update describes the need for changes to the risk assessment and what changes were made in comparison to the previous plan update.
- The update describes changes to risk exposure due to either of the following:

- Successful mitigation projects
- Changes in land use due to annexation or new development.
- The 2016 update describes changes to the action plan and the reasons for them.
- The 2016 update identifies completed, deleted, or deferred actions or activities from the previously approved plan as a benchmark for progress.
- The 2016 Plan includes in its evaluation and prioritization new mitigation actions identified since the previous plan update.
- To be compliant with California Senate Bill 379, the 2016 hazard mitigation plan includes linkage with the City’s General Plan. The bill requires the update to include a set of goals, policies, and objectives based on a vulnerability assessment, identification of the risks that climate change poses to the local jurisdiction and the geographic areas at risk from climate change impacts, and specified information from federal, state, regional, and local agencies.

3.5 PLAN DEVELOPMENT CHRONOLOGY/MILESTONES

Table 3-3 summarizes important milestones in the plan update process.

Table 3-3. Plan Development Chronology/Milestones

Date	Event	Description	Attendance
2014			
9/23	CRS re-verification visit	City undergoes its re-verification visit as the nation's only CRS Class 1 community. The Class 1 is re-verified by this process.	N/A
2015			
10/18	Selection of Tetra Tech as plan facilitation consultant through sole source contract	Technical assistance secured	N/A
11/3	1st Steering Committee meeting	Reconfirm Steering Committee organization/ground rules Review the plan update work plan Risk assessment update Review progress reports and state plan	13
11/30	2nd Steering Committee meeting	Progress Report Recommendations Hazards of Concern Confirmation Guiding Principle/Vision/Mission Statement Confirm Goals and Objectives Public Involvement Strategy	14
2016			
1/5	3rd Steering Committee Meeting	Risk Assessment Update Public Involvement Strategy Critical Facilities Definition General Plan Update Emergency Operations Plan Review Debris Management Plan	17
2/2	4th Steering Committee Meeting	Risk Assessment Update Public Involvement Strategy, Survey Finalization Public Involvement, PPI Alternatives Analysis	15
2/8	Survey Deployment	The public survey was deployed via multiple platforms including City websites, Facebook, Nextdoor, Twitter, and public announcement.	N/A
3/1	5th Steering Committee meeting	Risk assessment update Public Involvement Strategy Update, Public Meeting (Strengths, weaknesses, obstacles and opportunities)	16
4/16	Public information open house—Roseville Earth Day	Public open house held at the Roseville Earth Day Festival at Mahany Park outside of the Roseville Utility Exploration Center, 1501 Pleasant Grove Boulevard, Roseville from 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM. Risk assessment data shared with the public as well as distribution of hazard specific information.	50
8/2	6th Steering Committee meeting/Public Review Meeting	Review the public draft and launch the public comment period for the 2016 Plan	13
8/19	Public Comment Period Ends	Draft Plan posted on Hazard Mitigation Plan website. Press release advertising public comment period	N/A
9/01	Plan review	Plan sent to Cal OES and ISO for review and approval pending adoption (APA)	N/A
TBD	Final public meeting and Plan adoption	APA Plan presented to City Council for adoption. The public was provided opportunity to provide comment prior to formal adoption.	##
TBD	CRS approval	Plan was approved by ISO for CRS credit at ____ points	N/A
TBD	Final approval	FEMA granted final approval of the adopted plan	N/A

4. CITY OF ROSEVILLE PROFILE

4.1 GEOGRAPHIC PROFILE

The City of Roseville lies to the west of the foothills of the Sierra Nevada Range, about 16 miles northeast of downtown Sacramento. It is the largest city in Placer County and has experienced considerable residential and commercial growth in the past two decades.

The focus of this Hazard Mitigation Plan is the primary planning area defined in the *City of Roseville General Plan 2035*. The planning area includes 43.39 square miles of incorporated lands and an additional 796 acres making up the City's sphere of influence, as shown in Figure 4-1. It is divided into smaller areas called "Specific Plan Areas" for which more detailed individual plans have been developed to implement the General Plan. The City of Roseville is unusual in that 14 specific plans have been adopted. These Plan Areas contain detailed design guidelines and development agreements to guide development and ensure that development is funded and built as planned.

Roseville is largely urbanized. The greatest area of undeveloped property is in the western portion of the City, which includes the remainder of the developing West Roseville Specific Plan, as well as planned specific Plan Areas including Sierra Vista, Creekview and Amoruso Ranch. The incorporated area and sphere of influence are the primary focus of General Plan policies, but "secondary planning areas" also bear relationship to Roseville planning efforts, depending on the planning issue. For example:

- For the issue of air quality, the secondary planning area includes the City and all areas outside the City that are within the associated Sacramento Valley air basin.
- For flood protection, the secondary planning area encompasses the complete drainage basins of surface waters that flow through Roseville.
- Other secondary planning areas encompass varying boundaries beyond the primary planning area for issues such as solid waste, recycling, transportation and wastewater treatment.

The City's area is characterized by gently sloping terrain with areas of steep ravines in the northeast, and relatively flat valley on the western portion of the City. It is segmented by topographical and physical features, including streams, natural parkways, open space, Interstate 80 and Highway 65, the Union Pacific railroad, and industrial facilities. Traffic is directed around several of these topographical features by bridges and an underpass. These limitations may create traffic congestion and delay emergency response. Heavy traffic congestion at peak commute times on the City's major roadways acts as a barrier to timely response for emergency services. In the event of an accident or other emergency at one of the key intersections between a road and a stream, freeway, or railway, sections of the City could be isolated or have response time slowed.




Figure 4-1. Roseville Planning Area

4.2 HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

4.2.1 Pre-Development

The Placer County region was first inhabited by the Maidu Indians, whose territory extended from the Sacramento River Valley to the Sierra Nevada Range. The Southern Maidu occupied the American River basin, along with the Bear and Yuba River basins in the area now recognized as the City of Roseville. An abundance of plants and animals supported the Maidu tribes' large population. Evidence of the Maidu communities still exists along the banks of Strap Ravine and Dry Creek.

4.2.2 Founding of the Community

Fur trapping expeditions came to the area in the early 1800s, and James Marshall discovered gold in the region in 1848. Some of the miners who came in search of gold became the area's first pioneers, taking up farming along the fertile creeks. Eventually, disease, gold miners and early settlers killed or forcibly removed the Maidu from their traditional lands. By 1864, track-laying crews from the Central Pacific Railroad had pushed eastward from Sacramento building the western half of the nation's first transcontinental railroad line. At the site of today's Roseville, the rails of the Central Pacific intersected with those of the California Central, a small line which then linked the towns of Folsom and Lincoln. The place where the two lines joined was labeled on railroad maps as "The Junction." The small freight and passenger center called Roseville developed around the junction.

For many years, Roseville remained a small railroad shipping point of about 250 inhabitants, centered on the train depot and a few small businesses and houses lining the two principal streets, Atlantic and Pacific. This changed between 1906 and 1908, when railroad roundhouse and repair facilities were moved to Roseville from nearby Rocklin. By 1908, the population increased to 2,000. New subdivisions were laid out to accommodate newcomers, many of whom moved from Rocklin. The business district expanded along Lincoln, Main, Church, and Vernon Streets. A chamber of commerce was organized to provide municipal services such as water, electricity, police and fire protection. In April 1909, the town incorporated and began to grow until it became Placer County's largest city.

4.2.3 Post-Incorporation Development

Railroad expansion continued, and local businesses grew as well. In the 1920s, the Pacific Fruit Express ice plant was the world's largest artificial ice plant. Also by the 1920s, the Southern Pacific Railroad boasted the largest freight marshaling yards west of the Mississippi River at Roseville. By the start of the Great Depression in 1929, Roseville's population had risen to 6,425.

During World War II, thousands of troop and munitions trains made their way through Roseville. The City continued to boom as a railroad center into the post-war years, but by the 1950s it faced competition from airlines and interstate trucking. The introduction of jet aircraft and the construction of Interstate 80 through Roseville caused the once-booming passenger train service to decline abruptly. The local depot was closed in 1972 and razed the following year. The Pacific Fruit Express ice plant closed in 1974, rendered obsolete by the introduction of self-refrigerating shipping options.

Completion of Roseville Community Hospital in 1952, the Folsom Dam in 1955, and the Roseville Freeway (Interstate 80) in 1956 gradually shifted the population away from downtown Roseville to what would become known as East Roseville. Roseville Square, the town's first shopping complex, was completed in 1961. Today, Roseville has more than 28 million square feet of commercial, office, and industrial floor space, and is ranked 10th statewide in total taxable retail sales.

In 1964, Roseville was selected as one of Look magazine's All America Cities. Roseville experienced a population surge in the 1980s as developers built up its broad expanses of cheap open land with easy transportation access. As the population expanded, so did the need for water, electrical, sewage, police, fire protection, recreational and educational services.

4.2.4 Current Conditions

The City has continued to grow outward. An expansive industrial zone lies north of Roseville adjacent to Highway 65, along with numerous corporate headquarters along Douglas Boulevard and the Johnson Ranch Road area. Although Roseville is no longer just a railroad town, the railroad remains a major factor in the local economy, and Roseville is still one of the principal railroad centers of the West. Passenger service was reintroduced in 1987 and a new intermodal depot facility was completed.

Today Roseville is an emerging urban center with a mix of residential and employment uses. The center of the City is typified by the downtown and small lot, single-family residences, while newer commercial and office development and larger suburban-type residences characterize the edges of town. As of January 2016, the California Department of Finance estimated the City's population to be 134,073—a 61-percent increase since 2000. It is anticipated that Roseville, along with the remainder of the South Placer/Sacramento Region, will continue to be the focus of significant development. Currently, the focus of new development is along the eastern, western, and northern portions of the community.

4.3 MAJOR PAST HAZARD EVENTS

Presidential disaster declarations are typically issued for hazard events that cause more damage than state and local governments can handle without assistance from the federal government, although no specific dollar loss threshold has been established for these declarations. A presidential disaster declaration puts federal recovery programs into motion to help disaster victims, businesses and public entities. Some of the programs are matched by state programs. Table 4-1 lists the presidential major disasters and other federal declarations since 1950 that have affected Placer County, according to Placer County's Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan, Cal OES, and FEMA.

Review of these events helps identify targets for risk reduction and ways to increase a community's capability to avoid large-scale events in the future. Many natural hazard events do not trigger federal disaster declaration protocol but have significant impacts on their communities. These events are also important to consider in establishing recurrence intervals for hazards of concern.

4.4 PHYSICAL SETTING

4.4.1 Geology

Roseville is within the Great Valley and Sierra Nevada geomorphic provinces of California. Located on the east side of the Sacramento Valley, Roseville's geology consists of water deposited (alluvial) sediments from the erosion of the Sierra Nevada mountain range.

4.4.2 Soils

Soils in Roseville include some Quaternary (less than 1.8 million years old) sands, sandstones and mudstones, some Upper Tertiary (1.8 to 24 million years old) sandstones, mudstones and limestone, some Lower Tertiary (24 to 64 million years old) mudstones and sandstones, and Franciscan melange and serpentinite. These soils tends to be very dense or in some areas, soft rock. Some Quaternary muds, sands, gravels, silts and mud are located along 100-year floodplains. Soils in Roseville also include mehrten lava flow, which restricts permeability.

Table 4-1. Presidential Major Disaster, Emergency, and Fire Management Assistance Declarations

Type of Event	FEMA Disaster #	Date
Flooding	DR-47	12/23/1955
Flooding	DR-82	4/4/1958
Flooding	DR-138	10/24/1962
Late Winter Storms/Flooding	DR-145	2/7/1963
Late Winter Storms/Flooding	DR-183	12/28/1964
1969 Storms	DR-253	1/26/1969
Winter storms	DR-682	2/9/1983
Spring Storms/Flooding	DR-758	2/18/1986
Severe Winter Storms	DR-1044	1/10/1995
Late Winter Storms	DR-1046	1/13/1995
Winter Storms/Flooding	DR-1155	1/4/1997
Sierra Fire	FM-2463	9/19/2002
Stevens Fire	FM-2541	8/8/2004
Hurricane Katrina Evacuations: Economic	EM-3248	9/13/2005
Severe Rainstorms, Flooding, Landslides, and Mudslides	DR-1628	2/3/2006
Severe Storms, Flooding, Landslides, and Mudslides	DR-1646	6/5/2006
Wildfire	FM-2786	9/1/2008
Wildfire	FM-2832	8/31/2009

Source: FEMA, Placer County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan, 2016

4.4.3 Climate

Roseville and the northern Central Valley have a Mediterranean climate with warm, dry days and cool nights during the summer, when the average temperature is 93°F during the day and 57°F at night. In 2001, the California Energy Commission developed climate zones based on energy use, temperature, and other factors and created representative temperature data for each zone. Roseville is located in Zone 11: Red Bluff. As a whole, Zone 11 experiences sharply defined seasons with summers consisting of almost constant sunshine and dry air and winters with piercing winds and thick ground fog.

Table 4-2 presents a summary of annual climate conditions. Precipitation from May through October is rare, with most of the rainfall in the Greater Sacramento area, including Roseville, occurring between November and April. Prevailing winds in the summer can be light to gusty from the south. In the late summer and early fall, several wind events typically occur, with northerly winds that cause critical fire weather conditions in the City and surrounding areas.

4.5 DEVELOPMENT PROFILE

4.5.1 Land Use Policies

In addition to a considerable jump in residential growth, Roseville has experienced considerable growth in commercial and industrial development. Based on growth projections and current land use allocations in the General Plan, the City has sufficient development potential through 2035 for both residential and commercial uses. Typically residential land uses will be built out well before complete buildout of nonresidential land could occur, anticipated after 2050.

Table 4-2. Roseville Climate

	Average High Temperature (°F)	Average Low Temperature (°F)	Record High Temperature (°F)	Record Low Temperature (°F)	Total Inches of Precipitation
January	54	39	73	17	4.5
February	61	42	78	19	4.5
March	65	45	86	26	4.3
April	72	47	106	60	1.8
May	80	52	112	35	0.5
June	89	57	115	43	0.3
July	95	61	115	50	0.1
August	94	60	114	45	0.1
September	89	58	108	46	0.5
October	79	53	102	32	1.3
November	64	45	86	26	3.5
December	55	39	74	16	3.4
Annual Average or Total	77	51	100	36	24.8

Source: The Weather Channel

Numerous factors will influence growth throughout the South Placer County/Sacramento region:

- General economic conditions of the state
- Federal and state budget issues and cutbacks
- Competition from other growth areas
- Perceptions about the quality of life
- Housing costs and availability
- Employment opportunities
- Infrastructure and resource availability.

Management of the City's growth is guided by the Land Use Element of Roseville's General Plan, which consists of a land use map and land use policies. The overall goal of the Land Use Element is to promote a balanced and innovative land use pattern that retains and enhances the distinct character and identity of Roseville. It is organized into the following six components:

- **Existing Conditions and Projections**—Provides a description of the planning area, an existing land use inventory, and future projections.
- **Land Use Designations, Definitions and Standards**—Identifies and defines the City's land use categories, incorporating general use, development, intensity, siting, and compatibility standards.
- **Community Form**—Provides goals and policies to define and direct the future form and pattern of the City. Issues addressed include community character; relationship to transit and pedestrian uses; air quality; downtown and neighborhoods; jobs and housing; economic development; community involvement; and inter-jurisdictional coordination.
- **Community Design**—Includes goals and policies that address aesthetics and function; the integration of the built and natural environment; and community character. Emphasis is on the development of a design framework that reflects the City's goal of high quality, community-wide design.
- **Growth Management**—Focuses on the proactive management of growth in the community. Included is the identification of performance standards to regulate potential future growth areas. Policies addressing annexations and expansion of the City's sphere of influence are also included.

- **Relationship to Specific Plans**—Discusses the interrelationship between the General Plan and the City’s Specific Plans.

The land use map included in the Land Use Element generally shows the City’s existing and planned land use mix and pattern. The total land use allocation at buildout is shown in Figure 4-2. The land use map reflects only those policies that can be graphically shown. Land use decision-making is guided not only by the land use map but also by the goals, policies and implementation measures in the Land Use Element.

Source: City of Roseville, General Plan, 2015




Figure 4-2. Total Land Use Allocation in Roseville

The City’s land use policies are built upon underlying principles that were established based on input the City received from its residents and the Growth Management Committee established in 2005. These principles have impacted the overall policy direction and land use pattern in the City of Roseville. They include the following:

- Promote and enhance Roseville’s unique character and identity.
- Distinguish Roseville from adjacent communities through the quality of development and design, and the level of public services and facilities provided.
- Protect and enhance Old Town/ Downtown and the City’s established neighborhoods.
- Promote new development as an integrated and connected part of the City’s land use pattern.
- Provide a variety of housing types and opportunities, including those for all income groups.
- Create a balanced land use pattern with an appropriate mix of uses to accommodate resident employment, service, and social needs within the community.
- Promote a land use pattern that provides a high level of open space and recreational amenities and is sensitive to the natural environment.

- Create a land use mix and pattern that accommodates and promotes alternative transportation modes for ease of access and improved air quality.
- Proactively manage and plan for growth.
- Ensure that new development is fiscally neutral, and does not impact existing residents.

State, regional and local growth projections indicate that Roseville and the South Placer County/Sacramento region will continue to draw residential and employment growth. Much of this attraction can be attributed to desirable location and access, availability of an educated and skilled workforce, land costs and overall quality of life. Local and regional economic conditions will drive the local growth potential, and existing land use allocations may require modification in the near future.

4.5.2 Residential Development

The Land Use Element of the General Plan identifies three primary residential land uses:

- **Low-Density Residential**—The low-density residential land use category is for development of the single-family dwelling units that make up the majority of Roseville’s housing supply. The lower densities are assigned to lands that require flexibility to accommodate development constraints (e.g., slopes, trees, etc.). Typically, low-density residential lands should require minimal grading or disturbance of natural features.
- **Medium-Density Residential**—The medium-density residential land use category is for small-lot single-family detached dwelling units and attached patio homes, half-plexes, townhouses, condominiums, and mobile home parks. This residential land use accommodates a variety of housing types and designs, and is often used as a transition or buffer between higher intensity land uses and low-density residential land use. It may also be applied as a transition between higher volume roadways and lower density residential uses.
- **High-Density Residential**—The high-density residential land use category is normally developed with multiple-story apartment or condominium structures containing multiple attached dwelling units. The broad range of densities in this category yields a variety of design options. In some areas, this land use category may be combined with commercial uses to form a mixed-use development where higher densities are desirable and beneficial.

According to the State Department of Finance, there are 51,590 housing units in the City. Single-family detached homes made up over 75 percent of the housing stock as of January 2016. Multi-family homes made up 24 percent, and mobile homes accounted for less than 1 percent. Residential construction valuation reached \$208,581,000 in 2015. The Building Division reported that \$19,111,000 in new construction was completed during the 2015 – 2016 fiscal year. The Placer County Association of Realtors provided statistics indicating that the median purchase price of single-family houses and condominiums in Roseville rose approximately 9 percent between May 2015 and May 2016, from \$391,500 to \$425,000 and \$168,500 to \$178,300, respectively. As indicated by the increase in housing prices, the demand for single-family homes continues and available land for single-family homes is ample.

4.5.3 Non-Residential Development

Roseville’s non-residential land use designations include areas designated for commercial, office, industrial uses, special areas, and combining districts. Special designations include Central Business District, Public and Quasi-Public uses, Parks and Recreation, Open Space, and Urban Reserve. Like the residential designations, each non-residential designation includes a purpose statement, primary and secondary uses, and development standards, including a floor area ratio. Unlike the specific secondary uses listed for residential designations, which are intended to be subordinate and may be permitted only to support neighborhood convenience, the non-residential land use designations permit secondary land uses that are supportive and complementary of the primary uses, not

necessarily subordinate. Typically, the size of secondary uses is limited and therefore does not warrant a separate land use designation. Table 4-3 summarizes the non-residential land uses. A summary of non-residential development in Roseville is given in Table 4-4.

Table 4-3. Non-Residential Land Uses

Land Use	Purpose
Neighborhood Commercial	The neighborhood commercial land use designation is intended to provide basic commercial services for the convenience of surrounding neighborhoods within walking distance of major residential areas.
Community Commercial	The community commercial land use designation is distinguished from the neighborhood commercial designation by providing a broader range of goods and services to an expanded service area.
Regional Commercial	The regional commercial land use designation is intended to accommodate larger shopping centers and commercial activities where uses provide goods and services to a citywide and regional service area.
Business Professional	The business professional land use designation provides areas for small and large office uses, including uses supportive of offices.
Light Industrial	The light industrial land use designation is applied to lands reserved for office, industrial, and research and development uses that generate very limited noise, vibration, odor, dust, smoke, light, or other pollutants, and are either integrated or compatible with surrounding uses.
General Industrial	The general industrial land use designation is intended to provide areas for industrial uses that tend to generate noise, vibration, odor, dust, smoke, light, and an aesthetic appearance not compatible with residential and other sensitive receptors. The intent of this category is to provide a place for industrial uses within the City that is properly buffered from other uses.
Central Business District	The Central Business District is a distinct land use category that acknowledges land use patterns of significantly greater intensities and traditional mixed uses of retail, office, and apartment. The district is limited in its application to Central Roseville, the West Roseville Village Center, and areas of greater urban intensity.
Open Space	The open space land use designation is used to preserve and protect public and private lands that are significant due to wildlife habitat, natural features, or flood hazard. Within new development areas, the 100-year floodplain boundaries will be designated as Open Space. In addition, sensitive or unique natural features, including, but not limited to, wetlands, vernal pools, and oak woodlands, are to be designated as open space as part of specific plans and other major development review processes.
Public/Quasi-Public	The public/quasi-public land use designation is used to establish areas for education, religious assembly, governmental offices, municipal corporation yards, and water treatment plants.
Urban Reserve	The urban reserve land use designation is applied to lands that are anticipated to receive urban land entitlements, but at the present time are constrained by growth management policies, availability of services or other limitations.
Park/ Recreation	The park and recreation designation is used to identify public parks in Roseville
Floodplain	The floodplain designation identifies lands that are within the 100-year floodplain boundaries as defined in the Safety Element of the General Plan. Development of lands with a floodplain land use designation is strictly regulated by the City of Roseville. In areas with existing development, the floodplain designation is an overlay or combining land use. As part of a specific plan, the land use designation may be combined with an open space or parks designation, if found consistent with the policies of the Safety Element.
Study Area	The study area land use designation is used as a combining land use to identify future General Plan or neighborhood study areas. This combining designation may be applied to any area where the City believes that additional land use analysis and amendment of the General Plan may be desirable to resolve specific neighborhood or land use issues.
Village Center	The Village Center land use designation is intended allow for a mix and density of land uses common to a traditional downtown, urban setting. It allows for flexibility and deviation from the standards and permitted uses contained in the primary land use designation for which it is combined.
Transfer Station	The transfer station land use designation is intended to preserve and protect industrial areas suitable for a solid waste transfer station.

Table 4-4. Non-Residential Development Profile as of July 2016

Activity/Use	Total Developed Building Area (square feet)	Total Area Zoned for Use (acres)
Commercial	11,249,499	2,249
Office	8,080,479	802.69
Industrial	8,997,392	2,369
Public/Quasi Public	2,037,310	2,702

4.5.4 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

Critical and essential facilities and infrastructure are those that are critical to the health and welfare of the population. These become especially important after a hazard event. The Steering Committee created the following definition specific to Roseville, regarding which facilities are considered critical:

A structure or other improvement, public or private, that, because of its function, size, service area, or uniqueness, has the potential to cause serious bodily harm, extensive property damage, or disruption of vital socioeconomic activities if it is destroyed or damaged or if its functionality is impaired. Critical facilities may include, but are not limited to, health and safety facilities, utilities, government facilities, hazardous materials facilities, and transportation infrastructure.

The location of critical facilities and infrastructure in the planning area is shown on Figure 4-3 through Figure 4-5. Due to the sensitivity of this information, a detailed list of facilities is not provided. The list is on file with the City of Roseville. Table 4-5 and Table 4-6 provide summaries of the general types of critical facilities and infrastructure, respectively.

Table 4-5. Planning Area Critical Facilities

Facility Type	Number in Planning Area
Medical and Health	2
Government Functions	27
Protective Functions	10
Schools	49
Hazmat	6
Other Critical Functions	78
Total	172

Table 4-6. Planning Area Critical Infrastructure

Facility Type	Number in Planning Area
Bridges	68
Water Supply	11
Wastewater	23
Power	18
Communications	98
Other	6
Total	224




Figure 4-3. Critical Facilities in the Planning Area




Figure 4-4. Critical Infrastructure in the Planning Area—Transportation




Figure 4-5. Critical Infrastructure in the Planning Area—Utilities

4.5.5 Future Trends in Development

The Roseville General Plan and associated specific area plans govern land use decision and policy-making. Decisions on land use will be governed by these programs. This Plan will work together with these programs to support wise land use in the future by providing vital information on the risk associated with natural hazards in the planning area. The City of Roseville will incorporate by reference the updated Hazard Mitigation Plan in the Safety Element of its General Plan. In addition to proactively planning for the implementation of Senate Bill (SB) 379 upon the next plan update process (see Section 4.9 for a discussion of this state law), this incorporation will ensure that all future trends in development can be established with the benefits of the information on risk and vulnerability to natural hazards identified in this Plan.

4.6 OPEN SPACE AND HABITAT

The City recognizes that open space land is limited and that valuable resources must be conserved wherever possible. For many, the City's open space setting is a highly valued natural resource. Given the strong interrelationship between open space and conservation issues, the City of Roseville has chosen to address these issues in a single element of its General Plan: the Open Space and Conservation Element. Vegetation and wildlife resources and corridors are an important component of the overall open space system and have been the historical focus of preservation efforts in Roseville. If future generations are to enjoy and benefit from the resources available to the present generation, these finite and fragile resources must be preserved and managed.

The vegetation and wildlife resources of Roseville can be broadly classified by habitat type—grasslands, oak woodlands, riparian areas, and seasonal wetlands—as discussed below. Whenever possible, the focus of preservation efforts is multipurpose. It is therefore preferred, for example, to preserve woodlands, grasslands, and wetlands in combined rather than separate and unconnected settings.

4.6.1 Grasslands

Relatively small amounts of self-sustaining grasslands remain in the northern and western undeveloped edges of Roseville. Less extensive areas of grassland are present in smaller undeveloped areas scattered throughout the City. Before Spanish and later settlers arrived in the Central Valley, the grasslands contained native species. The effects of grazing and clearing of large tracts for agriculture resulted in the decline of native species. Today, most of the grasslands in the region contain non-native species. These areas do, however, provide important habitat for birds and other wildlife.

4.6.2 Oak Woodlands and Riparian Areas

Oak woodlands are generally present near the City's major stream channels. The microclimates and alluvial soils in the woodlands provide ideal conditions for deep-rooting shrubs and trees. Most woodland areas are relatively open, with little shrub growth.

Riparian areas support a much wider biological diversity. Situated along and within the City's creeks and watercourses, riparian corridors are a source of food and water and provide cover, nesting sites, and migration and dispersal corridors for wildlife. Riparian areas are also important in flood protection and improve air and water quality through natural filtering.

Oak woodland and riparian areas are City resources not only because of the diversity of species they support but also because they provide natural open space and aesthetic value. The City's creek systems are described in detail in the groundwater recharge and water quality component of the Open Space and Conservation Element. The City regulates the protection of native oak trees through the Tree Preservation Ordinance, which includes standards that limit disturbance within protected zones of oaks and emphasizes avoidance of tree removal. Where avoidance

is not feasible and tree removal is authorized by the City, mitigation is required on an inch-for-inch basis. The Tree Preservation Ordinance is a valuable tool in protecting Roseville's oak trees and habitats. A creek and riparian management and restoration plan is being developed that will provide standards for riparian area management and enhancement. Additionally, the City maintains an overarching management plan for upholding the City's requirements in maintaining open space.

4.6.3 Seasonal Wetlands

Many of the wetland areas in Roseville are seasonal and therefore receive, retain, and transport water only during the wet season. Wetlands are subject to the regulations of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under the provisions of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Two primary types of seasonal wetlands are present in the City: intermittent drainage and vernal pool wetlands.

Intermittent drainage wetlands typically consist of channels 1 to 10 feet wide that flow over a variety of substrata. Most are wet only during winter and transport runoff. They are typically dry during summer, with scattered ponds, but they may contain water from adjacent urban runoff.

Vernal pools represent a significant seasonal wetland resource in Roseville. Although relatively abundant in Roseville and the Sacramento/Placer County region, they are considered rare statewide for their limited natural occurrence and distribution and for the unique native plant and animal species they support. Found in valley grassland areas, vernal pools are typically small, shallow, hardpan-floored depressions that fill with water during the winter wet season, gradually drying by late spring or early summer. Several plant species occur only in association with these special habitats, which has triggered concern about their inventory and preservation. Two types of vernal pools are present in the Roseville area:

- Northern volcanic mud flow vernal pools occur in shallow depressions on Mehrten mud flow formations where the slope is generally less than 2 percent.
- Northern hardpan pools generally occur on the Inks or Cometa soil series at the lower basin portions of creek floodplains. During the wet season, the pools provide special habitat for unique plant and animal species whose germination, growth, and reproductive cycles coincide with the availability of collected water. Individual pools vary significantly in the length of time they remain wet and in the diversity of plant species present.

4.6.4 Sensitive Species

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife maintains the California Natural Diversity Data Base, which includes known locations of state and federally listed endangered, rare, and threatened plant and animal species, including species considered by the scientific community to be deserving of such listing.

The sensitive plant species that may be present in Roseville are primarily associated with vernal pool environments and include the following: Bogg's Lakehedge Hyssop (*Gratiola heterosepala*), Dwarf Downingia (*Downingia humilis*), and Vernal Pool Brodiaea (*Dichelostemma lacunavernalis*). Bogg's Lake Hyssop is listed as endangered by the state and California Native Plant Society. Dwarf Downingia and Vernal Pool Brodiaea are both included on the California Native Plant Society "watch list" and have sufficiently limited distribution to warrant continued monitoring. Vernal pools in the City may also contain federally listed, endangered vernal pool tadpole shrimp (*Lepidurus packardii*) and federally listed threatened vernal pool fairy shrimp (*Branchinecta lynchi*).

Anadromous chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) and Central Valley steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) are known to be present seasonally in Dry Creek and its upper tributaries. Steelhead is listed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act. Chinook salmon within the Central Valley Fall/Late Fall Run are listed as a candidate species. In addition to the federal and state classified rare or

endangered wildlife species known to inhabit Roseville, favorable habitats for other listed species are present in the area. Other special status species potentially present in Roseville include Cooper's Hawk, Swainson's Hawk, Valley Elderberry, Longhorn Beetle, Sanford's Arrowhead, and the Northwestern Pond Turtle. Bald eagles have been sighted near Folsom Lake, and the American peregrine falcon is present in the Sacramento Valley. All of these species thrive in the riparian habitats of floodplain environments.

Preservation of habitat for sensitive species benefits from the City of Roseville's Open Space Preserve Overarching Management Plan, as described in Section 4.9.3.

4.7 DEMOGRAPHICS

Some populations are at greater risk from hazard events because of decreased resources or physical abilities. Elderly people, for example, may be more likely to require additional assistance. Research has shown that people living near or below the poverty line, the elderly (especially older single men), individuals with disabilities, individuals with access and functional needs, women, children, ethnic minorities and renters all experience, to some degree, more severe effects from disasters than the general population. These vulnerable populations may vary from the general population in risk perception, living conditions, access to information before, during and after a hazard event, capabilities during an event, and access to resources for post-disaster recovery. Indicators of vulnerability often overlap spatially and often in the geographically most vulnerable locations. Detailed spatial analysis to locate areas where there are higher concentrations of vulnerable community members would help to extend focused public outreach and education to these most vulnerable citizens.

4.7.1 Population Trends

According to the California Department of Finance, Roseville's estimated population for 2015 was 134,073 and the estimated daytime population, which includes those coming into Roseville to work, shop, and do business, was 145,000. Roseville is the 45th largest of California's 482 cities. The City has been striving to accommodate growth while retaining and enhancing its distinct character.

The full-time population increased by 38,223 from 2000 to 2010, a 31.9-percent increase (see Figure 4-6). The 2010 population was more than four times that of 1982, when the City had 26,127 residents. The 2.6-percent growth rate from 2009 to 2010 was comparable to average annual growth rates of the past decade. This rate exceeded annual growth rates for Placer County (1.7 percent) and California (1.0 percent) for the same time period.

Between 2010 and the end of 2015, Roseville experienced an estimated 10.9 percent increase in population—averaging 2.2 percent per year. This trend indicates that the population of Roseville will continue to grow through the end of the decade, albeit more slowly than the population boom experienced between 2000 and 2010.

The average household size in Roseville is 2.61 persons, according to U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey estimates for 2010-2014. This household average may vary by land use and location in the City. For example, the 3,814 age-restricted low-density residential units in the Del Webb and West Roseville planning areas have an estimated average household size of 1.8.

The General Plan's estimates of when Roseville will achieve buildout (the maximum development allowed by zoning) vary based on the methodology used. Under all scenarios, however, Roseville and the Placer County/Sacramento Metropolitan region are expected to remain attractive to both residential and commercial development. As growth rates continue to climb in the region, the City of Roseville has captured an increasing share of that growth. Considerable recent growth in Roseville is attributed to the annexation of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Area of 2,064 acres and the Creekview Specific Plan of 500 acres in 2012.




Figure 4-6. Placer County and Roseville Population Growth

Additionally, the City is in the process of annexing the 694-acre Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan, located on the northwest boundary of the City. Through buildout, these western specific Plan Areas are projected to experience the highest increase in population. The overall population, when all residential property is developed, is projected to be over 185,000. Table 4-7 shows the General Plan's population forecasts by Specific Plan Area.

4.7.2 Age Distribution

The vulnerability of elderly citizens can vary significantly based on health, age, and economic security. However, as a group, the elderly are more apt to lack the physical and economic resources necessary for response to hazard events and are more likely to suffer health-related consequences making recovery slower. They are more likely to be vision, hearing, and/or mobility impaired, and more likely to experience mental impairment.


Additionally, the elderly are more likely to live in assisted-living facilities where emergency preparedness occurs at the discretion of facility operators. These facilities are typically identified as "critical facilities" by emergency managers because they require extra notice to implement evacuation. Elderly residents living in their own homes may have more difficulty evacuating their homes and could be stranded in dangerous situations. This population group is more likely to need special medical attention, which may not be readily available during natural disasters due to isolation caused by the event. Specific planning attention for the elderly is an important consideration given the current aging of the American population.

Children under 14 are particularly vulnerable to disaster events because of their young age and dependence on others for basic necessities. Very young children may additionally be vulnerable to injury or sickness; this vulnerability can be worsened during a natural disaster because they may not understand the measures that need to be taken to protect themselves from hazards.

Table 4-7. General Plan Projections of Residential Units and Population by Specific Plan Area

Specific Plan Area	Dwelling Units			Population		
	2016	2035	Buildout	2016	2035	Buildout
Infill	15,409	16,349	16,349	40,217	42,671	42,671
Southeast Roseville	3,047	3,163	3,163	7,953	8,255	8,255
Northeast Roseville	933	1,514	1,514	2,435	3,952	3,952
Northwest Roseville	8,941	9,068	9,068	23,336	23,667	23,667
North Central Roseville	4,247	4,487	4,711	11,085	11,711	12,296
North Industrial	1,043	1,043	1,043	2,722	2,722	2,722
Del Webb	3,210	3,210	3,210	5,895	5,859	5,895
Highland Reserve North	1,669	1,669	1,669	4,356	4,356	4,356
North Roseville	4,887	6,072	6,072	12,755	15,848	15,848
Stoneridge	2,446	2,861	2,861	6,384	7,467	7,467
West Roseville	2,899	10,478	10,478	6,996	26,651	26,651
Riverside Gateway	204	456	456	532	1,190	1,190
Downtown	255	638	2,272	666	1,665	5,930
Sierra Vista	0	5,905	8,679	0	15,412	22,652
Creekview	0	2,011	2,011	0	5,249	5,249
Amoruso Ranch	0	2,827	2,827	0	7,379	7,379
Total	49,190	71,751	76,383	125,332	184,054	196,180

According to the 2010-2014 U.S. Census American Community Survey estimates, 14.3 percent of Roseville's population is 65 or older, 21.1 percent of the population is under the age of 14 and the median age is 37.5. Figure 4-7 shows the age distribution for Roseville.

**Figure 4-7. Planning Area Age Distribution**

4.7.3 Race, Ethnicity and Language

Many disaster researchers have focused on the increased vulnerability that ethnic minorities experience in the United States. Research shows that minorities are less likely to be involved in pre-disaster planning and experience higher mortality rates during a disaster event. Post-disaster recovery can be ineffective and is often characterized by cultural insensitivity. Since higher proportions of ethnic minorities live below the poverty line than the majority white population, poverty can compound vulnerability.

According to the U.S. Census, Roseville's racial composition is predominately white, at about 80 percent of the City population. The largest minority population in Roseville is Hispanic, followed by Asian. Figure 4-8 shows the racial distribution of Roseville.

About 12 percent of Roseville's population is foreign-born, with the majority born in Latin America, according to 2014 U.S. Census estimates. Other than English, the most commonly spoken language in the City is Spanish. In the U.S. Census estimates, 5.6 percent of the City's residents reported speaking English "less than very well." Of the foreign born population, 38.5 percent speak English "less than very well." This has important implications for emergency managers, who must get crucial information out to all members of the population before, during and after emergency events.




Figure 4-8. Planning Area Race Distribution

4.7.4 Individuals with Disabilities and Others with Access and Functional Needs

Individuals with disabilities and others with access and functional needs have a special stake in emergency planning because they are more likely to have difficulty responding to a hazard event than the general population. According to the 2010 U.S. Census, 12.3 percent of the U.S. noninstitutionalized population lives with a disability. As individuals with disabilities and others with access and functional needs are increasingly integrated into society, relatively large segments of the population may require assistance during the first 72 hours post-disaster, the period generally reserved for self-help.

Disabilities and access/functional needs can vary greatly in severity and permanence, making these individuals difficult to define and track. There is no “typical” disability or need, which can complicate disaster-planning processes that attempt to incorporate them. Furthermore, disabilities and access/functional needs are likely to be compounded with other vulnerabilities, such as age, economic disadvantage and ethnicity, all of which mean that housing is more likely to be substandard.

While the City of Roseville’s percentage of individuals with disabilities and others with access and functional needs does not differ much from that of the state as a whole, the overall numbers are significant and warrant attention from planners and emergency managers (see Table 4-8). According to 2014 U.S. Census data, 10.3 percent of the City’s population over the age of 5 has a disability.

Table 4-8. Status of Non-Institutionalized Population with Disabilities

Age	Individuals with Disabilities and Others with Access and Functional Needs	% of Age Group Population
5-17 years	1,065	4.7
18-64 years	5,038	7.2
65+ years	5,979	34.9

4.8 ECONOMY

4.8.1 Income

In the United States, individual households are expected to use some private resources to prepare for, respond to and recover from disasters. This means that households living in poverty are automatically disadvantaged when confronting hazards. Additionally, the poor typically occupy more poorly built and inadequately maintained housing. Mobile or modular homes, for example, are more susceptible to damage in earthquakes and floods than other types of housing. In urban areas, the poor often live in older houses and apartment complexes, which are more likely to be made of un-reinforced masonry, a building type that is particularly susceptible to damage during earthquakes. Furthermore, residents below the poverty level are less likely to have insurance to compensate for losses incurred from natural disasters. This means that residents below the poverty level have a great deal to lose during an event and are the least prepared to deal with potential losses. The events following Hurricane Katrina in 2005 illustrated that personal household economics significantly impact people’s decisions on evacuation. Individuals who cannot afford gas for their cars will likely decide not to evacuate.

Based on U.S. Census American Community Survey estimates for 2014, per capita income in Roseville was \$34,6514, and the median household income was \$76,712. Table 4-9 compares the income and poverty estimates at the city, county, and state level. About 8.6 percent of Roseville residents are below the poverty level (meaning they spend more than a third of income on an economy food budget); this includes 10.2 percent of those under the age of 18 and 7.4 percent of those 65 or older.


Table 4-9. Population Under the Poverty Level

	Median Household Income	Percent of Total Population Below Poverty Level	Percent of Children (18 and Under) Below Poverty Level	Percent of Elderly (65 and Older) Below Poverty Level
City of Roseville	\$76,712	8.6	10.2	7.4
Placer County	\$73,747	8.9	11.2	6.8
California	\$61,489	16.4	22.7	10.2

4.8.2 Industry, Businesses and Institutions

The planning area's economy is strongly based in the educational/healthcare/social service industry (22 percent), followed by the retail trade and professional/scientific industries. Information, wholesale trade, and agriculture make up the smallest sources of the local economy, with less than 1 percent of local economy driven by agriculture. Figure 4-9 shows the breakdown of industry types in the planning area.

The planning area benefits from a variety of business activity. Major businesses include Kaiser Permanente, Union Pacific Railroad, Adventist Health and Sutter Roseville Medical Center.

**Figure 4-9. Industry in the Planning Area**

4.8.3 Employment Trends and Occupations

According to the American Community Survey, about 48.4 percent of the planning area's population is in the labor force. Of the working-age population group (ages 20 – 64), 88.5 percent of men and 75.6 percent of women are in the labor force. Figure 4-10 compares California's and Roseville's unemployment trends from 2009 through 2014. Roseville's unemployment rate was lowest in 2009, at 5.9 percent. Unemployment rates significantly dropped from 9.5 percent to 8.3 percent between 2013 and 2014.




Figure 4-10. California and Roseville Unemployment Rate (U.S. Census, 2009 – 2014)

Management, business, science and arts occupations and sales and office occupations make up 72 percent of the jobs in the planning area (see Figure 4-11). Service occupations make up 16 percent of the local working population.

As of October 2014, the largest employer is Kaiser Permanente, with 3,231 employees, followed by Hewlett-Packard, which employs 2,132. Other major employers include the following:

- Sutter-Roseville Medical Group
- Roseville Joint Union High School District
- Union Pacific Railroad Company
- Adventist Health System West
- Roseville City School District
- City of Roseville
- Wal-Mart Superstore (PG Blvd)
- LB Construction, Inc.

The U.S. Census estimates that over 79.6 percent of workers in the planning area commute alone (by car, truck or van) to work, and mean travel time to work is 26.1 minutes (the state average is 27.6 minutes).




Figure 4-11. Occupations in the Planning Area

4.9 LAWS AND ORDINANCES

Existing laws, ordinances and plans at the federal, state and local level can support or impact hazard mitigation actions identified in this Plan. Hazard mitigation plans are required by 44 CFR to include a review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information as part of the planning process (Section 201.6.b(3)). The following federal, state, and local laws described below were reviewed to inform this plan update process. Not all laws and ordinances reviewed during this process are relevant to the immediate process of plan development. In such instances, the City will assure compliance, where relevant, upon implementation of programs that overlap with the requirements of the following programs at project implementation.

4.9.1 Federal

Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000

The DMA is the latest federal legislation addressing hazard mitigation planning. It reinforces the importance of mitigation planning and emphasizes planning for disasters before they occur. It specifically addresses planning at the local level, requiring plans to be in place before Hazard Mitigation Grant Program funds are available to communities. The 2016 Plan is designed to meet the requirements of the DMA.

Endangered Species Act

The Endangered Species Act (ESA) was enacted in 1973 to conserve species that are facing depletion or extinction and the ecosystems that support them. The act sets forth a process for determining which species are threatened and endangered and requires the conservation of the critical habitat in which those species live. The ESA provides broad protection for species of fish, wildlife and plants that are listed as threatened or endangered. Provisions are made for listing species, as well as for recovery plans and the designation of critical habitat for listed species. The ESA outlines procedures for federal agencies to follow when taking actions that may jeopardize listed species and contains exceptions and exemptions. It is the enabling legislation for the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora. Criminal and civil penalties are provided for violations of the ESA and the Convention.

The purposes of the ESA are to provide a means of conserving the ecosystems upon which endangered and threatened species depend; to provide a program for conserving those species; and to take steps necessary to achieve the purposes of international treaties and conventions. The policy of Congress is that federal agencies must seek to conserve endangered and threatened species and use their authorities in furtherance of the ESA's purposes. The ESA defines three fundamental terms:

- **Endangered** means that a species of fish, animal or plant is “in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range.” (For salmon and other vertebrate species, this may include subspecies and distinct population segments.)
- **Threatened** means that a species “is likely to become endangered within the foreseeable future.” Regulations for a threatened species may be less restrictive than if it were endangered.
- **Critical habitat** means “specific geographical areas that are...essential for the conservation and management of a listed species, whether occupied by the species or not.”

Five sections of the ESA are of critical importance to understanding it:

- **Section 4: Listing of a Species**—The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries) is responsible for listing marine species; the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is responsible for listing terrestrial and freshwater aquatic species. The agencies may initiate reviews for listings, or citizens may petition for them. A listing must be made “solely on the basis of the best scientific and commercial data available.” After a listing has been proposed, agencies receive comment and conduct further scientific reviews for 12 to 18 months, after which they must decide if the listing is warranted. Economic impacts cannot be considered in this decision, but it may include an evaluation of the adequacy of local and state protections. Critical habitat for the species may be designated at the time of listing.
- **Section 7: Consultation**—Even when a listing has only been proposed, all federal agencies must ensure that any action they authorize, fund, or carry out is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a listed species or adversely modify its critical habitat. This includes private and public actions that require a federal permit. Once a final listing is made, non-federal actions are subject to the same review, termed a “consultation.” If the listing agency finds that an action will “take” a species, it must propose mitigations or “reasonable and prudent” alternatives to the action; if the proponent rejects these, the action cannot proceed.
- **Section 9: Prohibition of Take**—It is unlawful to “take” an endangered species, including killing or injuring it or modifying its habitat in a way that interferes with essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, feeding or sheltering.
- **Section 10: Permitted Take**—Through voluntary agreements with the federal government that provide protections to an endangered species, a non-federal applicant may commit a take that would otherwise be prohibited as long as it is incidental to an otherwise lawful activity (such as developing land or building a road). These agreements often take the form of a “Habitat Conservation Plan.”

- **Section 11: Citizen Lawsuits**—Civil actions initiated by any citizen can require the listing agency to enforce the ESA’s prohibition of taking or to meet the requirements of the consultation process

The Clean Water Act

The Clean Water Act (CWA) is the cornerstone of surface water quality protection in the United States. (The Act does not deal directly with groundwater or with water quantity issues.) The statute employs a variety of regulatory and non-regulatory tools to sharply reduce direct pollutant discharges into waterways, finance municipal wastewater treatment facilities, and manage polluted runoff. These tools are employed to achieve the broader goal of restoring and maintaining the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation’s waters so that they can support “the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish and wildlife and recreation in and on the water.”

Evolution of CWA programs over the last decade has included a shift from a program-by-program, source-by-source, pollutant-by-pollutant approach to more holistic watershed-based strategies. Under the watershed approach, equal emphasis is placed on protecting healthy waters and restoring impaired ones. A full array of issues are addressed, not just those subject to CWA regulatory authority. Involvement of stakeholder groups in the development and implementation of strategies for achieving and maintaining state water quality and other environmental goals is another hallmark of this approach.

National Flood Insurance Program

The National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) provides federally backed flood insurance in exchange for communities enacting and enforcing floodplain regulations. Since its inception in 1968, the NFIP has been successful in requiring new buildings to be protected from probable damage by 100-year flood events. Requirements for participation in this program are stipulated in Parts 59 through 79 of 44 CFR. At the time of the preparation of this Plan, the City is in good standing with the requirements of the NFIP. Participation and good-standing under NFIP are prerequisites for funding eligibility under the Robert T. Stafford Act.

National Incident Management System

The National Incident Management System (NIMS) is a systematic approach for government, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector to work together to manage incidents involving hazards. The NIMS provides a flexible but standardized set of incident management practices. Incidents typically begin and end locally, and they are managed at the lowest possible geographical, organizational, and jurisdictional level. In some cases, success depends on the involvement of multiple jurisdictions, levels of government, functional agencies, and emergency responder disciplines. These cases necessitate coordination across a spectrum of organizations. Communities using NIMS follow a comprehensive national approach that improves the effectiveness of emergency management and response personnel across the full spectrum of potential hazards (including natural hazards, terrorist activities, and other human-caused disasters) regardless of size or complexity.

Americans with Disabilities Act and Amendments

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) seeks to prevent discrimination against people with disabilities in employment, transportation, public accommodation, communications, and government activities. Title II of the ADA deals with compliance with the Act in emergency management and disaster-related programs, services, and activities. It applies to state and local governments as well as third parties, including religious entities and private nonprofit organizations.

The ADA has implications for sheltering requirements and public notifications. During an emergency alert, officials must use a combination of warning methods to ensure that all residents have all necessary information. Those with hearing impairments may not hear radio, television, sirens, or other audible alerts, while those with visual impairments may not see flashing lights or visual alerts. Two technical documents issued for shelter

operators address physical accessibility needs of people with disabilities as well as medical needs and service animals.

The ADA intersects with disaster preparedness programs in regards to transportation, social services, temporary housing, and rebuilding. Persons with disabilities may require additional assistance in evacuation and transit (e.g., vehicles with wheelchair lifts or paratransit buses). Evacuation and other response plans should address the unique needs of residents. Local governments may be interested in implementing a special-needs registry to identify the home addresses, contact information, and needs for residents who may require more assistance.

Civil Rights Act of 1964

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex or nation origin and requires equal access to public places and employment. The Act is relevant to emergency management and hazard mitigation in that it prohibits local governments from favoring the needs of one population group over another. Local government and emergency response must ensure the continued safety and well-being of all residents equally, to the extent possible.

Rural Development Program

The mission of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Rural Development Program is to help improve the economy and quality of life in rural America. The program provides project financing and technical assistance to help rural communities provide the infrastructure needed by rural businesses, community facilities, and households. The program addresses rural America's need for basic services, such as clean running water, sewage and waste disposal, electricity, and modern telecommunications and broadband. Loans and competitive grants are offered for various community and economic development projects and programs, such as the development of essential community facilities including fire stations (USDA, 2015b).

Community Development Block Grant Disaster Resilience Program

In response to disasters, Congress may appropriate additional funding for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Community Development Block Grant programs to be distributed as Disaster Recovery grants (CDBG-DR). These grants can be used to rebuild affected areas and provide seed money to start the recovery process. CDBG-DR assistance may fund a broad range of recovery activities, helping communities and neighborhoods that otherwise might not recover due to limited resources. CDBG-DR grants often supplement disaster programs of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Small Business Administration, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Housing and Urban Development generally awards noncompetitive, nonrecurring CDBG-DR grants by a formula that considers disaster recovery needs unmet by other federal disaster assistance programs. To be eligible for CDBG-DR funds, projects must meet the following criteria:

- Address a disaster-related impact (direct or indirect) in a presidentially declared county for the covered disaster
- Be a CDBG-eligible activity (according to regulations and waivers)
- Meet a national objective.

Incorporating preparedness and mitigation into these actions is encouraged, as the goal is to rebuild in ways that are safer and stronger.

Emergency Watershed Program

The USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) administers the Emergency Watershed Protection (EWP) Program, which responds to emergencies created by natural disasters. Eligibility for assistance is not dependent on a national emergency declaration. The program is designed to help people and conserve natural

resources by relieving imminent hazards to life and property caused by floods, fires, wind-storms, and other natural occurrences. EWP is an emergency recovery program. Financial and technical assistance are available for the following activities (Natural Resources Conservation Service, 2016):

- Remove debris from stream channels, road culverts, and bridges
- Reshape and protect eroded banks
- Correct damaged drainage facilities
- Establish cover on critically eroding lands
- Repair levees and structures
- Repair conservation practices.

Presidential Executive Orders 11988 and 13690

Executive Order 11988 requires federal agencies to avoid to the extent possible the long and short-term adverse impacts associated with the occupancy and modification of flood plains and to avoid direct and indirect support of floodplain development wherever there is a practicable alternative. In accomplishing this objective, “each agency shall provide leadership and shall take action to reduce the risk of flood loss, to minimize the impact of floods on human safety, health, and welfare, and to restore and preserve the natural and beneficial values served by flood plains in carrying out its responsibilities” for the following actions:

- Acquiring, managing, and disposing of federal lands and facilities
- Providing federally-undertaken, financed, or assisted construction and improvements
- Conducting federal activities and programs affecting land use, including but not limited to water and related land resources planning, regulation, and licensing activities (FEMA, 1982).

Executive Order 13690 amends and expands Executive Order 11988, acknowledging that the impacts of flooding are anticipated to increase over time due to the effects of climate change and other threats. It mandates a Federal Flood Risk Management Standard, which is a flexible framework to increase resilience against flooding and help preserve the natural values of floodplains. This standard expands management of flood issues from the current base flood level to a higher vertical elevation and corresponding horizontal floodplain to address current and future flood risk and ensure that projects funded with taxpayer dollars last as long as intended (Office of the Press Secretary, 2015).

Presidential Executive Orders 11990

Executive Order 11990 requires federal agencies to provide leadership and take action to minimize the destruction, loss or degradation of wetlands, and to preserve and enhance the natural and beneficial values of wetlands. The requirements apply to the following activities (National Archives, 2016):

- Acquiring, managing, and disposing of federal lands and facilities
- Providing federally undertaken, financed, or assisted construction and improvements
- Conducting federal activities and programs affecting land use, including but not limited to water and related land resources planning, regulation, and licensing.

Emergency Relief for Federally Owned Roads Program

The U.S. Forest Service’s Emergency Relief for Federally Owned Roads Program was established to assist federal agencies with repair or reconstruction of tribal transportation facilities, federal lands transportation facilities, and other federally owned roads that are open to public travel and have suffered serious damage by a natural disaster over a wide area or by a catastrophic failure. The program funds both emergency and permanent repairs (Office of Federal Lands Highway, 2016).

4.9.2 State

California General Planning Law

California state law requires that every county and city prepare and adopt a comprehensive long-range plan to serve as a guide for community development. The general plan expresses the community's goals, visions, and policies relative to future land uses, both public and private. The general plan is mandated and prescribed by state law (Cal. Gov. Code §65300 et seq.), and forms the basis for most local government land use decision-making.

The plan must consist of an integrated and internally consistent set of goals, policies, and implementation measures. In addition, the plan must focus on issues of the greatest concern to the community and be written in a clear and concise manner. City actions, such as those relating to land use allocations, annexations, zoning, subdivision and design review, redevelopment, and capital improvements, must be consistent with the plan.

California Environmental Quality Act

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) was passed in 1970, shortly after the federal government passed the National Environmental Policy Act, to institute a statewide policy of environmental protection. CEQA requires state and local agencies in California to follow a protocol of analysis and public disclosure of the potential environmental impacts of development projects. CEQA makes environmental protection a mandatory part of every California state and local agency's decision making process.

CEQA establishes a statewide environmental policy and mandates actions all state and local agencies must take to advance the policy. For any project under CEQA's jurisdiction with potentially significant environmental impacts, agencies must identify mitigation measures and alternatives by preparing an environmental impact report and may approve only projects with no feasible mitigation measures or environmentally superior alternatives.

The Roseville City Council certified a mitigated negative declaration (MND) for the initial City of Roseville hazard plan on July 20, 2005. The MND evaluated potential environmental effects associated with adoption and implementation of the initial hazard plan. It was circulated for a 20-day public review and comment period (per CEQA Guidelines Section 15073(a)), and no comments were received.

Under CEQA guidelines (Section 15164), an addendum to an adopted MND shall be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary and none of the conditions have occurred calling for the preparation of a new negative declaration or Environmental Impact Report (as described in CEQA Section 15162). The addendum need not be circulated for public review; however, an addendum is to be considered by the decision-making body prior to making a decision on the project.

The City has determined that the 2016 Plan required a new Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND). The public comment period for the IS/MND ran concurrently with the public comment period for the plan update. During this time, no comments were received on the IS/MND. The results of this study were presented to the Council for consideration prior to their consideration of the revised Plan.

AB 52: Addition of Tribal Cultural Resources CEQA

This bill adds "tribal cultural resources" to the categories of cultural resources in CEQA, which had formerly been limited to historic, archeological, and paleontological resources. Recognizing that tribes may have expertise with regard to their tribal history and practices, AB 52 requires lead agencies to provide notice to tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a proposed project if they have requested notice of projects proposed within that area. If the tribe requests consultation within 30 days upon receipt of the notice, the lead agency must consult with the tribe.

In accordance with AB 52, in July 2016 the City of Roseville provided certified mail notification of the proposed hazard mitigation plan update to tribes that requested such notification. The City's notice included a summary project description, a location map and request for written response should the tribe desire formal AB 52 consultation on tribal cultural resources. Many of the hazard mitigation alternatives and selected actions contained in Chapter 19 are ongoing City activities and programs, some of which were previously subject to CEQA and do not require further CEQA compliance for continued implementation. However future action plan items that still require Council approval would also require future project-level CEQA compliance and therefore an additional opportunity for AB 52 consultation prior to implementation.

AB 162: Flood Planning, Chapter 369, Statutes of 2007

This California State Assembly bill passed in 2007 requires cities and counties to address flood-related matters in the land use, conservation, and safety and housing elements of their general plans. The land use element must identify and annually review the areas covered by the general plan that are subject to flooding as identified in floodplain mapping by either FEMA or the state Department of Water Resources (DWR). Upon the next revision of the housing element on or after January 1, 2009, the conservation element of the general plan must identify rivers, creeks, streams, flood corridors, riparian habitat, and land that may accommodate floodwater for the purposes of groundwater recharge and stormwater management. The safety element must identify information regarding flood hazards including:

- Flood hazard zones
- Maps published by FEMA, DWR, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Central Valley Flood Protection Board, Cal OES, etc.
- Historical data on flooding
- Existing and planned development in flood hazard zones.

The general plan must establish goals, policies and objectives to protect from unreasonable flooding risks including:

- Avoiding or minimizing the risks of flooding new development
- Evaluating whether new development should be located in flood hazard zones
- Identifying construction methods to minimize damage.

AB 162 establishes goals, policies and objectives to protect from unreasonable flooding risks. It establishes procedures for the determination of available land suitable for urban development, which may exclude lands where FEMA or DWR has determined that the flood management infrastructure is not adequate to avoid the risk of flooding.

AB 2140: General Plans: Safety Element, Chapter 739, Statutes of 2006

This bill provides that the state may allow for more than 75 percent of public assistance funding under the California Disaster Assistance Act only if the local agency is in a jurisdiction that has adopted a local hazard mitigation plan as part of the safety element of its general plan. The local hazard mitigation plan needs to include elements specified in this legislation. In addition this bill requires Cal OES to give federal mitigation funding preference to cities and counties that have adopted local hazard mitigation plan. The intent of the bill is to encourage cities and counties to create and adopt hazard mitigation plans. The City of Roseville linked the Roseville Hazard Mitigation Plan to the Safety Element of the General Plan by City Council resolution on May 10, 2010. The 2016 Roseville Hazard Mitigation Plan will continue to link to the Roseville General Plan.

AB 70: Flood Liability, Chapter 367, Statutes of 2007

This bill provides that a city or county may be required to contribute a fair and reasonable share to compensate for property damage caused by a flood to the extent that it has increased the state's exposure to liability for property damage by unreasonably approving new development in a previously undeveloped area that is protected by a state flood control project, unless the city or county meets specified requirements.

AB 32: The California Global Warming Solutions Act

This bill addresses greenhouse gas emissions. It identifies the following potential adverse impacts of global warming:

“... the exacerbation of air quality problems, a reduction in the quality and supply of water to the state from the Sierra snowpack, a rise in sea levels resulting in the displacement of thousands of coastal businesses and residences, damage to marine ecosystems and the natural environment, and an increase in the incidences of infectious diseases, asthma, and other human health-related problems.”

AB 32 establishes a state goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 (a reduction of approximately 25 percent from forecast emission levels) with further reductions to follow. The law requires the state Air Resources Board to do the following:

- Establish a program to track and report greenhouse gas emissions.
- Approve a scoping plan for achieving the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective reductions from sources of greenhouse gas emissions.
- Adopt early reduction measures to begin moving forward.
- Adopt, implement and enforce regulations—including market mechanisms such as “cap and-trade” programs—to ensure that the required reductions occur.

The Air Resources Board recently adopted a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit and an emissions inventory, along with requirements to measure, track, and report greenhouse gas emissions by the industries it determined to be significant sources of greenhouse gas emissions.

Senate Bill 97

Senate Bill 97, enacted in 2007, amended the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to clearly establish that greenhouse gas emissions and the effects of greenhouse gas emissions are appropriate subjects for CEQA analysis. It directed the Governor's Office of Planning and Research to develop draft CEQA guidelines for the mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions or their effects by July 1, 2009 and directed the California Natural Resources Agency to certify and adopt the CEQA Guidelines by January 1, 2010.

Senate Bill 5: Central Valley Flood Protection Act of 2008

The fundamental change imposed through this legislation was the directive for local agencies to revise their general plans no later than July 2, 2015 to address flood risk for affected land use decisions based on an Urban Level of Flood Protection. The legislation also requires local agencies to revise their zoning codes to reflect this new standard within one year following the adoption of their revised general plans. In areas not subject to the Urban Level of Flood Protection standards, the 100-year floodplain standards will continue to apply.

Senate Bill 1241: General Plans: Safety Element—Fire Hazard Impacts

In 2012, Senate Bill 1241 passed requiring that all future general plans address fire risk in state responsibility areas and very high fire hazard severity zones in their safety element. In addition, the bill requires cities and

counties to make certain findings regarding available fire protection and suppression services before approving a tentative map or parcel map.

Senate Bill 379: General Plans: Safety Element—Climate Adaptation

Senate Bill 379 builds upon the flood planning inclusions into the safety and housing elements and the hazard mitigation planning safety element inclusions in general plans outlined in AB 162 and AB 2140, respectively. SB 379 focuses on a new requirement that cities and counties include climate adaptation and resiliency strategies in the safety element of their general plans beginning January 1, 2017. In addition, this bill requires general plans to include a set of goals, policies and objectives, and specified implementation measures based on the conclusions drawn from climate adaptation research and recommendations. In anticipation of the implementation of this bill in 2017, the 2016 Hazard Mitigation Plan includes relevant information regarding climate adaptation and resiliency strategies for incorporation into the Roseville General Plan through existing linkage resulting from AB 2140.

California State Building Code

California Code of Regulations Title 24 (CCR Title 24), also known as the California Building Standards Code, is a compilation of building standards from three sources:

- Building standards that have been adopted by state agencies without change from building standards contained in national model codes
- Building standards that have been adopted and adapted from the national model code standards to meet California conditions
- Building standards authorized by the California legislature that constitute extensive additions not covered by the model codes adopted to address particular California concerns.

The state Building Standards Commission is authorized by California Building Standards Law (Health and Safety Code Sections 18901 through 18949.6) to administer the processes related to the adoption, approval, publication, and implementation of California's building codes. These building codes serve as the basis for the design and construction of buildings in California. The national model code standards adopted into Title 24 apply to all occupancies in California except for modifications adopted by state agencies and local governing bodies. Since 1989, the Building Standards Commission has published new editions of Title 24 every three years.

On January 1, 2014, California Building Code Accessibility Standards found in Chapter 11B incorporated the 2010 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Standards as the model accessibility code for California. The purpose for this incorporation was to ensure consistency with federal guidelines. As a result of this incorporation, the California standards will fully implement and include 2010 ADA Standards within the California Building Code while maintaining enhanced levels of accessibility already provided by existing California accessibility regulations.

Standardized Emergency Management System

CCR Title 19 establishes the Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) to standardize the response to emergencies involving multiple jurisdictions. SEMS is intended to be flexible and adaptable to the needs of all emergency responders in California. It requires emergency response agencies to use basic principles and components of emergency management. Local governments must use SEMS by December 1, 1996 in order to be eligible for state funding of response-related personnel costs under CCR Title 19 (Sections 2920, 2925 and 2930). Individual agencies' roles and responsibilities contained in existing laws or the state emergency plan are not superseded by these regulations.

California State Hazard Mitigation Plan

Under the DMA, California must adopt a federally approved state multi-hazard mitigation plan in order to be eligible for certain disaster assistance and mitigation funding. The intent of the California State Hazard Mitigation Plan is to reduce or prevent injury and damage from hazards in the state through the following:

- Documenting statewide hazard mitigation planning in California
- Describing strategies and priorities for future mitigation activities
- Facilitating the integration of local and tribal hazard mitigation planning activities into statewide efforts
- Meeting state and federal statutory and regulatory requirements.

The plan is an annex to the State Emergency Plan. It identifies past and present mitigation activities, current policies and programs, and mitigation strategies for the future. It also establishes hazard mitigation goals and objectives. The plan will be reviewed and updated annually to reflect changing conditions and new information, especially information on local planning activities.

Governor's Executive Order S-13-08

Governor's Executive Order S-13-08 enhances the state's management of climate impacts from sea level rise, increased temperatures, shifting precipitation and extreme weather events. It required the following key actions:

- Initiate California's first statewide climate change adaptation strategy to assess expected climate change impacts, identify where California is most vulnerable, and recommend adaptation policies by early 2009. This effort will improve coordination within state government so that better planning can more effectively address climate impacts on human health, the environment, the state's water supply and the economy.
- Request that the National Academy of Science establish an expert panel to report on sea level rise impacts in California, to inform state planning and development efforts.
- Issue interim guidance to state agencies for how to plan for sea level rise in designated coastal and floodplain areas for new projects.
- Initiate a report on critical infrastructure projects vulnerable to sea level rise.

4.9.3 City Plans and Programs

General Plan

The City of Roseville General Plan 2035 was developed concurrently with the mitigation planning effort. Roseville proactively addresses problems through the General Plan, which includes a Safety Element designed to address hazards. The 2016 General Plan and the 2016 Hazard Mitigation Plan will work together to achieve the goal of hazard risk reduction. Many of the action items identified in this 2016 Plan are recommendations of the General Plan. Updating the General Plan will serve as a trigger for future updates of the hazard mitigation plan.

Purpose

The General Plan is a long-term policy guide for the City's physical, economic, and environmental growth. City actions, such as those relating to land use allocations, annexations, zoning, subdivision, design review, redevelopment and capital improvements, must be consistent with the General Plan. The General Plan emphasizes performance policies or standards that define levels of service and other less tangible factors that the City is seeking to achieve. It also designates land use categories for the entire City. Land use category definitions in the General Plan include information on general uses, development, intensity, siting and compatibility standards. The General Plan serves these purposes:

- It enables the Roseville City Council and Planning Commission to establish long-range development policies.
- It provides a basis for judging whether private development proposals and public projects are in harmony with the policies.
- It guides public agencies and private developers in designing projects consistent with City policies.

The General Plan is designed to be:

- **Long-range**—Most development decisions have effects lasting more than 20 years. In order to create a useful context for development decisions, the General Plan looks toward 2035 and beyond.
- **Comprehensive**—The General Plan provides direction to coordinate all major components of the community's physical development.
- **General**—The General Plan's purpose is to serve as a framework for detailed public and private development proposals. It establishes requirements for additional planning studies that must be completed before modifying land-use allocations.

Contents

Two primary components constitute the City of Roseville General Plan:

- The General Plan document, which presents goals, policies, and implementation measures
- The land use map, which graphically represents the City's existing and planned land use mix and pattern.

The General Plan document is organized into nine elements. The state-mandated elements are land use, circulation, open space and conservation, safety, housing, and noise. The optional elements are air quality, parks and recreation, and public facilities. Each element includes a brief setting and outlook section describing existing conditions and critical issues for the topic area, followed by goals, policies and implementation measures. The goals state the overall desired conditions that the City would like to achieve. The policies indicate an action or direction that the City must take as a step toward achieving the goals. The implementation measures include precise actions to achieve the stated policies. The general content of each element is as follows:

- **Land Use Element** discusses existing and projected land-use conditions, land-use designations and standards, community form, community design, and growth management. The goals and policies are intended to promote a balanced land-use pattern that supports innovative land-use approaches and retains and enhances the distinct character and identity of Roseville.
- **Circulation Element** identifies the general locations and extent of existing and proposed roadways, highways, railroads, and transit routes. The element identifies policies and programs to reduce traffic congestion, promote alternative forms of transportation, and provide safe travel throughout the City.
- **Air Quality and Climate Change Element** integrates related land-use, transportation and circulation, transit, and energy issues. The policies and implementation measures are intended to improve air quality and encourage cooperation among the jurisdictions involved in regional air quality efforts.
- **Open Space and Conservation Element** provides for the conservation, development, and use of natural resources; details plans and measures for the preservation of open space; and provides for outdoor recreation, public health and safety. It is the overall goal of the element to preserve a comprehensive interconnected system of open space encompassing preservation and enhancement of natural habitat areas for the use and enjoyment of the community.
- **Parks and Recreation Element** provides goals and policies for both traditional "active" park lands and non-traditional "open space recreational" park lands. It specifies standards and conditions as guidelines for planning parks and recreation facilities, including size, type, and location.
- **Public Facilities Element** identifies facility and service needs of the community and performance standards to ensure that desired service levels are maintained. Discussed under this element are civic

facilities, libraries, schools, electric and privately owned utilities, water and wastewater systems, solid waste and recycling, water and energy conservation, and the extension of City services. Emphasis is placed on the fair-share contribution of new development toward the provision of services and facilities.

- **Safety Element** establishes standards and plans for the protection of the community from a variety of hazards, including earthquakes, flooding, crime, fire, hazardous materials, and electromagnetic fields.
- **Noise Element** establishes standards for transportation and fixed noise sources to protect the health and welfare of the community.
- **Housing Element** identifies the existing and projected housing needs and establishes goals, policies, and implementation measures for the preservation, improvement and development of housing to meet the needs of all economic sectors of the community.

Specific Plans

Roseville's specific plans are comprehensive planning documents that guide the development of defined geographic areas. Specific plans typically include more detailed information than the General Plan about land use, traffic circulation, affordable housing programs, resource management strategies, development standards and a comprehensive infrastructure plan. Specific plans currently exist for the Amoruso Ranch, Creekview, Del Webb, Downtown, Highland Reserve North, North Central Roseville, Northeast Roseville, North Industrial, North Roseville, Northwest Roseville, Riverside Gateway, Sierra Vista, Southeast Roseville, Stoneridge, West Roseville, and the Infill Area. All of these specific plans were adopted by the City Council after extensive review by City staff, commissions and the public. Specific plans contain detailed regulations, conditions, programs and design criteria unique to specific areas of the City and serve to implement the General Plan. Each specific plan includes a menu of strategies.

Development Agreements

California planning law authorizes cities and developers to enter into contracts to lock in regulations and policies governing a property. Development agreements benefit the City and its residents by detailing the developer's responsibilities for public improvements and infrastructure, such as street lights and roads. Development agreements also give developers the certainty they need to develop their property. With the obligations of both the City and the developer detailed and in writing, the project is able to move ahead smoothly with few obstacles.

Community Design Guidelines

Community design guidelines identify the City's expectations for planning, designing and reviewing development proposals in Roseville. They establish standards for high quality development and design. The community design guidelines provide design professionals, property owners, commissioners, staff, and residents with a clear and common understanding of the City's expectations for the planning, design, and review of development proposals in Roseville. They also increase the community's awareness and appreciation of design considerations.

Open Space Preserve Overarching Management Plan

In August 2011, the City of Roseville adopted an Open Space Preserve Overarching Management Plan (OSPOMP), which provides a City-wide approach to open space management, maintenance, and monitoring of the City's open space preserves. The OSPOMP also provides the same approach for the management and maintenance of open space areas outside of a preserve areas. Prior to adoption of the OSPOMP, the City managed, monitored, and provided reports to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for over 30 individual preserve management plans regulated by natural resource agencies, with various requirements for management and monitoring that had evolved in comprehensiveness and complexity since the 1990s. Adoption of the OSPOMP eliminates the need for additional management plans when new open space is dedicated through the development process or habitat conservation efforts.

Urban Water Management Plan

The City of Roseville Urban Water Management Plan assumes an important role in water supply planning and management. Current drought conditions have resulted in unprecedented State mandates for water conservation, and the 2015 UWMP serves as the primary compliance document for interim water use targets required by the Water Conservation Act of 2009. The primary objective of the UWMP is to provide a framework for long term water supply planning and document how urban water suppliers carry out long term resource planning responsibilities.

The 2015 UWMP describes City water system, historical and projected use, water supply sources, and a comparison of projected water supply to water demands during normal, single-dry, and multiple dry years in 5 year increments from 2020 to 2040.

Emergency Operations Plan

The City of Roseville Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) establishes an emergency management organization and assigns functions and tasks consistent with California's Standardized Emergency Management System. It provides for the integration and coordination of planning efforts of multiple jurisdictions. This plan was reviewed and approved by representatives from each City of Roseville department, local special districts with emergency services responsibilities in the City, and the Placer County Office of Emergency Services. The content is based on guidance approved and provided by the State of California and FEMA. The EOP provides direction on how to respond to an emergency from the initial onset, through an extended response, and into the recovery process.

A key element of the update process for this hazard mitigation plan was the simultaneous review of the EOP. The Steering Committee remained informed of major review findings of the EOP with an eye toward integration with key components of the hazard mitigation plan. Updates to the EOP will continue to coincide with the future updates of the multi-hazard mitigation plan.

4.9.4 Incorporation of Information into the 2016 Planning Process

Pursuant to 44 CFR §201.6(b)(3), the City of Roseville specifically reviewed certain plans and programs for inclusion into this update for the purpose of planning consistency among documents. The full capability assessment includes these reviewed plans, as well as additional regulatory, administrative, fiscal, and NFIP compliance information. Relevant information from reviewed plans, studies, reports, and technical information incorporated into the mitigation plan includes:

- **State Hazard Mitigation Plan** – The State Hazard Mitigation Plan was reviewed for recent updates on state-wide hazard events and hazard information.

- **Placer County Hazard Mitigation Plan** – The Placer County Hazard Mitigation Plan was reviewed for planning consistency and augmented hazard event history for hazards that extend beyond Roseville city limits, such as drought and severe weather.
- **General Plan and Specific Plans** – General Plan demographics and land use was cross referenced for inclusion into this Plan as part of the overall community profile. Additionally, area vulnerabilities identified in Specific Plan Areas were included as part of the vulnerability and risk assessment for wildfire, landslide, and flood. The General Plan and Specific Plans were also included as part of the capability inventory for the City’s capability assessment.
- **Urban Water Management Plan** – the information provided in the City’s UWMP provided the main resource for illustrating the historical and current conditions for the drought chapter. The UWMP was also included as part of the capability inventory for the City’s capability assessment.
- **Open Space Preserve Overarching Management Plan** – This plan was reviewed in reference to the open space policies regarding the City’s floodplain management program and the flood chapter of this Plan.
- **Emergency Operations Plan** – The EOP was reviewed to augment hazard information as it relates to response to the assessed natural hazards. Additionally, the EOP underwent a gap analysis review in coordination with the Plan development so as to identify further consistency opportunities among documents. The EOP was also included as part of the capability inventory for the City’s capability assessment.
- **Additional Resources and Technical Information** – A complete listing of technical reports, research materials, and articles used during development of this Plan is found in the References section.

4.10 CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

The planning team performed an inventory and analysis of existing authorities and capabilities called a “capability assessment.” A capability assessment creates an inventory of an agency’s mission, programs and policies, and evaluates its capacity to carry them out. An assessment of legal and regulatory capabilities is presented in Table 4-10. An assessment of administrative and technical capabilities is presented in Table 4-11. An assessment of fiscal capabilities is presented in Table 4-12. Information on National Flood Insurance Program compliance is presented in Table 4-13. An assessment of education and outreach capabilities is presented in Table 4-14. Classifications under various community mitigation programs are presented in Table 4-15.

Table 4-10. Legal and Regulatory Capability

	Local Authority	State or Federal Prohibitions	Other Jurisdiction Authority	State Mandated
Codes, Ordinances & Requirements				
Building Code	Y	NA	N	Y
Comments: The 2013 California Building Standards Code was adopted by the City of Roseville and incorporated by reference into the City of Roseville Municipal Code.				
Zoning Code	Y	NA	N	N
Comments: RMC, Title 19				
Subdivisions	Y	NA	N	Y
Comments: RMC, Title 18				
Stormwater Management	Y	NA	N	Y
Comments: RMC, Chapter 14.20				
Post-Disaster Recovery	N	NA	N	N
Comments: None at this time.				
Real Estate Disclosure	N	NA	Y	N
Comments: California Civil Code 1102 governs real estate and various disclosure laws. It does not mandate disclosure at the local government level but does require local governments to make known information on natural hazards available to the real estate community.				
Growth Management	Y	NA	N	Y
Comments: Growth management strategies are incorporated into the Land Use Element of the General Plan.				
Site Plan Review	Y	NA	N	N
Comments: The Zoning Ordinance (RMC 19.74.010.(C)) requires a design review permit for all new construction except single-family and two-family residences. Site design, building architecture, landscape design, and lighting are reviewed through the design review permit. Design review permits are reviewed and approved by the City's Design Committee or Planning Commission.				
Flood Damage Prevention	Y	N/A	Y	Y
Comments: The Roseville Zoning Ordinance incorporates combining or overlay of districts to regulate floodplain development, open space preservation, and other sensitive habitat. The Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (RMC 9.80) regulates development in special flood hazard areas. Outside agencies with jurisdiction over sensitive habitats include the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and California Department of Fish and Wildlife.				
Public Health and Safety	Y	NA	N	N
Comments: RMC, Title 9 includes multiple public health and safety regulations.				
Environmental Protection	N	NA	N	N
Comments: None at this time.				
Planning Documents				
General or Comprehensive Plan	Y	NA	N	Y
Is the plan equipped to provide linkage to this mitigation plan? Yes				
Comments: The City's General Plan was most recently updated in 2016 and is implemented through 14 specific plans (Amoruso Ranch, Sierra Vista, Creekview, Downtown, Riverside Gateway, Southeast Roseville, Northeast Roseville, Northwest Roseville, North Central Roseville, North Roseville, Highland Reserve North, Stoneridge, Del Webb, and West Roseville) and one other planning area (North Industrial).				
Capital Improvement Plan	Y	NA	N	N
What types of capital facilities does the plan address? Roads, water, and sewer				
How often is the plan updated? Every 2-3 Years.				
Comments: 6-year CIP				

	Local Authority	State or Federal Prohibitions	Other Jurisdiction Authority	State Mandated
Floodplain or Basin Plan <i>Comments: RMC 9.80 and Safety Element of the General Plan</i>	Y	NA	N	N
Stormwater Plan <i>Comments: City of Roseville 2004 Stormwater Management Plan. The plan is required by the State of California as part of the federal National Pollution Discharge Elimination System program. Outside jurisdictional authority is through the State Water Resources Control Board and Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Region).</i>	Y	NA	Y	Y
Habitat Conservation Plan <i>Comments: There are no Habitat Conservation Plans within the City. However, preserve areas have been established as a condition of Section 404 permits and biological opinions of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and are regulated through the City's Overarching Open Space Preserve Management Plan approved by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The Open Space and Conservation Element of the City's General Plan also contains policies relative to habitat conservation.</i>	N	NA	N	N
Economic Development Plan <i>Comments: Current economic development strategy was adopted by the City Council on May 23, 2012. This document will guide the City for efforts related to business attraction, retention, expansion and creation.</i>	Y	NA	N	N
Shoreline Management Plan <i>Comments: This is not applicable to Roseville. Shoreline management plans are applicable to coastal communities and are incorporated into local coastal plans reviewed and approved by the California Coastal Commission.</i>	Y	NA	N	Y
Community Wildfire Protection Plan <i>Comments:</i>	N	NA	Y	Y
Response/Recovery Planning				
Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan <i>Comments: The City of Roseville emergency operations plan was adopted by the City Council on July 21, 2004 (Resolution #04-301) and previously updated in conjunction with the 2011 hazard mitigation plan update. The EOP was subsequently reviewed parallel to the 2016 hazard mitigation plan update. The plan is mandated by the California Office of Emergency Services.</i>	Y	NA	N	Y
Threat & Hazard Identification & Risk Assessment <i>Comments:</i>	N	NA	N	N
Terrorism Plan <i>Comments: Terrorism Contingency Plan, 2004</i>	Y	NA	N	N
Hazard Mitigation Plan <i>Comments: The Roseville Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan was adopted on January 19, 2011. The City received formal approval by FEMA on March 28, 2011.</i>	Y	N	N	N
Post-Disaster Recovery Plan <i>Comments:</i>	N	NA	N	N
Continuity of Operations Plan <i>Comments: The EOP contains a general overview of continuity of government and continuity of operations guidelines. The City does not have a stand-alone plan for continuity of government or continuity of operations.</i>	Y (partial)	NA	N	N
Public Health Plan <i>Comments:</i>	N	NA	N	N

Table 4-11. Administrative and Technical Capability

Staff/ Personnel Resources	Available (Y or N)	Department or Agency (Positions)
1. Planners or engineers with knowledge of land development and land management practices	Y	Departments of Development Services, Public Works, Environmental Utilities, Electric, and Parks, Recreation & Libraries (Planners, Engineers, Landscape Architect)
2. Engineers or professionals trained in construction practices related to buildings and/or infrastructure	Y	Public Works, Development Services Department- Engineering Division (Engineering Inspectors); Building Inspection Division (Building Inspectors); Environmental Utilities Department (Engineers and Inspectors for Water/Sewer/Storm water), Parks, Recreation & Libraries (Park Development)
3. Planners or engineers with an understanding of natural hazards	Y	Development Services Department (Planners, Engineering); Public Works (Engineers); Environmental Utilities (Engineers)
4. Floodplain manager	Y	Public Works, Floodplain Management Division (Engineer)
5. Surveyors	N	No licensed surveyors on City staff. City can and has contracted for survey work on as-needed basis.
6. Personnel skilled or trained in GIS Applications	Y	Development Services Department (Business Services Technicians); Public Works (Engineering Assistants); Fire Department (GIS Analysts); Environmental Utilities Department (Mapping Manager); Information Technology Division (GIS Manager)
7. Scientist familiar with local natural hazards	N	
8. Emergency manager	Y	Fire Department (Emergency Preparedness Manager)
9. Grant writers	Y	City Manager's Office (Government Relations Manager)
10. Staff with expertise or training in benefit/cost analysis	Y	Finance Department (administration and budget); City Manager's Office (Economic Development Team); Public Works; Environmental Utilities Department; Electric Department

Table 4-12. Fiscal Capability

Financial Resources	Accessible or Eligible to Use (Y or N)
1. Community Development Block Grants	Y
2. Capital Improvements Project Funding	Y
3. Authority to Levy Taxes for Specific Purposes	Y
4. User Fees For Water, Sewer, Gas or Electric Service	Y
5. Impact Fees for Buyers or Developers of New Development/Homes	Y
6. Incur Debt through General Obligation Bonds	Y
7. Incur Debt through Special Tax Bonds	Y
8. Incur Debt through Private Activity Bonds	N
9. Could Withhold Public Expenditures in Hazard-Prone Areas	N
10. State-Sponsored Grant Programs	Y
11. Other	NA

Table 4-13. National Flood Insurance Program Compliance

Compliance Issue	Local Response
What local department is responsible for floodplain management?	City of Roseville Public Works
Who is your floodplain administrator? (department/position)	Public Works/Senior Civil Engineer
Are any certified floodplain managers on staff in your jurisdiction?	Yes
What is the date of adoption of your flood damage prevention ordinance?	2006
When was the most recent Community Assistance Visit or Community Assistance Contact?	September 10, 2014.
Does your jurisdiction have any outstanding National Flood Insurance Program compliance violations that need to be addressed?	No
Do your flood hazard maps adequately address the flood risk within your jurisdiction?	Yes
Does your floodplain management staff need any assistance or training to support its floodplain management program?	The City's floodplain management staff is always seeking ways to expand its nationally recognized subject matter expertise in the field of floodplain management.
• If so, what type of assistance/training is needed?	For this planning performance period, the training will focus on fundamental changes to the NFIP and CRS driven by flood insurance reform.
Does your jurisdiction participate in the Community Rating System?	Yes

Table 4-14. Education and Outreach

Criteria	Response
Do you have a Public Information Officer or Communications Office?	Yes – multiple communications specialists in multiple departments. The Public Works and Fire communications specialists are heavily involved in developing and distributing mitigation-specific information.
Do you have personnel skilled or trained in website development?	Yes
Do you have hazard mitigation information available on your website?	Yes
• If yes, please briefly describe.	Fire Department City website contains the maintained mitigation webpage. This page includes information on the Plan, meetings, and progress reports
Do you utilize social media for hazard mitigation education and outreach?	Yes
• If yes, please briefly describe.	Facebook, Twitter, Nextdoor
Do you have any citizen boards or commissions that address issues related to hazard mitigation?	Yes – the Roseville Coalition of Neighborhood Associations is an active neighborhood association that participated in the 2016 Plan Steering Committee.
Do you have any other programs already in place that could be used to communicate hazard-related information?	Yes
• If yes, please briefly describe.	Email distribution lists, annual events (e.g. Earth Day), Neighborhood Fire Station Tours
Do you have any established warning systems for hazard events?	Yes – Alert Roseville

Table 4-15. Community Classifications

	Participating?	Classification	Date Classified
Community Rating System	Yes	1	10/01/06
Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule	Yes	2/2	11/28/2011
Public Protection	Yes	2	May 2015
Storm Ready	Yes	Blue	N/A
Firewise	No	N/A	N/A

Part 2. Risk Assessment

5. IDENTIFIED HAZARDS OF CONCERN AND RISK ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

Risk assessment is the process of measuring the potential loss of life, personal injury, economic injury, and property damage resulting from natural hazards. It allows emergency management personnel to establish early response priorities by identifying potential hazards and vulnerable assets. The process focuses on the following elements:

- **Hazard identification**—Use all available information to determine what types of disasters may affect a jurisdiction, how often they can occur, and their potential severity.
- **Vulnerability identification**—Determine the impact of natural hazard events on the people, property, environment, economy and lands of the region.
- **Cost evaluation**—Estimate the cost of potential damage or cost that can be avoided by mitigation.

The risk assessment for this hazard mitigation plan update evaluates the risk of natural hazards prevalent in the planning area and meets requirements of the DMA (44 CFR, Section 201.6(c)(2)).

5.1 IDENTIFIED HAZARDS OF CONCERN

The Steering Committee considered the full range of natural and human-caused hazards that could impact the area, and then identified and ranked the hazards that present the greatest concern. The selection of hazards of concern was based on the following criteria:

- The California State Hazard Mitigation Plan identified Placer County as being susceptible to the hazard.
- Historical occurrence of the hazard within the City of Roseville has caused fatalities, injury, or property damage.
- There is local knowledge and perception that the hazard could significantly impact the planning area, regardless of past occurrence.

Based on review of all available resources, the following hazards of concern were identified for the 2016 Plan:

- Climate change
- Dam failure
- Drought
- Earthquake
- Flooding
- Landslide
- Severe weather
- Wildfire
- Health hazards
- Human-caused hazards.

The Steering Committee did not omit any hazard commonly recognized to affect the City of Roseville.

5.2 METHODOLOGY

The risk assessments in Chapters 6 through 15 describe the risks associated with each identified hazard of concern. Each chapter describes the hazard, the planning area's vulnerabilities, and probable event scenarios. The following steps were used to define the risk of each hazard:

- **Identify and profile each hazard**—The following information is given for each hazard:
 - Geographic areas most affected by the hazard
 - Event frequency estimates
 - Severity estimates
 - Warning time likely to be available for response.
- **Determine exposure to each hazard**—Exposure was determined by overlaying hazard maps with an inventory of structures, facilities, and systems to determine which of them are within the area affected by the hazard.
- **Assess the vulnerability of exposed facilities**—Vulnerability of exposed structures and infrastructure was determined by interpreting the probability of occurrence of each event and assessing structures, facilities, and systems that are exposed to each hazard. Tools such as geographic information systems (GIS) and FEMA's hazard-modeling program called Hazus-MH were used to perform this assessment for the flood, dam failure and earthquake hazards. Outputs similar to those from Hazus-MH were generated for other hazards, using maps generated by the Hazus program.

5.3 RISK ASSESSMENT TOOLS

5.3.1 Dam Failure, Earthquake and Flood—Hazus-MH

Overview

In 1997, FEMA developed the standardized Hazards U.S., or Hazus, model to estimate losses caused by earthquakes and identify areas that face the highest risk and potential for loss. Hazus was later expanded into a multi-hazard methodology, Hazus-MH, with new models for estimating potential losses from hurricanes and floods.

Hazus-MH is a GIS-based software program used to support risk assessments, mitigation planning, and emergency planning and response. It provides a wide range of inventory data, such as demographics, building stock, critical facility, transportation and utility lifeline, and multiple models to estimate potential losses from natural disasters. The program maps and displays hazard data and the results of damage and economic loss estimates for buildings and infrastructure. Its advantages include the following:

- Provides a consistent methodology for assessing risk across geographic and political entities.
- Provides a way to save data so that it can readily be updated as population, inventory, and other factors change and as mitigation planning efforts evolve.
- Facilitates the review of mitigation plans because it helps to ensure that FEMA methodologies are incorporated.
- Supports grant applications by calculating benefits using FEMA definitions and terminology.
- Produces hazard data and loss estimates that can be used in communication with local stakeholders.
- Is administered by the local government and can be used to manage and update a hazard mitigation plan throughout its implementation.

Levels of Detail for Evaluation

Hazus-MH provides default data for inventory, vulnerability and hazards; this default data can be supplemented with local data to provide a more refined analysis. The model can carry out three levels of analysis, depending on the format and level of detail of information about the planning area:

- **Level 1**—All of the information needed to produce an estimate of losses is included in the software's default data. This data is derived from national databases and describes in general terms the characteristic parameters of the planning area.
- **Level 2**—More accurate estimates of losses require more detailed information about the planning area. To produce Level 2 estimates of losses, detailed information is required about local geology, hydrology, hydraulics and building inventory, as well as data about utilities and critical facilities. This information is needed in a GIS format.
- **Level 3**—This level of analysis generates the most accurate estimate of losses. It requires detailed engineering and geotechnical information to customize it for the planning area.

Application for This Plan

The following hazards were evaluated using Hazus-MH:

- **Flood**—A Level 2, user-defined analysis was performed for general building stock in flood zones and for critical facilities and infrastructure. Preliminary planning area flood mapping was used to delineate flood hazard areas and estimate potential losses from the 10-, 100- and 500-year flood events. To estimate damage that would result from a flood, Hazus uses pre-defined relationships between flood depth at a structure and resulting damage, with damage given as a percent of total replacement value. Curves defining these relationships have been developed for damage to structures and for damage to typical contents within a structure. By inputting flood depth data and known property replacement cost values, dollar-value estimates of damage were generated.
- **Dam Failure**—A Level 2 analysis was run for Folsom Dam using the flood methodology described above.
- **Earthquake**—A Level 2 analysis was performed to assess earthquake exposure and vulnerability for two scenario events and one probabilistic event:
 - A Magnitude-6.8 event on the Concord-Green Valley Fault with an epicenter 56 miles southwest of Roseville
 - A Magnitude-7.1 event on the Great Valley Fault with an epicenter 58 miles west northwest of Roseville
 - The standard Hazus-MH 100-year probabilistic event.

5.3.2 Landslide, Severe Weather, and Wildfire

For most of the hazards of concern, historical data was not adequate to model future losses. However, areas and inventory susceptible to some of the hazards of concern were mapped, and exposure was evaluated. For other hazards, a qualitative analysis was conducted using the best available data and professional judgment.

5.3.3 Drought

The risk assessment methodologies used for the 2016 Plan focus on damage to structures. Because drought does not impact structures, the risk assessment for drought was more limited and qualitative than the assessment for the other hazards of concern.

5.3.4 Climate Change

Climate change was addressed to different standards than the above natural hazards for the following reasons:

- Specific data needed to assess risk, such as maps of extent and location and applied damage functions, are not readily available for climate change.
- Standardized climate change models based on greenhouse gas emissions do not currently exist, resulting in a high variation of scenarios that result in differing projections. Until a standardized model is identified, climate change assessment will remain subjective.

5.3.5 Health Hazards and Human-Caused Hazards

The non-natural hazards of concern were assessed to different standards than the natural hazards for the following reasons:

- The assessment of non-natural hazards is optional under federal hazard mitigation planning requirements (44 CFR Section 201.6).
- The data needed to assess risk, such as maps of extent and location and applied damage functions, are not readily available for these types of hazards.
- A key element of risk is the probability of occurrence. Probabilities are usually assigned based on past historical occurrences. While human-caused and human health hazards have had significant impacts on our nation as a whole, they have not impacted regions of the country uniformly as do natural hazard events. The lack of record of past occurrences within a planning area makes it difficult to assign probability of occurrence.

5.4 MAPPING

A review of national, state and county databases was performed to locate available spatially based data relevant to this planning effort. Maps were produced using GIS software to show the spatial extent and location of identified hazards when such data was available. These maps are included in the hazard profile chapters of this document. Information regarding the data sources and methodologies employed in these mapping efforts is provided in the sections below.

5.4.1 Building and Cost Data

Replacement cost values and detailed structure information derived from parcel and tax assessor data provided by the City of Roseville were loaded into Hazus-MH. When available, an updated inventory was used in place of the Hazus-MH defaults for critical facilities and infrastructure.

Replacement cost is the cost to replace the entire structure with one of equal quality and utility. Replacement cost is based on industry-standard cost-estimation models published in *RS Means Square Foot Costs* (RS Means, 2015). It is calculated using the RS Means square foot cost for a structure, which is based on the Hazus-MH occupancy class (e.g., multi-family residential, commercial retail trade), multiplied by the square footage of the structure from the tax assessor data. For single-family residential, the construction class and number of stories also factor into determining the square foot costs.

5.4.2 Hazus-MH Data Inputs

The following hazard data were used for the Hazus-MH Level 2 analysis conducted for the risk assessment:

- **Flood**—The preliminary Digital Flood Insurance Rate Map (DFIRM) for the planning area – dated December 28, 2015 – was used to delineate flood hazard areas and estimate potential losses from the

100-year, 500-year and 10-year flood events. Using the DFIRM floodplain boundaries and base flood elevation information, and the Central Valley Flood Delineation Project 3-foot digital elevation model data, flood depth grids were generated and integrated into the Hazus-MH model.

- **Dam Failure**—Inundation area data from the Folsom Dam Containment Dike Failure Risk Assessment Project, provided by the City of Roseville, and the 3-foot digital elevation model were used to develop depth grids that were integrated into the Hazus-MH model.
- **Earthquake**—Earthquake shake maps and probabilistic data prepared by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) were used for the analysis of this hazard. A National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program (NEHRP) soils map from the California Department of Conservation was also integrated into the Hazus-MH model.

5.4.3 Other Local Hazard Data

Locally relevant information on hazards was gathered from a variety of sources. Frequency and severity indicators include past events and the expert opinions of geologists, emergency management specialists and others. Data sources for specific hazards were as follows:

- **Landslide**—A dataset for landslide probability was created by intersecting slope data with NEHRP soils data. Three landslide probability classifications were created: high (greater than 30 percent slope, D soils), moderate (15 to 30 percent slope, D type soils), and low (0 to 15 percent slope, D type soils). The slope data were generated from the 3-foot digital elevation model. The NEHRP soils data were provided by the California Department of Conservation.
- **Severe Storm**—No GIS format severe storm area data were identified for the City of Roseville.
- **Wildfire**—California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) fire severity data was downloaded from the CAL FIRE website.

5.4.4 Data Source Summary

Table 5-1 summarizes the data sources used for the risk assessment for this project.

5.4.5 Limitations

Loss estimates, exposure assessments and hazard-specific vulnerability evaluations rely on the best available data and methodologies. Uncertainties are inherent in any loss estimation methodology and arise in part from incomplete scientific knowledge concerning hazards and their effects on the built environment. Uncertainties also result from the following:

- Approximations and simplifications necessary to conduct a study
- Incomplete or outdated inventory, demographic, or economic parameter data
- The unique nature, geographic extent and severity of each hazard
- Mitigation measures already employed
- The amount of advance notice residents have to prepare for a specific hazard event.

These factors can result in a range of uncertainty in loss estimates, possibly by a factor of two or more. Therefore, exposure and loss estimates are approximate. These results do not predict precise results and should be used only to understand relative risk. Over the long term, the City of Roseville will collect additional data to assist in estimating potential losses associated with other hazards.

Table 5-1. Hazus-MH Model Data Documentation

Data	Source	Date	Format
Property parcel data	City of Roseville	2016	Digital (GIS) format
Address points	City of Roseville	2016	Digital (GIS) format
Building footprints	City of Roseville	2016	Digital (GIS) format
Building information ^a	City of Roseville	2016	Digital (GIS) format
Building replacement cost	RS Means	2015	Printed. Updated RS Means values
Population data	Hazus-MH v2.2	2010	Digital (GIS and tabular) format
Flood hazard data	FEMA	2015	Digital (GIS) format
First floor elevation data	City of Roseville	2011	Digital (tabular) format
Earthquake shake maps	USGS Earthquake Hazards Program website	2012	Digital (GIS) format
NEHRP Soils	California Department of Conservation	2008	Digital (GIS) format
Dam inundation area	City of Roseville	2010	Digital (GIS) format
Landslide	Tetra Tech Inc.	2016	Digital (GIS) format
Wildfire	CAL FIRE	2008	Digital (GIS) format
Digital Elevation Model	City of Roseville	2015	Digital (GIS) format
CRITICAL FACILITIES AND ASSETS			
Landmarks ^b	City of Roseville	2015	Digital (GIS) format
State and local bridges	Caltrans	2015	Digital (GIS) format
Rail facilities	Caltrans	2015	Digital (GIS) format
Telecommunications facilities	City of Roseville	2015	Digital (GIS) format
Consolidated communications facilities	Consolidated Communications (from 2011 Hazard Mitigation Plan)	2011	Digital (GIS) format
Hazardous material facilities	U.S. EPA Toxic Release Inventory	2016	Digital (GIS) format
Potable water facilities	City of Roseville	2015	Digital (GIS) format
Sewer facilities	City of Roseville	2015	Digital (GIS) format

a. Building information includes area, occupancy, date of construction, and stories

b. Landmarks include fire stations, police stations, schools, medical care facilities, helipads, rail facilities, electric power facilities, potable water facilities, sewer facilities, and various government facilities

6. CLIMATE CHANGE CONSIDERATIONS FOR HAZARD MITIGATION

6.1 CALIFORNIA SENATE BILL NO. 379

California Senate Bill 379, adopted October 8, 2015, requires that local hazard mitigation plans adopted on or after January 1, 2017 include all of the following:

- A vulnerability assessment that identifies the risks that climate change poses to the local jurisdiction and the geographic areas at risk from climate change impacts, including but not limited to flood and fire hazards. Information available from federal, state, regional and local agencies should be used in the development of this assessment, including the following:
 - Information from the Internet-based Cal-Adapt tool
 - Information from the most recent version of the California Adaptation Planning Guide
 - Information from local agencies on the types of assets, resources, and populations that will be sensitive to various climate change exposures
 - Information from local agencies on their current ability to deal with the impacts of climate change
 - Historical data on natural events and hazards, including locally prepared maps of areas subject to previous risk, areas that are vulnerable, and sites that have been repeatedly damaged
 - Existing and planned development in identified at-risk areas, including structures, roads, utilities, and essential public facilities
 - Federal, state, regional, and local agencies with responsibility for the protection of public health and safety and the environment, including special districts and local offices of emergency services
- A set of adaptation and resilience goals, policies, and objectives based on the available information
- A set of feasible implementation measures designed to carry out the goals, policies, and objectives including, but not limited to, all of the following:
 - Feasible ways to avoid or minimize climate change impacts associated with new uses of land
 - Siting new essential public facilities outside of at-risk areas when feasible (including, but not limited to, hospitals and health care facilities, emergency shelters, emergency command centers, and emergency communications facilities) or, if these facilities are located in at-risk areas, using construction or other methods to minimize damage
 - The designation of adequate and feasible infrastructure in an at-risk area
 - Guidelines for working cooperatively with relevant local, regional, state, and federal agencies.
 - The identification of natural infrastructure that may be used in adaptation projects, where feasible. Where feasible, the plan shall use existing natural features and ecosystem processes or restore natural features and ecosystem processes, when developing alternatives for consideration.

At the time of the development of this hazard mitigation plan, guidelines and resources are still being developed to assist local governments in meeting the intent of Senate Bill No. 379. Information in this chapter addresses the issues presented and the intent of the requirements using the best currently available information. It focuses on the

vulnerability assessment of climate change as it relates to the natural hazards of concern selected by the steering committee. Goals, policies, objectives and implementation measures for climate change are incorporated into this Plan's overall mitigation goals, objectives, and actions presented in Part 3.

6.2 WHAT IS CLIMATE CHANGE?

Climate, consisting of patterns of temperature, precipitation, humidity, wind and seasons, plays a fundamental role in shaping natural ecosystems and the human economies and cultures that depend on them. "Climate change" refers to changes over a long period of time. Worldwide, average temperatures have increased 1.4°F since 1880 (NASA, 2015). Although this change may seem small, it can lead to large changes in climate and weather.

The warming trend and its related impacts are caused by increasing concentrations of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases in the earth's atmosphere. Greenhouse gases are gases that trap heat in the atmosphere, resulting in a warming effect. Carbon dioxide is the most commonly known greenhouse gas; however, methane, nitrous oxide and fluorinated gases also contribute to warming. Emissions of these gases come from a variety of sources, such as the combustion of fossil fuels, agricultural production, changes in land use and volcanic eruptions. According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), carbon dioxide concentrations measured about 280 parts per million (ppm) before the industrial era began in the late 1700s and have risen 43 percent since then, reaching 399 ppm in 2014 (see Figure 6-1). Scientists are able to place this rise in carbon dioxide in a longer historical context through the measurement of carbon dioxide in ice cores. According to these records, carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere are the highest that they have been in 800,000 years (NASA, 2016).




Figure 6-1. Global Carbon Dioxide Concentrations Over Time

According to NASA, most of this trend is very likely human-induced, and the rate of change has not been matched in the past 1,300 years (NASA, 2016). There is broad scientific consensus (97 percent of scientists) that climate-warming trends are very likely due to human activities (NASA, 2016). Unless emissions of greenhouse gases are substantially reduced, this warming trend and its associated impacts are expected to continue.

Climate change will affect the people, property, economy and ecosystems of the City of Roseville in a variety of ways. Climate change impacts are most frequently associated with negative consequences, such as increased flood vulnerability or increased heat-related illnesses and other public health concerns; however, other changes may present opportunities. The most important effect for the development of this Plan is that climate change will have a measurable impact on the occurrence and severity of natural hazards.

6.3 HOW CLIMATE CHANGE AFFECTS HAZARD MITIGATION

An essential aspect of hazard mitigation is predicting the likelihood of hazard events in a planning area. Typically, predictions are based on statistical projections from records of past events. This approach assumes that the likelihood of hazard events remains essentially unchanged over time. Thus, averages based on the past frequencies of, for example, floods are used to estimate future frequencies: if a river has flooded an average of once every 5 years for the past 100 years, then it can be expected to continue to flood an average of once every 5 years.

For hazards that are affected by climate conditions, the assumption that future behavior will be equivalent to past behavior is not valid if climate conditions are changing. As flooding is generally associated with precipitation frequency and quantity, for example, the frequency of flooding will not remain constant if broad precipitation patterns change over time. The risks of, landslide, severe storms, extreme heat and wildfire are all affected by climate patterns as well. For this reason, an understanding of climate change is pertinent to efforts to mitigate natural hazards. Information about how climate patterns are changing provides insight on the reliability of future hazard projections used in mitigation analysis. This chapter summarizes current understandings about climate change in order to provide a context for the recommendation and implementation of hazard mitigation measures.

6.4 CURRENT INDICATIONS OF CLIMATE CHANGE

The major scientific agencies of the United States and the world—including the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the Intergovernmental Panel of Climate Change (IPCC)—agree that climate change is occurring. Multiple temperature records from all over the world have shown a warming trend, and the IPCC has stated that the warming of the climate system is unequivocal (IPCC, 2014). Of the 10 warmest years in the 134-year record, all but one (1998) occurred since 2000, and 2015 was the warmest year on record (NASA, 2016).

Rising global temperatures have been accompanied by other changes in weather and climate. Many places have experienced changes in rainfall resulting in more intense rain, as well as more frequent and severe heat waves (IPCC, 2014). The planet's oceans and glaciers have also experienced changes: oceans are warming and becoming more acidic, ice caps are melting, and sea levels are rising (NASA, 2016). Global sea level has risen 6.7 inches, on average, in the last 100 years (NASA, 2016). This has already put some coastal homes, beaches, roads, bridges, and wildlife at risk (USGCRP, 2009).

NASA currently maintains information on the vital signs of the planet and has identified the following trends as of the time of the development of this Plan (NASA, 2016):

- Carbon Dioxide—Increasing trend, currently at 403.28 parts per million
- Global Temperature—Increasing trend, increase of 1.4°F since 1880
- Arctic Ice Minimum—Decreasing trend, 13.4 percent per decade

- Land Ice—Decreasing trend, 287.0 billion metric tons per year
- Sea Level—Increasing trend, 3.4 mm per year.

6.5 PROJECTED FUTURE IMPACTS

Climate change projections contain inherent uncertainty because they are dependent on future greenhouse gas emission scenarios. Different climate change models may assume different scenarios, resulting in differing projections. Generally, the uncertainty is addressed by developing projections for a range of scenarios: in low-emissions scenarios, greenhouse gas emissions are assumed to be reduced substantially from current levels; in high-emissions scenarios, they are assumed to increase or continue at current levels. Despite these uncertainties, climate change projections present valuable information to help guide decision-making for the future.

The Third National Climate Assessment Report for the United States indicates that impacts resulting from climate change will continue through the 21st century and beyond. Although not all changes are understood at this time and the impacts of those changes will depend on global emissions of greenhouse gases and sensitivity in human and natural systems, the following impacts are expected in the United States (NASA, 2016):

- Temperatures will continue to rise
- Growing seasons will lengthen
- Precipitation patterns will change
- Droughts and heat waves will increase
- Hurricanes will become stronger and more intense
- Sea level will rise 1 to 4 feet by 2100
- The Arctic may become ice free.

The California Climate Adaptation Planning Guide outlines the following climate change impact concerns for the North Sierra Region communities (Cal EMA et al., 2012):

- Increased temperature
- Decreased precipitation
- Reduced snowpack
- Reduced tourism
- Ecosystem change
- Sensitive species stress
- Increased wildfire.

Cal-Adapt, a publicly available resource, offers information on how climate change might impact local communities. It presents visualization tools that present the most current data available whenever possible. The following sections summarize projections by Cal-Adapt for the Roseville area's local climate.

6.5.1 Precipitation

According to Cal-Adapt, precipitation projections for California remain uncertain. Models show differing impacts from slightly wetter winters to slightly drier winters, with potential for a 10- to 20-percent decrease in total annual precipitation (Cal-Adapt, 2016). Changes in precipitation patterns, coupled with warmer temperatures, may lead to significant changes in hydrology. In high-emissions scenarios, more precipitation may fall as rain rather than snow, and snow may melt earlier in the season, impacting the timing of stream flow changes and floods (Cal-Adapt, 2016).

6.5.2 Temperature

The historical average (1961-1990) temperature in the Roseville area is 61.7°F. By 2090, the average temperature in the City is expected to increase above this baseline in the low- and high-emissions scenarios by 3.8°F and 6.5°F, respectively, as shown in Figure 6-2.




Figure 6-2. Observed and Projected Average Temperatures in the Roseville Area

6.5.3 Snow Pack

While there are no snow-water equivalency measurements for the Roseville area, Cal-Adapt indicates that some parts of California should expect snow pack levels to be reduced by up to 25 inches from the baseline (1961-1990) by 2090.

6.5.4 Wildfire

Wildfire risk is expected to change in the coming decades. Under the high-emissions scenario, the fire risk in Placer County may increase by 1.86 times the current risk by 2085, while the risk may be 1.31 times the current risk for the low-emissions scenario (see Figure 6-3).




Figure 6-3. Projected Future Fire Risk in Placer County Relative to 2010 Levels

6.6 RESPONSES TO CLIMATE CHANGE

Communities and governments worldwide are working to address, evaluate and prepare for climate changes that are likely to impact communities in coming decades. Societies across the world are facing the need to adapt to changing conditions associated with natural disasters and climate change. Farmers are altering crops and agricultural methods to deal with changing rainfall and rising temperature; architects and engineers are redesigning buildings; planners are looking at managing water supplies to deal with droughts or flooding.

6.6.1 Mitigation and Adaptation

Generally, climate change discussions encompass two separate but inter-related considerations: mitigation and adaptation. The term “mitigation” can be confusing, because it’s meaning changes across disciplines:

- Mitigation in climate change discussions is defined as “a human intervention to reduce the impact on the climate system.” It includes strategies to reduce greenhouse gas sources and emissions and enhance greenhouse gas sinks (EPA, 2013).
- Mitigation in emergency management is typically defined as the effort to reduce loss of life and property by lessening the impact of disasters (FEMA, 2016a).
- Mitigation in restoration ecology and related fields generally refers to policies, programs or actions that are intended to reduce or to offset the negative impacts of human activities on natural systems. Generally, mitigation can be understood as avoiding, minimizing, rectifying, reducing or eliminating, or compensating for known impacts (U.S. DOT, n.d.).

In this chapter, mitigation is used as defined by the climate change community. In the other chapters of this Plan, mitigation is primarily used in an emergency management context.

Adaptation is defined by the IPCC as adjusting to actual or expected climate and its effects. It includes efforts to moderate or avoid harm to human systems or take advantage of beneficial opportunities. It also includes human intervention to help natural systems adjust to expected climate change (IPCC, 2014).

Mitigation and adaptation are related, as the world’s ability to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions will affect the degree of adaptation that will be necessary. Some initiatives and actions can both reduce greenhouse gas emissions and support adaptation to likely future conditions.

6.6.2 Ecosystem-Based Adaptation

Ecosystem-based adaptation is the use of biodiversity and ecosystem services as part of an overall strategy to help people adapt to the adverse effects of climate change. This includes the sustainable management, conservation and restoration of specific ecosystems that provide key services. Most ecosystems show a remarkable ability to adapt to change and to buffer surrounding areas from the impacts of change. Forests can bind soils and hold large volumes of water during times of plenty, releasing it through the year; floodplains can absorb vast volumes of water during peak flows; coastal ecosystems can hold out against storms, attenuating waves and reducing erosion. Other ecosystem services—such as food provision, timber, materials, medicines and recreation—can provide a buffer to societies in the face of changing conditions.

6.6.3 City of Roseville Sustainability Efforts

The City of Roseville has taken steps to reduce the impacts of climate change through greenhouse gas mitigation and community sustainability efforts:

- The City of Roseville’s general plan highlights existing policies and programs that either reduce greenhouse gas emissions or assist in protecting residents from the potential adverse impacts of climate change (City of Roseville, 2016).
- In 2009, the City Council adopted the City-operations Climate Action Plan, which set a greenhouse gas emission reduction goal of 22.8 percent (City of Roseville, n.d.).
- In 2010 the Community-wide Sustainability Action Plan was developed, recommending 11 steps to reach the greenhouse gas emission targets. (City of Roseville, 2010a).

6.7 CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS ON HAZARDS

The following sections provide information on how each identified hazard of concern for this planning process may be impacted by climate change. They describe how these impacts may alter current exposure and vulnerability to these hazards of the people, property, critical facilities and environment in the City of Roseville. Detailed hazard profiles and risk assessment information on each hazard of concern are presented in Chapters 7 through 15.

6.7.1 Drought

Impacts on Hazard

The long-term effects of climate change on regional water resources are unknown, but global water resources are already experiencing the following stresses without climate change:

- Growing populations
- Increased competition for available water
- Poor water quality
- Environmental claims
- Uncertain reserved water rights
- Groundwater overdraft
- Aging urban water infrastructure.

With a warmer climate, droughts could become more frequent, more severe, and longer-lasting. According to the National Climate Assessment Report, higher surface temperatures caused by global warming increase the potential for drought. Evaporation and the higher rate at which plants lose moisture through their leaves both increase with temperature. Unless higher evapotranspiration rates are matched by increases in precipitation, areas become more dry, promoting drought conditions (Globalchange.gov, 2014).

Because expected changes in precipitation patterns are still uncertain, the potential impacts and likelihood of drought are uncertain. California DWR has already noted the impact of climate change on statewide water resources by charting changes in snowpack, sea level, and river flow. As temperatures rise and more precipitation comes in the form of rain instead of snow, these changes will likely continue or grow even more significant. DWR estimates that the Sierra Nevada snowpack, which supplies water for the City of Roseville and other parts of the state, will experience a 48- to 65-percent loss by the end of the century, based on historical April 1 averages (CA DWR 2016). Increasing temperatures may also increase net evaporation from reservoirs by 15 to 37 percent (CA DWR 2013).

Population

Population exposure and vulnerability to drought are unlikely to increase as a result of climate change. While greater numbers of people may need to engage in behavior change, such as water saving efforts, significant life or health impacts are unlikely.

Property

Property exposure and vulnerability may increase as a result of increased drought resulting from climate change, although this would most likely occur in non-structural property such as landscaping. It is unlikely that structure exposure or vulnerability would increase as a direct result of drought, although secondary impacts of drought, such as wildfire, may increase and threaten structures.

Critical Facilities

Critical facility exposure and vulnerability are unlikely to increase as a result of increased drought resulting from climate change; however, critical facility operators may need to alter standard management practices and actively manage resources, particularly in water-related service sectors.

Environment

The vulnerability of the environment may increase as a result of increased drought resulting from climate change. Ecosystems and biodiversity in the Roseville area are already under stress from development and water diversion. Prolonged or more frequent drought resulting from climate change may further stress the ecosystems in the region, which include many special status species (Cal EMA et al., 2012).

6.7.2 Earthquake

Impacts on Hazard

The impacts of global climate change on earthquake probability are unknown. Some scientists say that melting glaciers could induce tectonic activity. As ice melts and water runs off, tremendous amounts of weight are shifted on the earth's crust. As newly freed crust returns to its original, pre-glacier shape, it could cause seismic plates to slip and stimulate volcanic activity, according to research into prehistoric earthquakes and volcanic activity. NASA and USGS scientists found that retreating glaciers in southern Alaska may be opening the way for future earthquakes (NASA, 2004).

Secondary impacts of earthquakes could be magnified by climate change. Soils saturated by repetitive storms or heavy precipitation could experience liquefaction or an increased propensity for slides during seismic activity due to the increased saturation. Dams storing increased volumes of water due to changes in the hydrograph could fail during seismic events.

Population, Property, Critical Facilities and the Environment

Because impacts of climate change on the earthquake hazard are not well understood, increases in exposure and vulnerability of the local resources are not able to be determined.

6.7.3 Flood

Impacts on Hazard

Use of historical hydrologic data has long been the standard of practice for designing and operating water supply and flood protection projects. For example, historical data are used for flood forecasting models and to forecast snowmelt runoff for water supply. This method of forecasting assumes that the climate of the future will be similar to that of the period of historical record. However, the hydrologic record cannot be used to predict changes in frequency and severity of extreme climate events such as floods. Going forward, model calibration or statistical relation development must happen more frequently, new forecast-based tools must be developed, and a standard of practice that explicitly considers climate change must be adopted. Climate change is already impacting water resources, and resource managers have observed the following:

- Historical hydrologic patterns can no longer be solely relied upon to forecast the water future.
- Precipitation and runoff patterns are changing, increasing the uncertainty for water supply and quality, flood management and ecosystem functions.
- Extreme climatic events will become more frequent, necessitating improvement in flood protection, drought preparedness and emergency response.

The amount of snow is critical for water supply and environmental needs, but so is the timing of snowmelt runoff into rivers and streams. Rising snowlines caused by climate change will allow more mountain areas, such as the Sierra Nevada watersheds, to contribute to peak storm runoff. High frequency flood events (e.g. 10-year floods) in particular will likely increase with a changing climate. Along with reductions in the amount of the snowpack and accelerated snowmelt, scientists project greater storm intensity, resulting in more direct runoff and flooding. Changes in watershed vegetation and soil moisture conditions will likewise change runoff and recharge patterns. As stream flows and velocities change, erosion patterns will also change, altering channel shapes and depths, possibly increasing sedimentation behind dams, and affecting habitat and water quality. With potential increases in the frequency and intensity of wildfires due to climate change, there is potential for more floods following fire, which increase sediment loads and water quality impacts.

As hydrology changes, what is currently considered a 1-percent-annual-chance (100-year) flood may strike more often, leaving many communities at greater risk. Planners will need to factor a new level of safety into the design, operation, and regulation of flood protection facilities such as dams, bypass channels and levees, as well as the design of local sewers and storm drains.

Population and Property

Population and property exposure and vulnerability may increase as a result of climate change impacts on the flood hazard. Runoff patterns may change, resulting in flooding in areas where it has not previously occurred.

Critical Facilities

Critical facility exposure and vulnerability may increase as a result of climate change impacts on the flood hazard. Runoff patterns may change, resulting in risk to facilities that have not historically been at risk from flooding. Additionally, changes in the management and design of flood protection critical facilities may be needed as additional stress is placed on these systems.

Environment

The exposure and vulnerability of the environment may increase as a result of climate change impacts on the flood hazard. Changes in the timing and frequency of flood events may have broader ecosystem impacts that alter the ability of already stressed species to survive.

6.7.4 Landslide

Impacts on Hazard

Climate change may impact storm patterns, increasing the probability of more frequent, intense storms with varying duration. Increase in global temperature is likely to affect the snowpack and its ability to hold and store water. Warming temperatures also could increase the occurrence and duration of droughts, which would increase the probability of wildfire, reducing the vegetation that helps to support steep slopes. All of these factors would increase the probability for landslide occurrences.

Population and Property

Population and property exposure and vulnerability would be unlikely to increase as a result of climate change impacts on the landslide hazard. Landslide events may occur more frequently, but the extent and location should be contained within mapped hazard areas.

Critical Facilities

Critical facility exposure and vulnerability would be unlikely to increase as a result of climate change impacts on the landslide hazard; however, critical facility owners and operators may experience more frequent disruption to service provision as a result of landslide hazards. For example, transportation systems may experience more frequent delays if slides blocking these systems occur more frequently.

Environment

Exposure and vulnerability of the environment would be unlikely to increase as a result of climate change, but more frequent slides in riverine systems may impact water quality and have negative impacts on already stressed species.

6.7.5 Severe Weather

Impacts on Hazard

Climate change presents a challenge for risk management associated with severe weather. The frequency of severe weather events has increased steadily over the last century. The number of weather-related disasters during the 1990s was four times that of the 1950s, and cost 14 times as much in economic losses. Historical data shows that the probability of severe weather events increases in a warmer climate.

An increase in average surface temperatures can also lead to more intense heat waves that can be exacerbated in urbanized areas by what is known as urban heat island effect. Evidence suggests that heat waves are already increasing, especially in western states. According to information on Cal-Adapt, extreme heat days in Roseville (103°F is the extreme heat day threshold) are likely to increase from a historical average for four days annually. This increase would be coupled with an increase in heat waves and warm nights (67°F threshold).

Population and Property

For the most part, population and property exposure and vulnerability would be unlikely to substantially increase as a direct result of climate change impacts on the severe weather hazard. Severe weather events may occur more frequently. Disproportionately impacted populations such as the elderly or disadvantaged communities that have substandard living arrangements (homeless populations, etc.) would have a potential for increased exposure and vulnerability from severe weather. Secondary impacts, such as the extent of localized flooding, may increase, thus impacting greater numbers of people and structures.

Critical Facilities

Critical facility exposure and vulnerability would be unlikely to increase as a result of climate change impacts on the severe weather hazard; however, critical facility owners and operators may experience more frequent disruption to service provision. For example, more frequent and intense storms may cause more frequent disruptions in power service.

Environment

Exposure and vulnerability of the environment would be unlikely to increase as a result of climate change impacts on the severe weather hazard; however, more frequent storms and heat events and more intense rainfall may place additional stressors on already stressed systems.

6.7.6 Wildfire**Impacts on Hazard**

Wildfire is determined by climate variability, local topography, and human intervention. Climate change has the potential to affect multiple elements of the wildfire system: fire behavior, ignitions, fire management, and vegetation fuels. Hot dry spells create the highest fire risk. Increased temperatures may intensify wildfire danger by warming and drying out vegetation. Additionally, changes in climate patterns may impact the distribution and perseverance of insect outbreaks that create dead trees (increase fuel). When climate alters fuel loads and fuel moisture, forest susceptibility to wildfires changes. Climate change also may increase winds that spread fires. Faster fires are harder to contain, and thus are more likely to expand into residential neighborhoods.

Population, Property and Critical Facilities

According to the Cal-Adapt projections, wildfire risk in the areas surrounding the City of Roseville is expected to increase by 2085. Larger, more frequent fires may impact people, property and critical facilities by increasing the risk of ignition from nearby fire sources. Additionally, secondary impacts such as air quality issues may increase.

Environment

It is possible that the exposure and vulnerability of the environment will be impacted by impacts on wildfire risk from climate change. Natural fire regimes may change, resulting in more frequent or higher intensity burns. These impacts may alter the composition of the ecosystems in areas in and around Roseville.

7. DAM FAILURE

7.1 GENERAL BACKGROUND

7.1.1 Causes of Dam Failure

Dam failures can be catastrophic to human life and property downstream. Dam failures in the United States typically occur in one of four primary ways:

- Overtopping of the primary dam structure, which accounts for 34 percent of all dam failures, can occur due to inadequate spillway design, settlement of the dam crest, blockage of spillways, and other factors.
- Foundation defects due to differential settlement, slides, slope instability, uplift pressures, and foundation seepage can also cause dam failure. These account for 30 percent of all dam failures.
- Failure due to piping and seepage accounts for 20 percent of all failures. These are caused by internal erosion due to piping and seepage, erosion along hydraulic structures such as spillways, erosion due to animal burrows, and cracks in the dam structure.
- Failure due to problems with conduits and valves, typically caused by the piping of embankment material into conduits through joints or cracks, constitutes 10 percent of all failures.

The remaining 6 percent are due to other miscellaneous causes. Many of the historical dam failures in the United States have been secondary results of other disasters. The prominent causes are earthquakes, landslides, extreme storms, massive snowmelt, equipment malfunction, structural damage and foundation failures.

The most likely disaster-related causes of dam failure in Placer County and the Roseville vicinity are earthquakes, excessive rainfall, and landslides. Poor construction, lack of maintenance and repair, and deficient operational procedures are preventable or correctable by a program of regular inspections. Terrorism and vandalism are serious concerns that all operators of public facilities must plan for; these threats are under continuous review by public safety agencies.

DEFINITIONS

Dam—Any artificial barrier, together with appurtenant works, that does or may impound or divert water, and that either (a) is 25 feet or more in height from the natural bed of the stream or watercourse at the downstream toe of the barrier (or from the lowest elevation of the outside limit of the barrier if it is not across a stream channel or watercourse) to the maximum possible water storage elevation; or (b) has an impounding capacity of 50 acre-feet or more. (CA Water Code, Division 3.)

Dam Failure—An uncontrolled release of impounded water due to structural deficiencies in dam.

Emergency Action Plan—A formal document that identifies potential emergency conditions at a dam and specifies actions to be followed to minimize property damage and loss of life. The plan specifies actions the dam owner should take to alleviate problems at a dam. It contains procedures and information to assist the dam owner in issuing early warning and notification messages to responsible downstream emergency management authorities of the emergency situation. It also contains inundation maps to show emergency management authorities the critical areas for action in case of an emergency. (FEMA 2013)

High Hazard Dam—Dams where failure or improper operation will probably cause loss of human life. (FEMA 2004)

Significant Hazard Dam—Dams where failure or improper operation will result in no probable loss of human life but can cause economic loss, environmental damage or disruption of lifeline facilities, or can impact other concerns. Significant hazard dams are often located in rural or agricultural areas but could be located in areas with population and significant infrastructure. (FEMA 2004)

7.1.2 Regulatory Oversight

The potential for catastrophic flooding due to dam failures led to passage of the National Dam Safety Act (Public Law 92-367). The National Dam Safety Program requires a periodic engineering analysis of every major dam in the country. The goal of this FEMA-monitored effort is to identify and mitigate the risk of dam failure so as to protect the lives and property of the public.

National Dam Safety Act

The potential for catastrophic flooding due to dam failures led to passage of the National Dam Safety Act (Public Law 92-367). The National Dam Safety Program requires a periodic engineering analysis of every major dam in the country. The goal of this FEMA-monitored effort is to identify and mitigate the risk of dam failure so as to protect the lives and property of the public. The National Dam Safety Program is a partnership between the states, federal agencies, and other stakeholders that encourages individual and community responsibility for dam safety. Under FEMA's leadership, state assistance funds have allowed all participating states to improve their programs through increased inspections, emergency action planning, and the purchase of needed equipment. FEMA has also expanded existing training programs and initiated new ones. Grant assistance from FEMA provides support for improvement of dam safety programs that regulate most of the dams in the United States (FEMA 2015).

California Division of Safety of Dams

California's Division of Safety of Dams (a division of the Department of Water Resources) monitors dam safety at the state level. When a new dam is proposed, Division engineers and geologists inspect the site and the subsurface. Upon submittal of an application, the Division reviews the plans and specifications prepared by the owner to ensure that the dam is designed to meet minimum requirements and that the design is appropriate for the known geologic conditions. After approval of the application, the Division inspects all aspects of the construction to ensure that the work is done in accordance with the approved plans and specifications. After construction, the Division inspects each dam on an annual basis to ensure that it is performing as intended and is not developing problems. Roughly a third of these inspections include in-depth instrumentation reviews. The Division periodically reviews the stability of dams and their major appurtenances in light of improved design approaches and requirements, as well as new findings regarding earthquake hazards and hydrologic estimates in California (CA DWR, 2016a).

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Dam Safety Program

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is responsible for safety inspections of some federal and non-federal dams in the United States that meet the size and storage limitations specified in the National Dam Safety Act. The Corps has inventoried dams; surveyed each state and federal agency's capabilities, practices and regulations regarding design, construction, operation and maintenance of the dams; and developed guidelines for inspection and evaluation of dam safety (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2011).

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Dam Safety Program

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) has the largest dam safety program in the United States. The FERC cooperates with a large number of federal and state agencies to ensure and promote dam safety and, more recently, homeland security. Approximately 3,000 dams that are part of regulated hydroelectric projects are in the FERC program. Two-thirds of these dams are more than 50 years old. As dams age, concern about their safety and integrity grows, and oversight and a regular inspection program are extremely important. FERC staff inspects hydroelectric projects on an unscheduled basis to investigate the following:

- Potential dam safety problems
- Complaints about constructing and operating a project

- Safety concerns related to natural disasters
- Issues concerning compliance with the terms and conditions of a license.

Every five years, an independent consulting engineer, approved by the FERC, must inspect and evaluate projects with dams higher than 32.8 feet, or with a total storage capacity of more than 2,000 acre-feet.

FERC staff monitors and evaluates seismic research in geographic areas such as California where there are concerns about possible seismic activity. This information is applied in investigating and performing structural analyses of hydroelectric projects in these areas. FERC staff also evaluates the effects of potential and actual large floods on the safety of dams. During and following floods, FERC staff visits dams and licensed projects, determines the extent of damage, if any, and directs any necessary studies or remedial measures the licensee must undertake. The FERC publication *Engineering Guidelines for the Evaluation of Hydropower Projects* guides the FERC engineering staff and licensees in evaluating dam safety. The publication is frequently revised to reflect current information and methodologies.

The FERC requires licensees to prepare emergency action plans and conducts training sessions on how to develop and test these plans. The plans outline an early warning system if there is an actual or potential sudden release of water from a dam due to failure or accident. The plans include operational procedures that may be used, such as reducing reservoir levels and reducing downstream flows, as well as procedures for notifying affected residents and agencies responsible for emergency management. These plans are frequently updated and tested to ensure that everyone knows what to do in emergency situations.

7.2 HAZARD PROFILE

7.2.1 Past Events

According to the Placer County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan, there have been five dam failures in Placer County (none are known to have impacted the Roseville planning area):

- **Hell Hole Dam Failure**—In 1964, construction of the Hell Hole Dam was underway and the contractor had stopped operations for the winter. A major storm event in December caused the Hell Hole Reservoir to fill, and since the dam was not completed, it failed, sending a considerable amount of water toward Auburn. The water washed out a bridge on Highway 49 over the American River at the confluence of the North and Middle Forks and flooded a quarry. Due to the way the construction contract was worded, the contractor had to rebuild the dam at his own expense. As a result, Placer County incurred no costs related to this event. No claims for damage were filed against the Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) by either the quarry owner or the state.
- **1986 Auburn Coffey Dam Failure**—As a result of area flooding, the Coffey Dam at Auburn breached and partially washed away. The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation had designed the Coffey Dam for a controlled failure by building a soft earthen plug into the dam for this purpose. It appears the dam failed as designed.
- **August 2004 Ralston Dam Release Gate Break**—A broken release gate on Ralston Dam in the Middle Fork of the American River prompted the National Weather Service to issue a flash flood warning in Placer County. According to the PCWA, the gate near the Ralston Powerhouse malfunctioned, and the sudden release of water from Ralston Reservoir south of Auburn sent a wall of water 3 to 4 feet high down the river. The volume of water released was 800 to 1,000 acre-feet. Sheriff's deputies and California Highway Patrol officers alerted campers in the Auburn State Recreation Area to move to higher ground. The CHP monitored the muddy water as it approached Highway 49. There were no reports of injuries or damage along the river, which is popular with rafters, kayakers and residents during summer.

- **August 2009 Cottonwood Dam**—A privately owned and constructed dam on Miners Ravine in the Hidden Valley Estates subdivision (the Auburn Folsom Road and Twin Rocks Road area of Granite Bay), failed and leached flows and sediment into Miners Ravine. NOAA Fisheries quickly became involved because of the impacts on critical fish species. A temporary fix—a notch in the concrete portion of the dam—was approved and made while the homeowners association and interested agencies determined next steps. A dam removal project with creek restoration is now being proposed.
- **January 2016 Folsom Dam**—Seepage occurred at the Folsom cofferdam during final construction of the new Folsom Dam Auxiliary Spillway on January 20, 2016. The seepage was in the spillway basin. At no time was there a threat of a dam failure.

7.2.2 Location

According to the California Division of Safety of Dams, as of 2014 there are 45 dams in Placer County. Of these, the western levees along Folsom Lake, which is a reservoir lined by a series of containment dikes, have the potential to significantly impact the City of Roseville in the event of a failure. Another dam, the Miners Ravine Detention Facility located near Roseville’s eastern boundary, has the potential to adversely impact Roseville should it fail. Table 7-1 provides summary information about these two facilities.

Table 7-1. Dams in Placer and Sacramento Counties With Potential to impact Roseville

Name	Hazard Class ^a	Water Course	Owner	Year Built	Dam Type	Crest Length (feet)	Height (feet)	Storage Capacity (acre-feet)	Drainage area (sq. mi.)
Folsom	1A	American River	US Bureau of Reclamation	1956	Gravity	102,000	275	975,000	1,885
Miners Ravine Detention Facility	1B	Dry Creek	Placer County Flood & Water Conservation District	2007	Earthen	2000	22.5	120	14

a. Downstream Hazard Class 1A: > 300 lives at risk, 1B: 31 to 300 lives at risk, 1C: 7 to 30 lives at risk

7.2.3 Frequency

Dam failure events are infrequent and usually coincide with the events that cause them, such as earthquakes, landslides and excessive rainfall and snowmelt. There is a “residual risk” associated with dams; residual risk is the risk that remains after safeguards have been implemented. For dams, the residual risk is associated with events beyond those that the facility was designed to withstand. However, the probability of occurrence of any type of dam failure event is considered to be low in today’s regulatory and dam safety oversight environment.

7.2.4 Severity

Dam failure can be catastrophic to all life and property downstream. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed the classification system shown in Table 7-2 for the hazard potential of dam failures.

7.2.5 Warning Time

Warning time for dam failure varies depending on the cause of the failure. In events of extreme precipitation or massive snowmelt, evacuations can be planned with sufficient time. In the event of a structural failure due to earthquake, it is possible that there would be no warning time.

Table 7-2. Hazard Potential Classification

Hazard Category ^a	Direct Loss of Life ^b	Lifeline Losses ^c	Property Losses ^d	Environmental Losses ^e
Low	None (rural location, no permanent structures for human habitation)	No disruption of services (cosmetic or rapidly repairable damage)	Private agricultural lands, equipment, and isolated buildings	Minimal incremental damage
Significant	Rural location, only transient or day-use facilities	Disruption of essential facilities and access	Major public and private facilities	Major mitigation required
High	Certain (one or more) extensive residential, commercial, or industrial development	Disruption of essential facilities and access	Extensive public and private facilities	Extensive mitigation cost or impossible to mitigate

- Categories are assigned to overall projects, not individual structures at a project.
- Loss of life potential based on inundation mapping of area downstream of the project. Analyses of loss of life potential should take into account the population at risk, time of flood wave travel, and warning time.
- Indirect threats to life caused by the interruption of lifeline services due to project failure or operational disruption; for example, loss of critical medical facilities or access to them.
- Damage to project facilities and downstream property and indirect impact due to loss of project services, such as impact due to loss of a dam and navigation pool, or impact due to loss of water or power supply.
- Environmental impact downstream caused by the incremental flood wave produced by the project failure, beyond what would normally be expected for the magnitude flood event under which the failure occurs.

Source: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1995

A dam's structural type also affects warning time. Earthen dams do not tend to fail completely or instantaneously. Once a breach is initiated, discharging water erodes the breach until either the reservoir water is depleted or the breach resists further erosion. Concrete gravity dams also tend to have a partial breach as one or more monolith sections formed during dam construction are forced apart by the escaping water. The time for breach formation ranges from a few minutes to a few hours (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2011).

The City has established protocols for flood warning and response to imminent dam failure in the flood warning portion of its adopted emergency operations plan.

7.2.6 Folsom Dam Containment Dike Failure Risk Assessment

During the 2005 review of the initial Roseville Hazard Mitigation Plan, FEMA Region IX plan reviewers indicated that there was sufficient risk of dam failure of the western dikes on Folsom Lake (see Figure 7-1) to warrant treating dam failure as a stand-alone hazard in the City's next hazard mitigation plan update. Six dikes, increasing in size and numeric designation (from 1 to 6) from north to south, fill gaps along the western edge of Folsom Lake.

Because there was insufficient data to assess risk to the standards established for the other hazards in the hazard mitigation plan, the City developed a comprehensive, scenario-based risk assessment of the western dikes on the Folsom Dam complex during the 2011 Plan update. Detailed inundation modeling and mapping performed as part of this assessment are available to inform the City's preparedness and response to a dam breach of the Folsom Lake containment dike system. The maps are not presented in this Plan for security purposes. Figure 7-2 shows mapping that has been created by the City to inform citizens of the direction of flow and possible routes for evacuation during a dam failure event.

Source: United States Army Corps of Engineers, Michael Nevins [Public domain], via Wikimedia Commons



Figure 7-1. Folsom Dam and Folsom Lake on the American River, Looking Northeast

The study provided inundation mapping to determine the probable impact of flooding in Roseville if any of the western dikes were to fail. It addressed the relative risk of failure of each dike based on the frequency with which the dikes impound water, the potential for overtopping, the recent and in-progress work to upgrade the dikes to reduce the risk of failure due to piping, and a new reservoir spillway that is under construction. Models were prepared to simulate dike failures and resulting inundation. These simulations provide the basis for inundation area mapping and other emergency management tools such as maps that illustrate the time from failure to flooding.

The northernmost dikes are relatively low height embankments above the normal operating range of the lake. Though the occurrence of inundation due to dam failure is based on extremely remote conditions, failure of these facilities has the potential to cause significant property damage and loss of life in the City. The degree of impact would be affected by the water level of the lake at the time of failure, which could be just above the top of the dikes in the case of failure by overtopping. The study mapped the maximum depth of flooding and the timing of the flood wave from the time of failure for various scenarios. The study found that flood depths could reach as much as 58 feet in parts of the City.

7.3 SECONDARY HAZARDS

Dam failure can cause severe downstream flooding depending on the magnitude of the failure. Other potential secondary hazards of dam failure include landslides around the reservoir perimeter, bank erosion on the rivers, and destruction of downstream habitat.




Figure 7-2. Folsom Dam Containment Dike Failure Flow Direction and Evacuation Routes

7.4 EXPOSURE

The flood module of HAZUS-MH was used for a Level 2 assessment of dam failure risk exposure and vulnerability for facilities in Roseville with sufficient data to support modeling. HAZUS-MH uses census data at the block level and FEMA floodplain data, which has a level of accuracy acceptable for planning purposes. Where possible, the HAZUS-MH data for this risk assessment was enhanced using GIS data from county, state and federal sources. The exposure and vulnerability analyses focused on inundation data from the Folsom Dam Containment Dike Failure Risk Assessment.

7.4.1 Population

All populations located in a dam failure inundation zone would be exposed to the risk of a dam failure. The estimated population living in the Folsom Dam failure inundation area is 55,858, or 43.4 percent of the City's population.

7.4.2 Property

The HAZUS-MH model estimated that there are 20,303 structures within the Folsom Dam failure inundation areas. It is estimated that 18,746 or 92 percent, of these structures are residential. The value of exposed buildings in the planning area was generated using HAZUS-MH and is summarized in Table 7-3. This methodology estimated \$11 billion worth of building-and-contents exposure to Folsom Dam failure inundation, representing 37.1 percent of the total assessed value of the planning area.

Table 7-3. Value of Property Exposed to Dam Failure

Type	Number of Buildings Exposed	Value Exposed			% of Total Assessed Value
		Building	Contents	Total	
Residential	18,746	\$4,877,113,351	\$2,438,892,264	\$7,316,005,614	39.13%
Commercial	1,017	\$1,197,859,838	\$1,253,661,717	\$2,451,521,555	29.63%
Industrial	260	\$210,792,151	\$239,393,311	\$450,185,463	38.79%
Religion	53	\$86,626,396	\$86,626,396	\$173,252,792	69.13%
Government	18	\$19,135,549	\$19,135,549	\$38,271,098	22.66%
Education	209	\$284,707,447	\$284,707,447	\$569,414,895	52.17%
Total	20,303	\$6,676,234,732	\$4,322,416,685	\$10,998,651,417	37.11%

7.4.3 Critical Facilities

GIS analysis was used to determine the number of critical facilities in the mapped dam failure inundation areas. As Table 7-4 shows, 96 of the planning area's critical facilities (55.8 percent) are in the inundation areas.

Table 7-4. Critical Facilities in Dam Failure Inundation Areas in Roseville

Medical & Health Services	Government Function	Protective Function	Schools	Hazmat	Other Critical Function	Total
0	17	8	25	0	46	96

7.4.4 Environment

Reservoirs held behind dams affect many ecological aspects of a river. River topography and dynamics depend on a wide range of flows, but rivers below dams often experience long periods of very stable flow conditions or saw-

tooth flow patterns caused by releases followed by no releases. Water releases from a reservoir, including those exiting a turbine, usually contain very little suspended sediment; this can lead to scouring of river beds and loss of riverbanks.

The environment would be exposed to a number of risks in the event of dam failure. The inundation could introduce many foreign elements into local waterways. This could result in destruction of downstream habitat and could have detrimental effects on many species of animals, especially endangered species such as salmon.

7.5 VULNERABILITY

7.5.1 Population

Vulnerable populations are all populations downstream from dam failures that are incapable of escaping the area within the allowable time frame. This population includes the elderly and young who may be unable to get themselves out of the inundation area. The vulnerable population also includes those who would not have adequate warning from a television or radio emergency warning system. The potential for loss of life is affected by the capacity and number of evacuation routes available to populations living in areas of potential inundation.

7.5.2 Property

Vulnerable properties are those closest to the dam failure inundation area. These properties would experience the largest, most destructive surge of water. Low-lying areas are also vulnerable since they are where the dam waters would collect. Transportation routes are vulnerable to dam failure inundation and have the potential to be wiped out, creating isolation issues. This includes all roads, railroads and bridges in the path of the dam failure inundation. Those that are most vulnerable are those that are already in poor condition and would not be able to withstand a large water surge. Utilities such as overhead power lines, cable and phone lines could also be vulnerable. Loss of these utilities could create additional isolation issues for the inundation areas.

It is estimated that there could be up to \$4.46 billion of loss from a dam failure affecting the planning area. This represents 40.5 percent of the total exposure within the inundation area, or 15.0 percent of the total assessed value of the planning area. Table 7-5 summarizes the loss estimates for dam failure.

Table 7-5. Loss Estimates for Dam Failure

	Value Exposed			% of Total Assessed Value
	Building Loss	Contents Loss	Total Loss	
Residential	\$1,550,424,727	\$933,258,844	\$2,483,683,571	13.28%
Commercial	\$456,285,740	\$844,987,114	\$1,301,272,854	15.73%
Industrial	\$84,633,925	\$203,408,629	\$288,042,554	24.82%
Religion	\$34,364,944	\$72,524,654	\$106,889,598	42.65%
Government	\$11,072,696	\$16,609,362	\$27,682,057	16.39%
Education	\$82,091,723	\$166,677,363	\$248,769,086	22.79%
Total	\$2,218,873,754	\$2,237,465,967	\$4,456,339,721	15.03%

7.5.3 Critical Facilities

HAZUS estimated that critical facilities would receive an average of 40 percent damage to the structure and an average 70 percent damage to the contents during a dam failure event. The estimated functional down-time to restore these facilities to 100 percent of their functionality is 700 days.

7.5.4 Environment

The environment would be vulnerable to a number of risks in the event of dam failure. The inundation could introduce foreign elements into local waterways, resulting in destruction of downstream habitat and detrimental effects on many species of animals, especially endangered species such as coho salmon. The extent of the vulnerability of the environment is the same as the exposure of the environment.

7.6 FUTURE TRENDS IN DEVELOPMENT

All land use decision-making is guided by the goals, policies and implementation measures contained in the Land Use Element of Roseville's General Plan. The Safety Element of the General Plan establishes standards and plans for the protection of the community from hazards. Dam failure is currently not addressed as a stand-alone hazard in the Safety Element, but flooding is. The City has established comprehensive policies regarding sound land use in identified flood hazard areas. Most of the areas vulnerable to the more severe impacts from the bank-full Folsom Dam failure scenario intersect the City's flood hazard areas. Flood-related policies in the General Plan will help to reduce the risk associated with the dam failure hazard for all future development within the City.

The dam failure risk exposure within the planning area increased by 22% at an increase in value of over \$2 billion dollars. This increase in risk exposure can be attributed to the vast extent and location of the dam failure hazard, and a population growth rate of 14.5% over the performance period of the prior plan. The planning area also saw an increase in assessed valuation of real property of over 34%. This increase in value can be attributed to the continued economic recovery from the 2008 economic downturn that had a significant impact on the State of California as well as the City of Roseville. Any increase in asset value will increase risk quotient when risk is being measured by looking at assets exposed as is with this plan.

While the exposure went up within the dam failure inundation area, the loss estimation from Hazus decreased by over 28%. This decrease in vulnerability could be attributed to 2 factors. The first factor is that the new construction that has occurred during the performance period for the plan was built to high code standards that reduce the risk. While the City of Roseville does not have specific standards adopted specifically for the dam failure inundation area, their adopted improvements standards applied city-wide do include several higher standards that would reduce flood risk within a dam failure inundation area. The second factor could be due to the increased accuracy of the Hazus model. For this update, the digital elevation model used in Hazus was developed using LiDAR data available to the City. The accuracy of the Digital Elevation Model (DEM) for this update should be considered more accurate than the DEM from the last update. It is logical to assume that both of these factors play a role in the reduced vulnerability for the planning area.

7.7 REVIEW OF EXISTING ORDINANCES, PROGRAMS AND PLANS

Since most of the dam failure inundation areas overlay the regulated floodplain within the planning area, ordinances and programs in Chapter 4 are applicable to this hazard. The extent of dam failure inundation as well as the estimated flood depths significantly exceed those projected for flooding. Future revisions to the flood programs may want to consider the potential impacts of dam failure in their scope, even though the statistical probability of such an event is low.

7.8 SCENARIO

According to the 2011 Folsom Dam Containment Dike Failure Risk Assessment Project, the worst-case scenario would be a bank-full failure of Dikes 4, 5 and 6 due to overtopping. Overtopping flows may quickly erode the top and downstream portions of the dikes, causing failure. Therefore, there is a possibility of simultaneous failure due to overtopping. However, the likelihood of reservoir inflows that could cause overtopping is extremely low. The

completion of the new Folsom Dam spillway in early 2016 decreased the likelihood even further. Failure from piping could occur at any water surface elevation within the reservoir.

An earthquake within the region could lead to liquefaction of soils around the dams. This could occur without warning during any time of the day. A human-caused failure such as a terrorist attack also could trigger a catastrophic failure of a dam that impacts the planning area.

7.9 ISSUES

The most significant issue associated with dam failure involves the properties and populations in the inundation zones. Flooding as a result of a dam failure would significantly impact these areas. There is often limited warning time for dam failure. These events are frequently associated with other natural hazard events such as earthquakes, landslides or severe weather, which limits their predictability and compounds the hazard. Another significant issue is the loss of the City's primary potable water supply source if the dam were to fail (not overtop). The City would have to rely on significant water demand reductions, interties with other water agencies not dependent on Folsom and groundwater wells to provide some level of water supply to the community. Other important issues associated with dam failure include the following:

- Federally regulated dams have an adequate level of oversight and sophistication in the development of emergency action plans for public notification in the unlikely event of failure. However, the protocol for notification of downstream citizens of imminent failure needs to be tied to local emergency response planning.
- Mapping for federally regulated dams is already required and available; however, mapping that estimates inundation depths is needed for dams that are not federally regulated, in order to better assess the risk associated with failure of these facilities.
- Most dam failure mapping required at federal levels requires determination of the probable maximum flood. While the probable maximum flood represents a worst-case scenario, it is generally the event with the lowest probability of occurrence. For dams that are not federally regulated, mapping of failure scenarios that are less extreme than the probable maximum flood but have a higher probability of occurrence can be valuable to downstream community officials and emergency managers. This type of mapping can illustrate areas potentially impacted by more frequent events to support emergency response and preparedness actions.
- The concept of residual risk associated with structural flood control projects should be considered in the design of capital projects and the application of land use regulations.
- Addressing security concerns and the need to inform the public of the risk associated with dam failure is a challenge for public officials.

8. DROUGHT

8.1 GENERAL BACKGROUND

Most of California’s precipitation comes from storms moving across the Pacific Ocean. The path followed by the storms is determined by the position of an atmospheric high pressure belt that normally shifts southward during the winter, allowing low-pressure systems to move into the state. On average, 75 percent of California’s annual precipitation occurs between November and March, with 50 percent occurring between December and February. If a persistent Pacific high-pressure zone takes hold over California mid-winter, there is a tendency for the water year to be dry.

DEFINITIONS

Drought—The cumulative impacts of several dry years on water users. It can include deficiencies in surface and subsurface water supplies and generally impacts health, well being, and quality of life.

Hydrological Drought—Deficiencies in surface and subsurface water supplies.

A typical water year produces about 100 inches of rainfall over the North Coast, 50 inches of precipitation (combination of rain and snow) over the Northern Sierra, 18 inches in the Sacramento area, and 15 inches in the Los Angeles area. In extremely dry years, these annual totals can fall to as little as half, or even one-third of these amounts.

Rain and snowfall in the American River watershed eventually flow into Folsom Lake, a reservoir within the U.S. Central Valley Project. These flows directly affect water availability for Roseville water users. The City of Roseville owns the Roseville water system and water treatment plant and has negotiated contracts with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, the Placer County Water Agency (PCWA), and the San Juan Water District (SJWD) to ensure that water needs are met for existing and future growth.

Roseville is largely urbanized with little agricultural interests remaining. Lack of sufficient water supply would affect residents and businesses that rely on water for their daily household, employee, and industrial needs.

8.1.1 Water Supply Strategy

The water supply strategy for the City of Roseville uses a comprehensive approach to ensure water reliability for customers. The City has a diverse set of water supply options—including surface water contracts, recycled water, and groundwater wells—to ensure that even following a period of dry years, a combination of available water supplies and water conservation measures will meet the community’s water needs. The City has contracts for surface water with three agencies (see Table 8-1):

- The primary water contract is with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) for 32,000 acre-feet per year of surface water from Folsom Lake.
- The City also has a contract with PCWA for 30,000 acre-feet of water from PCWA’s American River Middle Fork Project. The City has a long-term agreement with the USBR to wheel PCWA water supplies through Folsom Reservoir for delivery to the City’s water treatment plant.

Table 8-1. City of Roseville Water Supply Contracts and Resources

Source	Contract Amount (acre-feet per year) ^a	Supply Projections ^b				
		2020	2025	2030	2035	2040
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000
San Juan Water District	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
Placer County Water Agency		20,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000
Treated Water (Additional Future Purchase)	N/A	0	0	1,500	1,500	1,500
Exercised	10,000					
Two additional options	20,000					
Placer County Water Agency Total	30,000					
Recycled Water	N/A	4,421	4,791	5,259	5,643	5,958
Total	66,000	60,421	70,791	72,759	73,143	73,458

a. N/A = Not Applicable based on future contract or existing recycled resources

b. Based on reasonable available volume.

- The third source of surface water for the City of Roseville is an additional 4,000 acre-feet of PCWA water transferred through SJWD. SJWD is a water district in Sacramento and Placer Counties that draws water from Folsom Lake. SJWD also wholesales water to Citrus Heights Water District, Fair Oaks Water District and Orangevale Water Company in Sacramento County. The City of Roseville has entered into a reallocation agreement with SJWD for this 4,000 acre-feet per year, which is a normal-year water supply only—it is not available for use during drought conditions.
- With the approval of the Amoroso Ranch Specific Plan, the City is pursuing an additional contract through PCWA, through its planned Ophir Water Treatment Plant facility. This new source and supply of water will not be dependent on Folsom Lake deliveries and will increase water reliability citywide. It is not subject to cutbacks during dry or driest years, and is estimated to provide 1,500 acre-feet of additional supply once the plant is on line.
- The City maintains six groundwater wells for emergency and dry-year supply, with plans to install 10 more in coming years as new development progresses. All wells are equipped for aquifer storage and recovery.

8.1.2 Water Supply Infrastructure

The City of Roseville Water Treatment Plant is on Barton Road east of Roseville. Constructed in 1971, the plant treats water from Folsom Lake to Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) domestic drinking water standards. The City owns a water system network consisting of water mains ranging from 4 to 66 inches in diameter. The system is designed to deliver an adequate supply of water throughout the community at an acceptable pressure level for domestic and fire flow purposes. A booster pump station near East Roseville Parkway and North Sunrise Boulevard is designed to provide sufficient water pressure to the higher elevations of the City and to fill and manage reservoirs in the system. Some areas within the Roseville city limits are served by PCWA, SJWD, or the City of Citrus Heights where topography and facility locations make it beneficial to do so.

The City maintains the capability to supplement its water supply in drought conditions with groundwater wells. These wells are planned to be used primarily to offset surface water cutbacks in times of drought or other emergencies. The City's groundwater wells are equipped to implement aquifer storage and recovery, in which potable water can be injected into the underground aquifers in wet years and recovered in dry years for public use. In addition, the City operates a recycled water system to lessen the use of potable water for irrigating landscaped areas.

8.1.3 The Water Forum

The Water Forum is a group of business and agricultural leaders, citizens groups, environmentalists, water managers, and local governments originally formed in Sacramento County. Water managers in Placer and El Dorado Counties joined the group in 1995. The City of Roseville is a member of the Water Forum and a signatory to the January 2000 Water Forum Agreement. The agreement provides a framework for how future surface water and groundwater supplies will be used in the region through 2040.

Although Roseville's water contract entitlements total 66,000 acre-feet per year, the City's diversions from the American River are limited by the Water Forum Agreement. In normal/wet years, the City has agreed to limit diversions from the American River to 58,900 acre-feet per year. In driest years (also called critically dry years), the maximum diversion from the American River is 39,800 acre-feet. In drier years, the City may divert between 39,800 and 54,900 acre-feet, depending on the unimpaired flow into Folsom Lake.

During the drier and driest years, the City agreed to have PCWA release an additional 20,000 acre-feet per year of water down the American River on the City's behalf through re-operation of PCWA's American River Middle Fork Project. This is not part of the City's contracted supply of 66,000 acre-feet per year. The intent of Middle Fork Project re-operational releases during drier and driest years is to mitigate environmental impacts resulting from increased diversions above 1995 baseline levels.

Roseville's water supply contracts, in combination with future planned supply sources, base level conservation measures, and groundwater resources, ensure that the City is well positioned to meet projected water needs.

8.1.4 Local Water Contracts—Definition of Drought

Roseville's drought levels are defined by the 2000 Water Forum agreement. The definition is based on the type of hydrologic year for inflow to Folsom Lake, as defined by 70 years of hydrologic data into the lake. The hydrological year types are as follows:

- **Baseline**—Baseline means the maximum amount of water that suppliers diverted from the American River in any one year through 1995 or, in certain instances, other amounts specified in a Purveyor Specific Agreement. For the City of Roseville, the baseline amount is 19,800 acre-feet per year.
- **Normal/Wet Years**—When the projected unimpaired flow into Folsom Reservoir is greater than or equal to 950,000 acre-feet
- **Drier Years**—When the projected unimpaired flow into Folsom Reservoir is between 400,00 acre-feet and 950,000 acre-feet
- **Driest Years**—When the projected unimpaired flow into Folsom Reservoir is less than 400,000 acre-feet.

Dry years over the 85-year hydrologic record are listed in Table 8-2, excluding the driest years. The driest years for American River flows in the Folsom Lake vicinity were 1924, with 379,000 acre-feet of unimpaired inflow to Folsom Lake, 1977, with 332,000 acre-feet, and 2015, with 321,000 acre-feet.

Table 8-2. Dry Year Flows into Folsom Lake

Year	Unimpaired Inflow to Folsom Lake (acre-feet)	Year	Unimpaired Inflow to Folsom Lake (acre-feet)
1931	571,000	1987	705,000
1934	690,000	1988	545,000
1939	873,000	1990	873,000
1959	872,000	1992	631,000
1961	854,000	1994	649,000
1976	518,000	2013	778,000
1981	881,000	2014	682,000

8.2 HAZARD PROFILE

Droughts originate from a deficiency of precipitation resulting from an unusual weather pattern. If the weather pattern lasts a short time (a few weeks or a couple months), the drought is considered short-term. If the weather pattern becomes entrenched and the precipitation deficits last for several months or years, the drought is considered long-term. It is possible for a region to experience a long-term pattern that produces drought, and to have short-term changes that result in wet spells within the long-term pattern. Likewise, it is possible for a long-term wet pattern to be interrupted by weather spells that result in short-term drought. Droughts typically occur after two or three years of below-average rainfall for the period from November to March.

8.2.1 Past Events

State of California

The California Department of Water Resources has state hydrologic data back to the early 1900s (<http://watersupplyconditions.water.ca.gov>). The hydrologic data show multi-year droughts from 1912 to 1913, 1918 to 1920 and 1922 to 1924. Since then, three prolonged periods of drought occurred in California:

- **1929 to 1934 Drought**—The 1929 to 1934 drought established the criteria for designing the supply and yield of many large Northern California reservoirs. The Sacramento Valley runoff was 55 percent of average for the time period from 1901 to 1996, with only 9.8 million acre-feet received.
- **1975 to 1977 Drought**—California had one of its most severe droughts due to lack of rainfall during the winters of 1976 and 1977. 1977 was the driest period on record in California, with the previous winter recorded as the fourth driest in California's hydrological history. The cumulative impact led to widespread water shortages and severe water conservation measures throughout the state. Only 37 percent of the average Sacramento Valley runoff was received, with just 6.6 million acre-feet recorded. Over \$2.6 billion in crop damage was recorded in 31 counties. A federal disaster declaration was declared in Placer County and surrounding counties.
- **1987 to 1992 Drought**—California received precipitation well below average levels for four consecutive years. While the Central Coast was most affected by the lack of rainfall and low runoff, the Sierra Nevada range in Northern California and Central Valley counties including Placer County were also affected. During this drought, only 56 percent of average runoff for the Sacramento Valley was received, totaling just 10 million acre-feet. By February 1991, all 58 counties in California were suffering from drought conditions. Urban areas as well as rural and agricultural areas were impacted.
- **2012 to 2016 (Ongoing) Drought**—California's current drought has set several records for the state:
 - The period from 2012 to 2014 ranked as the driest three consecutive years for statewide precipitation.
 - 2014 set new climate records for statewide average temperatures and for record-low water allocations in the State Water Project and federal Central Valley Project.
 - 2013 set minimum annual precipitation records for many communities.

On January 17, 2014 the governor declared a state of emergency for drought throughout California. This declaration followed release of a report that stated that California had had the least amount of rainfall in its 163-year history. Californians were asked to voluntarily reduce their water consumption by 20 percent. Drought conditions worsened into 2015. On April 1, 2015, following the lowest snowpack ever recorded, the governor announced actions to save water, increase enforcement to prevent wasteful water use, streamline the state's drought response, and invest in new technologies to make California more drought-resilient. The governor directed the State Water Resources Control Board to implement mandatory water reductions in cities and towns across California to reduce water usage by 25 percent on average. The City of Roseville was assigned a 28-percent water conservation target by the State Water Resources Control

Board. The City exceed its water conservation goal. Total impacts of the drought cannot be determined until after its conclusion.

Placer County

The following additional drought impacts have affected Placer County:

- **1977**—A federal disaster declaration was made as a result of a drought affecting Placer and surrounding counties. The PCWA declared a water shortage and restricted water use for both irrigation and treated water users. The restrictions included a 50-percent reduction in water usage by customers and rate increases. This shortage lasted until January 1978 when the PCWA terminated its restrictions.
- **1988**—Again the PCWA declared a water emergency. All customers had their water use reduced by 25 percent, and rates were again increased for excessive usage. The countywide emergency prohibited washing of sidewalks, driveways, parking lots and other hard surfaces, restricted the washing of vehicles, airplanes, and trailers to 3 gallons of water, prohibited fire hydrant flushing and drills, prohibited filling of pools, and prohibited new agricultural land irrigation.
- **1991**—Raw water customers had their water usage reduced by 50 percent annually and by 25 percent seasonally. Treated water users were given most of the same restrictions and prohibitions as in 1988. Due to a very late storm season, the emergency was lifted by April 1991.
- **2008**—The Governor of California declared a drought on June 4, 2008. In July 2009, PCWA reported the implementation of normal ongoing conservation measures.
- **2014**—On February 6, 2014, PCWA adopted a resolution declaring a water shortage emergency. This is the most recent declaration from PCWA. It was rescinded in February 2016.

Roseville Drought History

Roseville's drought history parallels the water shortages for the State of California and Placer County. The Roseville City Council has declared official drought alerts three times:

- From April 1991 to March 1993 when Stage 2 drought water restrictions were in effect and enforced through full-time water patrols
- In May 2008 when the City of Roseville's Environmental Utilities Department activated a Stage 1 drought alert
- In 2014, when the City enacted a Stage 3 drought alert asking residents to reduce water demand by 28 percent compared to 2013 water use.

In response to the 2014 drought, the City of Roseville took a proactive approach to water conservation. The City enacted water waste patrols, limited watering for residential and non-residential customers to specific days of the week depending on the time of year, and enacted funding for utility support. With a 2015 reduction target of 278 gallons per capital per day, Roseville's conservation efforts resulted in an actual accomplishment of 165 gallons per capital per day, far exceeding goals and expectations (Roseville, 2015a).

8.2.2 Location

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) has developed several indices to measure drought impacts and severity and to map their extent and locations:

- The **Palmer Crop Moisture Index** measures short-term drought on a weekly scale and is used to quantify drought's impacts on agriculture during the growing season. Figure 8-1 shows this index for the week ending January 30, 2016.
- The **Palmer Z Index** measures short-term drought on a monthly scale. Figure 8-2 shows this index for December 2015.




Figure 8-1. Palmer Crop Moisture Index for Week Ending January 30, 2016




Figure 8-2. Palmer Z Index Short-Term Drought Conditions (December 2015)

- The **Palmer Drought Index** measures the duration and intensity of long-term drought-inducing circulation patterns. Long-term drought is cumulative, so the intensity of drought during a given month is dependent on the current weather patterns plus the cumulative patterns of previous months. Weather patterns can change quickly from a long-term drought pattern to a long-term wet pattern, and the Palmer Drought Index can respond fairly rapidly. Figure 8-3 shows this index for January 2016.
- The hydrological impacts of drought (e.g., reservoir levels, groundwater levels, etc.) take longer to develop and it takes longer to recover from them. The **Palmer Hydrological Drought Index**, another long-term index, was developed to quantify hydrological effects. The Palmer Hydrological Drought Index responds more slowly to changing conditions than the Palmer Drought Index. Figure 8-4 shows this index for January 2013.
- While the Palmer indices consider precipitation, evapotranspiration and runoff, the **Standardized Precipitation Index** considers only precipitation. In the Standardized Precipitation Index, an index of zero indicates the median precipitation amount; the index is negative for drought and positive for wet conditions. The Standardized Precipitation Index is computed for time scales ranging from one month to 24 months. Figure 8-5 shows the 24-month Standardized Precipitation Index map for February 2011 through January 2013.




Figure 8-3. Palmer Drought Severity Index (December 2015)




Figure 8-4. Palmer Hydrological Drought Index Long-Term Hydrologic Conditions (December 2015)




Figure 8-5. 24-Month Standardized Precipitation Index (January 2013 – December 2015)

8.2.3 Frequency

Historical drought data for the Placer County region indicate that, in the 88 years from 1929 through 2016, four multi-year droughts have spanned a total of 20 years. This averages to a five-year drought every 22 years, or a 22 percent chance of a drought in any given year.

8.2.4 Severity

Drought can have a widespread impact on the environment and the economy, although it typically does not result in loss of life or damage to property, as do other natural disasters. Nationwide, the impacts of drought occur primarily in the agriculture, transportation, recreation and tourism, forestry, and energy sectors. Social and environmental impacts are also significant, although it is difficult to put a precise cost on these impacts. The National Drought Mitigation Center uses three categories to describe likely drought impacts:

- Water supply—Drought threatens supplies of water for irrigated crops and for communities.
- Fire hazard—Drought increases the threat of wildfires from dry conditions in forest and rangelands.

The severity of a drought depends on the degree of moisture deficiency, the duration, and the size and location of the affected area. The longer the duration of the drought and the larger the area impacted, the more severe the potential impacts. When measuring the severity of droughts, analysts typically look at economic impacts. All people could pay more for water if utilities increase their rates due to shortages. Other water- or electricity-dependent industries are commonly forced to shut down all or a portion of their facilities, resulting in further layoffs. A drought can harm recreational companies that use water (e.g., swimming pools, water parks, and river rafting companies) as well as landscape and nursery businesses.

Drought generally does not affect groundwater sources as quickly as surface water supplies, but groundwater supplies generally take longer to recover. Reduced precipitation during a drought means that groundwater supplies are not replenished at a normal rate. This can lead to a reduction in groundwater levels and problems such as reduced pumping capacity or wells going dry. Shallow wells are more susceptible than deep wells. Reduced replenishment of groundwater affects streams. Much of the flow in streams comes from groundwater, especially during the summer when there is less precipitation and after snowmelt ends. Reduced groundwater levels mean that even less water will enter streams when stream flows are lowest.

8.2.5 Warning Time

Droughts are climatic patterns that occur over long periods of time. Only generalized warning can take place due to the numerous variables that scientists have not pieced together well enough to make accurate and precise predictions.

Empirical studies conducted over the past century have shown that meteorological drought is never the result of a single cause. It is the result of many causes, often synergistic in nature; these include global weather patterns that produce persistent, upper-level high-pressure systems along the West Coast with warm, dry air resulting in less precipitation.

Scientists at this time do not know how to predict drought more than a month in advance for most locations. Predicting drought depends on the ability to forecast precipitation and temperature. Anomalies of precipitation and temperature may last from several months to several decades. How long they last depends on interactions between the atmosphere and the oceans, soil moisture and land surface processes, topography, internal dynamics, and the accumulated influence of weather systems on the global scale.

8.3 SECONDARY HAZARDS

The secondary hazard most commonly associated with drought is wildfire. A prolonged lack of precipitation dries out vegetation, which becomes increasingly susceptible to ignition as the duration of the drought extends. Millions of board feet of timber have been lost, and in many cases erosion occurred, which caused serious damage to aquatic life, irrigation, and power production by heavy silting of streams, reservoirs, and rivers.

Drought also is often accompanied by extreme heat, exposing people to the risk of sunstroke, heat cramps and heat exhaustion. Pets and livestock are also vulnerable to heat-related injuries.

8.4 EXPOSURE

All people, property and environments within the City of Roseville would be exposed to some degree to the impacts of moderate to extreme drought conditions.

8.5 VULNERABILITY

Based on hydrologic data for the American River, there is a probability that rainfall will be insufficient once every 17 years to supply Folsom Lake and guarantee the City of Roseville its existing contract amounts. In these years, the City by agreement is required to find alternate sources of supply.

Having the flexibility to use both the USBR and PCWA contractual supplies during a drier year or driest year enables the City to provide a reliable surface water supply for municipal and industrial uses. Any shortages can easily be compensated for by water use reductions through conservation (implementation of drought stages as outlined in the Roseville Municipal Code). By incorporating emergency groundwater reserves into the water supply strategy, the City's reliability is increased further still.

The City's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan outlines the potable water supply reliability for normal and dry years, as well as for a three-year drought. Water would be supplied by the American River through Folsom Lake, with conservation measures and groundwater reserves implemented as needed. Roseville's recycled water utility is expected to provide an offset to demand for irrigation supply, thereby reducing the demand for potable water. A summary of the water supply reliability until 2040 for multiple dry water years is provided in Table 8-3.

8.5.1 Population

The City of Roseville, regional water purveyors, members of the Water Forum, and the USBR have spent considerable time and effort to protect life, safety and health should several consecutive dry years occur. Provisions and measures have been taken to analyze and account for anticipated water shortages. The City has the ability to minimize any impacts on residents and water consumers in Roseville. No significant life or health impacts are anticipated as a result of drought in Roseville.

8.5.2 Property

No structures will be directly affected by drought conditions in Roseville, though some structures may become vulnerable to wildfires, which are more likely following years of drought.

8.5.3 Critical Facilities

Critical facilities as defined for this Plan will continue to be operational during a drought. Critical facility elements such as landscaping may not be maintained due to limited resources, but the risk to the City's critical facilities inventory will be largely aesthetic. These aesthetic impacts are not considered significant.

Table 8-3. Water Supply Reliability by 2040

	Normal Water Year	Single Dry Water Year	Multiple Dry Water Years		
			Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Surface Water (acre-feet)	60,400 ^a	39,500 ^b	52,894 ^b	55,500	46,926 ^c
Groundwater (acre-feet)	0	6569	0	0	0
Recycled Water (acre-feet)	4,838	4,838	4,838	4,838	4,838
Projected Demand (acre-feet)	50,907 ^d	50,907 ^d	50,907 ^d	50,907 ^d	50,907 ^d
Surplus or (Deficit) (acre-feet)^e	4,655	0	6,826	8,931	857

- a. Although additional water is under contract, surface water supplies are available based on Water Forum agreement diversion commitments. This projection includes anticipated PCWA supply from the future Ophir Water Treatment Plant project.
- b. Although contracts are in place for normal water year supplies of 67,500 acre-feet, the supply shown is consistent with Water Forum agreement diversion limits and the limitation that 4,000 acre-feet of SJWD supplies are only available for use in normal years.
- c. Surface supply reduction is consistent with Water Forum supply agreement anticipating worst case shortage (driest years).
- d. No conservation measures are assumed for any year type.
- e. Assume full use of available recycled water to offset potable demand for landscape irrigation.

Source: Roseville, 2015a

8.5.4 Environment

Environmental losses are the result of damage to plants, animals, habitat, and air and water quality; wildfires; degradation of landscape; loss of biodiversity; and soil erosion. Some of the effects are short-term and conditions quickly return to normal following the end of the drought. Other environmental effects linger for some time or may even become permanent. Wildlife habitat, for example, may be degraded through the loss of wetlands, lakes, and vegetation. However, many species will eventually recover from this temporary aberration. The degradation of landscape quality, including increased soil erosion, may lead to a more permanent loss of biological productivity. Although environmental losses are difficult to quantify, growing public awareness and concern for environmental quality has forced public officials to focus greater attention and resources on these effects.

8.5.5 Economic Impact

Economic impact will be largely associated with industries that use water or depend on water for their business. For example, landscaping businesses were affected in the droughts of the past as the demand for service significantly declined because landscaping was not watered. The City's Environmental Utilities Department, through the water conservation programs, works to ensure that businesses that rely on water receive allotments to continue operating.

There is always the possibility of some financial exposure for the City as a result of drought conditions. The Environmental Utilities Department plans proactively for this possibility in order to mitigate these impacts to the greatest extent possible.

8.6 FUTURE TRENDS IN DEVELOPMENT

Table 8-4 lists past, current, and projected water use from 2010 to 2040. Water use projections for 2020 through 2040 are based on land use-based water demand projections documented in the City's General Plan.

The general building stock within the planning area increased by 17.7% with an increase in valuation from \$21.967 billion to \$29.641 billion (34.9%). This increase in valuation of the planning area was impacted by the areas recovery from the economic downturn of 2008. Since the entire planning area would be considered susceptible to drought, it would be perceived that there was an increase in drought exposure over the performance

period of the 2011 plan. However, since droughts typically do not kill or injure people or damage structures, there would be no increase in vulnerability to drought from this increased exposure.

Table 8-4. City of Roseville Past, Current, and Projected Water Use

	Water Use (acre-feet/year)						
	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040
Single family residential	15,836	11,680	21,262	22,425	23,862	25,254	26,365
Multi-Family residential	2,196	1,464	2,399	2,530	2,692	2,849	2,974
Commercial	2,042	1,930	3,402	3,588	3,818	4,041	4,219
Industrial	891	934	1,699	1,792	1,907	2,018	2,107
Institutional and Governmental	667	561	1,001	1,056	1,123	1,189	1,241
Landscape	5,534	4,152	7,559	7,973	8,483	8,978	9,373
Losses^a	1,195	2,160	3,732	3,936	4,189	4,433	4,628
Total	28,361	22,881	41,054	43,300	46,074	48,762	50,907

a. Losses include unbilled/unmetered losses for 2010 and 2015

Source: Roseville, 2015a

8.7 REVIEW OF EXISTING ORDINANCES, PROGRAMS AND PLANS

Since California's 1975 to 1977 drought, Roseville has had a policy of no water waste supported by City ordinances. The City adopted a "No Waste" ordinance in 1989 and updated the Water Conservation Ordinance (Roseville Municipal Code Chapter 14.09—Water Conservation) to include drought mitigation measures in April 1991. The ordinance provides conservation measures for shortages in water supply due to drought. Drought mitigation is achieved through a tiered approach that is based on the surface water available to Roseville. As water supplies decrease, additional restrictions are imposed. Conservation measures (water use restrictions) have been established to address conditions from adequate water supplies to conditions in which surface water supplies are capable of meeting only 50 percent of Roseville's water needs.

A significant portion of Roseville's water is used for landscape irrigation. Landscape irrigation also accounts for a large portion of water wasted in Roseville. Conservation patrols are used to enforce City ordinances restricting water waste. These patrols generally consist of existing service workers that identify and document water waste during daily travels or when responding to complaints. Evening calls are made in response to resident complaints.

In times of reduced water availability, higher drought stages are implemented. In summer 1991, Roseville hired temporary employees to serve as the first dedicated water patrol. This patrol supplemented existing service crew coverage and provided 24-hour-per-day capability. These patrols led to the issuance of over 500 water waste citations that greatly decreased water wasted through malfunctioning irrigation systems and/or excessive watering. In response to the current drought, Roseville instituted these water patrols once more.

Roseville has a number of programs and policies that are implemented as early as possible to reduce water use in the event of a prolonged water shortage. As a USBR contractor, Roseville is required to develop and maintain a water conservation plan consistent with the requirements of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act of 1992. In addition, Roseville is a member and signatory to the American River Water Forum, which also includes requirements for water conservation programs.

To proactively promote water conservation and to be prepared in the event of a water shortage, the City implements demand management (conservation) measures, is developing supplemental water supplies, and has a water shortage contingency plan. These are summarized in the City of Roseville 2010 Urban Water Management Plan Update and detailed in the work programs for the Environmental Utilities Department Water Division.

Given recent legislation and state oversight of the City's water conservation efforts, the Roseville City Council adopted a revised Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance on March 16, 2016. The revised ordinance, effective on April 16, 2016, responds to state legislation mandating stricter requirements for reducing landscape irrigation, water consumption and waste. The revised ordinance addresses the objectives of the Department of Water Resources model ordinance by incorporating the new water efficient landscape requirements into Chapter 14.18 of the Roseville Municipal Code.

8.8 SCENARIO

An extreme multi-year drought can impact the region with little warning. Combinations of low precipitation and unusually high temperatures could occur over several consecutive years. Intensified by such conditions, extreme wildfires could break out throughout Placer County, increasing the need for water. Surrounding communities, also in drought conditions, could increase their demand for water supplies relied upon in the City of Roseville, causing social and political conflicts. If such conditions persisted for several years, the economy of Placer County and Roseville could experience setbacks, especially in water dependent industries.

8.9 ISSUES

The planning team has identified the following drought-related issues:

- Identification and development of alternative water supplies
- Utilization of groundwater recharge techniques to stabilize the groundwater supply
- The probability of increased drought frequencies and durations due to climate change
- The promotion of active water conservation even during non-drought periods.

9. EARTHQUAKE

9.1 GENERAL BACKGROUND

California is seismically active because of movement of the North American Plate, on which everything east of the San Andreas Fault sits, and the Pacific Plate, which includes coast communities west of the fault. The Pacific Plate is constantly moving northwest past the North American Plate, at a relative rate of movement of about 2 inches per year (SHMP 2013). The movement of the tectonic plates creates stress released as energy that moves through the earth as waves called earthquakes.

DEFINITIONS

Earthquake—The shaking of the ground caused by an abrupt shift of rock along a fracture in the earth or a contact zone between tectonic plates. Earthquakes are typically measured in both magnitude and intensity.

Liquefaction—A condition in which water-saturated sands, silts or gravelly soils are shaken so violently that the individual grains lose contact with one another and “float” freely in the water, turning the ground into a pudding-like liquid.

9.1.1 Damage from Earthquakes

Earthquakes can last from a few seconds to over 5 minutes; they may also occur as a series of tremors over a period of several days. The actual movement of the ground in an earthquake is seldom the direct cause of injury or death. Casualties generally result from falling objects and debris, because the shocks shake, damage or demolish buildings and other structures. Disruption of communications, electrical power supplies and gas, sewer and water lines should be expected. Earthquakes may trigger fires, dam failures, landslides or releases of hazardous material, compounding their disastrous effects.

9.1.2 Earthquake Classifications

Earthquakes are typically classified in one of two ways: By the amount of energy released, measured as magnitude; or by the impact on people and structures, measured as intensity.

- Magnitude represents the amount of seismic energy released at the hypocenter of the earthquake. It is based on the amplitude of the earthquake waves recorded on instruments. Magnitude is thus represented by a single, instrumentally determined value.
- Intensity represents the observed effects of ground shaking at any specified location. The intensity of earthquake shaking lessens with distance from the earthquake epicenter. Tabulated peak ground accelerations for a listed “maximum credible earthquake” are a measure of how a site will be affected by seismic events on distant faults.

Magnitude

An earthquake’s magnitude is a measure of the energy released at the source of the earthquake. It is commonly expressed by ratings on either of two scales (Michigan Tech University 2016):

- The Richter scale measures magnitude of earthquakes based on the amplitude of the largest energy wave released by the earthquake. Richter scale readings are suitable for smaller earthquakes; however, because

it is a logarithmic scale, the scale does not distinguish clearly the magnitude of large earthquakes above a certain level. Table 9-1 presents the Richter scale magnitudes and corresponding earthquake effects.

- A more commonly used magnitude scale today is the moment magnitude (M_w) scale, with classifications as shown in Table 9-2. The moment magnitude scale is based on the total moment release of the earthquake (the product of the distance a fault moved and the force required to move it). Moment magnitude roughly matches the Richter scale but provides more accuracy for larger magnitude earthquakes.

Table 9-1. Richter Magnitude Scale

Richter Magnitude	Earthquake Effects
2.5 or less	Usually not felt, but can be recorded by seismograph
2.5 to 5.4	Often felt, but causes only minor damage
5.5 to 6.0	Slight damage to buildings and other structures
6.1 to 6.9	May cause a lot of damage in very populated areas
7.0 to 7.9	Major earthquake; serious damage
8.0 or greater	Great earthquake; can totally destroy communities near the epicenter

Source: Michigan Tech University n.d.

Table 9-2. Moment Magnitude Scale

Magnitude Class	Magnitude Range
Great	$M_w \geq 8$
Major	$M_w = 7.0 - 7.9$
Strong	$M_w = 6.0 - 6.9$
Moderate	$M_w = 5.0 - 5.9$
Light	$M_w = 4.0 - 4.9$
Minor	$M_w = 3.0 - 3.9$
Micro	$M_w \leq 3$

Intensity

Currently the most commonly used intensity scale is the modified Mercalli intensity scale, with ratings defined as follows (USGS, 1989):

- I. Not felt except by a very few under especially favorable conditions
- II. Felt only by a few persons at rest, especially on upper floors of buildings.
- III. Felt quite noticeably by persons indoors, especially on upper floors of buildings. Many people do not recognize it is an earthquake. Standing cars may rock slightly. Vibrations similar to the passing of a truck.
- IV. Felt indoors by many, outdoors by few during the day. At night, some awakened. Dishes, windows, doors disturbed; walls make cracking sound. Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing cars rocked noticeably.
- V. Felt by nearly everyone; many awakened. Some dishes, windows broken. Unstable objects overturned. Pendulum clocks may stop.
- VI. Felt by all; many frightened. Some heavy furniture moved; a few instances of fallen plaster. Damage slight.
- VII. Damage negligible in buildings of good design and construction; slight in well-built ordinary structures; considerable in poorly built or badly designed structures. Some chimneys broken.

- VIII. Damage slight in specially designed structures; considerable damage in ordinary buildings with partial collapse. Damage great in poorly built structures. Fall of chimneys, factory stacks, columns, monuments, walls. Heavy furniture overturned.
- IX. Damage considerable in specially designed structures; well-designed frame structures thrown out of plumb. Damage great in substantial buildings, with partial collapse. Buildings shifted off foundations.
- X. Some well-built wooden structures destroyed; most masonry and frame structures destroyed with foundations. Rails bent.
- XI. Few, if any (masonry) structures remain standing. Bridges destroyed. Rails bent greatly.
- XII. Damage total. Lines of sight and level are distorted. Objects thrown into the air.

9.1.3 Ground Motion

Earthquake hazard assessment is also based on expected ground motion. This involves determining the annual probability that certain ground motion accelerations will be exceeded, then summing the annual probabilities over the time period of interest. The most commonly mapped ground motion parameters are the horizontal and vertical peak ground accelerations (PGA) for a given soil or rock type. Instruments called accelerographs record levels of ground motion due to earthquakes at stations throughout a region. These readings are recorded by state and federal agencies that monitor and predict seismic activity.

Maps of PGA values form the basis of seismic zone maps that are included in building codes such as the International Building Code. Building codes that include seismic provisions specify the horizontal force due to lateral acceleration that a building should be able to withstand during an earthquake. PGA values are directly related to these lateral forces that could damage “short period structures” (e.g. single-family dwellings). Longer period response components determine the lateral forces that damage larger structures with longer natural periods (apartment buildings, factories, high-rises, bridges). Table 9-3 lists damage potential and perceived shaking by PGA factors, compared to the Mercalli scale.

Table 9-3. Mercalli Scale and Peak Ground Acceleration Comparison

Modified Mercalli Scale	Perceived Shaking	Potential Structure Damage		Estimated PGA ^a (%g)
		Resistant Buildings	Vulnerable Buildings	
I	Not Felt	None	None	<0.17%
II-III	Weak	None	None	0.17% - 1.4%
IV	Light	None	None	1.4% - 3.9%
V	Moderate	Very Light	Light	3.9% - 9.2%
VI	Strong	Light	Moderate	9.2% - 18%
VII	Very Strong	Moderate	Moderate/Heavy	18% - 34%
VIII	Severe	Moderate/Heavy	Heavy	34% - 65%
IX	Violent	Heavy	Very Heavy	65% - 124%
X - XII	Extreme	Very Heavy	Very Heavy	>124%

a. PGA measured in percent of g, where g is the acceleration of gravity

Sources: USGS, 2008; USGS, 2010

9.1.4 Effect of Soil Types

The impact of an earthquake on structures and infrastructure is largely a function of ground shaking, distance from the source of the quake, and liquefaction, a secondary effect of an earthquake in which soils lose their shear strength and flow or behave as liquid, thereby damaging structures that derive their support from the soil.

Liquefaction generally occurs in soft, unconsolidated sedimentary soils. A program called the National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program (NEHRP) creates maps based on soil characteristics to help identify

locations subject to liquefaction. Table 9-4 summarizes NEHRP soil classifications. NEHRP Soils B and C typically can sustain ground shaking without much effect, dependent on the earthquake magnitude. The areas that are commonly most affected by ground shaking have NEHRP Soils D, E and F. In general, these areas are also most susceptible to liquefaction.

Table 9-4. NEHRP Soil Classification System

NEHRP Soil Type	Description	Mean Shear Velocity to 30 m (m/s)
A	Hard Rock	1,500
B	Firm to Hard Rock	760-1,500
C	Dense Soil/Soft Rock	360-760
D	Stiff Soil	180-360
E	Soft Clays	< 180
F	Special Study Soils (liquefiable soils, sensitive clays, organic soils, soft clays >36 m thick)	

9.2 HAZARD PROFILE

9.2.1 Past Events


The last seismic event recorded in the Roseville vicinity measuring at least 4.0 on the Richter scale occurred between Placerville and Roseville in 1908 on a north-south fault line between Folsom and Auburn. No significant seismic events in the Roseville vicinity have been recorded since then. Significant recent earthquakes in California include the 1906 earthquake in San Francisco, the 1971 San Fernando Earthquake, the 1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake, and the 1994 Northridge earthquake. Table 9-5 lists recent earthquakes with a magnitude of 5.0 or greater within a 100-mile radius of Roseville. Figure 9-1 shows the location of the most recent four events in relation to Roseville.

Table 9-5. Recent Earthquakes Magnitude 5.0 or Larger Within 100-mile radius

Date	Magnitude	Epicenter Location
8/24/2014	6.0	6 miles southwest of Napa, CA
5/24/2013	5.7	12 miles southeast of Chester, CA
4/26/2008	5.1	6 miles west of Reno, NV
10/31/2007	5.6	10 miles northeast of San Jose, CA
8/10/2001	5.5	9 miles west of Portola, CA
9/3/2000	5.17	8 miles northwest of Napa, CA
10/30/1998	5.35	4 miles south-southeast of Truckee, CA
12/28/1995	5.33	7 miles east-northeast of Markleeville, CA
12/23/1995	5.08	8 miles east of Markleeville, CA
9/12/1994	5.95	7 miles north-northeast of Markleeville, CA
9/12/1994	5.12	7 miles north-northeast of Markleeville, CA
3/31/1986	5.70	12 miles east-northeast of Milpitas, CA

Source: Earthquake Catalogs, Northern California Earthquake Data Center, USGS

Source: NCEDC, 2014; Google Earth

**Figure 9-1. Location of Recent Earthquakes in Roseville Vicinity**

9.2.2 Location

A direct relationship exists between a fault's length and location and its ability to generate damaging ground motion at a given site. Small, local faults produce lower magnitude quakes, but ground shaking can be strong and damage can be significant in areas close to the fault. Large regional faults can generate earthquakes of great magnitudes but, because of their distance and depth, they may result in only moderate shaking in an area. The City of Roseville is in a region of moderate seismicity between the seismically active Coast Ranges and the historically seismic Foothills Fault Zone in the Sierra Nevada. The primary seismic hazard for the City is potential ground shaking from distant large faults.

East of Roseville

The Great Valley Fault Zone is the geomorphic boundary of the Coast Ranges and the Central Valley. It is underlain by a 300-mile long seismically active fold-and-thrust belt that has been the source of recent earthquakes, such as the 1983 Magnitude-6.5 Coalinga and the 1985 Magnitude-6.1 Kettleman Hills earthquakes. Nearly the entire thrust system is concealed (Krazan & Associates, 2011). The Great Valley fault system consists of 14 segments, named numerically based on location along the fault system from north (1) to south (14).

The Foothill Fault Zone, a complex series of northwest trending-faults that are related to the Sierra Nevada uplift, runs from about Oroville in the north to east of Fresno in the south. This was the source of Oroville's 1975 earthquake and an event in the 1940s. Subsequent research of these events led to the identification and naming of the zone. Earthquakes on fault segments in the zone could be a source of ground shaking in Placer County.

The closest potentially active faults in the near vicinity of Roseville are the Bear Mountain and Melones Faults. The closest recently active fault in the western Sierra Nevada foothills is the Cleveland Hills Fault, about 36 miles northwest of Auburn.

Eastern Placer County borders the Basin and Range geological province, which includes most of Nevada and western Utah. This area is riddled with active faults that form the boundary between each basin or valley and the neighboring mountain range.

The Lake Tahoe Basin is seismically active with earthquakes greater than 7.0 that have occurred beneath Lake Tahoe. According to the Placer County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan, a series of small earthquakes also occurred in late 2003 and early 2004 due to volcanic magma (molten rock) moving 20 miles below the Sierra Nevada Mountains. The earthquakes reflect the movement of the Sierra Nevada range to the northwest at a rate of about half an inch per year.

West of Roseville

Tectonic stresses associated with the North American-Pacific Plate boundary can generate damaging earthquakes along faults 30 to 100 miles west of Placer County. Both the San Andreas fault (source of the estimated 8.0-Richter magnitude San Francisco earthquake that caused damage in Sacramento in 1906) and the closer Hayward fault have the potential for experiencing major to great events. Another potential earthquake source is the Midland Fault Zone on the western side of the Sacramento Valley. This was the source of the 1892 Vacaville-Winters earthquake.

The Petrolia (coastal Humboldt County) earthquake increased concern about how amplified long-period motions from much closer major events, such as on the San Andreas Fault or the Hayward Fault, might reach damaging levels and affect Sacramento.

Other potential earthquake sources are the faults associated with the western edge of the Central Valley, recently defined as the Coast Range Central Valley Boundary Thrust Fault System. Various documents define portions of this little known system as the Midland Fault Zone or the Dunnigan Hills fault, where the 1892 Vacaville-Winters earthquake occurred. A southern part of the system may have been the source of the 1983 Coalinga earthquake.

Inactive Faults

Active faults are those that have experienced displacement in historical time. However, inactive faults, for which no such displacements have been recorded, also have the potential to reactivate or experience displacement along a branch sometime in the future. An example of a fault zone that has been reactivated is the Foothills Fault Zone. The zone was considered inactive until evidence of an earthquake (approximately 1.6 million years ago) was found near Spenceville, California. Then, in 1975, an earthquake occurred on another branch of the zone near Oroville, California (now known as the Cleveland Hills Fault). The State Division of Mines and Geology

indicates that increased earthquake activity throughout California may cause tectonic movement along currently inactive fault systems.

No active faults are known to exist in Placer County. The following inactive faults have been identified within the city limits:

- The Volcano Hill fault extends northwest from Volcano Hill for a distance of 1 mile, terminating near Eureka Road. No activity has been recorded along this fault; therefore, it is considered inactive.
- Identified in 1973, the Linda Creek fault is located along Linda Creek in Roseville and Sacramento County. No activity has been recorded along this fault.
- The Willows Fault and Stockton Fault are in the Roseville vicinity and are considered inactive as displacement occurred greater than 1.8 million years ago.
- An unnamed fault extends east to west between Folsom Lake and the City of Rocklin. Segments of the fault are concealed and therefore unmapped. However, the east/west alignment suggests that the fault could connect to the Bear Mountain Fault, branches of which are located beneath Folsom Lake. The Bear Mountain Fault is a fault that could be undergoing reactivation as a result of continental tectonic activity. However, no evidence has been identified along the unnamed fault alignment of such reactivation.

Maps of Earthquake Impact in Roseville

A probabilistic seismic hazard map shows the hazard from earthquakes that seismologists agree could occur. It is probabilistic in the sense that the analysis takes into consideration the uncertainties in the size and location of earthquakes and the resulting ground motions that can affect a particular site. The maps are expressed in terms of probability of exceeding a certain ground motion, such as the 10-percent probability of exceedance in 50 years. This level of ground shaking has been used for designing buildings in high seismic areas. Figure 9-2 shows the estimated ground motion for a 100-year probabilistic earthquake.

Earthquake scenarios describe the expected ground motions and effects of specific hypothetical large earthquakes for a region. Maps of these scenarios can be used to support all phases of emergency management. Two such scenarios were evaluated for this Plan:

- A Magnitude-6.8 event on the Concord-Green Valley Fault with an epicenter 56 miles southwest of Roseville near Vallejo, California (see Figure 9-3)
- A Magnitude-7.1 event on the Great Valley Fault with an epicenter 58 miles west northwest of Roseville (see Figure 9-4)

NEHRP Soil Maps

NEHRP soil types define locations that will be significantly impacted by an earthquake. NEHRP Soils B and C typically can sustain low-magnitude ground shaking without much effect. Areas with NEHRP Soils D, E and F are most commonly affected by ground shaking. Figure 9-5 shows NEHRP soil classifications in the county.




Figure 9-2. 100-Year Probabilistic PGA




Figure 9-3. Concord-Green Valley Fault Scenario PGA




Figure 9-4. Great Valley 3 Fault Scenario PGA




Figure 9-5. National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program Soil Classification

9.2.3 Frequency

California experiences hundreds of earthquakes each year, most with minimal damage and magnitudes below 3.0 on the Richter Scale. Earthquakes that cause moderate damage to structures occur several times a year. According to the USGS, a strong earthquake measuring greater than 5.0 on the Richter Scale occurs every two to three years and major earthquakes of more than 7.0 on the Richter Scale occur once a decade. Both the San Andreas Fault and the closer Hayward Fault have the potential for experiencing major to great events. The State Hazard Mitigation Plan indicates that in the next 30 years in California there is over a 99-percent probability of a magnitude 6.7 earthquake and a 94-percent probability of a magnitude 7.0 earthquake.

9.2.4 Severity

Placer County and Roseville are identified as a low-severity zone. While there are several faults with the potential for large-magnitude earthquakes in the vicinity, the distance between those faults and the City of Roseville would result in very low, peak-ground accelerations in the City. The biggest contributor to potential intensity of shaking in Roseville is the Foothills Fault Zone.

Liquefaction

Liquefaction of loose sandy soil with a high water content during an earthquake undermines the ground's ability to solidly support building structures. Foundations supported on liquefiable soils can lose their ability to support load, and can experience settlement on the order of several inches or more. Differential settlement can cause significant damage to buildings, lifelines, and transportation structures, with partial or total collapse.

The City of Roseville is not specifically addressed in currently available State Division of Mines and Geology liquefaction risk data. No determination has been made as to whether liquefaction potential exists in Roseville. Based on project-specific analysis that has been done for many of Roseville's development projects, liquefaction has not been identified as a significant problem in Roseville.

The prevailing water table in the vicinity of Roseville is approximately 80 feet below grade. Without water to saturate the soil, liquefaction is not possible. The liquefaction potential in Roseville is, therefore, considered to be very low. The most likely location for liquefaction would be along the City's creek beds. The City's policy of protecting floodplain areas has avoided development in many of the most susceptible areas.

Ground Failure

Roseville's geographic location, soil conditions, and surface terrain combine to minimize risk of major damage from landslides, subsidence (gradual shrinking of the earth's surface due to underground resource extraction), or other geologic hazards resulting from seismic activity and related natural forces.

Slopes

Roseville is located on relatively level terrain, with slopes that gradually increases to the north and east. Recent development in the Stoneridge Specific Plan and Northeast Roseville Specific Plan is adjacent to ravine areas and developed property would be more susceptible in the event of seismic activity due to steep slopes in some areas.

9.2.5 Warning Time

There is no current reliable way to predict the day or month that an earthquake will occur at any given location. Research is being done with warning systems that use the low energy waves that precede major earthquakes. These potential warning systems would give approximately 40 seconds notice that a major earthquake is about to occur. The warning time is very short but it could allow for someone to get under a desk, step away from a hazardous material they are working with or shut down a computer system.

9.3 SECONDARY HAZARDS

Earthquakes can cause large and sometimes disastrous landslides and mudslides. River valleys are vulnerable to slope failure, often as a result of loss of cohesion in clay-rich soils. When soil liquefaction occurs, building and road foundations can lose load-bearing strength and may sink quicksand-like into what was previously solid ground. Unless properly secured, hazardous materials can be released during earthquakes, causing significant damage to the environment and people. Earthen dams and levees are highly susceptible to seismic events and the impacts of their eventual failures can be considered secondary earthquake hazards.

The City of Roseville faces potential social impacts in the wake of mass evacuations should a large seismic event occur in the San Francisco Bay area. As the first major metropolitan city along Interstate 80 east of Sacramento, the City's services and infrastructure could be strained as evacuating populations seek shelter close to home. Evacuees could need shelter for long periods, depending on the magnitude of the event. This could significantly tax hospitals, schools and services in the City, causing significant economic impacts.

9.4 EXPOSURE

9.4.1 Population

All of the population of Roseville, both residents and visitors, would be directly or indirectly exposed to the potential impacts of an earthquake.

9.4.2 Property

All structures within Roseville are exposed to the potential impacts of an earthquake.

9.4.3 Critical Facilities

Since the entire planning area has exposure to the earthquake hazard, all critical facilities and infrastructure components are exposed to the earthquake hazard, as summarized in Table 9-6 and Table 9-7.

Table 9-6. Critical Facilities Exposed to the Earthquake Hazard

Facility Type	Number in Planning Area
Medical and Health	2
Government Functions	27
Protective Functions	10
Schools	49
Hazmat	6
Other Critical Functions	78
Total	172

Table 9-7. Critical Infrastructure Exposed to the Earthquake Hazard

Facility Type	Number in Planning Area
Bridges	68
Water Supply	11
Wastewater	23
Power	18
Communications	98
Other	6
Total	224

The City's Water Treatment Plant on Barton Road is the only critical facility located near an identified local inactive fault. All other City facilities are within Roseville and are not located near an inactive local fault. However, all are considered to be exposed to the same earthquake risk as the general building stock.

Most of the City's critical facilities have been built since the Uniform Building Code (UBC) was amended to include provisions for seismic safety. For example, the two major hospitals—Sutter Roseville Medical Center and Kaiser Permanente—were both constructed in the 1990s, as were the Roseville Police Department and Roseville Civic Center. The movement of the California Building Code to the International Building Code standard in 2013 has upheld seismic standards previously established by the UBC.

Critical industrial facilities are of concern because of potential hazardous materials spills or the potential for critical employment centers to continue operating. Many forms of hazardous materials are present in Roseville at private businesses, in permanent storage locations, along the Union Pacific Railroad, and on Interstate 80 and Highway 65.

Hazardous Materials

Hazardous material releases from fixed facilities and transportation-related releases can occur during an earthquake event. Roseville's location at the junction of two major rail lines with two freeways increases the potential for a hazardous materials event should a major earthquake occur. Facilities holding hazardous materials are of particular concern because of possible isolation of surrounding populations.

Roads

Roads have the potential to be significantly damaged during an earthquake. Access to major roads is crucial to life and safety after a disaster event as well as to response and recovery operations.

Bridges

Earthquake events can significantly impact bridges, which often provide the only access to some neighborhoods. Since soft soil regions generally follow floodplain boundaries, bridges that cross water courses are considered vulnerable. Since most of the City's bridges provide access across water courses, most are at least somewhat vulnerable to earthquakes. Key factors in the degree of vulnerability are the facility's age and type of construction, which indicate the standards to which the facility was built.

Water and Sewer Infrastructure

Water and sewer infrastructure would likely suffer considerable damage in the event of an earthquake. This is hard to analyze due to the amount of infrastructure and the fact that water and sewer infrastructure are usually linear easements. Without further analysis of individual system components, it should be assumed that these systems are exposed to breakage and failure.

9.4.4 Environment

Environmental problems as a result of an earthquake can be numerous. Secondary hazards will likely have some of the most damaging effects on the environment. Earthquake-induced landslides in landslide prone areas can significantly impact surrounding habitat. It is also possible for streams to be rerouted after an earthquake. This can change the water quality, possibly damaging habitat and feeding areas. There is a possibility of streams fed by groundwater wells drying up because of changes in underlying geology.

9.5 VULNERABILITY

The data in this section was generated using the HAZUS-MH program for earthquakes. Once the location and size of a hypothetical earthquake are identified, HAZUS-MH estimates the intensity of the ground shaking, the number of buildings damaged, the number of casualties, the amount of damage to transportation systems and utilities, the number of people displaced from their homes, and the estimated cost of repair and clean up.

Although Roseville is in California and has three faults documented in the City's General Plan, the seismic hazard is not considered to be a serious risk to life or property. Studies have not identified the Sierra Foothills, including Placer County, as a likely location for a significant seismic event. Roseville is fortunate in that more than three-quarters of the development in the City has occurred in the past two decades and all applicable seismic building codes have been enforced through the planning and development process.

9.5.1 Population

The measurable impact of earthquake on loss of life is minimal in Roseville and has not been estimated for this Plan. The life-safety exposure to earthquake in Roseville is low and would most likely occur in buildings as a result of damage to structures. To prevent damage to structures that could lead to loss of life, the City has a strict code enforcement policy to prevent improper alterations to original buildings. The City has funded façade grants to renovate older commercial structures, and has established an infill development team to work with property owners to upgrade and add value to older properties.

The City encourages residents to be prepared through public education and training via the Roseville Fire Department and local non-profits. Local employers such as Union Pacific, Sutter Roseville Medical Center, Kaiser Hospital, HP and NEC maintain emergency response plans that include earthquake preparedness and response training to protect life and property. Earthquake preparedness and response training prepares employees to continue service to the community in the event of a seismic event.

The vulnerable populations are those living in economically disadvantaged households, those over 65 and those under 16.

9.5.2 Property

Loss Potential

An earthquake would cause property damage in a small percentage of the City's buildings built prior to 1933 and structures such as manufactured homes and older homes that have not been well maintained. Loss estimates for the planning area were generated for the 100-year earthquake event as well as the Concord-Green Valley Fault scenario event and the Great Valley 3 Fault scenario event, through a Level 2 analysis using HAZUS-MH. A summary of results is as follows:

- For a 100-year earthquake, the estimated damage potential is \$43.37 million, or 0.15 percent of the total assessed value for the planning area.
- For a 6.8-magnitude event on the Concord-Green Valley Fault, the estimated damage potential is \$1.7 million, or 0.01 percent of the total assessed value for the planning area.
- For a 7.1-magnitude event on the Great Valley 3 Fault, the estimated damage potential is \$21.3 million, or 0.07 percent of the total assessed value for the planning area.

Age of Structures

The City of Roseville is a relatively new community, with most of its development occurring since 1976. The California Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan identifies significant milestones in building and seismic code

requirements that affect the structural integrity of development in California. Table 9-8 lists the City's structures by the time period in which they were built, based on age-of-structure data from the City's land inventory database. The number of structures is approximate and is based on best available data currently entered into Roseville and Placer County databases. The number of structures does not reflect the number of total housing units, as many multi-family units and attached housing units are reported as one structure.

Table 9-8. Age of Structures in the City of Roseville

Time Period	Number of Structures in Roseville	Significance of Time Period
Pre-1933	540	Before 1933, there were no explicit requirements for earthquakes in building codes. State law did not require local governments to have building officials or issue building permits.
1933-1940	608	In 1940, the first strong motion recording was made in El Centro.
1941-1960	2,526	In 1960, the Structural Engineers Association of California reached the first statewide consensus on recommended earthquake provisions and published the guidelines.
1961-1975	3,029	In 1975, significant improvements were made to lateral force requirements that were then enforced throughout the state.
1976-1994	12,932	In 1994, the Uniform Building Code was amended to include provisions for seismic safety.
1994 to present	26,423	Seismic code is currently enforced.
Total	46,058	

Just over 57 percent of the City's structures were constructed since the UBC was amended in 1994 to include seismic safety provisions. Approximately 1 percent of the City's structures were built before 1933 when there were no building permits, inspections, or seismic standards. Figure 9-6 shows the distribution of structures across the City by age.

Construction Materials

The type of construction is a factor in a building's ability to withstand shaking and liquefaction should an earthquake occur. Developers in Roseville have built primarily wood frame structures. The tallest building in Roseville is currently three stories. HAZUS-MH generated the percentages of each building type in Roseville as shown in Table 9-9.

Table 9-9. Building Type

Building Type	Percent of Total
Wood	96.67%
Reinforced Masonry	<1%
Manufactured Homes	<1%
Concrete	1.2%
Un-reinforced Masonry	<1%
Steel	<1%
Total	100%

Sources: HAZUS – MH (Occupancy Class Data)




Figure 9-6. Age of Construction of Structures in Roseville

9.5.3 Critical Facilities

Roseville's utilities all have funded rehabilitation programs that identify and replace worn infrastructure to ensure continuous service. The latest technologies, including computerized alarms, video inspections, and mapping of all of the City's water, wastewater, recycled water and electric systems, would identify damaged sections in the event of a seismic event. Private utilities in Roseville also use modern technology to monitor their infrastructure in Roseville and respond quickly to service interruptions.

Level of Damage

The inventory of critical facilities was entered into HAZUS-MH to determine the vulnerability of these facilities to earthquake damage. Critical facilities were categorized into the following levels of damage probability: no damage, slight damage, moderate damage, extensive damage, or complete damage. HAZUS-MH calculated the probability of damage under each of these categories for the 100-year event and the Great Valley 3 Fault Scenario. The results are summarized in Table 9-10 and Table 9-11. The impact on critical facilities for the Concord-Green Valley Fault scenario was not run due to the limited impacts of this event identified by the general building stock analysis.

Table 9-10. Damage Probability (Vulnerability) of Critical Facilities from a 100-Year Earthquake Event

Category	No Damage	Slight Damage	Moderate Damage	Extensive Damage	Complete Damage
Medical and Health	99.8	0.2	0	0	0
Government Functions	93.4	5.0	1.5	0.1	0
Protective Functions	97.4	2.4	0.2	0	0
Schools	97.3	2.5	0.2	0	0
Other Critical Functions	95.4	4.0	0.6	0	0
Average	96.7	2.8	0.5	0	0

Table 9-11. Damage Probability (Vulnerability) of Critical Facilities from the Great Valley 3 Scenario

Category	No Damage	Slight Damage	Moderate Damage	Extensive Damage	Complete Damage
Medical and Health	100	0	0	0	0
Government Functions	99.3	0.7	0	0	0
Protective Functions	99.7	0.3	0	0	0
Schools	99.8	0.2	0	0	0
Other Critical Functions	99.6	0.4	0	0	0
Average	99.7	0.3	0	0	0

Time to Return to Functionality

HAZUS-MH estimates the expected time required to restore critical facilities to full functional use, in the form of percent probability of being functional at specified time increments post-event: 1, 3, 7, 14, 30 and 90 days after the event occurs. For example, HAZUS-MH may estimate that a facility has 5-percent chance of being fully functional at Day 3, and a 95-percent chance of being fully functional at Day 90. The functionality analysis was performed for all critical facilities and infrastructure components in the planning area for both the 100-year event and the Great Valley 3 Scenario. Results are summarized in Table 9-12 and Table 9-13.

9.5.4 Environment

The environment vulnerable to earthquake hazard is the same as the environment exposed to the hazard.

Table 9-12. Functionality of Critical Facilities, 100-Year Earthquake

Planning Unit	# of Critical Facilities	Probability of Being Fully Functional (%)					
		at Day 1	at Day 3	at Day 7	at Day 14	at Day 30	at Day 90
Medical and Health	2	99.7	99.7	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9
Government Functions	27	93.4	93.6	98.3	98.3	99.8	99.9
Protective Functions	10	97.3	97.3	99.7	99.8	99.9	99.9
Schools	49	97.2	97.2	99.7	99.8	99.9	99.9
Other Critical functions	78	95.3	95.5	99.3	99.3	99.9	99.9
Total/Average	166	96.6	96.7	99.4	99.4	99.9	99.9

Table 9-13. Functionality of Critical Facilities, Great Valley 3 Scenario

Planning Unit	# of Critical Facilities	Probability of Being Fully Functional (%)					
		at Day 1	at Day 3	at Day 7	at Day 14	at Day 30	at Day 90
Medical and Health	2	100	100	100	100	100	100
Government Functions	27	99.2	99.2	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9
Protective Functions	10	99.7	99.7	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9
Schools	49	99.8	99.8	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9
Other Critical functions	78	99.5	99.5	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9
Total/Average	166	99.6	99.6	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9

9.6 FUTURE TRENDS IN DEVELOPMENT

The general building stock within the planning area increased by 17.7% with an increase in valuation from \$21.967 billion to \$29.641 billion (34.9%). This increase in valuation of the planning area was impacted by the areas recovery from the economic downturn of 2008. Since the entire planning area would be considered susceptible to earthquake, there was an increase in earthquake exposure over the performance period of the 2011 plan. However, the vulnerability of this new exposure should be considered to be low due to the application of strong seismic building code standards that are contained within the International Building Code.

Roseville is expected to grow considerably in the next 10 years. The moderate potential for earthquake in Roseville is not likely to lessen or prohibit development in the City.

The City's development departments will strictly enforce all seismic building codes and design standards to prevent loss of life and property due to earthquake. Public education, cooperation with the development community, and individual preparedness are essential as Roseville welcomes thousands of new residents and hundreds of new businesses to the City each year.

9.7 REVIEW OF EXISTING ORDINANCES, PROGRAMS AND PLANS

9.7.1 International Building Codes

The State of California provides minimum standards for structural design and site development through the California Building Standards Code (California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 24). The California Building Code (CBC) is based on the International Building Code (IBC), which is widely used throughout the United States and has been modified for California conditions with numerous more detailed and stringent regulations.

Chapter 18 of the IBC/CBC regulates the excavation of foundations and retaining walls and regulates grading activities, including drainage and erosion control, and construction on expansive soils (soils that expand when

water is added, and shrink when they dry out). Specific minimum seismic safety and structural design requirements are set forth in Chapter 16 of the IBC/CBC. The IBC/CBC requires a site-specific geotechnical study to address seismic issues and identifies seismic factors that must be considered in structural design.

The following uniform codes have been adopted in Chapter 16 of the Roseville Zoning Ordinance to ensure that buildings are designed and sited properly to protect against seismic and unstable soil conditions: CBC (2013), California Plumbing Code (2013), California Green Building Standards (2013), and the California Mechanical Code (2013).

To reduce the risk of seismic-related safety hazards and structural damage to pipelines, roads, and residential homes to an acceptable level, the City of Roseville conditions of approval for development projects require that at the time of tentative map approval, construction be in accordance with the IBC and local building standards, as administered by the Roseville Building Division. Regular monitoring and enforcement through the building permit and plan check process ensures that new development and construction meet all seismic and geologic safety standards, reducing the risk of building damage.

9.7.2 Improvement Standards

The City of Roseville Improvement Standards require the development of a grading plan, an erosion and sedimentation control plan, and mitigation monitoring requirements to reduce the exposure of people and structures to seismic hazards.

9.7.3 Geotechnical Studies

The City of Roseville requires the preparation of site-specific geotechnical studies as part of the building permit process. The technical information that must be compiled for these studies, which address both seismic hazards and soil conditions, is specified in Chapters 16 and 18 of the CBC. The studies provide recommendations to address slope and foundation instability, stream bank protection, and slope evaluation, as well an evaluation of expansive soils and differential settlement. Implementation of recommendations minimizes impacts associated with the exposure of people and structures to seismic hazards, the development of structures on expansive soils, grading that increases slope instability, increased erosion along stream channels, and soil erosion from grading.

9.8 SCENARIO

Inactive faults in the region could significantly impact the City of Roseville should they reactivate, but modeling such impact is difficult due to the lack of data. The direct earthquake risk in Roseville is considered to be low to moderate, but indirect impacts from a significant event in the region could be significant. The City would most likely experience impacts from a large seismic event in the Bay Area. As a large metropolitan center with easy access to transportation corridors, the City would likely become a major evacuation center in response to such an event. This could significantly tax City resources.

9.9 ISSUES

Important issues associated with an earthquake in Roseville include but are not limited to the following:

- Planning is required for mass evacuations into the City of Roseville.
- There is enough older building stock in the City featuring un-reinforced masonry construction to warrant structural and non-structural mitigation.
- There is a need for better comprehensive soils data to better identify the probable earthquake risks in the City.

- A large seismic event in the Sacramento Region could trigger a dam failure on Folsom Lake, causing significant impacts.
- The perceived lack of risk can lead to complacency. Earthquakes provide a significant risk to all populations in California, whether the impacts are direct or indirect.
- There is still much to learn about the impacts of climate change on seismic activity.

10. FLOODING

10.1 GENERAL BACKGROUND

A floodplain is the area adjacent to a river, creek or lake that becomes inundated during a flood. Floodplains may be broad, as when a river crosses an extensive flat landscape, or narrow, as when a river is confined in a canyon.

10.1.1 Measuring Floods and Floodplains

The frequency and severity of flooding are measured using a discharge probability, which represents the probability that a certain discharge level will be equaled or exceeded in a given year. Discharge is the volume of water flowing in a stream or river and over its banks during a given time. Flood studies use historical records to determine the probability of occurrence for different discharge levels. The flood frequency equals 100 divided by the discharge probability. For example, the 100-year discharge has a 1 percent chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year. The “annual flood” is the greatest flood event expected to occur in a typical year.

The extent of flooding associated with a 1-percent annual probability of occurrence (the base flood or 100-year flood) is commonly used as the regulatory boundary. This boundary is also referred to as the special flood hazard area (SFHA). Many communities have maps that show the extent and likely depth of flooding for the base flood. The base flood elevation is computed using discharge probabilities. The corresponding water-surface elevations describe the exact elevation of water that will result from a given discharge level, which is one of the most important factors used in estimating the potential flood damage in a given area.

10.1.2 Effects of Human Activities

Throughout history, humans have developed settlements in floodplains to take advantage of the benefits of being near the water bodies, but such settlements have always been susceptible to damage from flooding. Human activities concentrate in floodplains for a number of reasons: water is readily available; land is fertile; transportation by water is easily accessible; and land is flatter and easier to develop. But human activity in floodplains frequently interferes with natural processes. It can affect the distribution and timing of drainage, thereby increasing flood problems. Human development creates local flooding problems by altering or confining drainage channels. This increases flood potential in two ways: it reduces the stream’s capacity to contain flows, and it increases flow rates or velocities downstream during all stages of a flood event.

10.1.3 Floodplain Ecosystems

Floodplains can support ecosystems that are rich in biological quantity and diversity. Wetting of the floodplain soil releases a surge of nutrients: those left over from the last flood, and those that result from the rapid decomposition of organic matter that has accumulated since then. Microscopic organisms thrive and larger species enter a rapid breeding cycle. Opportunistic feeders—particularly birds—move in to take advantage. The production of nutrients peaks and falls away quickly, but the surge of new growth endures for some time. This makes floodplains particularly valuable for agriculture. Riparian zone species have significant differences from those outside of floodplains. For instance, riparian trees tend to be very tolerant of root disturbance and tend to be very quick-growing compared to non-riparian trees.

10.1.4 Federal Flood Programs

National Flood Insurance Program

The NFIP makes federally backed flood insurance available to homeowners, renters, and business owners in participating communities. For most communities participating in the NFIP, FEMA has prepared a detailed Flood Insurance Study. The study presents water surface elevations for floods of various magnitudes, including the 1-percent annual chance flood and the 0.2-percent annual chance flood (the 500-year flood). Base flood elevations and the boundaries of the 100- and 500-year floodplains are shown on Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs).

Roseville entered the NFIP on December 15, 1983. The date of the City's current effective FIRM is November 21, 2001. As a participant in the NFIP, the City must, at a minimum, regulate development in its floodplain areas in accordance with NFIP criteria. Before a permit to build in a floodplain area is issued, the City must ensure that two basic criteria are met:

- All new buildings and developments undergoing substantial improvements must, at a minimum, be elevated to protect against damage by the 100-year flood.
- New floodplain development must not worsen existing flood problems or increase damage to other properties.

Properties constructed after a FIRM has been adopted are eligible for reduced flood insurance rates. Such structures are less vulnerable to flooding since they were constructed after regulations and codes were adopted to decrease vulnerability. Properties built before the FIRM was adopted may be more vulnerable to flooding and related damage because they do not meet code or are located in hazardous areas. The first FIRMs for Roseville were available at the end of 1983. According to Placer County Assessor records, 131 of the 154 structures located in the City's regulated floodplain were constructed prior to January 1984 and are therefore considered pre-FIRM under the NFIP. The number of post-FIRM structures in the regulatory floodplain is extremely low because of the City's proactive floodplain management policy of not allowing new development in the floodplain.

The Community Rating System

The Community Rating System (CRS) is a voluntary incentive program within the NFIP. The CRS encourages floodplain management activities that exceed the minimum NFIP requirements (FEMA 2002). Flood insurance premium rates are discounted to reflect the reduced flood risk resulting from community actions meeting the following three goals of the CRS:

- Reduce flood losses.
- Facilitate accurate insurance rating.
- Promote awareness of flood insurance.

For participating communities, flood insurance premium rates are discounted in increments of 5 percent. For example, a Class 1 community would receive a 45 percent premium discount, and a Class 9 community would receive a 5 percent discount. (Class 10 communities are those that do not participate in the CRS; they receive no discount.) The CRS classes for local communities are based on 18 creditable activities in the following categories:

- Public Information
- Mapping and Regulations
- Flood Damage Reduction
- Flood Preparedness

Figure 10-1 shows the nationwide number of CRS communities by class as of May 1, 2016, when there were 1,391 communities receiving flood insurance premium discounts under the CRS program. Although insurance

premium discounts are one benefit of participation in the CRS, more important benefits result from activities that save lives and reduce property damage. Communities participating in the CRS represent a significant portion of the nation's flood risk as evidenced by the fact that over 68 percent of the NFIP's policy base is located in these communities. Communities receiving premium discounts through the CRS range from small to large and represent a broad mixture of flood risks, including both coastal and riverine flood risks.




Figure 10-1. CRS Communities by Class as of May 1, 2016

The City of Roseville participated as a pilot-test community during CRS development in the late 1980s. The City began its official participation in the CRS program in 1991 and became the nation's first and only Class 1 community on October 1, 2006. This classification provides flood insurance policy holders in Roseville up to a 45-percent reduction in flood insurance premiums and represents an annual savings of \$101,858 in flood insurance premiums; an average of \$172 per year for each policy in force.

10.2 HAZARD PROFILE

10.2.1 Flooding Types

Flooding in Roseville is typically caused by high-intensity storms of relatively short duration (1 to 3 hours) concentrated on a stream reach with already saturated soil. In Roseville, two types of flooding typically occur:

- Flash floods that occur suddenly after a brief but intense and concentrated downpour. They move rapidly, end suddenly, and can occur in areas not generally associated with flooding (such as subdivisions not adjacent to a water body and areas serviced by underground drainage systems). Although the duration of these events is usually brief, the damage they cause can be severe. Flash floods cannot be predicted accurately and happen whenever there are heavy storms.

- Riverine floods, which are described in terms of their extent (including the horizontal area affected and the vertical depth of floodwater) and the related probability of occurrence (expressed as the percentage chance that a flood of a specific extent will occur in any given year).

Some localized flooding not associated with creek or stream overflow occurs in Roseville when rainfall runoff volumes exceed the design capacity of drainage facilities or when there are no drainage facilities to control flows. The City has attempted to address this type of flooding with regulations that require an “overland release” of stormwater generated at a site to a recognized stormwater facility. The City also requires mitigation of any increase in runoff generated from new development. However, some developments and facilities in the City were put in place before these policies were adopted.

10.2.2 Past Events

Correspondence from the 1930s between the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the City of Roseville indicated a need for establishing flood control measures along Dry, Cirby, and Linda Creeks. The flood of February 1986 was the largest flood on record at its time. This flood caused substantial property damage and was considered to be a 70- to 100-year event, depending on location. In January 1995, the City was subject to flooding that exceeded the 1986 flood event in most streams in Roseville, and that flood is now considered to be the flood of record.

Based on data from the National Climactic Data Center and the University of South Carolina’s Spatial Hazard Events and Losses Database for the United States, 16 major flood events were reported in Placer County between January 1950 and December 2009, with an estimated \$49,115,460 in property damage. Table 10-1 shows the estimated damage from flooding in Placer County that impacted Roseville from 1973 to 2009.

Table 10-1. Reported Damage from Major Flooding in Roseville (1973 to 2009)

Date	Reported Damage (not adjusted for inflation)
January 1973	\$86,207
March 1983	Not Available
February 1986	\$5,000,000 (Roseville only)
January 1995	\$8,000,000 Total (\$4.4 million structural)
January 26, 1997	\$43,600 (structural)
February 1998	\$20,000 (structural)
December 17, 2005	\$2,000,000 (county-wide)

Significant flood events impacting the City of Roseville are discussed below with respect to damage, frequency, injuries and fatalities. Unreported injury or illness may be associated with each event. In addition to the events discussed below, flooding occurred during other storms in 1950, 1952 and 1963. However, little information is available to define the extent and impacts of these flooding events.

December 1955

Flooding occurred primarily along Dry Creek. Homes in the Douglas Boulevard area were surrounded by floodwater, and one family was evacuated. Douglas Boulevard was impassable, and pavement was damaged. Royer Park was inundated, and floodwater extended across Park Drive. No injuries or fatalities were reported.

April 1958

This flood, which continued for at least 12 hours, was the second largest event on record at the time. Flooding was most severe on Sunrise Avenue in the southeast portion of the City, on Douglas Boulevard, in the Royer Park area, and on Riverside Avenue at Dry Creek. Agricultural damage occurred along Dry Creek immediately west of

the City. Many homes and businesses were surrounded by floodwater. Several families were evacuated by boat from homes in the Columbia Street and Douglas Boulevard areas. At Royer Park, floodwater covered the ball field and extended across Park Drive. Part of the sewage treatment plant was flooded, but the plant remained operational. No injuries or fatalities were reported.

October 1962

This flood was considered the flood of record at the time. Over 9 inches of rain fell. Creeks overflowed their banks throughout the City, but the areas most affected were along Linda Creek in the Sierra Gardens Subdivision and along Dry Creek. A number of families were evacuated from their homes on Lee Way and Douglas Boulevard. Royer Park was completely inundated for a time, and one deer in the zoo was drowned before animals could be evacuated. Other flood losses in the park included bank erosion, destruction of fencing, damage to a footbridge, and damage to a recreation building and the park office. Restoration of the park required two weeks. Water mains were damaged in the Cresthaven and Atlantic Street areas. The Dry Creek Bridge on Riverside Avenue and the Antelope Creek Bridge on Atlantic Street were damaged. No injuries or fatalities were reported.

December 1964

During this flood event, the fire and police departments evacuated four families when floodwater from Linda Creek surrounded their homes on Champion Oaks Drive and Lee Way. Dry Creek overflowed its banks in several locations, and flood-borne debris was removed in an effort to keep the stream flowing at Booth Road and the Southern Pacific railroad tracks. Floodwater at this location was deep enough to submerge a car stalled in the underpass. Stream-bank erosion occurred along the east bank of Dry Creek behind the Campfire Girls lodge on Sutter Avenue. No injuries or fatalities were reported.

January 1969

A series of downpours beginning on January 16, 1969 caused flooding along Dry Creek, affecting Royer Park, the Champion Oaks area, and the intersection of Cirby Way and Old Auburn Road. Rising water from Linda Creek crested at the doorsteps of five homes along Champion Oaks Drive. City crews prepared to load belongings into vehicles if floodwater entered the homes. A second storm during the week of January 25, caused rising water in Linda Creek that led to the evacuation of five homes on Champion Oaks Drive. Dry Creek Bridge on Douglas Boulevard at Royer Park was closed when Dry Creek washed out fill placed by City crews in response to an earlier washout. No injuries or fatalities were reported.

January 1970

Heavy rains and severe winds caused flooding in Roseville and throughout northern California. High water levels were reported on Champion Oaks Way, Subway Road, and Royer Park. No injuries or fatalities were reported.

January 1973

Heavy rain and high winds impacted northern California border during the week of January 16, 1973. City crews kept watch on Linda Creek at Champion Oaks Drive and closed Subway Road because of flooding. Royer Park flooded after Dry Creek overflowed its banks. No injuries or fatalities were reported.

March 1983

This flood damaged approximately 25 residences along Linda and Cirby Creeks. Portions of Royer Park and areas in the Sierra Lakes Mobile Home Park were inundated. Dry Creek overflowed the Darling Way and Riverside Avenue bridges and flooded six businesses along Riverside Avenue. No injuries or fatalities were reported.

February 1986

This flood caused widespread damage in most of the Dry Creek basin. Nearly all bridges and culverts were overtopped, with 30 sustaining embankment damage. The crossing at Rocky Ridge Drive washed out. Two bridges over Dry Creek were damaged, and street cave-ins occurred at a number of locations. Approximately 209 homes along Dry, Linda, and Cirby Creeks reported flood damage, with water levels up to 5 feet above finished floor levels. The Roseville City Library was closed due to flooding. Floodwaters reached the foundation of the Public Safety Building but did not cause any damage. One fatality associated with this flood event was reported.

January 1995

The January 1995 flood event (Figure 10-2) exceeded the flood event of 1986 on Cirby and Linda Creeks. This event is now considered the flood of record for Dry Creek based on flood heights. The flood was calculated to be a 100-year event. This flood resulted in 358 structures in the Dry Creek Basin being inundated by floodwaters. No injuries or fatalities were reported.



Figure 10-2. Dry Creek Flooding, January 1995

January 1997

Flood events in 1997 were some of the most severe on record for the region. An isolated storm event typical for the Roseville area occurred on soils saturated from repetitive storm events, causing a flash flood. This flooding resulted in 21 structures being inundated with floodwater. The impact of this event was significantly reduced by the partially completed Cirby, Linda, and Dry Creek flood control project. No injuries or fatalities were reported.

February 1998

A small flood occurred on February 3, 1998, resulting in eight structures being inundated by floodwater in the Dry Creek Basin (Figure 10-3). This event was caused by an isolated storm event centered over the basin. No injuries or fatalities were reported.



Figure 10-3. Business Flooding, February 1998

10.2.3 Location

Primary Flood Sources

Upstream flows generated in Placer County enter the City of Roseville's creeks and tributaries from the east and north. Picking up additional stormwater runoff, the creek systems flow west-southwest through Roseville. These flows continue to move west-southwest, passing through Placer, Sacramento, and Sutter Counties to their ultimate destination, the Sacramento and American Rivers.

Roseville is located in portions of two major drainage basins: the Pleasant Grove Creek Basin and the Dry Creek Basin. Pleasant Grove Creek and its tributaries drain most of the western and central areas of the City, and the Dry Creek Basin and its tributaries drain the rest of the City.

The Dry Creek system has year-round flow in its major water courses, and the Pleasant Grove system is intermittent, with only seasonal flow. Since 1950, there have been no reports of structural flood damage along Pleasant Grove Creek. Due to the City's floodplain management policies, no structures in the Pleasant Grove Creek Basin are presently subject to flooding. The focus of flood hazard management is the Dry Creek Basin.

Seven creeks and streams that drain the 80-square-mile Upper Dry Creek Basin pass through and join within the city limits of Roseville. Three of these creeks have primary flooding impacts on the City: Cirby, Dry, and Linda Creeks.

Regulatory Floodplain

The science available at the time that most of the City of Roseville was developed did not accurately project flood heights that could occur from typical rainfall events in the region. Development therefore occurred in areas needed for stormwater conveyance, with insufficient levels of flood protection. Development now exists in low-lying areas adjacent to creek or stream systems needed to convey the over-bank flooding that can occur during storm events.

The City eventually modeled flooding using the best available hydrologic and hydraulic science to better reflect actual rainfall events that can impact the City. This modeling generated a projection of flood heights and areas of inundation that is well supported by conditions observed during the 1986 flood. The City has since used this information to create and enhance its floodplain management program to minimize flood risk to all new developments. Based on the detailed modeling, the City identified a regulatory floodplain that exceeds the SFHA mapped by FEMA. Figure 10-4 shows FEMA's mapped floodplain and the City's regulatory floodplain, as authorized by the Roseville City Code. The City has mapped and regulates 2,372 acres as floodplain, which includes the 1,529 acres of floodplain identified by FEMA on the current effective FIRM for the City. The regulatory floodplain is the area susceptible to risk from flooding based on City-approved studies. These areas are based on detailed hydrologic and hydraulic floodplain modeling that meets or exceeds FEMA criteria for mapping and modeling floodplains. The flood event used to delineate these boundaries is referred to as "the regulatory flood" to differentiate it from the "base flood" used by FEMA.

In many portions of the City, the Nolte Future Floodplain has been used to designate floodplain boundaries. The Nolte Future Floodplain defines floodway and floodway fringe boundaries within the floodplain. The floodway fringe is an area along the boundary of the floodplain that, if totally obstructed, would not result in more than a 1-foot rise in the water surface elevation. The floodway constitutes the remainder of the floodplain area and is typically where floodwaters have the most velocity.

10.2.4 Frequency

Flood magnitude measurements reflect statistical averages only; it is possible for two or more rare floods (with a 100-year or higher recurrence interval) to occur within a short time period. Assigning recurrence intervals to historical floods on different streams can help indicate the intensity of a storm over a large area. For example, the 1995 flood event was determined to be a 100-year flood on Dry Creek and a 50-year flood on Linda Creek.

Recent history has shown that Roseville can expect an average of one episode of minor river flooding each winter. Recent flooding resulting in property damage has occurred about every 3 to 5 years since 1950, except for the period from 1973 to 1981, when no significant flooding occurred. The frequency of flood events that cause significant damage has decreased significantly over the past 10 years due to City efforts to mitigate flood risk. Exposure to events that could cause significant flooding can be expected every 5 to 10 years. Additionally, the City can expect what is often referred to as "nuisance" flooding annually in the historic core due to urban drainage issues.




Figure 10-4. Floodplains

10.2.5 Severity

Table 10-2 shows observed flooding characteristics for the Pleasant Grove and Dry Creek basins, based on measurements made during past flood events.

Table 10-2. Observed Characteristics of Flooding

	Pleasant Grove Creek Basin	Dry Creek Basin
Approximate Base Flood Velocity (feet/second)^a	0.5 to 8.0	2.0 to 14.0
Flow Rate (cubic feet per second)^b	1,100 to 5,000	900 to 15,000
Base Flood Elevation (feet, National Geodetic Vertical Datum)		
Downstream limit	89.7	79.7
Upstream limit	150.0	210.0
Approximate Depth of Overbank Flooding (feet above existing grade)	0 to 2	0 to 3
Approximate Warning Time (hours)	3	3

a. Higher velocities were observed in the channel; lower velocities were observed in the overbank area

b. 1 cubic foot is about 7.5 gallons

The City recently completed five phases of the seven-phase “Cirby-Linda-Dry Creek Flood Control Project.” The purpose of this project is to reduce stormwater backup at constrictions and increase the overall capacity of the floodplain during storm conditions. Project structures were designed to provide 1 foot of freeboard above the projected 500-year flood elevation. This project significantly reduced the flood risk exposure for this area, but did not eliminate it.

10.2.6 Warning Time

Due to the extended precipitation needed to cause serious flooding, it is unusual for a flood to occur without warning. Flash flooding can be less predictable, but hazard areas can be warned in advanced of potential flash flooding. Typical warning times for Roseville range from 1 to 3 hours. The City’s flood warning system has four ways to warn the public of potential flooding:

- A comprehensive graphical display of stream levels, broadcast on Channel 14 or 73, with the status of the warning
- The “Stream Level” link on the City of Roseville home web page (www.roseville.ca.us)
- An automatic telephone dialing system to problem areas
- Flooding status broadcasted on radio station 530 AM.

Numerous stream flow and rain gauges form the City’s stream monitoring system for the Upper Dry Creek Drainage Basin. These stations are placed at strategic locations throughout the drainage basin. For example, one is mounted on the floodwall just upstream from the pedestrian bridge that crosses between Tina Way and Marlin Drive and another is on Dry Creek at the Vernon Street Bridge. Each station transmits information via radio antenna to a central computer. Stream level information from five of the most critical stream level gauges is broadcasted on cable Channel 14/73 and on the City’s web page during significant storm events. City staff uses this information in deciding whether to advise residents to evacuate. The goal is to provide up to 3 hours of advance warning. The continuously changing variables of precipitation, stream levels, and forecasts have a major effect on meeting this goal. The display shown on Channel 14/73 consists of a set of basic graphics shown in 15-second intervals:

- The first, which is shown only once for every complete cycle, is a City of Roseville map that includes major roadways (Vernon Street, Douglas Boulevard, Cirby Way, etc.), the three major streams (Dry Creek, Linda Creek, and Cirby Creek) and the five stream level gauge locations. Residents living in a

designated floodplain can determine which of the five stream gauges best represents their neighborhood. Once this is established, it is important to focus on how the streams are reacting to the weather conditions.

- Following this display, a more specific map identifies a single stream gauge's location in relation to nearby roadways and streams.
- Transmitted information from the gauges is presented in visual formats that include the current stream depth and the stream depth over the past six hours.

The stream level graph is divided into four colored categories of flood depth stages (see Figure 10-5):

- Blue (Normal Stage)—Stream level conditions are normal and safe.
- Green (Advisory Stage)—City staff is continuously monitoring creek levels and weather conditions. Residents should be closely watching for further information about flooding in their area.
- Yellow (Warning Stage)—There is a possibility of flooding in this area. Necessary precautions need to be taken to secure personal property and safety.
- Red (Critical Stage)—Flooding appears imminent in this area. Residents should evacuate their homes.




Figure 10-5. Example of Stream Gauge Graphic Display

The numeric values of the stream depths associated with the flood depth stages are shown on the vertical bar graph for all five of the stream level gauges, and reference stream levels are identified for each gauge. For example, the stream level during the 1995 flood is marked for each location. Also identified are other reference

points such as roadway surface, bridge and/or top of berm levels. This enables viewers to identify and understand the present stage of the stream in relation to known benchmarks.

The City of Roseville also has an automated telephone dialing system. During significant storm events, this system is used to phone residents and businesses in the floodplain and provide recorded messages containing important information. The message to be played will depend on the flood threat in the area at that time.

10.3 SECONDARY HAZARDS

The most significant secondary hazard for flooding in Roseville is bank erosion. The dangers of bank erosion often are greater than those of flooding. Flooding is responsible for landslides when high flows over-saturate soils on steep slopes, causing them to fail. Hazardous materials spills are also a secondary hazard of flooding if storage tanks rupture and spill into streams, rivers or drainage sewers.

10.4 EXPOSURE

The Level 2 HAZUS-MH protocol was used to assess the risk and vulnerability to flooding in the planning area. HAZUS-MH uses census data at the block level, FEMA floodplain data, and GIS data for the City's regulatory floodplain. Where possible, the HAZUS-MH data for this risk assessment was enhanced using GIS data from the City and from county, state and federal sources. The following sections describe risk exposure and vulnerability of the general building stock, critical facilities and infrastructure, land use, and environment within the City's mapped regulatory floodplain.

10.4.1 Population

Estimates of the population living in the floodplain in the planning area were generated by analyzing census blocks that intersect with the City's regulatory floodplain. Census blocks do not follow the same boundaries as the floodplain. Therefore, the methodology used to generate these estimates counted census block groups whose centers are in the floodplain or where the majority of the population most likely lives in or near the floodplain. HAZUS-MH estimated the number of buildings within the floodplain in each block, and then estimated the total population by multiplying the number of residential structures by the City average of 2.54 persons per household. Using this approach, the exposed population within the regulatory floodplain was estimated to be 330 (0.25 percent of the total City population). This is only slightly greater than the estimated 322 people exposed in the SFHA.

10.4.2 Property

Structures in the Floodplain

Table 10-3 summarizes the number and type of structures in the floodplain, as calculated from the Level 2 HAZUS-MH analysis. There are 210 structures in the City of Roseville regulatory floodplain. This represents less than 1 percent of the total structures in the City. It includes the 200 buildings identified within FEMA's SFHA.

Table 10-3. Structures Within the SFHA and the Roseville Regulatory Floodplain

	# of Structures in Mapped Floodplain						Total
	Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Religion	Government	Education	
FEMA-Preliminary Mapped SFHA	157	34	7	1	0	1	200
Roseville Regulatory Floodplain	156	38	11	2	2	1	210

Exposed Value

The value of exposed buildings within the City's regulated floodplain area and the SFHA was generated using HAZUS-MH and is summarized in Table 10-4 and Table 10-5. This methodology estimated \$289 million worth of building-and-contents exposure, representing 0.97 percent of the total building-and-contents value in the City.

Table 10-4. Value of Exposed Buildings Within the FEMA SFHA

	Value of Exposed Property in the Mapped Floodplain			% of Total Value in the City
	Buildings	Contents	Total	
Residential	\$24,700,000	\$12,400,000	\$37,000,000	0.2%
Commercial	\$75,600,000	\$77,000,000	\$152,600,000	1.8%
Industrial	\$2,400,000	\$2,600,000	\$5,000,000	0.4%
Religion	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
Government	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
Education	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000	\$2,500,000	0.2%
Total	\$103,900,000	\$93,200,000	\$197,100,000	0.7%

Table 10-5. Value of Exposed Buildings Within the Roseville Regulatory Floodplain

	Value of Exposed Property in the Mapped Floodplain			% of Total Value in the City
	Buildings	Contents	Total	
Residential	\$39,719,211	\$19,859,606	\$59,578,817	0.32%
Commercial	\$84,278,680	\$87,860,805	\$172,139,485	2.08%
Industrial	\$24,855,494	\$25,109,167	\$49,964,662	4.30%
Religion	\$1,337,875	\$1,337,875	\$2,675,749	1.07%
Government	\$1,032,368	\$1,032,368	\$2,064,736	1.22%
Education	\$1,231,683	\$1,231,683	\$2,463,365	0.23%
Total	\$152,455,311	\$136,431,504	\$288,886,814	0.97%

Land Use in the Floodplain

To preserve the natural and beneficial functions of open space resource areas adjacent to the floodplain areas of Roseville, the City has adopted policies under the Open Space and Conservation Element of its General Plan that include the following:

- Preserve and rehabilitate continuous riparian corridors and adjacent habitat along the City's creeks and waterways.
- Require dedication of the 100-year floodplain or comparable mechanism to protect habitat and wildlife values in perpetuity.
- Restrict development within the 200-year floodplain subject to the State of California Urban Level of Flood Protection Criteria.
- Require preservation of contiguous areas outside the 100-year floodplain as merited by special resources or circumstances, which may include, but are not limited to, sensitive wildlife or vegetation, wetland habitat, oak woodland areas, grassland connections in association with other habitat areas, slope or topographical considerations, recreation opportunities, and maintenance access requirements.
- Limit recreation activities within the 100-year floodplain and require additional setback areas for trails and other recreation uses so that natural resource areas are not adversely impacted.
- Provide protection and enhancement of fishery resources, including continued coordination with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to release water to Linda Creek.

Because of these policies, a large portion of the floodplains within Roseville is held for open space use, much of it in a natural or beneficial state. Currently, 1,491.4 acres (97 percent) of the regulatory floodplain within Roseville is designated for open space use, as defined in the Open Space and Conservation Element of the General Plan.

10.4.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

Flooding poses numerous risks to critical facilities and infrastructure:

- Roads or railroads that are blocked or damaged can prevent access throughout the area and can isolate residents and emergency service providers needing to get to vulnerable populations or to make repairs.
- Bridges washed out or blocked by floods or debris from floods also can cause isolation.
- Creek or river floodwaters can back up drainage systems, causing localized flooding.
- Culverts can be blocked by debris from flood events, also causing localized urban flooding.
- Floodwaters can get into drinking water supplies, causing contamination.
- Sewer systems can be backed up, causing waste to spill into homes, neighborhoods, rivers and streams.
- Underground utilities can also be damaged.

The inventory of critical facilities in Roseville's SFHA and regulatory floodplain is shown in Table 10-6 and Table 10-7.

Table 10-6. Critical Facilities in Flood Area

	Critical Facilities within the SFHA	Critical Facilities within the City of Roseville Regulated Floodplain
Medical & Health Services	0	0
Government Function	0	0
Protective Function	0	0
Schools	0	0
Societal Function	2	2
Hazmat	0	0
Other Critical Function	17	1
Total	19	3

Table 10-7. Critical Infrastructure in Flood Areas

	Critical Infrastructure within the SFHA	Critical Infrastructure within the City of Roseville Regulated Floodplain
Water Supply	0	4
Wastewater	5	4
Power	0	0
Fuel Storage	0	0
Communications	1	2
Bridges	11	27
Total	17	18

The City of Roseville has determined that the following major roadways and stream crossings (bridges or culverts) would be impassable during a 100-year flood event:

- Dry Creek Road Crossings
- Cirby Creek Road Crossings

- Vernon Street
- Riverside Avenue
- Darling Way
- Douglas Boulevard
- Folsom Road
- Linda Creek Road Crossings
 - Rocky Ridge Drive
 - Champion Oaks Drive
 - Sierra College Boulevard
- Miners Ravine
 - Sunrise Avenue
 - Coloma Way
 - Oakridge Road
 - Sierra Gardens Drive
 - Huntington Drive
 - Sierra College Boulevard

10.4.4 Environment

Flooding is a natural event, and floodplains provide many natural and beneficial functions. Nonetheless, with human development factored in, flooding can impact the environment in negative ways:

- Migrating fish can wash into roads or over dikes into flooded fields, with no possibility of escape.
- Pollution from roads, such as oil, and hazardous materials can wash into rivers and streams.
- Pollutants carried by floodwaters can settle onto normally dry soils, polluting them for agricultural uses.
- Human development, such as bridge abutments and levees, and logjams from timber harvesting can increase streambank erosion, causing rivers and streams to migrate into non-natural courses.

With much of Roseville’s regulatory floodplain zoned for open space use, the City has taken significant steps to preserve the natural and beneficial functions of the floodplain, while at the same time reducing the risk exposure to the built environment. Still, all vegetation and wildlife resources and corridors in the floodplain open space system—grasslands, oak woodlands, riparian areas, and seasonal wetlands—are exposed to the flood risk.

10.5 VULNERABILITY

10.5.1 Population

Flooding can be a deadly hazard. Roads running through low-lying areas prone to sudden and frequent flooding are a serious threat. Motorists often attempt to drive through barricaded or flooded roadways. Because as little as 18 to 24 inches of water moving across a roadway can carry away most vehicles, floods can present significant potential safety risks. The second largest potential for injuries from flooding results from people walking or playing in or near flooded areas. Generally, floods kill people in one of two situations: when people ignore basic safety precautions (such as evacuations and warnings), and when a flash flood hits an area with no warning.

Although it is possible to analyze life and safety impacts resulting from the flood hazard, injuries and casualties were not estimated for this hazard. One flood-related fatality in Roseville has been recorded, but the flood hazard is not generally considered to pose a serious risk to life in this area, for the following reasons:

- Flooding in Roseville tends to be rapid in terms of the rise and fall of floodwaters. Because of the City’s geographical location in the watershed, floods tend to come and go quickly as they move toward their drainage endpoints, thereby decreasing the threat that people become trapped by floodwaters.
- The City has made it a priority to warn and educate its citizens on the dangers and impacts of flooding. The City implements public outreach programs that provide information on flood warnings, property protection, flood safety, and flood insurance. The City also has developed a comprehensive flood warning program that can deliver real-time data to citizens and emergency management personnel through cable

television and the Internet. The program can provide a warning up to 3 hours before a flood event occurs in the 100-year floodplain. The City's approach has resulted in an educated and well-informed constituency.

The June 2004 City of Roseville Emergency Operations Plan, most recently updated in 2010, directs the City of Roseville Emergency Management Organization, coordinates the actions of emergency operations center staff, establishes operational priorities, ensures development and implementation of strategies to meet the needs of the emergency, works with local elected officials on issues related to emergency response and recovery, identifies procedures for evacuation, communicates with the media, coordinates response with outside agencies, and ensures the safety of responders. The Emergency Operations Plan follows California's Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) format (see Section 4.9.2).

Regarding health concerns, one of Roseville's sewage treatment facilities is located on the downstream end of Dry Creek. This facility is located above the 100-year floodplain but has overflow ponds within the floodplain. When plant influent loads exceed the plant capacity, untreated sewage is discharged to the overflow ponds. If this scenario occurred simultaneously with a 100-year flood, floodwaters could be contaminated. This situation has not occurred during past flood events, and its probability of occurrence is low. Therefore, its potential impacts on health were not estimated as part of this assessment.

10.5.2 Property

Flood Insurance

Flood insurance statistics help identify vulnerability by showing where there is claim activity, where there is a high rate of flood insurance in force, and where flooding may be occurring in areas not identified as flood-prone. Table 10-8 lists flood insurance statistics for the City of Roseville. The total of \$9.9 million paid on 292 claims through July 31, 2010 represents an average of \$33,923 per claim.

Table 10-8. Flood Insurance Statistics for the City of Roseville

Date of Entry Initial FIRM Effective Date	December 15, 1983
Current FIRM Effective Date	November 21, 2001
Number of flood insurance policies in force as of 3/31/2016	591
Total annual premium	\$311,643
Average policy cost	\$527 (national average = \$412)
Total insurance coverage	\$176,339,200
Total claims filed (1978 to 11/30/2009)	292
Value of claims paid	\$9,905,478
Average claim paid	\$33,923
Number of flood insurance policies in force within the SFHA	111
X Standard/AR/A99 policies	18
Preferred Risk Policies	462

Flood insurance statistics relevant to reducing flood hazard are as follows:

- Approximately 76 percent of the insurable structures in the SFHA are currently covered by a flood insurance policy. This is well above the national average. According to a study conducted for the NFIP, about 49 percent of single-family homes in special flood hazard areas nationwide are covered by flood insurance.
- 81.2 percent of the current policies in force are for properties outside the SFHA.

- The high percentage of policies outside the SFHA is probably due to the impact of the Cirby-Linda-Dry Creek Flood Control Project and resulting remapping.

Flood Loss Potential of Structures

The HAZUS-MH program calculates losses to structures from flooding by looking at depth of flooding and type of structure. Using historical flood insurance claim data, HAZUS-MH estimates the percentage of damage to structures and their contents by applying established damage functions to an inventory. This inventory comes pre-loaded within the HAZUS-MH model and is based on data from the U.S. Census, state databases, the U.S. Highway Administration, and other sources. Default values can be overridden with locally generated data if available. For this analysis, local data on facilities was used to assess flood risk in the City of Roseville. The City has created a flood inventory database of site-specific information for each property in the regulatory floodplain. This database includes information for the following basic categories:

- Buildings in the regulatory floodplain
- Building use
- Building area
- Building value
- Permit history
- Flood loss history
- Regulatory flood elevation
- Base flood elevation
- Pre- and post-FIRM structures
- Elevation of lowest adjacent grade
- Finished floor elevation

The HAZUS-MH analysis is summarized in Table 10-9 through Table 10-11. It is estimated that there would be up to \$2.16 million of flood loss from a 10-year flood event. This represents less than 0.01 percent of the total assessed value of the City. It is estimated that there would be up to \$7.04 million of flood loss from a 100-year flood event. This represents 3.6 percent of the total value exposed to the flood hazard in the regulatory floodplain and 0.02 percent of the total assessed value of the City. It is estimated that there would be \$7.14 million of flood loss from a 500-year flood event, representing 3.4 percent of the total value exposed to the flood hazard in the regulatory floodplain and 0.02 percent of the total assessed value for the City.

Table 10-9. Estimated Flood Loss for the 10-Year Flood Event (Preliminary FIRM)

	Estimated Flood Loss			% of Total Assessed Value
	Buildings	Contents	Total	
Residential	\$1,275,990	\$609,637	\$1,885,627	<0.01%
Commercial	\$70,143	\$172,585	\$242,727	<0.01%
Industrial	\$16,759	\$21,065	\$37,825	<0.01%
Agricultural	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
Religion	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
Government	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
Education	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
Total	\$1,362,892	\$803,287	\$2,166,179	<0.01%

Table 10-10. Estimated Flood Loss for the 100-Year and 500-Year Flood Events (Preliminary FIRM)

	Estimated Flood Loss						% of Total Assessed Value	
	Buildings		Contents		Total			
	100-year	500-year	100-year	500-year	100-year	500-year	100-year	500-year
Residential	\$2,253,989	\$2,253,989	\$1,257,030	\$1,257,030	\$3,511,019	\$3,511,019	0.02%	0.02%
Commercial	\$686,896	\$704,051	\$2,366,376	\$2,452,152	\$3,053,271	\$3,156,203	0.04%	0.04%
Industrial	\$107,228	\$107,228	\$375,139	\$375,139	\$482,368	\$482,368	0.04%	0.04%
Agricultural	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%	0.00%
Religion	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%	0.00%
Government	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%	0.00%
Education	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%	0.00%
Total	\$3,048,113	\$3,065,269	\$3,998,545	\$4,084,321	\$7,046,658	\$7,149,590	0.02%	0.02%

Table 10-11. Estimated Flood Loss for the Regulatory Floodplain

	Estimated Flood Loss			% of Total Assessed Value
	Buildings	Contents	Total	
Residential	\$2,096,568	\$944,975	\$3,041,544	0.02%
Commercial	\$1,322,410	\$3,044,262	\$4,366,672	0.05%
Industrial	\$87,710	\$254,384	\$342,094	0.03%
Agricultural	\$33,023	\$240,436	\$273,459	0.11%
Religion	\$1,603	\$9,617	\$11,220	0.01%
Government	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
Education	\$3,541,314	\$4,493,675	\$8,034,988	0.03%
Total	\$2,096,568	\$944,975	\$3,041,544	0.02%

Repetitive Loss

Several federal government programs encourage communities to identify and mitigate “repetitive loss” properties. Nationwide, repetitive loss properties make up only 1 to 2 percent of the flood insurance policies currently in force, yet they account for 40 percent of the flood insurance claim payments. A report on repetitive loss structures by the National Wildlife Federation found that 20 percent of these structures are listed as outside the 100-year floodplain. In 1998, FEMA reported that the NFIP’s 75,000 repetitive loss structures had already cost \$2.8 billion in flood insurance payments.

FEMA identifies repetitive loss structures based on flood insurance payments. A repetitive loss area is the portion of the floodplain where numerous buildings have been subject to repetitive flooding. The purpose of identifying repetitive loss areas is to identify structures that are subject to the same risk but are not on FEMA’s list because a flood insurance policy was not in force at the time of loss.

The list of repetitive loss properties maintained by FEMA identifies one commercial repetitive loss property within the City’s regulatory floodplain. When Roseville first began its participation in the CRS program in 1991, the list of repetitive loss properties totaled 27 locations. Since then, flood protection and mitigation projects (including purchase and relocation of structures) have occurred at 23 repetitive loss locations and all 23 locations are no longer subject to repetitive flood losses. This represents an 85 percent reduction in exposure of insured properties to repetitive flood losses. This reduction is a prime example of how the City of Roseville’s proactive flood mitigation practices have decreased the exposure of its citizens to the flood hazard, reduced the number of repetitive loss properties, and minimized reliance on post-disaster assistance provided by the federal government and the nation’s taxpayers.

Figure 10-6 shows the location of Roseville's single remaining repetitive loss area. The City is required to address its repetitive loss area as a condition of its participation in the CRS program. This hazard mitigation plan meets this CRS requirement.

10.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

HAZUS-MH was used to estimate the flood loss potential of critical facilities exposed to the flood risk. The model uses depth/damage function curves to estimate the percent of damage to a building and its contents and correlates that with an estimate of functional downtime (the time it will take to restore a facility to 100 percent of its functionality). The findings were as follows:

- On average, critical facilities would receive 5 percent damage to the structure and 19 percent damage to the contents during a 100-year flood event, and the estimated time to restore these facilities to full functionality would be 90 days.
- On average, critical facilities would receive 8 percent damage to the structure and 31 percent damage to the contents during a 500-year flood event, and the estimated time to restore these facilities to full functionality would be 160 days.

Six critical facilities are exposed and vulnerable to flooding in Roseville. A detailed vulnerability analysis of all critical facilities is on file with appropriate City staff and will not be published for public review. Of these six critical facilities, two have sufficient vulnerability to flooding to warrant mitigation strategies. Flood protection has been provided to the two churches identified, although it is not 100-year flood protection. The estimated depth of flooding for these two facilities is minimal and there have been no reports of flood damage. The County courthouse has been elevated to above the 100-year flood level. Mitigation strategies outlined in this Plan will mitigate the impact of flooding on the remaining facilities, including retrofitting the floodwall that protects the library and public safety building.

Of Roseville's two wastewater treatment plants, only the Dry Creek Plant is partially located in the floodplain. The storm sewer system is separate from the sanitary sewer system, so the sanitary sewers are not significantly affected by storm events.

10.5.4 Environment

The environment vulnerable to the flood hazard is the same as the environment exposed to the hazard. While flood events have historically caused significant damage to the environment, estimating damage can be difficult. Loss estimation platforms such as HAZUS-MH are not currently equipped to measure environmental impacts of flood hazards. The best gauge of vulnerability of the environment would be a review of damage from past flood events. Loss data that segregates damage to the environment were not available at the time of this Plan. Capturing this data from future events could be beneficial in measuring the vulnerability of the environment for future updates to this Plan.

10.6 FUTURE TRENDS IN DEVELOPMENT

Increased urbanization of western Placer County within the Pleasant Grove and Dry Creek Basins has resulted in the potential for increased flooding problems in Roseville. Land development typically results in increased hard surfaces and decreased vegetation, conditions that limit infiltration opportunities and, without adequate mitigation, can increase stormwater runoff rates and volumes and decrease the time required to reach peak discharge.




Figure 10-6. Repetitive Loss Area

Recognizing that typical growth patterns in California would impact and exacerbate the flood hazard problem, the City of Roseville took an aggressive, proactive approach to managing its floodplains through the development of its General Plan in 1992. Land-use categories are defined in the General Plan, with information on general uses, development, intensity, siting, and compatibility standards in relation to the flood hazard. City actions, such as land-use allocation, annexations, zoning, subdivision and design review, redevelopment and capital improvements, must be consistent with the General Plan.

Only three parcels in Roseville's regulatory floodplain are in the current buildable lands inventory. These parcels were all created before the City's flood-protection policies were enacted. Any new development on these parcels would be subject to strict regulations.

Because of policies, activities and mitigation measures in place in Roseville, it can be concluded that future land development trends will not impact or be impacted by flooding in Roseville as long as existing policies remain in force.

10.7 REVIEW OF EXISTING ORDINANCES, PROGRAMS, AND PLANS

The City of Roseville has a long-standing policy to proactively manage its floodplains. Under the guidance of the General Plan and its Safety Element, Roseville has been able to decrease the exposure of its citizens to flooding with a comprehensive approach that includes the following measures:

- Structural mitigation (flood control)
- Non-structural mitigation (elevation or acquisition)
- Regulations
- Stormwater management
- Flood warning
- Outreach and public education.

This section discusses each element except flood warning, which is discussed in Section 10.2.6).

10.7.1 Structural Mitigation

The following major flood control improvements have been accomplished by the City of Roseville since the January 1995 flood event:

- **Tina Way/Elisa Way Area**—Completed in 1996 at the cost of \$3 million (100 percent City-funded), this project included channel excavation and construction of berms and floodwalls. The project removed 40 structures from the floodplain. Based on the pre-project location and construction of these structures, the entire area would have flooded during the 1997 flood if the improvements had not been implemented.
- **Riverside Avenue/Vernon Street Area**—Completed in 1996 at the cost of \$2 million (90 percent funded by the Union Pacific Railroad and 10 percent funded by the City), the construction project included replacing culverts with a new bridge over Dry Creek. The net effect of this project lowered flood elevations for the reach by 5 to 7 feet and removed 150 structures from the floodplain.
- **Sunrise Avenue/Oakridge Drive and Champion Oaks Areas**—Completed in 2001 at the cost of \$16.1 million (\$8.7 million from FEMA and \$7.4 million from the City), this project replaced culverts with a new bridge over Linda Creek at Sunrise Avenue. Twin 9-foot-diameter bypass pipes were installed in the Oakridge Drive area. The project included channel excavation and berm and floodwall construction. The project removed 233 structures from the floodplain; 44 structures remained in the floodplain, but these structures were less likely to be flooded. Features included maintaining a channel in

as natural a state as possible; planting over 500 oak trees; assigning biologists, ornithologists, and arborists to minimize environmental impacts; and monitoring fish passage and plantings for 5 years.

The City has spent more than \$22 million on flood mitigation since the January 1995 flood event and has eliminated 445 flood-prone structures from the floodplain.

10.7.2 Non-Structural Mitigation

Structural mitigation projects reduced the flood exposure of property by 91 percent. Roseville offered mitigation through acquisition or home elevation to the remaining 9 percent of properties exposed to flooding. Completed in 2001 at the cost of \$1 million (50 percent funded by FEMA, 40 percent funded by the property owners, and 10 percent funded by the City), the project included elevating 27 homes and acquiring (buying out) 4 homes. This effort resulted in 22 flood-prone homes with post-project floor levels higher than the floodplain level.

10.7.3 Regulations

The City of Roseville regulates its floodplain areas through land use, zoning, and other development restrictions, including a policy that prohibits most development within the 100-year floodplain area. Development in floodplain areas in Roseville is restricted by the following:

- 2035 General Plan, Safety Element, Flood Protection Component
- Improvement Standards
- Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (Roseville Municipal Code [RMC] Chapter 9.80)
- Zoning Ordinance (RMC Chapter 19.18)
- State of California Urban Level of Flood Protection Legislation.

2035 General Plan, Safety Element, Flood Protection Component

The Safety Element of Roseville's General Plan sets forth goals and policies to address community safety concerns. The flood protection component identifies nine policies and 12 measures to achieve the following goals:

- Minimize the potential for loss of life and property due to flooding.
- Pursue flood control solutions that are cost-effective and minimize environmental impacts.

The policies and implementation measures are incorporated into the City's area-specific plans and are legally enforceable. Key to the City's flood-protection effort is the clear definition and application of floodplain boundaries. The flood protection component of the Safety Element establishes policies prohibiting new development in an identified floodplain or requiring an appropriate level of flood protection in design and construction for any development that does occur in the floodplain:

- **Infill Areas**—No development is permitted in the future floodway. Development may be permitted within the future floodway fringe. In accordance with the Nolte Future Floodplain definition, such development is limited to areas within the assumed cumulative 1-foot rise in water surface elevation, if it can be demonstrated that the development will not impact flood levels (see Figure 10-7).
- **Remainder of the City (specific plans and north industrial area)**—No development is permitted within the future floodplain (floodway and floodway fringe). Exceptions may be considered by the City on a case-by-case basis if encroachment is limited to only the future floodway fringe and would not result in any off-site increase in the water surface elevation (see Figure 10-8).




Figure 10-7. Floodplain Designation Cross-Sections for Infill Areas




Figure 10-8. Floodplain Designation Cross-Sections for Areas Other Than Infill Areas

The City is committed to exploring environmentally sensitive flood control solutions, so this component is intended to be used in combination with the goals, policies, and implementation measures contained in the Open Space and Conservation Element of the General Plan. Emphasis is placed on protecting floodplain areas and on pursuing regional cooperation on flooding issues.

Improvement Standards

Roseville's improvement standards provide minimum standards for the following:

- Improvements dedicated to the public and accepted by the City for maintenance or operation
- Certain private works
- Improvements to be installed within existing rights-of-way and easements.

Improvement standards provide coordinated development of required facilities used by and for the protection of the public. They apply to, regulate, and guide preparation of traffic impact studies and the design and preparation of plans for construction of streets, highways, alleys, drainage systems, sewage systems, traffic signals, site access structures, water supply facilities and related public improvements. The standards also set guidelines for private

works that involve drainage, grading, tree removal, and related improvements. Section 10 of the improvement standards deals with drainage as follows:

- Requires residential lots developed in and adjacent to a designated floodplain to have a pad elevation a minimum of 2 feet above the regulatory flood elevation.
- Establishes stormwater management provisions that require mitigation of the increase in runoff generated by new development.
- Establishes provisions that require the building pads of structures built outside the regulatory floodplain to be a minimum of 1 foot above the 100-year water surface elevation for the site, assuming total blockage of drainage facilities.

Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (RMC Chapter 9.80)

The flood damage prevention ordinance provides regulatory provisions for the floodplains of Roseville and is a requirement for participation in the NFIP. Chapter 9.80 of the RMC meets the NFIP requirements (44 CFR, Section 60.3) and includes the following standards that exceed those requirements:

- Adoption of a regulatory floodplain that includes areas not mapped by FEMA for application
- Requirement for elevation to 2 feet above the regulatory flood elevation for all structures within the flood hazard area
- Provisions to track substantial improvements to structures over a period of 10 years.

Zoning Ordinance (RMC Chapter 19.18)

Updated in September 2010, the zoning ordinance implements the City's general and specific plans and establishes regulations governing the use, placement, spacing and size of land and buildings. The zoning ordinance describes permits available through the Planning Division, when permits are needed, and the process for obtaining permits. This ordinance includes policy that prohibits most development within the 100-year floodplain. Exceptions to this policy exist primarily within the infill area and for the maintenance of essential services. Where encroachments may be permitted, improvements are required to minimize cumulative upstream and downstream effects.

The zoning ordinance identifies floodway and floodway fringe zoning districts. The floodway zoning district is not synonymous with FEMA's defined floodway. Development is generally prohibited in the floodway zone, with some level of development allowed in the floodway fringe zones with restrictions. The floodway fringe and floodway zone boundaries are based on previous hydraulic modeling conducted by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The floodplain boundaries have changed over time since this modeling, but the zone district boundaries have not changed. The zone boundaries are updated on a parcel-by-parcel basis at a landowner's request using best available data.

State of California Urban Level of Flood Protection Legislation

The Central Valley Flood Protection Act of 2008 (SB 5) and its subsequent amendments (SB 1278, AB 1965 and AB 1259) include requirements and standards for flood protection that relate to land use planning. The legislation defines the Urban Level of Flood Protection (ULOP) as the level of protection necessary to withstand flooding that has a 1-in-200 (0.5-percent) chance of occurring in any given year (also referred to as the 200-year flood). This legislation directed local agencies to revise their general plans no later than July 2, 2015 to address flood risk for affected land use decisions based on an ULOP. It also required local agencies to revise their zoning codes to reflect the new standard within one year after the adoption of their revised general plans. In areas not subject to the ULOP standards, the 100-year floodplain standards will continue to apply.

The legislation defines five locational criteria that determine whether the ULOP applies. All areas of the City of Roseville meet two of the criteria (the City is an urban area of more than 10,000 people and the City is within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley), but only certain areas of the City meet the remaining three criteria:

- Areas mapped as either a special hazard area or an area of moderate hazard on FEMA's official (i.e., effective) Flood Insurance Rate Map
- Areas with a potential flood depth above 3 feet from sources other than localized conditions
- Areas within a watershed with a contributing area of more than 10 square miles.

As required by SB 5 as amended, the City of Roseville will implement the following:

- Updating the General Plan to define the City's regulatory floodplain as the combination of the City's mapped 100-year floodplain, the ULOP floodplain, and the FEMA floodplain.
- Amendment of the Land Use Element to include a reference to the Safety Element map identifying existing and planned development areas within the regulated floodplain as defined above.
- Amendment of the Open Space and Conservation Element setting and background to reflect the current regulatory environment.
- Amendment of the Safety Element to identify and revise flood hazard information and policies which protect communities from flooding risks as follows:
 - Revise the setting, outlook, and floodplain designations portions of the flood protection section to reflect the updated regulatory environment and to identify sources of floodplain mapping and hazard data.
 - Revise the floodplain designation policy and the implementation measures sections to include definitions and floodplain development regulations and implementation for the ULOP floodplain.
 - Provide new floodplain maps showing the extent of the FEMA 100-year, City's regulatory 100-year, and ULOP floodplains.

As required by adopted State law, the various City regulations requiring preservation of the floodplain and elevation of structures above the floodplain will include the ULOP floodplain, which is shown on Figure 10-9. After the modeling analysis was completed by the City, staff examined the data to determine the effect on land uses. Both the ULOP and the 100-year floodplains along Pleasant Grove Creek are almost entirely contained within existing or planned open space and recreation areas. This is generally because these areas of Roseville were planned or developed relatively recently in the City's history, and in compliance with the City's current General Plan goals and objectives restricting development in the floodplain.

The areas where the ULOP floodplain extends into residential or commercial areas are older areas of the City along Dry Creek, where development was planned and implemented prior to Roseville's initial participation in the NFIP in 1983 and prior to adoption of the City's current General Plan. These infill areas are already affected by the FEMA 100-year floodplain, and a few areas will now also be affected by the ULOP.

According to the City's GIS database, 4 of 11 vacant parcels affected by the ULOP are privately owned. The remaining 7 parcels are City-owned. In the future, any new habitable structure along streams affected by the ULOP floodplain will need to be elevated slightly higher (less than 1 foot) than would have been required prior to the legislation. For existing structures, additional elevation would only be required if the owner undertook a "substantial improvement" to the structure (defined within the City's Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance as any work in a 10-year period that is worth 50 percent or more of the value of the structure).




Figure 10-9. Updated Floodplain Mapping

10.7.4 Stormwater Management

Stormwater management in the City of Roseville is accomplished through a multi-tiered approach. The City uses a combination of regional development impact studies, sub-regional impact studies, the City of Roseville improvement standards, the City of Roseville grading ordinance, and the Placer County stormwater management manual. All of these tools manage the City's stormwater system at different levels. The Roseville General Plan is the principal planning document that lays out goals for managing the flooding hazard. Each update to the General Plan reviews these goals to determine their effectiveness in managing watershed characteristics. Regional master planning, sub-regional master planning, and project drainage design are discussed below.

Regional Master Planning

City ordinances establish developer fees to pay for mitigation projects that will reduce development impacts on flooding on major streams in the Dry Creek and Pleasant Grove Creek basins. Regional master planning for each basin has been conducted through the Placer County Flood Control District (PCFCD). Seven communities, including the City of Roseville, are members of this district.

The Dry Creek and Pleasant Grove Creek basins each have a detailed hydrology report that calculates the 5-, 10-, 50-, and 100-year storm frequencies based on total buildout of the basin:

- **Dry Creek Basin Report**—The *Final Report for the Dry Creek Flood Control Plan*, adopted by the Roseville City Council in April 1992, was co-sponsored, supported, and approved by the PCFCD and the Sacramento County flood control agency that oversees floodplains downstream of Placer County.
- **Pleasant Grove Creek Basin Report**—Pleasant Grove Creek Basin hydrology is included in the *Cross Canal Study*. Pleasant Grove Creek is one of several major streams that flow to a reclamation district canal; overflow is stored behind levees during Sacramento River flooding. Except for the PCFCD, this report was supported, sponsored, and approved by all agencies within the basin, in particular Sutter County and State Reclamation Board Districts 1001 and 1000.

Each report defines development impacts on the basin and specifies mitigation procedures and improvements to developers' mitigation. Both reports indicate a strategy for mitigation of floods resulting from new development on a regional scale. The reports indicate that most of Roseville is in the part of the watershed where detention is not recommended. These studies have been submitted to FEMA for approval, and FEMA is currently using the hydrology and hydraulics information provided in the reports to update FIRMs for the region.

Sub-Regional Master Planning

The City requires each sub-region to develop a master plan and mitigation strategy in a specific plan. Specific plans currently exist for Amoruso Ranch, Creekview, Del Webb, Downtown, Highland Reserve North, North Central Roseville, Northeast Roseville, North Industrial, North Roseville, Northwest Roseville, Riverside Gateway, Sierra Vista, Southeast Roseville, Stoneridge, West Roseville, and the Infill Area. Before zoning and development rights are issued for these newly developing areas, a detailed hydrology and hydraulic study dealing with that sub-region's concerns is required, in order to examine local drainage problems, define flood levels based on total buildout of the watershed, and set aside floodplain areas as open space. Floodplains are defined on swales with drainage areas greater than 300 acres. The City of Roseville and PCFCD review and approve each specific plan.

Major drainage infrastructure in the specific plans is designed as part of the infrastructure of the sub-regions and is constructed prior to development in the area; this eliminates the need for on-site detention requirements because regional detention, if required, is built into the infrastructure for the entire specific plan and not on a project-by-project basis. This approach allows for more control of the design and easier maintenance of the facility. In

addition, in newly developing areas, hydraulic requirements used to define floodplains assume well-vegetated swales and creeks, which reduces the need to provide constant cleaning of these streams by maintenance crews.

Project Drainage Design

As each project in the specific plan is developed, the City requires the project to meet drainage improvement standards. The standards require storm drain systems that support more than one parcel to be dedicated to the City for maintenance or that project owners maintain the system. In both cases, the storm drain system is reviewed by the City's Public Works Department to meet the same hydraulic standards. Project owners must demonstrate that in the case of total system failure, surface water would be able to exit the project area without causing damage. For example, if drain inlets are not maintained on a commercial site and water ponds, surface water should be able to discharge into the public drainage system without entering any on- or off-site buildings. This requirement eliminates the need for the City to monitor private storm drain systems to verify that they are adequately maintained.

10.7.5 Outreach and Public Education

The City of Roseville makes a concerted effort to educate and inform its citizens on the impacts of flooding and how to prepare for flooding impacts. The ongoing outreach and public education program uses multiple media:

- Floodplain information is published in "Roseville Reflections," a City-sponsored newsletter sent to all citizens.
- Flood information is published on the City's website and includes real-time flood warning and flood threat recognition information. The website is www.roseville.ca.us/flood/alert/floodalert.html.
- On-line surveying is used to identify public perception of flood risk and support of mitigation.
- An informational brochure, "Weathering the Storm," is available to the public.
- Literature on flood warning, property protection, and flood safety is mailed annually to Roseville residents.

10.8 SCENARIO

The City of Roseville has made great strides to reduce the risk from flooding. Events like those that caused past flooding will continue to occur, but impacts will be significantly less than in the past. Intense isolated rainstorms over the region will cause creeks and streams to overflow their banks, causing road closures and power outages. However, structure damage to personal property will be limited to the few properties that have exposure to significant depths of flooding. Flash flooding caused by rainfall runoff exceeding the capacity of stormwater systems will also continue to occur. However, potential personal property damage will be limited to structures constructed prior to building and stormwater standards adopted by the City to remediate these impacts.

10.9 ISSUES

Important issues associated with flood hazard in Roseville include but are not limited to the following:

- The boundaries of the 100-year floodplain could be as specified in the floodplain designations section of the flood-protection component of the City's General Plan. Floodplain areas shall be preserved as specified in the Open Space and Conservation Element. Preservation may include required dedication to the City. If needed, the City's ordinances can be modified to include floodplain use regulations consistent with the goals, policies, and implementation measures of the Safety Element, Land Use Element, Open Space and Conservation Element, and Parks and Recreation Element of the City's General Plan. This effort would be overseen by the Planning Division and would require no special funding.

- The development, implementation, and expansion of the Flood Alert and Early Warning Program systems should be continued, and the systems should be integrated with other local jurisdictions to form a regional warning program. This effort is overseen by the Public Works Department. Annual funding is provided through the City's general fund and is about \$100,000 per year.
- By remaining actively involved in the PCFCD, the City of Roseville should continue to pursue a regional approach to flood issues. Involvement includes cooperation in the development of a comprehensive regional database. Regional drainage planning and design for all individual developments in the Placer County Flood Control District should be encouraged to address cumulative flooding impacts. The City should also continue to participate in regional flooding studies, including the Auburn Creek/Coon Creek/Pleasant Grove Creek flood mitigation plan and the Dry Creek Basin flood control plan. Efforts would be overseen by the Public Works Department. Annual funding for membership to the PCFCD is currently provided by the City's General Fund and is about \$90,000 per year.
- The City should continue coordination with other agencies on issues of flood control. Coordination between the City and adjacent jurisdictions occurs through several mechanisms, including the distribution of development proposals for review and comment. The City should also continue its cooperation with federal, state, and local agencies, including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, California Reclamation Board, FEMA, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Placer County Resource Conservation District, and PCFCD. This effort would be overseen by the Community Development Department, Planning Division, and Public Works Department as appropriate and should not require special funding.
- The final two phases of the Cirby-Linda-Dry Creek Flood Control Project should be completed. Five of the seven phases of this project have been completed at a cost of about \$18,000,000. This project is overseen by the Public Works Department. The cost for the last two phases would be about \$3,000,000. Funding could be from City, state, federal, or private developer sources.
- Alternative improvements to the Cirby-Linda-Dry Creek Flood Control Project could be analyzed. These improvements may be cost-effective in the following flood-prone areas of Roseville:
 - Dry Creek from Darling Way to Riverside Avenue
 - The area on Dry Creek upstream of Folsom Road in the Columbia Avenue, Marilyn Avenue, Bonita Street area
 - The Linda Creek area near Champion Oaks Drive, Samoa Way, and Hurst Way
 - Cirby Creek in the Trimble Way and Zien Court area.
- The existing wood flood wall along Dry Creek that is protecting the City's Main Library and Public Safety Building could be replaced. The wood wall allows floodwater to leak through, and constant pumping is required. This effort would be overseen by the Public Works Department and cost about \$300,000. Funding could be from City, state, federal, private developer, property owner sources.
- How will the potential impacts of climate change impact flood conditions in the City of Roseville?

11. LANDSLIDE

11.1 GENERAL BACKGROUND

According to the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), the term landslide includes a wide range of ground movement, such as rock falls, deep failure of slopes, and shallow debris flows. Although gravity acting on an over-steepened slope is the primary reason for a landslide, there are other contributing factors (USGS, n.d.).

Landslides and mudslides can be initiated by storms, earthquakes, fires, volcanic eruptions or human modification of the land. They can move rapidly down slopes or through channels, and can strike with little or no warning at avalanche speeds.

Landslides can pose a serious hazard to properties on or below hillsides. When landslides occur—in response to such changes as increased water content, earthquake shaking, addition of load, or removal of downslope support—they deform and tilt the ground surface. The result can be destruction of foundations, offset of roads, breaking of underground pipes, or overriding of downslope property and structures.

11.1.1 Landslide Types

Landslides are commonly categorized by the type of initial ground failure. Common types of slides are shown on Figure 11-1 through Figure 11-4 (Ecology 2014). The most common is the shallow colluvial slide, occurring particularly in response to intense, short-duration storms. The largest and most destructive are deep-seated slides, although they are less common than other types.

Mudslides (or debris flows) are rivers of rock, earth, organic matter and other soil materials saturated with water. They develop in the soil overlying bedrock on sloping surfaces when water rapidly accumulates in the ground, such as during heavy rainfall or rapid snowmelt. Water pressure in the pore spaces of the material increases to the point that the internal strength of the soil is drastically weakened. The soil's reduced resistance can then easily be overcome by gravity, changing the earth into a flowing river of mud.






A debris avalanche (Figure 11-5) is a fast-moving debris flow that travels faster than about 10 miles per hour (mph). Speeds in excess of 20 mph are not uncommon, and speeds in excess of 100 mph, although rare, can occur. The slurry can travel miles from its source, growing as it descends, picking up trees, boulders, cars, and anything else in its path. Although these slides behave as fluids, they pack many times the hydraulic force of water due to the mass of material included in them. They can be among the most destructive events in nature.

DEFINITIONS

Landslide—The movement of masses of loosened rock and soil down a hillside or slope. Slope failures occur when the strength of the soils forming the slope is exceeded by the pressure, such as weight or saturation, acting upon them.

Mass Movement—A collective term for landslides and mudslides.

Mudslide (or Debris Flow)—A river of rock, earth, organic matter and other materials saturated with water. Mudslides develop in the soil overlying bedrock on sloping surfaces when water rapidly accumulates in the ground, such as during heavy rainfall or rapid snowmelt. Water pressure in the pore spaces of the material increases to the point that the internal strength of the soil is drastically weakened. The soil's reduced resistance can then easily be overcome by gravity, changing the earth into a flowing river of mud or "slurry."

**Figure 11-1. Deep Seated Slide****Figure 11-2. Shallow Colluvial Slide****Figure 11-3. Bench Slide****Figure 11-4. Large Slide****Figure 11-5. Typical Debris Avalanche Scar and Track**

Landslides also include the following:

- Rock Falls—blocks of rock that fall away from a bedrock unit without a rotational component
- Rock Topples—blocks of rock that fall away from a bedrock unit with a rotational component
- Rotational Slumps—blocks of fine-grained sediment that rotate and move down slope
- Transitional Slides—sediments that move along a flat surface without a rotational component
- Earth Flows—fine-grained sediments that flow downhill and typically form a fan structure
- Creep—a slow-moving landslide often only noticed through crooked trees and disturbed structures
- Block Slides—blocks of rock that slide along a slip plane as a unit down a slope

11.1.2 Landslide Modeling

Two characteristics are essential to conducting an accurate risk assessment of the landslide hazard:

- The type of initial ground failure that occurs, as described above
- The post-failure movement of the loosened material (“run-out”), including travel distance and velocity.

All current landslide models—those in practical applications and those more recently developed—use simplified hypothetical descriptions of mass movement to simulate the complex behavior of actual flow. The models attempt to reproduce the general features of the moving mass of material through measurable factors, such as base shear, that define a system and determine its behavior. Due to the lack of experimental data and the limited current knowledge about the behavior of the moving flows, landslide models use simplified parameters to account for complex aspects that may not be defined. These simplified parameters are not related to specific physical processes that can be directly measured, and there is a great deal of uncertainty in their definition. Some, but not all, models provide estimates of the level of uncertainty associated with the modeling approach.

Run-out modeling is complicated because the movement of materials may change over the course of a landslide event, depending on the initial composition, the extent of saturation by water, the ground shape of the path traveled and whether there is additional material incorporated during the event (Savage and Hutter 1991; Rickenmann & Weber 2000; Iverson 2004).

11.2 HAZARD PROFILE

11.2.1 Past Events

There is little or no record of landslides occurring in Roseville that caused damage to property. Three notable landslide events have been recorded in Placer County, according to the Placer County Hazard Mitigation Plan. These events occurred in the eastern portion of the county, which is significantly different from Roseville in geologic terms. Therefore, no parallel can be drawn from these events for Roseville.

11.2.2 Location

Landslide hazard areas are areas where characteristics such as the following indicate a landslide risk:

- A slope greater than 15 percent
- A history of landslide activity during the last 10,000 years
- Stream or wave activity that has caused erosion or cut into a bank to cause the surrounding land to be unstable
- The presence of an alluvial fan, which indicates vulnerability to the flow of debris or sediments
- The presence of impermeable soils, such as silt or clay, mixed with granular soils such as sand and gravel.

The California Landslide Hazard Identification Act directs the State Geologist to identify and map hazardous landslide areas for use by municipalities in planning and decision-making on grading and building permits. Three factors that characterize landslide hazard areas include significant slope, weak rocks, and heavy rains. This program focuses on urban areas and growth areas that exhibit these characteristics.

Roseville and the surrounding Sacramento region are not identified as areas prone to landslide hazards. The City's geographic location, soil conditions, and surface terrain combine to minimize risk of major damage from landslides, subsidence (gradual shrinking of the earth's surface due to underground resource extraction), or other geologic hazards resulting from seismic activity and related natural forces. Therefore, the region has not been included as a part of the state's study program. The USGS, in its identification of geologic hazard areas and their susceptibility and rate of incidence, has classified Placer County and the Roseville vicinity as a low rate of incidence, with less than 1.5 percent of the area susceptible to landslides.

Little scientific analysis is available about landslide hazards in Roseville. Assessment of the risk from this hazard is based on past occurrences, observed conditions, and guidance from state and federal agencies. However, with slopes steeper than 15 percent and the frequent occurrence of multiple intense storms that can saturate the soil, there is an exposure to landslides. Future risk assessment of landslides could be enhanced with better data specific to the hazard.

While Roseville is located on relatively level terrain, the slope gradually increases to the east and north. The most significant slopes are along creeks and ravines. The soil in ravine areas is a Mehrten soil typically associated with post-volcanic activity. It is very dense and not considered to be erosion prone.

Areas with slopes greater than 15 percent in the Stoneridge Specific Plan Area exhibit characteristics of potential landslide hazard areas. Landsliding in these areas has likely occurred numerous times in the past, as evidenced by past deposits exposed in erosion gullies. The timeframe for these past occurrences is probably over the last several hundred years, if not thousands.

Due to the lack of available data on this hazard, the extent and location of the hazard has been estimated with an emphasis on steepness of slopes. Figure 11-6 shows the estimated landslide hazard areas in Roseville, based on slopes of 15 to 30 percent (moderate risk) and 30 percent and higher (high risk). The map represents a general assessment of citywide exposure; it does not apply on a site-specific basis and should be used with caution.

11.2.3 Frequency

Landslides are often triggered by other natural hazards such as earthquakes, heavy rain, floods or wildfires, so the frequency of landslides is related to the frequency of these other hazards. In the Roseville vicinity, landslides are most likely to occur during and after major storms. Due to the soil types in the steep slope areas of Roseville and the lack of historical occurrence of significant landslide events, the frequency of occurrence of landslide events in Roseville is considered to be low.

11.2.4 Severity

Landslides destroy property and infrastructure and can take the lives of people. Slope failures in the United States result in an average of 25 lives lost per year and an annual cost of about \$1.5 billion. Due to the lack of exposure to this hazard in Roseville, the severity of the impacts of landslides on the people, property and economy of Roseville is considered to be low.




Figure 11-6. Roseville Area Landslide Hazard Map

11.2.5 Warning Time

Mass movements can occur suddenly or slowly. Some methods used to monitor mass movements can provide an idea of the type of movement and the amount of time prior to failure. It is also possible to determine what areas are at risk during general time periods. Assessing the geology, vegetation, and amount of predicted precipitation for an area can help in these predictions. However, there is no practical warning system for individual landslides. Correlations can be made based on soil type, slope and rainfall amount. No known correlations have been made for the Roseville planning area. The current procedure is to monitor situations on a case-by-case basis, and respond after an event has occurred. Generally accepted warning signs for landslide activity include the following:

- Springs, seeps, or saturated ground in areas that have not typically been wet before
- New cracks or unusual bulges in the ground, street pavements or sidewalks
- Soil moving away from foundations
- Ancillary structures such as decks and patios tilting and/or moving relative to the main house
- Tilting or cracking of concrete floors and foundations
- Broken water lines and other underground utilities
- Leaning telephone poles, trees, retaining walls or fences
- Offset fence lines
- Sunken or down-dropped road beds
- Rapid increase in creek water levels, possibly accompanied by increased turbidity (soil content)
- Sudden decrease in creek water levels though rain is still falling or just recently stopped
- Sticking doors and windows, and visible open spaces indicating jambs and frames out of plumb
- Unusual sounds, such as trees cracking or boulders knocking together
- A faint rumbling sound that increases in volume as a landslide nears.

11.3 SECONDARY HAZARDS

Landslides can cause several types of secondary effects, such as blocking access to roads, which can isolate residents and businesses and delay emergency response or commercial, public and private transportation. This could result in economic losses for businesses. Other potential problems resulting from landslides are power and communication failures. Utility poles on slopes can be knocked over, resulting in losses to power and communication lines. Landslides also have the potential of destabilizing the foundation of structures, which may result in monetary loss for residents. They also can damage rivers or streams, potentially harming water quality, fisheries and spawning habitat.

11.4 EXPOSURE

Figure 11-6 was used to estimate the exposure of population and structures to the landslide hazard.

11.4.1 Population

Using the percent of residential buildings exposed, multiplied by the estimated per-household population in 2014, it is estimated that there are 36 persons living in households exposed to the high landslide risk hazard and 140 persons exposed to the moderate landslide risk hazard. This represents 0.03 percent and 0.11 percent of the total population of the City, respectively.

11.4.2 Property

An estimated 12 structures are exposed to high landslide risk and 57 structures to moderate landslide risk. These high landslide risk structures have a total replacement cost value of \$3,691,741, or 0.01 percent of the total

replacement cost value of the City. The moderate landslide risk structures have a total value of \$49,714,043, or 0.17 percent of the total value of the City. These are residential, commercial and educational structures. These results are based on a spatial GIS exercise identifying all structure locations that intersect the high and moderate risk hazard zones.

11.4.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

Facilities

An analysis of critical facilities inventory to determine exposure to the landslide hazard determined that two of the City's critical facilities are exposed to the landslide hazard.

Infrastructure

Roads and Bridges

A significant amount of infrastructure (roads, bridges and utilities) can be exposed to mass movements. Access to major roads is crucial to life-safety after a disaster event and can help to provide resilience during response and recovery operations. Landslides have the potential to block roads, causing isolation of all or part of the City. Roadway blockages caused by landslides can create traffic problems resulting in delays for emergency vehicles and public and private transportation. This could result in economic losses for businesses.

Landslide events can significantly impact bridges. They can knock out bridge abutments or significantly weaken the soil supporting a bridge, obstructing the bridge or making it hazardous for use. Bridges in areas of high landslide risk often provide the only ingress and egress to large areas and in some cases to isolated areas. None of the City bridges are considered to have exposure to the landslide hazard. However, bridges outside the City within the County are susceptible to landslides. Damage to one of these facilities could close off an access route to the City. These facilities have not been inventoried for this assessment.

Power Lines

Other potential problems resulting from landslides are power and communication failures creating problems for vulnerable populations or businesses and potential loss of life in emergency situations. Power lines are generally elevated above steep slopes, but the towers supporting them can be subject to landslides. A landslide could cause the soil underneath a tower to fail, causing it to collapse, and ripping down the lines. An inventory of these types of facilities was not available for this assessment.

11.4.4 Environment

Environmental problems as a result of mass movements can be numerous. Landslides fall into streams and significantly impact fish and wildlife habitat, as well as affecting water quality.

11.5 VULNERABILITY

11.5.1 Population

Due to the nature of census block group data, it is difficult to determine demographics of populations vulnerable to mass movements. In general, all persons exposed to landslides hazards are considered to be vulnerable.

11.5.2 Property

Loss estimates for the landslide hazard are not based on modeling using damage functions, because no such damage functions have been generated. Instead, loss estimates were developed representing 10 percent, 30 percent and 50 percent of the assessed value of exposed structures. This allows emergency managers to evaluate a range of potential economic impacts based on an estimate of the percent of damage to the building stock. Damage in excess of 50 percent is considered to be substantial by most building codes and typically requires total reconstruction of the structure. Table 11-1 and Table 11-2 list loss estimates to the general building stock in moderate and high landslide hazard areas.

Table 11-1. Loss Estimates for Buildings Vulnerable to High Landslide Hazard

Building Count	Assessed Value	10% Damage	30% Damage	50% Damage
12	\$3,691,741	\$369,174	\$1,107,522	\$1,845,871

Table 11-2. Loss Estimates for Buildings Vulnerable to Moderate Landslide Risk Hazard

Building Count	Replacement Cost	10% Damage	30% Damage	50% Damage
57	\$49,714,043	\$4,971,404	\$14,914,212	\$24,857,022

11.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

Two identified critical facilities are exposed to the landslide hazard, based on the best available data. Several types of infrastructure are exposed to mass movements, including transportation, water and sewer and power infrastructure. At this time, all infrastructure and transportation corridors identified as exposed to the landslide hazard are considered vulnerable until more information becomes available.

11.5.4 Environment

The environment vulnerable to landslide hazard is the same as the environment exposed to the hazard.

11.6 FUTURE TRENDS IN DEVELOPMENT

The areas that are most vulnerable to the landslide hazard make up a small portion of the City of Roseville. Because these ravine areas in the southeastern portion of the City are considered to be non-developable and the probability of occurrence of this type of hazard is low due to the soil type in this region, this hazard should have little or no impact on future development and redevelopment trends. The City's current land use policies should also ensure that no future development or re-development would be impacted by this hazard.

The landslide risk exposure with in the planning did not increase over the performance period of the 2011 Plan. The value of the properties exposed to steep slope hazards increased by 12% which can be attributed to normal appreciation in property values observed for the Roseville planning area. Since there are currently no nationally recognized damage functions for landslide risk modeling, a comparative analysis of vulnerability was not performed. However, since there was no increase in risk exposure, the increase in vulnerability should coincide with the increase in value of the assets at risk.

11.7 REVIEW OF EXISTING ORDINANCES, PROGRAMS, AND PLANS

Since 1975, state law has required that a safety element be included as part of all general plans. In 1984, the state consolidated the safety and seismic elements into one element that includes seismic safety, geologic hazards, fire safety, and flooding. The seismic and geologic hazards component includes goals and policies to protect the

City's residents from danger associated with active faults, liquefaction, ground failure (landslides), and steep slopes.

The Safety Element of the Roseville General Plan includes components that address geologic hazards such as landslides. While the potential for geologic hazards such as landslides in Roseville is not high, the soil and geologic characteristics of the City continue to play an important role in determining safety procedures. Current policies and ordinances reflect the City's ongoing obligations to protect lives and property and include ongoing monitoring of seismic activity and periodic updating of plans for emergency events. Continued implementation of these policies and enforcement of City ordinances and General Plan policies will ensure that efforts are maximized for protecting the safety of Roseville's citizens from potential geologic safety hazards. The following policies identified in the Seismic and Geologic component of the Safety Element will mitigate the potential exposure to geologic hazards within Roseville:

- Continue to mitigate the potential impacts of geologic hazards through building plan review.
- Minimize soil erosion and sedimentation by maintaining compatible land uses, suitable to the existing environment.
- Develop appropriate building designs and implement appropriate construction techniques to decrease the impact of a landslide.
- Create and adopt slope development standards prior to or as part of the planning process for any area identified as having significant slope.
- Require contour grading, where feasible, and re-vegetation to mitigate the appearance of engineered slopes and to control erosion.

These policies are implemented through existing, ongoing programs that include the following:

- **California Building Code**—Through the Building Division of the Development Services Department, continue to enforce and keep abreast of the most recent updates to the CBC that include construction standards for seismic and geologic safety.
- **Development Review Process**—Refer any development proposal that may be impacted by grading, soil, or geologic issues to the Public Works Department. Consider the comments of the Public Works Department in the development review process. The environmental review for projects shall include a full inventory of potential grading impacts and any potential soil or geologic concerns, assessment of potential project impacts, and identification of mitigation and monitoring measures. Issues relating to slopes, liquefaction, ground failure and erosion shall be addressed. Project design, grading, and building construction techniques shall be used to minimize impacts. Sites that are determined to have significant slope shall be identified, and appropriate design restrictions shall be implemented to avoid the risk of erosion or landslide. Graded slopes shall be limited to 2:1 where feasible. Slopes that are less than 2:1 should be encouraged. The use of retaining walls or stepped building designs should be pursued as an alternative to high or steep slopes where feasible and desirable.
- **Grading Ordinance**—Enforce and regularly evaluate the Grading Ordinance. The Grading Ordinance includes standards for project construction and erosion control. This ordinance requires prompt re-vegetation of disturbed areas, avoidance of grading activities during wet weather, avoidance of disturbance in drainage ways, and other erosion control measures.
- **Specific Plans**—Ensure that specific plans are consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan. Specific plans shall identify potential geologic, soil, and seismic hazards in the planning area and shall include measures to reduce the risk of such hazards. Proposed specific plans shall identify criteria for development on steep slope areas, as applicable, in order to ensure public safety and minimize environmental and aesthetic impacts.

- **Land Use Designation**—In areas where potentially significant soil and erosion impacts are identified, the City should consider open space or other appropriate land use designations, as specified in the Land Use Element, to minimize potential impacts.

11.8 SCENARIO

Due to the lack of significant exposure to this hazard, a scenario where a landslide would have a significant impact on the City of Roseville is currently unlikely. Mass movements are becoming more of a concern as development moves outside of city centers and into areas less developed in terms of infrastructure. Major mass movements in Placer County and areas surrounding Roseville occur as a result of soil conditions that have been affected by severe storms, groundwater or human development activities. After heavy rains, soils become saturated with water. As water seeps downward through upper soils that may consist of permeable sands and gravels and accumulates on impermeable silt, it will cause weakness and destabilization in the slope. As rains continue, the groundwater table rises, adding to the weakening of the slope. Gravity, poor drainage, a rising groundwater table and poor soil exacerbate hazardous conditions.

Roseville's most likely risk exposure to landslides is as a secondary risk associated with an earthquake or wildfire. The ground shaking that could occur during an earthquake could trigger landslides in the steep slope areas. This scenario could be further enhanced should an earthquake occur during a time when the soils are saturated due to repeated storm events. After a wildfire, the landscape becomes denatured and unable to absorb the impacts of repeated intense rainfall. This can cause the soil to become saturated and vulnerable to sliding.

11.9 ISSUES

Important issues associated with landslide hazards in Roseville include but are not limited to the following:

- The data and science regarding the mapping and assessment of landslide hazards is constantly evolving. As new data and science become available, assessments of landslide risk should be re-evaluated.
- The impact of climate change on landslides is uncertain. If climate change impacts atmospheric conditions, the exposure to landslide risks in Roseville could increase.

12. SEVERE WEATHER

12.1 GENERAL BACKGROUND

Most of the federal and state disaster declarations for the Roseville area and Placer County are related to severe weather conditions. Severe weather conditions vary greatly from the western portion of Placer County to the eastern portion, primarily due to variation in topography and elevation across the county. Heavy rainfall and snowfall result when humid air masses blow in from the ocean and move up the mountain ranges. Moist air, traveling inland on prevailing westerly winds, pushes up against the Sierra Nevada mountains, which wrings moisture out of the air as it rises, cools and condenses.

Roseville's location in the western, low-lying portion of the county helps explain why, at well below the 4,000 foot snowfall region, the City avoids the harshest of winter conditions that occur in eastern Placer County. Figure 12-1 shows Roseville's elevation of approximately 165 feet above sea level. Although the climate of Roseville is relatively mild, with an average of 257 sunny days each year, the City is near the foothills of the Sierra Nevada range and can experience severe weather resulting from rapid changes in topography.




Figure 12-1. Roseville Regional Surface Elevation

DEFINITIONS

Thunderstorm—Typically 15 miles in diameter and lasting about 30 minutes, thunderstorms are underrated hazards. Lightning, which occurs with all thunderstorms, is a serious threat to human life. Heavy rains over a small area in a short time can lead to flash flooding. Strong winds, hail and tornadoes are also dangers associated with thunderstorms.

Tornado—Tornadoes are funnel clouds of varying sizes that generate winds more than 300 miles per hour. A tornado is formed by the turbulent mixing of layers of air with contrasting temperature, moisture, density and wind flow. The mixing layers of air account for most of the tornadoes occurring in April, May and June, when cold, dry air meets warm, moister air moving up from the south. They can affect an area up to a mile wide, with a path of varying length. Tornadoes can come from lines of cumulonimbus clouds or from a single storm cloud. They are measured using the Fujita Scale ranging from F0 to F6.

Windstorm—A storm featuring violent winds. Southwesterly winds are associated with strong storms moving onto the coast from the Pacific Ocean. Southern winds parallel to the coastal mountains are the strongest and most destructive winds. Windstorms tend to damage ridgelines that face into the winds.

12.1.1 Tornadoes

A tornado is a violently rotating column of air extending between, and in contact with, a cloud and the surface of the earth. Tornadoes are often (but not always) visible as a funnel cloud. On a local-scale, tornadoes are the most intense of all atmospheric circulations and wind can reach destructive speeds of more than 300 mph. A tornado's vortex is typically a few hundred meters in diameter, and damage paths can be up to 1 mile wide and 50 miles long. Figure 12-2, adapted from FEMA, illustrates the potential impacts and damage from tornadoes of different magnitude. Tornadoes can occur throughout the year at any time of day but are most frequent in the spring during the late afternoon. As shown in Figure 12-3, California has a relatively low risk compared to states in the Midwestern and Southern U.S.

12.1.2 Windstorms

Windstorms are generally short-duration events involving straight-line winds or gusts of over 50 mph, strong enough to cause property damage. Windstorms are especially dangerous in areas with significant tree stands and areas with exposed property, poorly constructed buildings, mobile homes (manufactured housing units), major infrastructure, and above-ground utility lines. A windstorm can topple trees and power lines, cause damage to residential, commercial and critical facilities, and leave tons of debris in its wake. There are seven types of damaging winds:

- **Straight-line winds**—Any thunderstorm wind that is not associated with rotation; this term is used mainly to differentiate from tornado winds. Most thunderstorms produce some straight-line winds as a result of outflow generated by the thunderstorm downdraft.
- **Downdrafts**—A small-scale column of air that rapidly sinks toward the ground.
- **Downbursts**—A strong downdraft with horizontal dimensions larger than 2.5 miles resulting in an outward burst or damaging winds on or near the ground. Downburst winds may begin as a microburst and spread out over a wider area, sometimes producing damage similar to a strong tornado. Although usually associated with thunderstorms, downbursts can occur with showers too weak to produce thunder.
- **Microbursts**—A small concentrated downburst that produces an outward burst of damaging winds at the surface. Microbursts are generally less than 2.5 miles across and short-lived, lasting only 5 to 10 minutes, with maximum wind speeds up to 168 mph. There are two kinds of microbursts: wet and dry. A wet microburst is accompanied by heavy precipitation at the surface. Dry microbursts, common in places like the high plains and the intermountain west, occur with little or no precipitation reaching the ground.
- **Gust front**—A gust front is the leading edge of rain-cooled air that clashes with warmer thunderstorm inflow. Gust fronts are characterized by a wind shift, temperature drop, and gusty winds out ahead of a thunderstorm. Sometimes the winds push up air above them, forming a shelf cloud or detached roll cloud.
- **Derecho**—A derecho is a widespread thunderstorm wind caused when new thunderstorms form along the leading edge of an outflow boundary (the boundary formed by horizontal spreading of thunderstorm-cooled air). The word “derecho” is of Spanish origin and means “straight ahead.” Thunderstorms feed on the boundary and continue to reproduce. Derechos typically occur in summer when complexes of thunderstorms form over plains, producing heavy rain and severe wind. The damaging winds can last a long time and cover a large area.
- **Bow Echo**—A bow echo is a linear wind front bent outward in a bow shape. Damaging straight-line winds often occur near the center of a bow echo. Bow echoes can be 200 miles long, last for several hours, and produce extensive wind damage at the ground.




Figure 12-2. Potential Impact and Damage from a Tornado




Figure 12-3. Tornado Risk Areas in the Coterminous United States

Windstorms can result in collapsed or damaged buildings, damaged or blocked roads and bridges, damaged traffic signals, streetlights and parks, and other damage. Wind speeds as low as 32 mph can cause structural damage, and winds of 100 mph can actually destroy wood-frame structures (Seattle Office of Emergency Management 2014). High winds can also cause direct losses to buildings, people, and vital equipment. There are direct consequences to the local economy resulting from windstorms related to both physical damage and interrupted services.

Wind pressure can create a direct and frontal assault on a structure, pushing walls, doors, and windows inward. Conversely, passing winds can create lift and suction forces that act to pull building components and surfaces outward. As positive and negative forces impact a building's doors, windows and walls, the result can be roof or building component failures and considerable structural damage. The effects of winds are magnified in the upper levels of multi-story structures.

Debris carried along by extreme winds can contribute directly to loss of life and indirectly to the failure of protective building envelopes. Falling trees and branches can damage buildings, power lines, and other property and infrastructure. Tree limbs breaking in winds of only 45 mph can be thrown over 75 feet, so overhead power lines can be damaged even in relatively minor windstorm events. During wet winters, saturated soils cause trees to become less stable and more vulnerable to uprooting from high winds. Utility lines brought down by summer thunderstorms have also been known to cause fires, which start in dry roadside vegetation. Electric power lines falling down to the pavement create the possibility of lethal electric shock.

Downed trees and power lines, and damaged property also can be major hindrances to emergency response and disaster recovery. Emergency response operations can be complicated when roads are blocked or when power supplies are interrupted. Industry and commerce can suffer losses from interruptions in electric service and from extended road closures.

Windstorms in Placer County are more probable during the fall through early spring. Because of the shape and orientation of the Sacramento Valley, prevailing winds are southerly. When atmospheric conditions are favorable, usually in conjunction with a significant storm tracking along the coast, these winds may combine and become strong enough to cause property damage and personal injury. The most significant windstorm in Northern California was the Columbus Day storm of 1962. Significant damage occurred along the coast and in the far northern part of the Sacramento Valley. Because Roseville lies far enough south in the valley, windstorms such as those during the 1962 Columbus Day Storm, typically do not intensify to damaging levels. It is rare for southwesterly winds flowing parallel to the Sierra Nevada Mountains to reach sustained gusts above 60 mph in the valley floor. The predicted wind speed given in wind warnings issued by the National Weather Service is for a one-minute average; gusts may be 25 to 30 percent higher.

Site-specific data on windstorms in Roseville are incomplete. Regionally, a few windstorm events have resulted in significant damage. The impacts of these events were felt to the north and east of Roseville. There have been a couple of instances of unusual wind bursts that resulted in some property damage. December 1993 saw a downburst of wind that did significant damage to a sound wall that was under construction. Another event occurred on January 1, 1995, when a wind gust through northwest Roseville snapped several power poles. Table 12-1 shows monthly wind records for Sacramento.

Table 12-1. Monthly Wind Records for Sacramento, California

Month	Year of Record	Fastest Wind Speed (miles per hour)	Month	Year of Record	Fastest Wind Speed (miles per hour)
January	1954	60	July	1956	36
February	1938	58	August	1954	38
March	1952	66	September	1965	42
April	1955	45	October	1950	68
May	1912	40	November	1953	70
June	1950	47	December	1952	70

Source: Masters-Bevan 2001.

12.1.3 Fog

Fog is a cloud near the ground that forms when air close to the ground can no longer hold all the moisture it contains. This occurs either when air is cooled to its dew point or the amount of moisture in the air increases. Heavy fog is hazardous because it can restrict surface visibility. Severe fog incidents can close roads, cause vehicle accidents, cause airport delays, and impair the effectiveness of emergency response. Financial losses associated with transportation delays caused by fog have not been calculated in the United States, but they are known to be substantial. Fog can occur almost anywhere during any season and is classified based on how it forms, which is related to where it forms. Certain seasons are more likely to have foggy days or nights based on a number of factors, including topography.

In Placer County, heavy fog occurs mostly during the midwinter. A low-lying, early morning “tule fog” can occur anytime during the wet, cold season. Tule fog or radiation (ground) fog is common on clear nights with little or no wind. It is caused by the rapid cooling of the Earth and corresponding drop in air temperature to the dew point. This type of fog is known as “valley fog” when it persists throughout the day and is thick. Table 12-2 summarizes dense fog events in the southern Sacramento valley. Given the nature of fog in the Roseville area, future severe or dense fog events are expected to happen on an annual basis, but are not expected to occur frequently.

Table 12-2. Monthly Dense Fog Occurrence

Month	Year of Record	Mean Number of Days	Maximum Number of Days
January	1961	9.9	23
February	1963 ^a	5.3	13
March	1986	1.7	6
October	1962	1.4	11
November	1982	5.3	11
December	1989*	9.5	22
Annual	1962	33.8	64

a. Also occurred in previous years.

Source: Masters-Bevan 2001.

12.1.4 Heavy Rains, Thunderstorms and Lightning

Severe weather in the City of Roseville generally includes heavy rains and is periodically accompanied by strong winds, lightning, or hail. Heavy rains coupled with low temperatures or other severe weather conditions can result in increases in traffic accidents, disruptions in transportation, commerce, government, and education. Severe weather incidents can also cause utility outages due to falling trees or other debris, as well as injuries.

Roseville's Mediterranean type of climate is typified by nearly 90 percent of the annual precipitation occurring during a window of about 16 weeks. The most severe storms occur during the late fall to early spring. The climate pattern, coupled with the onshore flow of warm, moist Pacific air during the winter, can generate severe and prolonged periods of heavy rain.

Roseville experiences heavy rains every year. Some of these events may include thunderstorms. Thunderstorms are typically few in number and are more likely to appear in spring or late fall. Table 12-3 shows the average and record occurrence of thunderstorms in Sacramento between 1948 and 2008.

Table 12-3. Frequency of Thunderstorms in Sacramento, California, 1948 – 2008

Month	Year of Record	Number of Days with Thunderstorms	
		Average	Maximum
January	1970	0.4	3
February	1970	0.5	4
March	1992	0.8	4
April	1983	0.7	3
May	1967	0.3	3
June	1956	0.2	2
July	1989	0.2	2
August	1991 ^a	0.2	2
September	1989 ^a	0.5	2
October	1989 ^a	0.3	2
November	1979*	0.3	3
December	1970	0.2	2
Annual	1970	4.7	10

a. Also occurred in previous years between January 1948 and December 2000.

Source: Masters-Bevan 2008.

NOAA classifies a thunderstorm as a storm with lightning and thunder produced by cumulonimbus clouds, usually producing gusty winds, heavy rain, and sometimes hail. Thunderstorms are usually short in duration (seldom more than 2 hours). Heavy rains associated with thunderstorms can lead to flash flooding during the wet or dry season.

According to the American Meteorological Society *Glossary of Meteorology*, thunderstorms are reported as light, medium, or heavy according to the following characteristics:

- Nature of the lightning and thunder
- Type and intensity of the precipitation, if any
- Speed and gustiness of the wind
- Appearance of the clouds
- Effect on surface temperature.

Lightning is an electrical discharge that results from the buildup of positive and negative charges within a thunderstorm. When the buildup becomes strong enough, lightning appears as a “bolt.” This flash of light usually occurs within the clouds or between the clouds and the ground. A bolt of lightning reaches temperatures approaching 50,000°F instantaneously. The rapid heating and cooling of air near the lightning causes thunder. Lightning is a major threat during a thunderstorm. In the United States, between 75 and 100 Americans are killed by lightning each year.

12.1.5 Ice and Freezing Rain

Ice and freezing rain are not part of the climate pattern in southern Sacramento valley. Periods have occurred where the daily minimum temperature has been at or below 32°F for several days. Yet the low temperatures reflect diurnal variations with clear skies, not part of a synoptic feature generating any precipitation. The bitterest cold snap on record, occurring December 9 to 15, 1935, was ended by the onset of a Pacific storm bringing warmer air. Although ice storms and freezing rains are a significant natural hazard, the extremely remote possibility of their occurrence in Roseville precludes any further discussion in this analysis.

12.2 HAZARD PROFILE

12.2.1 Past Events

Table 12-4 summarizes past severe weather events in Roseville and Placer County as recorded by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration since 1958.

12.2.2 Location

Severe weather events have the potential to happen anywhere in Placer County. Communities in low-lying areas next to streams or lakes are more susceptible to flooding. Mountainous regions experience heavier snowfall and a greater risk of road closures. Wind events are most damaging to areas that are heavily wooded.

12.2.3 Frequency

The planning area can expect to experience exposure to some type of severe weather event at least annually.

Table 12-4. Severe Weather Events in Placer County since 1958 (NOAA 2015)

Location	Date	Type	Magnitude	Deaths or Injuries	Property Damage
Placer County	01/13/1957	Tornado	F0	0	0
Placer County	04/22/1967	Hail	0.00 Inches	0	0
Placer County	10/15/1972	Tornado	F0	0	0
Placer County	03/03/1983	Tornado	F0	0	0
Placer County	03/22/1983	Tornado	F1	0	\$250,000
Placer County	04/23/1990	Tornado	F0	0	\$2,500
Placer County	12/30/1992	Hail	0.50 inches	0	0
Description: Severe thunderstorms produced golf ball-sized hail. Damage occurred at several auto dealers in Roseville.					
Roseville	12/22/1996	Thunder Storm/Wind	0	0	0
Description: Downburst winds snapped five 75-foot-high power poles into several pieces.					
Roseville	01/22/1997	Flash Flood	0	0	0
Description: Heavy rains on saturated soil caused flooding on Dry Creek and Linda Creek, damaging 21 homes.					
Roseville	01/26/1997	Flash Flood	0	0	0
Description: Heavy rain caused flooding on Dry Creek and Linda Creek, damaging 21 buildings.					
Placer County	01/12/1998	Heavy Rain	N/A	0	0
Description: Heavy rains caused widespread but minor flooding across the Sacramento Valley and nearby foothills.					
Placer County	01/18/1998	Heavy Rain	N/A	2	0
Description: A Pacific storm brought brief but heavy rain to the Sacramento Valley and surrounding foothills. 27,000 customers lost power at some time during the storm. Two teens were drowned when their car flipped into a flooded ditch near Loomis.					
Roseville	01/22/2000	Heavy Rain	N/A	0	0
Description: Rainfall totaling 5.43 inches fell in just over 48 hours.					
Roseville	02/11/2000	Heavy Rain	N/A	0	\$10,000
Description: Heavy rain that persisted for nearly 72 hours was responsible for the closure of Granite Bay High School. The school lost power and phone service. Local businesses were affected by the flooding and closed as well.					
Placer County	12/17/2005	Heavy Rain	N/A	0	0
Description: A series of storms brought heavy rainfall to Northern California. Five-day rainfall for Roseville was 2.99 inches.					
Placer County	01/01/2006	Severe Storm/Flood	N/A	0	\$2,000,000
Description: Storms brought heavy rain, mudslides, flooding, and high winds to Northern California. Levee overtopping, breaching, and river flooding occurred along numerous rivers, creeks, and streams. Several urban areas had significant street flooding. The Sacramento weir was opened for the first time since 1997. Airports were closed due to high winds and major road closures resulted from flooding and mudslides. Interstate 80 between Sacramento and Reno, NV, was closed for more than a day due to a mudslide, as were both directions of U.S. Highway 50 between Sacramento and South Lake Tahoe. Placer County was among the counties declared in need of federal disaster assistance.					
Placer County	07/25/2013	Hail	N/A	0	0
Description: Strong to severe thunderstorms affected the Sierra and northeast California.					
Roseville	03/36/2014	Tornado	EF0	0	0
Description: EF0 tornado began in a field southwest of Roseville, but did not cause damage until it reached the Pleasant Grove Blvd housing developments in West Roseville. The winds were estimated to be 75 to 85 mph. Several windows were blown out from houses, 25 to 30 feet of fence was blown down, projectile damage to stucco occurred. The tornado lasted 5 to 10 minutes.					
Roseville	05/14/2015	Heavy Rain	N/A	0	0
Description: Thunderstorms brought local heavy rain and minor flooding. Unusually late winter snow fell in the Sierra, causing travel delays and chain controls over passes. Funnel clouds were reported with thunderstorms, but no touchdowns were confirmed. Street flooding was reported at Martin Road and East Roseville Parkway from a thunderstorm.					

12.2.4 Severity

Severe weather disaster declarations for Placer County, as shown in Table 12-4, are often related to heavy rains, thunderstorms, and freezing temperatures. The most common problems associated with severe storms are immobility and loss of utilities. Fatalities are uncommon, but can occur. Roads may become impassable due to flooding, downed trees, or a landslide. Power lines may be downed due to high winds, and services such as water or phone may not be able to operate without power. Lightning can cause severe damage and injury. Windstorms have been known to cause damage to utilities.

Tornadoes are potentially the most dangerous of local storms, but they are not common in the Roseville vicinity. If a major tornado were to strike a populated area such as Roseville, damage could be widespread. Businesses could be forced to close for an extended period or permanently, fatalities could be high, many people could be homeless for an extended period, and routine services such as telephone or power could be disrupted. Buildings may be damaged or destroyed. Compared with other states, California ranks 32nd for frequency of tornadoes, last for number of deaths, 36th for injuries, and 31st for cost of damage. California ranks 44th for the frequency of tornados per square mile.

12.2.5 Warning Time

A meteorologist can often predict the likelihood of a severe storm. This can give several days of warning time. However, meteorologists cannot predict the exact time of onset or the severity of the storm. Some storms come on more quickly and have only a few hours of warning time.

12.3 SECONDARY HAZARDS

The most significant secondary hazards associated with severe weather are floods, falling and downed trees, landslides and downed power lines. Rapidly melting mountain snow combined with heavy rain can overwhelm natural and man-made drainage systems, causing overflow and property destruction. Landslides occur when the soil on slopes becomes oversaturated and fails.

12.4 EXPOSURE

12.4.1 Population

A lack of data separating severe weather damage from flooding and landslide damage prevented a detailed analysis for exposure and vulnerability. However, it can be assumed that the entire Roseville planning area is exposed to severe weather events. Certain areas are more exposed due to geographic location and localized weather patterns. Populations living at higher elevations with large stands of trees or power lines may be more susceptible to wind damage and black out, while populations living in low lying areas are at risk for flooding.

12.4.2 Property

All structures within Roseville are exposed to the potential impacts of severe weather.

12.4.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

All critical facilities exposed to flooding are also likely exposed to severe weather. Additional facilities on higher ground may also be exposed to wind damage or damage from falling trees. The most common problem associated with severe weather is the loss of utilities. Downed power lines can cause blackouts, leaving large areas isolated. Phone, water and sewer systems may not function. Roads may become impassable due to ice or snow or from a secondary hazard such as landslides.

12.4.4 Environment

Severe storm events can drastically affect the physical environment, changing natural landscapes. Natural habitats such as streams and trees risk major damage and destruction during a severe storm. Prolonged rains can saturate soils and lead to slope failure. Flooding caused by severe weather can cause stream channel migration.

12.5 VULNERABILITY

There are currently no loss estimation tools with uniform damage functions for severe weather events. This can be attributed to the variety of impacts that severe weather events generate. Also, the severity of severe weather events varies by location. Since secondary effects of severe weather events include flooding, landslides or even wildfires in drier climates, the vulnerability assessments under those hazards can provide emergency managers a gage of the economic impact of severe weather events. For this section, the vulnerability to severe weather events is discussed qualitatively. Where possible, damage estimates are made using reasonable assumptions and best available data.

12.5.1 Population

Particularly vulnerable populations are the elderly, low income or linguistically isolated populations, people with life-threatening illnesses, and residents living in areas that are isolated from major roads. Power outages can be life threatening to those dependent on electricity for life support. These populations face isolation and exposure during severe weather events and could suffer more secondary effects of the hazard.

12.5.2 Property

All property is vulnerable during severe weather events, but structures in poor condition or constructed to low building code standards risk the most damage. The frequency and degree of damage will depend on specific locations. Those in higher elevations and on ridges may be more prone to wind damage. Those that are located under or near overhead lines or near large trees may be damaged in the event of a collapse.

Estimates of potential loss for the severe weather hazard are not based on damage functions, because no such damage functions have been generated. Instead, estimates were developed representing 10 percent, 30 percent and 50 percent of the assessed value of exposed structures. This allows emergency managers to select a range of potential economic impact based on an estimate of the percent of damage to the general building stock. Damage in excess of 50 percent is considered to be substantial by most building codes and typically requires total reconstruction of the structure. Table 12-5 lists the potential loss estimates to the general building stock.

Table 12-5. Loss Potential for Roseville Buildings Vulnerable to Severe Weather Hazard

	Building Count	Assessed Value	10% Damage	30% Damage	50% Damage
Residential	43,163	\$18,695,442,494	\$1,869,544,249	\$5,608,632,748	\$9,347,721,247
Commercial	1,811	\$8,274,963,659	\$827,496,366	\$2,482,489,098	\$4,137,481,830
Industrial	475	\$1,160,642,905	\$116,064,290	\$348,192,871	\$580,321,452
Agricultural	1	\$28,530	\$2,853	\$8,559	\$14,265
Religion	71	\$250,600,927	\$25,060,093	\$75,180,278	\$125,300,463
Government	92	\$168,856,266	\$16,885,627	\$50,656,880	\$84,428,133
Education	445	\$1,091,399,472	\$109,139,947	\$327,419,842	\$545,699,736
Total	46,058	\$29,641,934,254	\$2,964,193,425	\$8,892,580,276	\$14,820,967,127

12.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

Incapacity and loss of roads are the primary transportation failures, most of which are associated with secondary hazards. Landslides that block roads are caused by heavy prolonged rains. High winds can cause significant damage to trees and power lines, with obstructing debris blocking roads, incapacitating transportation, isolating population, and disrupting ingress and egress. Of particular concern are roads providing access to isolated areas and to the elderly.

Prolonged obstruction of major routes due to landslides, debris, or floodwaters can disrupt the shipment of goods and other commerce. Large and prolonged storms can have negative economic impacts for an entire region.

Severe windstorms and downed trees or power lines can create serious impacts on power and above-ground communication lines. Broken power and communication lines would result in isolation because some residents would be unable to call for assistance.

12.5.4 Environment

The environment vulnerable to the severe weather hazard is the same as the environment exposed to the hazard.

12.6 FUTURE TRENDS IN DEVELOPMENT

The general building stock within the planning area increased by 17.7% with an increase in valuation from \$21.967 billion to \$29.641 billion (34.9%). This increase in valuation of the planning area was impacted by the areas recovery from the economic downturn of 2008. Since the entire planning area would be considered susceptible to earthquake, there was an increase in earthquake exposure over the performance period of the 2011 plan. However, the vulnerability of this new exposure should be considered to be low due to the application of strong building code standards that are contained within the International Building Code.

Many of the impacts associated with severe weather hazards can be addressed through proactive planning and the use of best available information in making land use decisions. Roseville has and will achieve this goal through the implementation of its General Plan. The General Plan serves as a long-term policy guide for the physical, economic, and environmental growth of the City. It includes a statement of the community's vision of its ultimate physical growth. Implementation of the General Plan, along with other programs such as Building Code enforcement, public information and early warning, will help Roseville to manage the probable impacts of severe weather hazards as the City grows in the future.

12.7 REVIEW OF EXISTING ORDINANCES, PROGRAMS, AND POLICIES

Roseville implements numerous programs and policies that can impact severe weather hazards. Like most programs and policies cited in this Plan, these are tied to the City's general plan. Maintenance of these existing programs is included in the action plan for this hazard mitigation plan.

12.8 SCENARIO

A worst-case event would involve prolonged high winds during an extreme rainstorm. Such an event would have both short-term and long-term effects. Initially, schools and roads would be closed due to flooding, downed tree obstructions, and downed power lines. Power outages would be common throughout the City. Some subdivisions in the City could experience limitations on ingress and egress. Continuing rains could produce flooding, overtopped culverts with ponded water on roads, and landslides on steep slopes. Flooding and landslides could further obstruct roads and bridges, further isolating residents.

12.9 ISSUES

In general, every household and resident in the City is likely to be exposed to severe weather, but some are more likely than others to experience isolation as a result. Those residing in higher elevations with limited transportation routes may have the greatest vulnerability to isolation from storms. Another group at risk is the portion of the population that is over the age of 65.

13. WILDFIRE

13.1 GENERAL BACKGROUND

13.1.1 Contributing Factors

A wildfire is any uncontrolled fire occurring on undeveloped land that requires fire suppression. Wildfires can be ignited by lightning or by human activity such as smoking, campfires, equipment use, and arson. The potential for wildfire is primarily influenced by the following factors:

- Fuel, which may include living and dead vegetation on the ground, along the surface as brush and small trees, and above the ground in tree canopies.
- Topography, which includes both slope and elevation.
- Air conditions, including temperature, relative humidity, wind speed and direction, cloud cover, precipitation amount and duration, and the stability of the atmosphere.

DEFINITIONS

Wildland-Urban Interface

Area—An area susceptible to wildfires where wildland vegetation and urban or suburban development occur together. Examples include dispersed rural housing in forested areas.

Wildfire—A fire that causes uncontrolled destruction of forests, brush, field crops, grasslands, and real and personal property in non-urban areas.

How a fire behaves primarily depends on the following:

- Fuel—Lighter fuels such as grasses, leaves and needles quickly expel moisture and burn rapidly, while heavier fuels such as tree branches, logs and trunks take longer to warm and ignite. Trees killed or defoliated by forest insects and diseases are more susceptible to wildfire.
- Weather—Strong, dry winds produce extreme fire conditions. Such winds generally reach peak velocities during the night and early morning hours.
- Thunderstorm activity—The thunderstorm season typically begins in June with wet storms, and turns dry with little or no precipitation reaching the ground as the season progresses into July and August.
- Terrain—The topography of a region influences the amount and moisture of fuel; the impact of weather conditions such as temperature and wind; potential barriers to fire spread, such as highways and lakes; and elevation and slope of land forms (fire spreads more easily uphill than downhill).
- Time of Day—A fire's peak burning period generally is between 1 p.m. and 6 p.m.

Short-term loss caused by a wildfire can include the destruction of timber, wildlife habitat, scenic vistas, and watersheds. Long-term effects include smaller timber harvests, reduced access to affected recreational areas, and destruction of cultural and economic resources and community infrastructure. Vulnerability to flooding increases due to the destruction of watersheds. The potential for significant damage to life and property exists in areas designated as “wildland-urban interface areas,” where development is adjacent to densely vegetated areas.

13.1.2 Local Conditions Related to Wildfire Hazard

Vegetation

The vegetation in Roseville can be broadly classified in three categories:

- There are large tracts of self-sustaining grasslands in the northern and western undeveloped edges of Roseville. Less extensive areas of grassland can be found in smaller, undeveloped areas scattered throughout the City. Most of the grasslands are non-native, following the effects of grazing and clearing for agricultural uses.
- Oak woodland, riparian and creek areas are found in proximity to Roseville's major stream channels where microclimates and alluvial soils provide ideal conditions for the deeper rooting shrubs and trees found in these habitats. Most woodland areas are relatively open, with little shrub growth.
- Seasonal wetlands in Roseville include intermittent drainages and vernal pools. Intermittent drainages are wet only in winter and dry during the summer, with scattered ponds; they may contain water from adjacent urban runoff. Vernal pools represent a significant seasonal wetland resource in Roseville.

Undeveloped Areas

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has required developers in Roseville to preserve areas of vernal pools that are dedicated to the City and maintained in perpetuity. These areas are to be left undisturbed and are typically open grassy areas during the hot summer months when the vernal pools are dry.

Preservation of open space, wetlands, natural parkways, riparian corridors along the City's watersheds, vernal pools and endangered species habitat have added to the inventory of vegetation susceptible to wildfire. The City of Roseville has 2,600 acres of dedicated open space within the city limits. Nearly 740 acres will be added on dedication of properties in the West Roseville Specific Plan. The City recently acquired the Reason Farms property in unincorporated Placer County, which will be the site for a retention basin projected to have water only eight days per year. The property will be preserved in perpetuity as open space with passive recreational uses planned, including biking, hiking, camping, and boating on a man-made lake. The Roseville Fire Department will assume fire protection duties for this significant piece of open space at a future date.

Fire-Fighting and Fire Prevention

Federal, state, county, city, and private agencies provide fire protection and firefighting services in California. Wildfires usually are extinguished while smaller than 1 acre, but they can spread to more than 100,000 acres and may require thousands of firefighters and several months to extinguish.

Roseville Fire Protection Services

The Roseville Fire Department is a fully functional agency that primarily provides fire suppression and emergency medical services for the urban environment of the City. The department operates eight stations. The department has eight paramedic engine companies, with a minimum staffing of three, two paramedic truck companies with a minimum staffing of four, and one battalion chief. The department also operates a hazardous materials response unit (cross-staffed the truck company); five grass/wildland units, and one technical rescue unit (cross-staffed by engine companies). The department maintains four reserve engines and one reserve truck.

Regional Services

Regional fire protection is provided by municipal fire departments and those assigned to specially designated lands outside city boundaries. The Placer County Fire Department provides fire protection to much of Placer County including west of the Roseville city limits. The South Placer Fire District serves unincorporated Placer County east of Roseville. The City of Rocklin Fire Department provides services within the City of Rocklin to the north and east of Roseville. The Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District provides fire protection to the City of Citrus Heights and the unincorporated Sacramento County areas to the south of Roseville.

State of California

The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) is charged with both assessing the threat of fire in California and suppressing fires on state and federal lands, while providing mutual aid if needed to communities that do not include public lands. The California Fire Plan formalizes much of the work that has been done to assess the threat of wildfire statewide. CAL FIRE's Fire and Resource Assessment Program (FRAP) assesses the amount and extent of California's forests and rangelands, analyzes their conditions and identifies alternative management and policy guidelines.

Firewise Communities

The national Firewise Communities program is a multi-agency effort involving homeowners, community leaders, planners, developers, and others to protect people, property and natural resources from the risk of wildfire before a fire starts. The program emphasizes community responsibility for planning a safe community and effective emergency response, and individual responsibility for safer home construction and design, landscaping and maintenance. Firewise Communities is directed and sponsored by the National Wildfire Coordinating Group, a consortium of organizations and federal agencies responsible for wildfire management in the U.S.

13.2 HAZARD PROFILE

13.2.1 Past Events

Fire history shows multiple wildfires in or near Roseville since the 1950s:

- In the 1950s, one fire occurred just east of the current location of Interstate 80 on the Roseville/Rocklin border, including parts of the Stoneridge area. A second fire occurred south of Douglas Boulevard where Roseville Parkway is now located.
- In the 1970s, a significant fire occurred in undeveloped grasslands along what is now Galleria Boulevard and Harding Boulevard in north central Roseville. Another fire occurred just outside the city limits on both sides of Cavitt-Stallman in the Loomis area.
- In the 1980s, five wildfires were mapped, including one in the grasslands of the North Central Roseville Specific Plan just north of Highway 65, where Pleasant Grove Boulevard is now located. Three grassland fires occurred west of Roseville, one just west of Fiddymont Road and two west of Fiddymont Road and south of Athens Road. A major fire occurred in 1983 where Baseline Road and Country Club Drive now intersect. The fire scorched 1,500 acres north past the current Blue Oaks Boulevard, stopping at Pleasant Grove Creek. The area is now developed with urban uses.
- The 2002 Sierra Fire in Loomis and Granite Bay was the largest in recent history near Roseville. The fire charred 900 acres of grass, brush and oaks in the area between Interstate 80 and Cavitt-Stallman Road. The fire destroyed six structures and threatened two schools. One hundred homes were evacuated, and more than 1,000 homes in both communities were threatened.
- On May 17, 2016, a grass fire broke out near Highway 65 north of Roseville. The fire, located at Athens Avenue and Industrial Boulevard, south of Lincoln in Placer County stretched to 169 acres.

Statewide, California experiences frequent significant wildfires. Most recently, the following two fires occurred:

- The 2003 Cedar fire in San Diego County burned 273,246 acres, destroyed 2,820 structures and directly resulted in 15 deaths. The fire was caused by human ignition.
- The 2015 Valley Fire in Lake County is considered the third worst fire in history, based on the number of structures damaged or destroyed. The fire consumed 75,781 acres and killed four people.

CAL FIRE maintains a website (<http://www.calfire.ca.gov/general/firemaps/>) with interactive maps that detail the fire history in California since 2011.

13.2.2 Location

State

CAL FIRE also developed an estimate of fire risk in designated wildland-urban interface areas, based on a variety of factors affecting fire frequency and fire behavior. The results are combined into a single assessment called fire threat. A significant fire threat is found throughout California, with 48 percent of the state's wildland area ranked as high, very high or extremely high. About 37 percent of the state has a moderate fire threat. Large areas of high threat are found in Southern California, the central coast, the lower elevations of the Sierra Nevada and much of the interior of northern California. Much of the fire threat is near densely populated areas and new development.

Regional

Wildfire safety is an increasing concern in the western Sierra foothills and valley as development continues in rural areas while grasslands and open space border urban areas. The potential for wildfire and urban wildfire is always present, with fire conditions from a combination of hot weather, an accumulation of vegetation, and low moisture content typically present in the warm fire season within the Central Valley and Sierra Nevada foothills. Wildfire risk in Placer County is primarily in the wildland-urban interface areas. A majority of Placer County is deemed to be a high or very high fire threat risk based on analysis by CAL FIRE, as shown on Figure 13-1. These are areas with dense vegetation, increasing elevation, and steep slopes in the foothills and the mountains of the Sierra Nevada Mountain Range.

CAL FIRE's FRAP website (<http://frap.cdf.ca.gov/>) includes maps of the communities most at risk for wildfire that are within 1.5 miles of a high or very high wildfire threat on federal or non-federal lands. The threat is based on the FRAP fuels and hazard data. The map identifies seven communities in Placer County not adjacent to federal lands that are at risk for wildfire, including the City of Roseville and communities adjacent to or within the Tahoe National Forest.

Local

The City of Roseville does not include any designated wildland-urban interface areas. A significant portion of the area around the City is developed. State maps show that the City has a moderate fire threat. While the City rarely has critical fire weather conditions, a combination of dry grasslands, the topography in northeast Roseville, and hot temperatures with limited rainfall could result in a risk of wildfire on occasion. The following are the most likely wildfire hazards in Roseville:

- Grassland fires on undeveloped properties in the West Roseville Specific Plan Area or west or north of Roseville
- Fires in northeast Roseville where significant slopes are adjacent to ravines and residential development
- Fires in open space and preserve areas within the developed sections of Roseville.




Figure 13-1. CAL FIRE FRAP Map for Placer County

Grassland Fires

Prior to August 2004, Roseville's northwestern boundary was Fiddymment Road. Since the annexation of 3,200 acres in West Roseville, the City now includes a significant amount of undeveloped non-native annual grassland with some riparian and oak woodland along Pleasant Grove Creek and Kaseberg Creek. The property to the west of Roseville along this border is also non-native annual grassland. The 2004 West Roseville Specific Plan Open Space Preserve Operations and Management Plan has provisions for reducing fire hazard if the preserve becomes a fire hazard. The preserve manager will work with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Roseville Fire Department to decide the best way to reduce the hazard. Fire breaks are allowed within the 50-foot buffer around the preserve. Fire breaks in other locations would require U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service approval.

The Sierra Vista Specific Plan Area, annexed in January 2012, consists of largely nonnative, annual grasslands. The Sierra Vista Specific Plan Area will develop as urban uses, but will also contain 267 acres of preserve areas. A 50-foot wide open space buffer area is maintained at the perimeter of all open space preserves for fuel modification and fire management, among other uses. The Roseville Fire Department's Fire Station #5 serves as the primary responding area for this area.

Ravine Fires

The Stoneridge Specific Plan includes 1,089 acres of land that will include 2,882 dwelling units, along with office and commercial uses, schools, parks, and open space. Approximately 252 acres will be set aside as open space with an extensive network of bike trails. The main ingress and egress to the area is Secret Ravine Parkway, which will link Sierra College Boulevard with East Roseville Parkway. The ravines also border the Northeast Roseville Specific Plan Area, which is largely developed, with some construction continuing along the ravine edges.

The key topographic features in Stoneridge are the three ravines: Secret Ravine, False Ravine, and Miners Ravine. The creek at the base of Miner's Ravine flows year-round. The elevation of the property is among the highest in the City, ranging from 225 feet to 375 feet above sea level. Slopes in Miner's Ravine range from a 5-percent grade to a 26-percent grade.

Vegetation in the Stoneridge Specific Plan Area is primarily annual grasslands, oak woodlands, and oak riparian landscapes (see Figure 13-2). Annual grasses with scattered downed trees and limbs cover the ground. The overstory includes scattered oaks and a few other broad leaf trees. The riparian vegetation includes Blue Oak, Valley Oak and Interior Live Oak, along with willows, cottonwood, and ash trees. The vegetation on the plateaus between the three main ravines is primarily annual grasses. The ravines do not have a continuous fuel ladder from the ground vegetation to the overstory trees.



Figure 13-2. View of Ravine, Tree Canopy and Stoneridge Development

The 1999 Stoneridge Specific Plan Wildfire Safety Plan outlined the following risks resulting from development of the Plan Area (see Figure 13-3):

- Fire in the grass of the open space area was identified as the most serious wildfire threat for the Stoneridge Specific Plan. Extensive grass fuels in the open space areas will quickly ignite and fire will spread rapidly, especially in summer. The plan cites a fire history that has demonstrated that grass and other light fuels are a threat to fire risk for other vegetation types as well as people.
- Wildfire rate of spread can increase with steep slopes. The three ravines in the project area have moderate slopes that can cause a fast rate of wildfire spread.
- Risk of fire starts will increase with development. The greatest risk from fire ignitions will be in the open space areas as use of these areas by future residents and other members of the public increases. Bike trails, for example, will make open space areas more accessible than when the Plan Area was undeveloped.
- Initial work by the developer to reduce the amount of fuel in the area must be maintained over the long-term to keep fire risk in check.
- Home design and siting often do not adequately mitigate wildfire risk. Measures specific to development within the Plan Area have been adopted by the City and are being enforced at the building permit stage. Owners will be required to maintain a clearing of flammable vegetation around the structures, use only fire resistant materials for roofs and fences, and ensure adequate water for fire suppression.

The Stoneridge Wildfire Safety Plan outlines short and long-term mitigation measures to prevent or minimize the impact of wildfire in this area of Roseville. These are included in the mitigation section of this 2016 Plan.




Figure 13-3. Stoneridge Specific Plan Wildfire Threat Areas

Open Space Fires

The City is adding new open space areas through dedication as part of the specific plan process. This will result in construction of new developments immediately adjacent to open space areas, which poses moderate risk to such developments. The Fire Department reviews these during the planning process, and fire safety provisions are accounted for in Specific Plan design guidelines and development agreements.

13.2.3 Frequency

The Roseville Fire Department maintains a database of every incident type responded to by Roseville fire personnel. Wildfires are tracked in four categories: natural or vegetation fire; forest, woods, or wildfire; brush or brush and grass fire; and grass fire. Table 13-1 provides the number of wildfire incidents recorded from 2011 to 2015. Placer County has had nearly 150 significant wildfires since 1908. In California, vegetation fires occur daily. Most are controlled and contained early, with limited damage.

Table 13-1. Wildfire Incident Counts—2011 to 2015

Incident Type	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Cultivated vegetation, crop fire	–	1	3	3	2
Cultivated trees or nursery stock fire	–	–	–	2	1
Cultivated vegetation, crop fire, other	–	1	3	1	1
Fire in mobile property used as fixed structure	1	–	1	–	–

Fire in mobile home used as fixed residence	–	–	1	–	–
Fire in portable building, fixed location	1	–	–	–	–
Natural Vegetation Fire	47	54	70	62	53
Brush, or brush and grass mixture fire	11	16	20	14	29
Forest, woods or wildland fire	–	1	2	1	–
Grass fire	24	23	26	29	18
Natural vegetation fire, other	12	14	22	18	6
Outside Rubbish Fire	67	61	92	70	76
Dumpster or other outside trash receptacle fire	16	8	9	12	17
Outside rubbish fire, other	18	19	39	34	27
Outside rubbish, trash or waste fire	32	34	44	23	32
Outside stationary compactor/compacted trash fire	1	–	–	1	–
Total	115	116	166	135	131

Source: City of Roseville Fire Department Incident Type Count Reports 2010-2015

13.2.4 Severity

Wildfires have never resulted in loss of life in Roseville, though some property damage has resulted from wildfire incidents, including some fences on occasion. CAL FIRE maps areas of significant fire hazard based on fuel, terrain, weather, and other relevant factors. The mapped fire hazard severity zones define the application of mitigation strategies to reduce risk associated with wildfires. Figure 13-4 shows fire hazard severity zones for the Roseville planning area. The City's wildfire hazard is rated as moderate. While the City is also a Community at Risk from Wildfire as designated on the State of California map, the Roseville Fire Department assessment in the General Plan concurs that wildfires in open space areas represent a moderate hazard. Most fires of this type are small and localized. The open space areas are typically easily accessible for fire suppression apparatus, and the response time is such that fires are suppressed rapidly.




Figure 13-4. Fire Hazard Severity Zones in the Planning Area

13.2.5 Warning Time

Wildfires are typically caused intentionally or accidentally by humans. There is no way to predict when one might break out. Dry seasons and droughts greatly increase fire likelihood. If a fire breaks out and spreads rapidly, residents may need to evacuate within days or even hours. Once a fire has started, fire alerting is reasonably rapid in most cases. The spread of cellular and two-way radio communications has contributed to a significant improvement in warning time.

Since fireworks often cause brush fires, extra diligence can be taken around the Fourth of July when the use of fireworks is highest. Dry lightning may also trigger wildfires, so special attention can be paid during weather events that may trigger wildfires. Reliable National Weather Service lightning warnings are available on average 24 to 48 hours prior to a significant electrical storm. National Weather Service fire weather forecasts for the country (http://www.spc.noaa.gov/products/fire_wx) are monitored by local fire departments, including the City of Roseville Fire Department, to assess the risk for wildfire at any given time and enhance preparedness.

13.3 SECONDARY HAZARDS

Wildfires can generate a range of secondary effects, which in some cases may cause more widespread and prolonged damage than the fire itself. Fires can cause direct economic losses in the reduction of harvestable timber and indirect economic losses in reduced tourism. Wildfires cause the contamination of reservoirs, destroy transmission lines and contribute to flooding. They strip slopes of vegetation, exposing them to greater amounts of runoff. This in turn can weaken soils and cause major landslides several years after the wildfire. Most wildfires burn hot and for long durations that can bake soils, especially those high in clay content, thus increasing the imperviousness of the ground. This increases runoff generated by storm events, increasing the chance of flooding.

13.4 EXPOSURE

13.4.1 Population

Population could not be examined by fire hazard severity zone because census block group areas do not coincide with the fire risk areas. However, the planning team was able to create a population estimate using the structure count of buildings located within the highest-risk fire hazard severity zone for Roseville (moderate), and applying the census value for persons per household for Roseville (2.54). Using this approach, it is estimated that the population living within the moderate fire hazard severity zones is 29,178. This represents 22.7 percent of the total population for the City.

13.4.2 Property

Using the base mapping created to support the HAZUS-MH analyses, the planning team determined that there are 10,338 structures within the moderate fire hazard severity zones within the planning area, with the predominant use being residential. The total assessed value of these structures and their contents is \$7.76 billion. This represents 26.2 percent of the total assessed value for the City.

13.4.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

Critical facilities are public and private structures where vital community functions are conducted. If the facility is damaged or destroyed by wildfire, there could be severe consequences to public health and safety. The Roseville Fire Department, all first responders and mutual aid agencies would work to protect those facilities in areas where wildfire is a potential. Table 13-2 provides a list of critical facilities that are in potential wildfire areas.

Table 13-2. Critical Facilities and Infrastructure Adjacent to Potential Wildfire Areas

Facility Type	Number
Communications Facilities	29
Utilities	16
Fire Stations	4
Hazardous Materials Facilities	2
Bridges	21
Medical	1
Government	4
Religious	2
Schools	5

13.4.4 Environment

It can take decades or even centuries for ecosystems to recover from a wildfire, which can cause severe environmental impacts:

- **Damaged Fisheries**—Critical trout, salmon and steelhead fisheries can suffer from increased water temperatures, sedimentation, and changes in water quality.
- **Soil Erosion**—The protective covering provided by foliage and dead organic matter is removed, leaving the soil fully exposed to wind and water erosion. Accelerated soil erosion occurs, causing landslides and threatening aquatic habitats.
- **Spread of Invasive Plant Species**—Non-native woody plant species frequently invade burned areas. When weeds become established, they can dominate the plant cover over broad landscapes and become difficult and costly to control.
- **Disease and Insect Infestations**—Unless diseased or insect-infested trees are swiftly removed, infestations and disease can spread to healthy forests and private lands. Timely active management actions are needed to remove diseased or infested trees.
- **Destroyed Endangered Species Habitat**—Catastrophic fires can have devastating consequences for endangered species. For instance, the Biscuit Fire in Oregon destroyed 125,000 to 150,000 acres of spotted owl habitat.
- **Soil Sterilization**—Topsoil exposed to extreme heat can become water repellant, and soil nutrients may be lost. Some fires burn so hot that they can sterilize the soil.

13.5 VULNERABILITY

Structures, above-ground infrastructure, critical facilities and natural environments are all vulnerable to the wildfire hazard. There is currently no validated damage function available to support wildfire mitigation planning. Except as discussed in this section, vulnerable populations, property, infrastructure and environment are assumed to be the same as described in the section on exposure.

13.5.1 Population

There are no recorded incidents of loss of life from wildfires in Roseville, and the risk from wildfire has been deemed moderate by the State and the Roseville Fire Department. Given the immediate response times to reported fires, the likelihood of injuries and casualties is minimal; therefore, injuries and casualties were not estimated for the wildfire hazard.

Air pollution from wildfires can be a severe health hazard, especially for sensitive populations, including children, the elderly and those with respiratory and cardiovascular diseases. Smoke generated by wildfire consists of visible and invisible emissions that contain particulate matter (soot, tar and minerals), gases (carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, nitrogen oxides), and toxics (formaldehyde, benzene). Emissions from wildfires depend on the type of fuel, the moisture content of the fuel, the efficiency of combustion, and the weather. Public health impacts associated with wildfire include difficulty in breathing, odor, and reduction in visibility.

Wildfire may also threaten the health and safety of those fighting the fires. First responders are exposed to the dangers from the initial incident and after-effects from smoke inhalation and heat stroke.

13.5.2 Property

Loss estimations for the wildfire hazard are not based on modeling utilizing damage functions, because no such damage functions have been generated. Instead, loss estimates were developed representing 10 percent, 30 percent and 50 percent of the assessed value of exposed structures. This allows emergency managers to select a range of economic impact based on an estimate of the percent of damage to the general building stock. Damage in excess of 50 percent is considered to be substantial by most building codes and typically requires total reconstruction of the structure. Table 13-3 lists the loss estimates for the exposed building stock.

Table 13-3. Potential Loss Estimates for the Wildfire Hazard

	Building Count	Assessed Value	10% Damage	30% Damage	50% Damage
Residential	9,792	\$4,811,813,630	\$481,181,363	\$1,443,544,089	\$2,405,906,815
Commercial	322	\$2,309,864,426	\$230,986,443	\$692,959,328	\$1,154,932,213
Industrial	108	\$365,734,419	\$36,573,442	\$109,720,326	\$182,867,209
Agricultural	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Religion	5	\$33,408,645	\$3,340,865	\$10,022,594	\$16,704,323
Government	52	\$79,624,825	\$7,962,482	\$23,887,447	\$39,812,412
Education	59	\$175,116,040	\$17,511,604	\$52,534,812	\$87,558,020
Total	10,338	\$7,775,561,985	\$777,556,198	\$2,332,668,595	\$3,887,780,992

13.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

Critical facilities of wood frame construction are especially vulnerable during wildfire events. A detailed vulnerability analysis for all critical facilities is on file with City staff and will not be published for review due to security reasons.

In the event of wildfire, there would likely be little damage to most infrastructure. Most roads and railroads would be without damage except in the worst scenarios. Power lines are the most at risk from wildfire because most poles are made of wood and susceptible to burning. Fires can create conditions that block or prevent access and can isolate residents and emergency service providers. Wildfire typically does not have a major direct impact on bridges, but it can create conditions in which bridges are obstructed. Many bridges in areas of high to moderate fire risk are important because they provide the only ingress and egress to large areas and in some cases to isolated neighborhoods.

13.6 FUTURE TRENDS IN DEVELOPMENT

Roseville is expected to grow considerably in the next 10 years. The moderate potential for wildfire in Roseville is not likely to lessen or prohibit development in Roseville.

The wildfire risk exposure within the planning area increased by 54% at an increase in value of over \$3 billion dollars. This increase in risk exposure can be attributed to the vast extent and location of the moderate fire severity zone within Roseville, and a population growth rate of 14.5% over the performance period of the prior plan. The planning area also saw an increase in assessed valuation of real property of over 34%. This increase in value can be attributed to the continued economic recovery from the 2008 economic downturn that had a significant impact on the State of California as well as the City of Roseville. Any increase in asset value will increase risk quotient when risk is being measured by looking at assets exposed as is with this Plan. However, the vulnerability of this new exposure should be considered to be low due to the application of strong building code standards that are contained within the California Fire Code.

13.7 REVIEW OF EXISTING PROGRAMS, PLANS AND ORDINANCES

The City of Roseville and Roseville Fire Department have adopted a number of policies, programs, plans and ordinances to meet the following fire protection goals detailed in the Roseville General Plan:

- Protect against the loss of life, property, and the environment by appropriate prevention and suppression measures.
- Provide emergency services in a well-planned, cost-effective, and professional manner through the best use of equipment, facilities and training available.

13.7.1 Fire Prevention Programs and Standards

Roseville Fire Prevention

Roseville fire prevention includes the fire marshal, hazardous materials officer, two senior fire inspectors, four fire inspectors and one public safety community relations coordinator (shared with the Police Department). The key role of these staff members is improving the safety and quality of life of the citizens of Roseville.

The Roseville Fire Department has an extensive work program to promote and implement fire prevention in developed and undeveloped areas of the City. These programs promote or provide the following services:

- Regular inspection and code enforcement
- Fire-safe roofing requirements
- Adequate access to and fire breaks adjoining open space areas
- Early warning devices such as automatic detection and reporting devices and smoke detectors
- Automatic fire suppression systems such as fire sprinkler systems
- Public education and information
- Code and ordinance development and updates
- Training and planning
- Fire investigation and data analysis
- Hazardous materials process and inspection.

Development Review Process

Section 16.16.050 of the Roseville Municipal Code specifies that all development plans be reviewed and approved by the Roseville Fire Department prior to construction. The code section states the following:

“...complete plans, specifications, and information for new construction, remodeling, tenant improvements, or additions to buildings shall be submitted for review and approval prior to construction to the Chief or his/her designated representative having jurisdiction. Plan approval shall be required prior to the issuance of a Fire Department Inspection Record Card for those instances where such card may be

required. In addition to the submittal of hard copy plan sets, a digitized copy of the approved drawings for new buildings shall be submitted to the Fire Department for pre-fire documentation purposes. Said copy shall be submitted in an approved format.”

The Roseville Fire Department is an integral part of the development planning and review process, with specific emphasis on the provision of access to lands for firefighting purposes, street access to all structures, fire prevention programs, and the enforcement of building and fire codes and City ordinances. The Fire Department also evaluates water supply for firefighting and fire suppression systems.

California Building Code

Roseville Municipal Code Title 16 has been adopted to enforce the 2013 California Building Code for all construction in the City. Roofing and building materials, construction techniques, wiring standards, and fire detection/warning devices are defined and enforced to minimize the risk of structural fire damage.

California Fire Code

Chapter 16.16 of the Roseville Municipal Code includes adoption of, reference to and amendments to the Uniform Fire Code. Last amended in 2013, the code provides specifications and standards for fire safety. Early warning devices such as automatic sprinkler systems, automatic detection and reporting devices, and smoke detectors are required as preventative measures to reduce the risk of fire. The code also states the amount of water needed for fire protection.

Weed Abatement Ordinance

Chapter 9.20 of the Roseville Municipal Code includes provisions for the abatement of weeds, dirt, rubbish, and rank growths. The ordinance specifies that weeds be eradicated by property owners to prevent the presence of fire fuels. Properly implemented, the ordinance ensures accessibility of firefighters to open space areas and creation of firebreaks that slow the spread of fire.

13.7.2 Adopted Service Levels for Response Time

Specific Plans

Roseville’s specific plan process is used by the Fire Department to plan future fire station locations and response times based on the circulation systems, and to ensure that revenues from the Fire Service Construction Tax and General Fund are sufficient to provide fire protection services to the area and cumulatively city-wide. The Fire Department is involved in every specific plan process from the initial planning process to adoption, construction, and ongoing inspections.

Should there be significant fire-related concerns, the Fire Department may require supplemental analysis as a condition of the specific plan. For example, a mitigation measure for adoption of the Stoneridge Specific Plan required the preparation of the Stoneridge Plan Wildfire Safety Plan. The Safety Plan analyzes the factors contributing to the risk of wildfire in Stoneridge and mitigation measures to enhance fire prevention.

Capital Improvement Program

The Capital Improvement Program is a five-year plan updated annually with the City’s fiscal year budget that includes all public projects under construction and planned within the five-year time frame. The Capital Improvement Program allocates funds from each of the revenue sources collected to pay for City facilities, services, and programs. Fire Department stations and apparatus are included in the Capital Improvement Program along with the status of the Fire Service Construction Tax current and projected revenues to ensure that fire stations are built and apparatus is procured to keep pace with development.

Fire Service Construction Tax

The Fire Service Construction Tax, approved by Roseville voters in 1984, requires that 1/2 percent of the value of any new construction be collected as part of the building permit fee and designated for fire suppression and protection. The funds must be spent on capital improvements such as fire stations, fire apparatus, and other Fire Department equipment. The funds may not be allocated to expenses such as salaries or training. The City's newer Specific Plan Areas include provisions that extend this tax collection to the buildout of each Plan Area.

Dedications, Fees, and Exactions

The City of Roseville, through the specific plan process, and if necessary as part of individual project approvals, requires the dedication of property and payment of fees or exactions. The Fire Department reviews the project proposals and may require dedication of land or payment of appropriate fees and exactions to help offset municipal costs for fire-related facilities and services. The City of Roseville requires the dedication of fire station sites through the specific plan process. Should revenues be deemed insufficient to fully support fire services, additional assessments may be required to ensure adequate protection in the future. For example, recent specific plans through development agreements require owners to pay a special assessment for public safety, including fire protection, as part of their annual property tax bills.

Water System Master Plan

The City of Roseville Environmental Utilities Department maintains and updates a distribution system model to ensure adequate water sources, quantities and water pressure, along with emergency backup systems to ensure maximum firefighting capacity.

Interagency Agreements

The City of Roseville Fire Department participates in the statewide mutual aid agreement, whereby the Fire Department will respond to any other department or district should the need arise. In addition, the Department maintains mutual aid agreements with other agencies, including agreements through Cal OES Mutual Aid Region IV and the Placer County Operational Area.

13.7.3 Annual Monitoring of Fire Department Service Levels

Program Performance Measures

The Roseville Fire Department compiles program performance measures as part of the City's annual budget to monitor service levels and address deficiencies before they become serious. The annual evaluation includes establishment of goals and objectives, formulation of key indicators relating to activities, and efficiencies that can be monitored throughout the year, along with a line item cost for the programs and objectives. The Fire Department budget and program performance measures include a review of fire service levels and department goals.

National Fire Incident Reporting System

The National Fire Incident Reporting System requires local fire departments to report fire service data. Performance indicators are routinely reviewed to evaluate capability and coverage, demand for service and trends. Key components of the system include GIS and mapping, fire incident reporting, emergency medical management, personnel and training management, inspection management, and equipment and supplies inventory management. Fire Department incident data are input into a computer database and submitted to the State Fire Marshal's Office per state standards. The data are also used by the City of Roseville to evaluate operations and track trends in fire service within the City.

13.7.4 Personnel Training

The Roseville Fire Department Training program includes dedicated staff and facilities to ensure that personnel are properly trained and updated as new techniques and equipment become available. The Fire Training staff provides training for all firefighters within the department at the City's state of the art training center (Figure 13-5). This training is the most important ingredient to the readiness of Roseville firefighters and emergency responders to fulfill their assigned mission. The Training Center is also used by other fire departments and local agencies on a fee-for-use basis. The training staff consists of one fire training officer.



Figure 13-5. City of Roseville Fire Training Center

13.7.5 Fire Investigation

Fires in the City of Roseville are investigated by Roseville Fire Department investigators. The program ensures proper investigation of the cause, origin, and circumstances of each fire; collects and preserves evidence; coordinates with authorities in detection, apprehension and prosecution of arsonists; and pursues each investigation to conclusion. Information is reported to the State Fire Marshal for inclusion in annual state reports.

13.7.6 Comprehensive Emergency Medical Services

The state requires a Multi-Hazard Function Plan that details response strategies for all types of emergencies. The plan addresses interagency cooperation, emergency functions, continuity of government, and public awareness. In addition, the plan provides for the operation of police, fire and health services, as well as transportation alternatives in the event of a multi-hazard emergency. The City's Emergency Plan conforms with the Standardized Emergency Management System and is approved by the City Council and Cal OES.

13.7.7 Accreditation Recommendation

The Commission on Fire Accreditation International provides a comprehensive system of fire and emergency service evaluation that helps local governments determine their risks and fire safety needs, evaluate the performance of the organizations involved and provide a method for continuous improvement. The self-assessment process covers 10 categories: governance and administration; assessment and planning; goals and objectives; financial resources; programs; physical resources; human resources; training and competency; essential resources; and external systems relations. Within these categories are several related performance indicators and core competencies that the agency must address. In completing the self-assessment process, agencies must develop a strategic or master plan as well as a standard of response coverage document.

The Roseville Fire Department staff spent more than four years on the self-assessment and preparing the materials for the accreditation. In June 2005 the Commission on Fire Accreditation International recommended accreditation for the Roseville Fire Department. Reaccreditation was obtained in 2010. Only 220 departments in the world are accredited, and only 16 in California.

13.8 SCENARIO

As the future growth of Roseville expands into wildland-urban interface areas, a wildfire in Roseville has the potential to cause significant damage to exposed areas. A major wildfire might begin with a wet spring, adding to fuels already present on the forest floor. Flashy fuels would build throughout the spring. The summer could see the onset of insect infestation. A dry summer could follow the wet spring, exacerbated by dry hot winds. Carelessness with combustible materials or a tossed lit cigarette, or a lighting storm could trigger a multitude of small isolated fires.

The embers from these smaller fires could be carried miles by hot, dry winds. The deposition zone for these embers would be deep in the forests and wildland-urban interface zones. Fires that start in flat areas move more slowly, but wind still pushes them. It is not unusual for a wild fire pushed by wind to burn the ground fuel and later climb into the crown and reverse its track. This is one of many ways that fires can escape containment, typically during periods when response capabilities are overwhelmed. These new small fires would likely merge. Suppression resources would be redirected from protecting the natural resources to saving remote subdivisions.

The worst-case scenario would include an active fire season throughout the American west, spreading resources thin. Firefighting teams would be exhausted or unavailable. Many federal assets would be responding to other fires that started earlier in the season. While local fire districts would be useful in the wildland-urban interface areas, they have limited wildfire capabilities or experience, and they would have a difficult time responding to the ignition zones. Even though the existence and spread of the fire is known, it may not be possible to respond to it adequately, so an initially manageable fire can become out of control before resources are dispatched.

To further complicate the problem, heavy rains could follow, causing flooding and landslides and releasing tons of sediment into rivers, permanently changing floodplains and damaging sensitive habitat and riparian areas. Such a fire followed by rain could release millions of cubic yards of sediment into streams for years, creating new floodplains and changing existing ones. With forests removed from the watershed, stream flows could double.

Floods that had been expected every 50 years may occur every couple of years. With streambeds unable to carry the increased discharge because of increased sediment, floodplain elevations would increase.

13.9 ISSUES

The major issues for wildfire are as follows:

- Public education and outreach to people living in or near the fire hazard zones should include information about and assistance with mitigation activities such as defensible space, and advance identification of evacuation routes and safe zones.
- Wildfires could cause landslides as a secondary natural hazard.
- Climate change could affect the wildfire hazard.
- Future growth into wildland-urban interface areas should continue to be managed.
- The Fire Department needs to continue to train on wildland-urban interface type events.
- Expand the City's vegetation management activities. This would include enhancement through expansion of the target areas as well as additional resources.
- Expand certifications and qualifications for Fire Department personnel. Ensure that all firefighters are trained in basic wildfire behavior, basic fire weather, and that all company officer and chief level officers are trained in the wildland command and strike team leader level.

14. HUMAN HEALTH HAZARDS

14.1 GENERAL BACKGROUND

Human health hazards include transmittable diseases and environmental hazards such as extreme weather. The following sections describe commonly recognized human health hazards.

14.1.1 Influenza

Influenza, commonly called flu, is a viral infection that attacks the respiratory system. Epidemics of the flu typically occur in the fall and winter. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) estimates that the 2014-2015 flu season for California was moderately severe, with high levels of outpatient illness and influenza-associated hospitalizations, particularly among adults 65 and older. The California Department of Public Health received 42,812 reports of cases tested positive for influenza.

Laboratory-confirmed influenza-associated deaths among patients under 65 have been reportable in California since the 2009 influenza pandemic. For the 2014-2015 flu season, there were 78 fatal cases of influenza-related illness statewide among those under 65. This number is significantly down from the 404 fatal cases during the 2013-2014 influenza season.

H1N1

In April 2009, the World Health Organization (WHO) issued a health advisory on an outbreak of influenza-like illness caused by a new subtype of influenza A (A/H1N1) in Mexico and the United States.

The disease spread rapidly, with the number of confirmed cases rising to 2,099 by May 7, despite aggressive measures taken against the disease by the Mexican government. On June 11, the WHO declared an H1N1 pandemic, marking the first global pandemic since the 1968 Hong Kong flu. On October 25, the U.S. declared H1N1 a national emergency. On August 10,

DEFINITIONS

Anthrax—A disease caused by the bacteria *Bacillus anthracis*. Most forms of the disease are lethal, and it affects both humans and other animals. There are effective vaccines against anthrax, and some forms of the disease respond well to antibiotic treatment.

Epidemic—The spread of an infectious disease beyond a local population, reaching people in a wider geographical area. Several factors determine whether an outbreak will become an epidemic: the ease with which the disease spreads from vectors, such as animals, to people and the ease with which it spreads from person to person.

Influenza—A viral infection that attacks the respiratory system; commonly called flu.

H1N1 “Swine Flu”—A subtype of the Influenza A virus that has mutated into various strains including the Spanish Flu strain, mild human flu strains, endemic pig strains, and various strains found in birds.

H5N1/H7N9 “Bird Flu”—A subtype of the Influenza A virus that causes the flu commonly known as “avian influenza” or “bird flu.”

Pandemic—A worldwide epidemic.

Vector—An organism (such as an insect or rodent) that transmits pathogens that cause disease

Vector-Borne Illness—Diseases transmitted to people from insects and other animals. These include, but are not limited to, Hanta Virus, Plague, Tularemia, Lyme Disease, West Nile Virus and the Zika Virus.

Viral Hemorrhagic Fever (VHF)—A group of illnesses caused by a viral infection (usually restricted to a specific geographic area) resulting in fever and gastrointestinal symptoms followed by capillary hemorrhage. These include, but are not limited to, Ebola, Dengue Fever and Yellow Fever.

Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS)—An infectious respiratory illness characterized by fever, dry cough, and breathing difficulties, often accompanied by headache and body aches; believed to be caused by a coronavirus.

Smallpox—An infection caused by the variola virus, a member of the poxvirus family. Throughout history, smallpox has been responsible for epidemics that resulted in large numbers of deaths. The last outbreak was in 1977. The disease was declared eradicated in 1980.

2010, the WHO International Health Regulations Emergency Committee declared an end to the 2009 H1N1 pandemic globally.

H1N1 viruses and seasonal influenza viruses are co-circulating in many parts of the world. It is likely that the 2009 H1N1 virus will continue to spread for years to come, like a regular seasonal influenza virus.

H5N1/H7N9

The highly pathogenic H5N1 avian influenza virus is an influenza A subtype that occurs mainly in birds, causing high mortality among birds and domestic poultry. Outbreaks of highly pathogenic H5N1 among poultry and wild birds are ongoing in a number of countries.

H5N1 virus infections of humans are rare and most cases have been associated with direct poultry contact during poultry outbreaks. Rare cases of limited human-to-human spread of H5N1 virus may have occurred, but there is no evidence of sustained human-to-human transmission. Nonetheless, because all influenza viruses have the ability to change and mutate, scientists are concerned that H5N1 viruses one day could be able to infect humans more easily and spread more easily from one person to another, potentially causing another pandemic.

While the H5N1 virus does not now infect people easily, infection in humans is much more serious when it occurs than is infection with H1N1. More than half of people reported infected with H5N1 have died. Figure 14-1 summarizes human cases of the virus through 2013.

Source: World Health Organization




Figure 14-1. Areas with Confirmed H5N1 2003-2013

Infections in humans and poultry by a new avian influenza A virus (H7N9) continue to be reported in China. While mild illness in human cases has been seen, most patients have had severe respiratory illness and some have died. The only case identified outside of China was recently reported in Malaysia.

Source investigation by Chinese authorities is ongoing. Many of the people infected with H7N9 are reported to have had contact with poultry. However some cases reportedly have not had such contact. Close contacts of confirmed H7N9 patients are being followed to determine whether any human-to-human spread of H7N9 is occurring. No sustained person-to-person spread of the H7N9 virus has been found at this time. However, based on previous experience with avian flu viruses, some limited human-to-human spread of this the virus would not be surprising.

As of the publication of this document, H5N1 and the new H7N9 virus have not been detected in people or birds in the United States

14.1.2 Smallpox

Smallpox is a sometimes fatal infectious disease. There is no specific treatment, and the only prevention is vaccination. Symptoms include raised bumps on the face and body of an infected person. The oldest evidence of smallpox was found on the body of Pharaoh Ramses V of Egypt who died in 1157 BC.

Outbreaks have occurred from time to time for thousands of years, but the disease is now eradicated after a successful worldwide vaccination program. The last case of smallpox in the United States was in 1949. The last naturally occurring case in the world was in Somalia in 1977. As of the publication of this document, there are no cases of smallpox in the world. Currently only two locations in the world have samples of smallpox: the CDC in Atlanta and the Ivanovsky Institute of Virology in Russia.

After the disease was eliminated, routine vaccination among the general public was stopped. Therefore, any cases of smallpox in the world would be considered an immediate international emergency. In 2003, the Wisconsin Division of Public Health conducted an investigation of state residents who became ill after having contact with prairie dogs. The cases appeared in May and June of 2003, and symptoms in the human cases included fever, cough, pox-like rash and swollen lymph nodes. CDC laboratory test results indicated that the cause of the human illness was Monkeypox, an orthopox virus that could be transmitted by prairie dogs. This outbreak, and the potential use of smallpox as a weapon of bioterrorism, brought the fear of smallpox back to the forefront of the population. A detailed nationwide smallpox response plan created at the end of 2002 is designed to quickly contain a potential outbreak and vaccinate the population.

14.1.3 Viral Hemorrhagic Fevers

Viral hemorrhagic fevers (VHFs) are a group of illnesses caused by several distinct families of viruses. VHF describes a multisystem syndrome (multiple systems in the body are affected). Characteristically, the overall vascular system is damaged and the body's ability to regulate itself is impaired. These symptoms are often accompanied by hemorrhage (bleeding); however, the bleeding itself is rarely life-threatening. While some types of hemorrhagic fever viruses can cause relatively mild illnesses, many cause severe, life-threatening disease.

The viruses that cause VHFs are distributed over much of the globe. However, because each virus is associated with one or more particular host species, the virus and the disease it causes are usually seen only where the host species live. Some hosts, such as the rodent species carrying several of the New World arenaviruses, live in geographically restricted areas. Therefore, the risk of getting VHFs caused by these viruses is restricted to those areas. Other hosts range over continents, such as the rodents that carry viruses that cause the hantavirus pulmonary syndrome in North and South America, or the rodents that carry viruses that cause hemorrhagic fever with renal syndrome in Europe and Asia.

Ebola

The 2014 Ebola virus outbreak was unprecedented in geographical reach and impact on health care systems across the globe. This was the largest and deadliest Ebola virus outbreak ever recorded. It was the first time the West African countries of Guinea, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Nigeria, Mali, and Senegal saw the virus. Ebola is more common in Central African countries, such as the Democratic Republic of Congo and Sudan, where it was first discovered in 1976. It was also the first time that Ebola made it to the United States and Europe, prompting world-wide preparedness and response efforts. Figure 14-2 shows areas that ultimately were affected. The outbreak was closely monitored and traveler screenings were developed for those returning from West Africa.

Source: World Health Organization




Figure 14-2. 2014 Distribution of Ebola Virus Outbreaks in Humans and Animals

In August 2014 two U.S. healthcare workers returned to the United States for treatment for Ebola. The case that most impacted the health care system in the United States was a patient diagnosed with Ebola in Dallas, Texas who died due to Ebola in October 2014. The nurse who provided care for him later tested positive for Ebola. This caused responses across the country from hospitals, emergency medical teams, fire departments and public health agencies to enhance isolation precautions, develop emergency policies, train with personal protective equipment and conduct multi-agency emergency exercises in case the spread of Ebola became a pandemic.

Before the 2014 outbreak, only 2,200 cases of Ebola had been recorded and 68 percent were fatal. Twenty percent of new Ebola infections were linked to burial traditions in which family and community members wash and touch dead bodies before burial. In Guinea, 60 percent of Ebola infections were linked to traditional burial practices. From 2014 to the publishing of this document, there have been no confirmed cases of Ebola in California.

Hantavirus

Hantavirus is a rodent-borne disease and one of the most important in California. It was discovered in 1993 in the southwestern U.S., and it has determined that the disease had been present, but unrecognized, at least as early as 1959. It has now been identified in over half of the states of the U.S. In 2013, seven cases of Hantavirus occurred in Yosemite National Park. Hantavirus has also been detected in the local Sierra Nevada region.

The hantavirus spreads when individuals touch or eat something contaminated with infected rodent urine, droppings or saliva. It can also be transmitted through aerosolization, which occurs when dried materials contaminated by infected rodent droppings or saliva are disturbed and brought up into the air and inhaled. Infected persons first develop symptoms one to two weeks, and up to five weeks, after exposure. Early symptoms include fever, headache, and muscle aches, especially in the thighs, hips, back, and shoulders. Other early symptoms include dizziness, chills, nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, and abdominal pain. After two to seven days of these symptoms, patients develop breathing difficulties that range from cough and shortness of breath to severe respiratory failure. Approximately 40 percent of hantavirus patients die from the disease.

From 2011 to the publishing of this document there have been 16 cases of hantavirus in California, including one case in Placer County.

14.1.4 Plague

Plague is a potentially fatal infectious disease of animals and humans caused by the *Yersinia pestis* bacterium. People usually get plague from being bitten by a flea that is carrying the plague bacterium or by handling an infected animal. Today, modern antibiotics are effective against plague, but if an infected person is not treated promptly, the disease is likely to cause illness or death.

Plague is an ancient disease but outbreaks throughout the world continue. Major plague epidemics occurred in the middle of the sixth century in Egypt, Europe and Asia; during the 14th century in Europe, following caravan routes; in the 18th century in Austria and the Balkans; and in the late 19th century worldwide (but mostly in China and India). Manchuria in 1910–1911 witnessed about 60,000 deaths due to pneumonic plague with a repeat in 1920–1921. A minor outbreak occurred as recently as the summer of 1994 in Surat, India, closely following an earthquake in September 1993. Globally, the WHO reports 1,000 to 3,000 cases of plague every year. Monitoring of mammals routinely occurs in California to mitigate potential plague (see Figure 14-3).

In North America, plague is found in certain animals and their fleas from the Pacific Coast to the Great Plains, and from southwestern Canada to Mexico. The last urban plague epidemic in the United States occurred in Los Angeles in 1924-25. Since then, human plague in the U.S. has occurred as mostly scattered cases in rural areas (an average of 10 to 15 persons each year per the CDC). Most human cases in the United States occur in northern New Mexico, northern Arizona, southern Colorado, California, southern Oregon, and far western Nevada.


From 2011 to the publishing of this document, there has been one case of plague in California, which occurred in Yosemite National Park.

14.1.5 Tick-Borne Disease

Ticks are small, insect-like creatures most often found in naturally vegetated areas. They feed by attaching to animals and humans, sticking their mouthparts into the skin, and sucking blood for up to several days. Ticks do not fall from trees, jump or fly. Most species are found on wild grasses and low plants. Adult ticks wait at the ends of grass or other foliage for a host to brush by so they may attach. Sometimes ticks carry bacteria or viruses that can be transmitted to a person while the tick is attached and feeding. There are 47 species of ticks in California, but only eight are known to commonly bite humans:

- Western blacklegged tick (*Ixodes pacificus*)
- American dog tick (*Dermacentor variabilis*)
- Pacific Coast tick (*Dermacentor occidentalis*)
- Wood tick (*Dermacentor andersoni*)
- Brown dog tick (*Rhipicephalus sanguineus*)
- *Ornithodoros hermsi*
- *Ornithodoros parkeri*
- *Ornithodoros coriaceus*.

Source: California Department of Public Health

**Figure 14-3.** California 2014 *Yersinia Pestis* Results in Tested Mammals by County

Tularemia

Tularemia, named after Tulare County in California where it was first described in 1911, is a tick-borne disease of animals and humans caused by the bacterium *Francisella tularensis*. Tularemia is similar to plague, but is typically spread differently. While plague is usually spread to humans by fleas, humans usually become infected with Tularemia by tick and deer fly bites, skin contact with infected animals, ingestion of contaminated water or meat, or inhalation of contaminated dusts or aerosols. Symptoms vary depending upon the route of infection.

Rabbits, hares, and rodents are especially susceptible and often die in large numbers during outbreaks. Although Tularemia can be life-threatening, most infections can be treated successfully with antibiotics. Steps to prevent Tularemia include use of insect repellent, wearing gloves when handling sick or dead animals, and not mowing over dead animals. In the United States, naturally occurring infections have been reported from all states except Hawaii. From 2011 to the publishing of this document there have been 11 cases of Tularemia in California.

Lyme Disease

Lyme disease, named after the city in Connecticut where it was first identified in 1975, is a tick-borne disease caused by the bacterium *Borrelia burgdorferi*, which normally lives in mice, squirrels and other small animals. It is transmitted among these animals and to humans through the bites of certain species of ticks. In the northeastern and north-central United States, the black-legged tick (or deer tick, *Ixodes scapularis*) transmits Lyme disease. In the Pacific coastal United States, the disease is spread by the western black-legged tick (*Ixodes pacificus*). Other major tick species found in the United States have not been shown to transmit the disease.

Typical symptoms include fever, headache, fatigue, and a skin rash. If left untreated, infection can spread to joints, the heart, and the nervous system. Lyme disease is diagnosed based on symptoms, physical findings (e.g., rash), and the possibility of exposure to infected ticks. Laboratory testing is helpful in later stages of the disease. Most cases of Lyme disease can be treated successfully with a few weeks of antibiotics. Steps to prevent Lyme disease include using insect repellent, removing ticks promptly, landscaping, and integrated pest management. The ticks that transmit Lyme disease can occasionally transmit other tick-borne diseases as well. From 2011 to the publishing of this document, there have been 458 cases of Lyme disease in California.

Rocky Mountain Spotted Fever

Rocky Mountain spotted fever is a potentially fatal tick-borne disease caused by the bacterium *Rickettsia rickettsii*. It is transmitted to humans by the bite of an infected American dog tick (*Dermacentor variabilis*), Rocky Mountain wood tick (*Dermacentor andersoni*), or brown dog tick (*Rhipicephalus sanguineus*).

Typical symptoms include fever, headache, abdominal pain, vomiting, and muscle pain. A rash may also develop, but is often absent in the first few days, and in some patients, never develops. Rocky Mountain spotted fever can be a severe or even fatal illness if not treated in the first few days of symptoms. It can be treated successfully with a few weeks of antibiotics. Steps to prevent the disease include using insect repellent, removing ticks promptly, landscaping, and integrated pest management. The ticks that transmit Rocky Mountain spotted fever can occasionally transmit other tick-borne diseases as well. From 2011 to the publishing of this document there have been 44 cases of Rocky Mountain spotted fever in California.

14.1.6 Mosquito-Borne Disease

Many of the 48 species of mosquitoes in California can carry disease. The City of Roseville actively supports the Placer County public outreach campaign and task force about the potential for mosquito-borne disease.

Malaria

Malaria is a sometimes fatal mosquito-borne disease caused by a parasite that commonly infects the *Anopheles* mosquito, which feeds on humans. People who contract malaria are typically very sick with high fevers, chills, and flu-like illness. Although malaria can be fatal, illness and death can usually be prevented.

On average 1,500 cases of malaria are diagnosed in the United States each year. The vast majority are in travelers and immigrants returning from countries where malaria transmission occurs, many from sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. Although rare, cases of malaria have been reported in California. In many temperate areas, such as western Europe and the United States, economic development and public health measures have succeeded in eliminating malaria. However, most of these areas have *Anopheles* mosquitoes that can transmit malaria, and reintroduction of the disease is a constant risk.

Individuals in areas with malaria need to reduce their likelihood of being bitten by mosquitoes. Screens on windows and doors should be examined to confirm that they are in good repair. Repellents containing 20 to 30 percent DEET should be applied to exposed skin and clothing to keep mosquitoes from biting. From 2011 to the publishing of this document there have been 44 cases of malaria in California.

West Nile Virus

West Nile virus (WNV) is a potentially serious mosquito-borne that may affect residents in the planning area. Experts believe WNV is established as a seasonal epidemic in North America that flares up in the summer and continues into the fall. WNV is a recent disease to affect California. Mosquitoes transmit the virus to birds, livestock and humans. As of January 2016, human-infection cases of the virus had been reported in all states of the continental U.S. except West Virginia, New Hampshire and Vermont, and those states had reported non-human infections. The Placer County West Nile Virus Task Force has had a strong and active role in the community since WNV arrived in 2004.

According to the CDC, approximately 80 percent of people who are infected with WNV will show no symptoms. Up to 20 percent have symptoms such as fever, headache, and body aches, nausea, vomiting, and sometimes swollen lymph glands or a skin rash on the chest, stomach and back. Symptoms can last for as short as a few days, though even healthy people have become sick for several weeks. About 1 percent of people infected with WNV will develop severe illness, with symptoms that can include high fever, headache, neck stiffness, stupor, disorientation, coma, tremors, convulsions, muscle weakness, vision loss, numbness and paralysis. These symptoms may last several weeks, and neurological effects may become permanent. There is no specific treatment for WNV infection. In more severe cases, people may need to go to the hospital where they can receive supportive treatment including intravenous fluids, help with breathing and nursing care.

Individuals in areas with WNV need to reduce their likelihood of being bitten by mosquitoes. Screens on windows and doors should be examined to confirm that they are in good repair. Repellents containing 20 to 30 percent DEET should be applied to exposed skin and clothing to keep mosquitoes from biting.

From 2011 to the publishing of this document there have been 2,811 cases of WNV in California. Of those, 36 were from Placer County. Between 2005 and 2015, there were 5,205 cases of WNV in California, and Placer County had 82 cases, an average of 7.45 cases per year. Due to proactive mitigation of the hazard with mosquito abatement and education efforts, the number of confirmed cases has trended down. The first year the tracking began, there were 35 human cases of WNV in Placer County. In 2015, there were none. The agricultural nature of Placer County, with the potential for standing water to be present throughout the County, continues to put the planning area at risk from WNV and other mosquito-borne illnesses.

Denque Fever

Dengue is a mosquito-borne disease caused by any of four closely related dengue viruses (DENV-1, DENV-2, DENV-3 and DENV-4). People get dengue from the bite of an infected mosquito. The mosquito becomes infected when it bites a person who has dengue virus in their blood. It takes a week or more for the dengue virus to replicate in the mosquito; then the mosquito can transmit the virus to another person when it bites. Dengue is transmitted by yellow fever mosquito (*Aedes aegypti*) and the Asian tiger mosquito (*Aedes albopictus*). These mosquitoes are not native to California, but infestations have been reported in multiple counties in California. Dengue virus cannot be transmitted from person to person.

The main symptoms of dengue are high fever, severe headache, severe pain behind the eyes, joint pain, muscle and bone pain, rash, bruising, and sometimes mild bleeding from the nose or mouth. Generally, younger children and those with their first dengue infection have a milder illness than older children and adults. Severe dengue typically begins with signs and symptoms similar to dengue. Rather than recover, severe dengue patients proceed to experience more bleeding, severe pain in the abdomen, respiratory distress, and fluid accumulation in the abdomen and around the lungs as the smallest blood vessels (capillaries) begin to leak. If not treated, severe dengue can result in death. There is no specific treatment for dengue infection. Rest and fluids are generally sufficient for persons with dengue. Severe dengue may require hospitalization and intensive medical care.

Individuals in areas with dengue need to reduce their likelihood of being bitten by mosquitoes. Screens on windows and doors should be examined to confirm that they are in good repair. Repellents containing 20 to 30 percent DEET should be applied to exposed skin and clothing to keep mosquitoes from biting. From 2011 to the publishing of this document there have been 483 cases of dengue fever in California, with three of the cases in Placer County.

Zika Virus

Zika is a mosquito-borne disease. The most common symptoms of Zika are fever, rash, joint pain, and conjunctivitis (red eyes). The illness is usually mild, with symptoms lasting for several days to a week after being bitten by an infected mosquito. People usually do not get sick enough to go to the hospital, and they rarely die of Zika. For this reason, many people might not realize they have been infected. However, Zika virus infection during pregnancy can cause a serious birth defect called microcephaly, as well as other severe fetal brain defects. Once a person has been infected, he or she is likely to be protected from future infections.

Zika virus is transmitted by yellow fever mosquito (*Aedes aegypti*) and the Asian tiger mosquito (*Aedes albopictus*). These mosquitoes are not native to California, but infestations have been reported in multiple counties in California. An *Aedes* mosquito can only transmit Zika virus after it bites a person who has this virus in their blood. Thus far in California, Zika virus infections have been documented only in people who were infected while traveling outside the United States or through sexual contact with an infected traveler. Zika virus is not spread through casual contact, but can be spread by infected men to their sexual partners. There is a growing association between Zika and microcephaly (abnormally small head and brain) in newborns, as well as Zika and Guillain-Barré Syndrome, a disease affecting the nervous system. Studies are ongoing to further evaluate these associations. From 2015 to the publishing of this document there has been no local mosquito-borne transmission of Zika virus in California.

Chikungunya

Chikungunya (pronounced chik-en-gun-ye) is an infectious mosquito-borne disease with symptoms that typically include fever and severe joint pain. It is caused by the chikungunya virus, which is transmitted by yellow fever mosquito (*Aedes aegypti*) and the Asian tiger mosquito (*Aedes albopictus*). These mosquitoes are not native to California, but infestations have been reported in multiple counties in California. An *Aedes* mosquito can only transmit chikungunya virus after it bites a person who has this virus in their blood. A person with chikungunya is

not contagious. As of the publication of this document, chikungunya infections have been documented only in persons who were infected while traveling outside the United States.

14.1.7 Anthrax

Anthrax is a disease caused by *Bacillus anthracis*, a bacterium that forms spores (a spore is a cell that is dormant but may come to life with the right conditions). There are three forms of anthrax:

- **Cutaneous**—The first symptom is a small sore that develops into a blister. The blister then develops into a skin ulcer with a black area in the center. The sore, blister and ulcer do not hurt.
- **Gastrointestinal**—The first symptoms are nausea, loss of appetite, bloody diarrhea, and fever, followed by bad stomach pain.
- **Inhalation**—The first symptoms of inhalation anthrax are like cold or flu symptoms and can include a sore throat, mild fever and muscle aches. Later symptoms include cough, chest discomfort, shortness of breath, tiredness and muscle aches.

Anthrax is a naturally occurring illness and isolated cases occur all over the world yearly. Humans can become infected with anthrax by handling products from infected animals or by breathing in anthrax spores from infected animal products (such as wool). People can become infected with gastrointestinal anthrax by eating undercooked meat from infected animals. Anthrax does occur in California, and animals have tested positive; however, there have been no positive human cases of anthrax in California in the last 10 years. Anthrax can be treated successfully with antibiotics.

Anthrax can be used as a weapon, as happened in the United States in 2001, when anthrax was spread through the postal system by sending letters with powder containing anthrax spores. This caused 22 cases of anthrax infection and brought anthrax back into the public eye. From 2011 to the publishing of this document there have been no cases of anthrax in California.

14.1.8 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome

Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) is a viral respiratory illness caused by a coronavirus (SARS-CoV). SARS was first reported in Asia in February 2003. Over the next few months, the illness spread to more than two dozen countries in North America, South America, Europe, and Asia before the global outbreak was contained. According to the WHO, 8,098 people worldwide became sick with SARS during the 2003 outbreak and 774 died. In the United States, only eight people had laboratory evidence of SARS-CoV infection. All of these people had traveled to parts of the world where SARS was present. SARS did not spread more widely in the United States.

In general, SARS begins with a high fever, headache, an overall feeling of discomfort and body aches. Some people also have mild respiratory symptoms at the outset. About 10 percent to 20 percent of patients have diarrhea. After two to seven days, SARS patients may develop a dry cough. Most patients develop pneumonia.

The main way that SARS seems to spread is by close person-to-person contact. The virus that causes SARS is thought to be transmitted most readily by respiratory droplets produced when an infected person coughs or sneezes. Droplet spread can happen when droplets from the cough or sneeze of an infected person are propelled a short distance (generally up to 3 feet) through the air and deposited on the mucous membranes of the mouth, nose, or eyes of persons nearby. The virus also can spread when a person touches a surface or object contaminated with infectious droplets and then touches his or her mouth, nose, or eyes. It is also possible that the SARS virus might spread more broadly through the air or by other ways that are not now known.

As of May 2005, according to the CDC, there was no remaining sustained SARS transmission anywhere in the world. However, CDC has developed recommendations and guidelines to help public health and healthcare

officials plan for and respond quickly to the reappearance of SARS if it occurs again. Lessons learned from the SARS outbreak helped healthcare facilities and communities successfully plan and respond to the 2009 H1N1 pandemic. The California Health and Safety Code lists SARS among the communicable diseases that must be reported to health authorities. Placer County is authorized to collect records and data, initiate disease control measures, control property and manage persons (including isolation and quarantine) for containment of communicable disease. From 2011 to the publishing of this document there have no cases of SARS in California.

14.1.9 Extreme Weather

From 2006 to 2010, more people in the U.S. died from extreme heat or extreme cold than from hurricanes, tornadoes, floods and earthquakes combined. The western United States is subject to many weather extremes. Severe spring storms can lead to risk of traumatic injuries, mudslides, flooding and property damage. Extreme heat can lead to dehydration and heat-related illness. Severe winter weather can lead to risk of traumatic injuries, hypothermia and icy conditions.

Severe Spring Storms

Thunderstorms cause most of the severe spring weather. Tornadoes are rare in California but can occur. Since 2011, a total of 44 tornadoes have occurred in California, one of them in Placer County. When these events occur unexpectedly, the risk of injury and death increases. Advance planning can decrease the risks. Citizens should pay close attention to changing weather conditions when there is a severe thunderstorm watch or warning.

Lightning strikes are a danger during thunderstorms. A lightning bolt is 6 to 8 centimeters in diameter, carrying between 10 and 100 million volts in 20 to 50 thousand amps of direct current. The duration is approximately one millisecond. Volts of 2 billion and 500 thousand amps have been measured. A lightning strike can cause death or injury to one or several persons. Long-term injuries from lightning strike can include memory and attention loss, chronic numbness, muscle spasm, stiffness, depression, hearing loss and sleep disturbance. Seventy percent of all lightning injuries and fatalities occur in the afternoon; 85 percent of victims are children and young men (age 10 to 35) engaged in outdoor recreation and work activities. Hikers, campers, backpackers, skiers, fishermen, and hunters are especially vulnerable.

Extreme Heat

California, Nevada and Arizona experience very high temperatures during the summer. Those susceptible to extreme heat may suffer heat-related illnesses:

- **Heat Exhaustion**—Heat exhaustion is a mild form of heat-related illness that can develop after several days of exposure to high temperatures and inadequate or unbalanced replacement of fluids. It is the body's response to an excessive loss of the water and salt contained in sweat. Those most prone to heat exhaustion are elderly people, people with high blood pressure, and people working or exercising in a hot environment.
- **Heat Cramps**—Heat cramps usually affect people who sweat a lot during strenuous activity. This sweating depletes the body's salt and moisture. The low salt level in the muscles may be the cause of heat cramps. Heat cramps may also be a symptom of heat exhaustion.
- **Heat Stroke**—Heat stroke is a severe, dangerous form of heat-related illness. It occurs when the body's temperature rises rapidly, the sweating mechanism fails, and the body is unable to cool down. Body temperature may rise to 106°F or higher within 10 to 15 minutes. Heat stroke can cause death or permanent disability if emergency treatment is not provided. This is a medical emergency.

Heat has caused 9,000 deaths in the United States from 1979 to 2013. Air-conditioning is the number one protective factor against heat-related illness and death. If a home is not air-conditioned, people can reduce their risk for heat-related illness by spending time in public facilities that are air-conditioned.

The California Office of Emergency Services has a comprehensive contingency plan for excessive heat emergencies. The plan describes state operations during heat-related emergencies and provides guidance for state agencies, local government, and non-governmental organizations in the preparation of heat emergency response plans and related activities. Placer County has an emergency contingency plan and participates in the opening of local cooling centers if extreme heat continues for an extended period of time.

Severe Winter Weather

When winter temperatures drop significantly below normal, staying warm and safe can become a challenge. Extremely cold temperatures often accompany a winter storm, which may also cause power failures and icy roads. Staying indoors as much as possible can help reduce the risk of car crashes and falls on the ice, but cold weather also can present hazards indoors. Many homes will be too cold, either due to a power failure or because the heating system is not adequate for the weather. When people must use space heaters and fireplaces to stay warm, the risk of residential fires increases, as well as the risk of carbon monoxide poisoning.

Extreme cold can bring on health emergencies in susceptible people, such as those without shelter or who are stranded, or who live in a home that is poorly insulated or without heat:

- **Hypothermia**—When exposed to cold temperatures, the body begins to lose heat faster than it can be produced. Prolonged exposure to cold will eventually use up the body's stored energy. The result is hypothermia, or abnormally low body temperature. Body temperature that is too low affects the brain, making the victim unable to think clearly or move well. This makes hypothermia particularly dangerous because a person may not know it is happening and will not be able to do anything about it. Warning signs of hypothermia include shivering, exhaustion, confusion, fumbling hands, memory loss, slurred speech, drowsiness, bright red cold skin, and very low energy.
- **Frostbite**—Frostbite is an injury to the body caused by freezing of the tissues. Frostbite causes a loss of feeling and color in affected areas. It most often affects the nose, ears, cheeks, chin, fingers, or toes. Frostbite can permanently damage the body, and severe cases can lead to amputation. The risk of frostbite is increased in people with reduced blood circulation and among people who are not dressed properly for extremely cold temperatures. A victim is often unaware of frostbite until someone else points it out because the frozen tissues are numb. Signs of frostbite may be a white or grayish-yellow skin area, skin that feels unusually firm or waxy and numbness.

Infants and the elderly are particularly at risk to cold temperatures, but anyone can be affected. If extreme winter weather conditions are expected for an extended period, Placer County has an emergency contingency plan to provide shelter and care areas to provide heating centers for those in need. Preventive action is the best defense against having to deal with extreme cold-weather conditions. Preparing homes and cars in advance for winter emergencies, and observing safety precautions during times of extremely cold weather can reduce the risk of weather-related health problems.

14.2 HAZARD PROFILE

The severity of human health hazards is dependent upon the hazard and the population exposed to it. As the population increases, so does the risk of exposure to hazards. The key to reducing the disease hazard is isolation so that the exposed population does not continue to spread the hazard to the uninfected population. For disease and weather-related human health hazards, promoting education and personal preparedness will help to mitigate and reduce the severity of the hazard.

14.2.1 Past Events

Communicable Diseases

The following is a summary of recent disease outbreak events:

- In the United States during the 2009 H1N1 influenza pandemic, there were 59,979,608 confirmed cases of the disease, 270,435 people hospitalized due to the illness and 12,271 deaths. In California, there were 4,134 people hospitalized due to the illness and 596 deaths. In Placer County, there were 45 confirmed cases, with 5 deaths due to the illness. The pandemic was mild compared to the Spanish Flu pandemic of 1918, which caused 100 million deaths worldwide—a total of 3 percent of the world's total population.
- West Nile Virus arrived in Placer County in July 2004. The first case was diagnosed in September 2004. The 56-year old patient was recovering from meningitis in the hospital when the test came back positive for WNV. From 2011 to the publishing of this document there have been 2,811 cases of WNV in California, 36 of them in Placer County
- There were two confirmed cases of SARS in California during the worldwide outbreak in 2002-2003, none of them in Placer County.
- From 2011 to the publishing of this document there have been 458 cases of Lyme disease in California, 4 of them in Placer County.
- From 2011 to the publishing of this document there have been 16 cases of hantavirus in California, including one in Placer County.
- As of the publishing of this document, no cases of tularemia or plague have been reported in Placer County, but cases of these diseases have been reported in California and nearby counties. Even though these hazards may not be endemic to the area, they can be brought into the planning region and are still considered to be a risk.

Extreme Weather

The following is a summary of recent extreme weather events that threatened human health:

- From 2006 to 2010, excessive heat exposure caused 3,332 deaths in the United States.
- In July 2006, California experienced a heat wave impacting the entire state. Coroners attributed 140 deaths to hyperthermia, and it has been estimated from other data that more than 600 heat-related deaths may have occurred over a 17-day period.
- From 2006 to 2010, hypothermia caused 6,660 deaths in the United States.
- From 2006 to 2010, lightning strikes caused 657 deaths in the United States.

14.2.2 Location

It is difficult to map the extent of human-health hazards compared to others, such as floods, wildfires and dam failures. All of the City of Roseville Planning Area is susceptible to the human health hazards discussed in this chapter. While some hazards, such as the West Nile Virus and Lyme disease, can have a geographic presence within the planning area, other diseases can cause exposure to the planning area from outside the local region. Roseville residents who travel can become exposed to diseases while abroad and bring the diseases back with them, potentially placing the region at risk for exposure. Extreme weather poses an equal human health hazard across the City.

14.2.3 Frequency

Communicable Disease

Due to increased air travel, the growing population and the country's aging population, the probability of a communicable disease epidemic or pandemic is a growing threat. Certain human health hazards, such as influenza, can be expected seasonably, with variations on specific strains year to year. Additionally, tick-borne diseases are likely to increase during spring and fall, when people participate in outdoor activities such as hiking. The frequency of other health hazards is difficult to establish and depends largely on the unique circumstances surrounding a localized outbreak and its subsequent expansion into epidemics and eventually pandemics.

Extreme Weather

Trauma due to injuries directly due to storms (such as motor vehicle collisions and falls), heat related illness and hypothermia are a factor of the weather and in some cases a technological hazard.

14.2.4 Severity

The severity of the human health hazard varies from individual to individual. Typically, young children and older adults are more susceptible to acquiring communicable diseases due to developing or diminishing immune systems or experiencing adverse effects to extreme weather conditions. These populations often experience the most severe of symptoms, as their immune systems are not capable of fighting off infection or efficiently regulating temperature. In general, severity varies depending on the pathology of the disease, the health of the infected, and the availability of treatments for alleviating symptoms or curing the disease.

14.3 SECONDARY HAZARDS

Human health hazards are not like natural hazards that have measurable secondary impacts, such as earthquakes, floods or wildfires. The largest secondary impact caused by human health hazards would be economic. Large outbreaks of any human health hazard could reduce the work force significantly, causing businesses and agencies to close or be greatly impacted.

Another secondary impact could be stigmatization. The fear of the human health hazard and fear of the unknown could lead to isolation, violence and self-inflicted injury. Hospitals and health care providers could be overwhelmed with the "worried well" seeking care and comfort. Providing key and critical information can reduce and mitigate this secondary risk.

14.4 EXPOSURE AND VULNERABILITY

14.4.1 Population

All citizens in the Roseville planning area could be susceptible to the human health hazards discussed in this chapter. A large outbreak or epidemic, a pandemic or a use of biological agents as a weapon of mass destruction could have devastating effects on the population of Roseville.

West Nile Virus and other mosquito-borne illnesses are a significant concern in the local wetlands and west of Roseville in the flooded rice fields. A concentrated at-risk population is on the western border of the city limits near the rice fields where the mosquitoes breed.

While all of the population in the planning area is considered at risk to the human health hazards discussed in this chapter, the young and the elderly, those with compromised immune systems, and those with special needs are

considered the most vulnerable. The City has a large elderly community with a concentration of older residents in areas such as Sun City Roseville. The introduction of a disease such as the plague or influenza could rapidly impact those at risk.

14.4.2 Property

None of the health hazards discussed in this chapter would have significant measurable impact on the structural environment or property of the planning area.

14.4.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

None of the health hazards discussed in this chapter would have significant measurable impact on the critical facilities or infrastructure of the planning area. However, health care facilities (including long-term care and clinics and even veterinary offices) have adopted the recommended “all-hazards” approach to preparedness and have prepared for the health hazards addressed in this chapter.

The acute care hospitals in Roseville have collaborated, trained and planned on a local, regional, state and national level to provide immediate and comprehensive medical care to the citizens of Roseville and the greater western Placer County population. Emergency management and preparedness planning incorporates all response disciplines (fire, law, first responder ground and air ambulance agencies, public health, mental and spiritual health). Planning includes identifying shelters, alternate treatment facilities, isolation capacity and methods to immediately expand physical and human resources.

14.4.4 Environment

None of the health hazards discussed in this chapter would have significant measurable impact on the environment of the planning area. While many of the vectors of the health hazards discussed in this chapter (mosquitoes, rodents, fleas, ticks and deer flies) rely on local or regional environments for their survival, the human health hazard that they carry or potentially transmit would have no significant measurable impact on the environment.

14.4.5 Economy

The economic impact of a human health hazard could be localized to a single region or population, or could be widespread. The impact could be significant, depending on the hazard, number of cases and the availability of resources to care for those affected by the hazard. Other financial impacts could be absorbed or managed by the organization affected.

14.5 FUTURE TRENDS IN DEVELOPMENT

The potential for communicable diseases, vector-borne diseases or extreme weather in Roseville and the planning area is not likely to lessen or prohibit growth or development in Roseville.

14.6 REVIEW OF EXISTING ORDINANCES, PROGRAMS AND PLANS

14.6.1 Hospital Expansions to Care for Growing Populations

Kaiser Permanente operates medical facilities in Roseville as follows:

- In October 1998, Kaiser Permanente opened a 116-bed hospital on Eureka Road adjacent to its medical offices. Since then, the hospital increased the number of beds to 166 (not including the Women’s and

Children's Center). In addition to the hospital, comprehensive outpatient, primary, and specialty care services are offered, as well as education, pharmacy, laboratory, radiology, optical, EKG, and physical therapy services at three sites in Roseville.

- Kaiser opened a 75,000 square-foot medical office building in Lincoln in October 2006.
- In December 2008, a \$52 million expansion project was completed that quadrupled the size of the Kaiser Roseville emergency room and doubled the number of beds. The radiology department was tripled in size and provided with high tech rooms with advanced diagnostic tools.
- Kaiser Roseville's Women's and Children's Center opened in January 2009 and includes 174 beds, neonatal and pediatric intensive care units, and a second medical office building.
- Kaiser Roseville is a certified Stroke and STEMI (heart attack) Receiving Center.
- Kaiser's Roseville Medical Center was named as a "Top Hospital" on the 2015 Leapfrog Top Hospitals listing—a voluntary program recognizing hospitals that demonstrate success in minimizing mortality rates for high-risk procedures and preventing medical errors.

Sutter Roseville Medical Center operates medical facilities in Roseville as follows:

- The current Sutter Roseville Medical Center campus opened in 1997 and provides comprehensive community health and trauma care for more than seven counties.
- Sutter Roseville Medical Center provides critical care, cardiology, neurology, pulmonary and orthopedic services, a dedicated cancer center, a Family Birth Center, a Neo Natal Intensive Care Unit, wound care, a 24-hour emergency department and the Sutter Rehabilitation Institute, a 55-bed acute rehabilitation center with accreditation from the Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities
- Sutter Roseville Medical Center is an accredited regional Level II trauma center and designated disaster/medical control facility, as well as a certified Stroke Receiving Center, STEMI (heart attack) Receiving Center and National Disaster Medical Systems hospital.
- Sutter Roseville is in the process of expanding its emergency department, intensive care and trauma neuro intensive care units and inpatient and outpatient surgery programs.
- In 2015, Truven Health Analytics named Sutter Health and Sutter Health's Valley Area, which includes Sutter Roseville Medical Center, as two of the nation's top five performers among large health care systems in its 15 Top Health Systems study.

Past and future expansion of these medical centers will enhance the capacity and services offered to treat illness and injury in Roseville and the surrounding region.

14.6.2 Memorandums of Agreement

The following memorandums of agreement enhance Roseville's ability to respond to the human health hazard:

- Sutter Roseville Medical Center has a memorandum of agreement with the Department of Quarantine, a division of the CDC, to provide isolation treatment in the event of a highly contagious and virulent disease.
- Sutter Roseville Medical Center has cooperative memorandums of agreement with Beale Air Force Base and the Placer County Department of Health and Human Services to provide assistance and care in disaster and mass casualty incidents.
- Since 2013 Sutter Roseville Medical Center has been a designated one of the nation's 1,500 National Disaster Medical Systems Hospital by the Department of Defense, Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Veteran's affairs. This designation can provide the facility and the region more rapid care and assistance if a catastrophe strikes.

- Kaiser Roseville and Sutter Roseville Medical Center are coalition members with Placer County Public Health in the Healthcare Emergency Coalition to prepare, train and exercise to provide services in mass casualty situations.

14.6.3 Integrated Emergency Response

FEMA and the Joint Commission for Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations (JCAHO) expect acute care facilities to provide planning for an “all hazard” disaster response and care for mass casualties, whether the incidents and events are naturally occurring, human caused, or a combination of both. JCAHO requires the integration of emergency response planning with local response agencies, ensuring that the community will receive the highest level of integrated response and protection available. These planning efforts are supported by local, regional, state and federal grant funding.

14.7 SCENARIO

A human health worst-case scenario for the planning area would be an epidemic or large-scale incident of any of the human health hazards discussed in this chapter. Medical treatment facilities in the planning area would be overwhelmed and taxed beyond their capabilities as the numbers of patients escalates. The impacts on the workforce within the planning area could have acute and long-term economic impacts on the primary employers in the planning area. First responders would be exposed to the human health hazards, which could deplete the medical workforce and could have profound impact on the potential escalation of the scenario.

14.8 ISSUES

Important issues associated with the human health hazards include but are not limited to the following:

- Prevention through vaccination and personal emergency and disaster preparation will help to reduce the impacts of human health hazards.
- Medical and response personnel need to be integrated in a unified command to provide care when needed in response to human health hazards.
- Medical and response personnel must be adequately trained and supplied.
- Up-to-date and functional all-hazard contingency planning should be carried out.
- A system needs to be in place for informing the public with a unified message about the human health hazard.
- Health agencies and facilities require surge capacity management and adaptation to the rising number and needs of the region.

15. HUMAN-CAUSED HAZARDS

15.1 GENERAL BACKGROUND

Although the DMA does not require an assessment of human-caused hazards, The City of Roseville is including human-caused hazards in this hazard mitigation plan for the following reasons:

- The City takes a proactive approach to disaster preparedness, especially in an effort to protect the public safety of all citizens.
- Preparation for and response to a human-caused disaster will involve many of the same staff training, critical decisions, and commitment of resources as for a natural hazard.
- The multi-hazard mitigation planning effort is an opportunity to inform the public about all hazards, including human-caused hazards.
- The likelihood of a human-caused hazard in Roseville is greater than several of the identified natural hazards in this Plan.
- The City has a Terrorism Contingency Plan (June 2004) and a Hazardous Materials Contingency Plan (September 2004) already in place with instructions for a response by City of Roseville first responders and staff of the emergency operations center.

Human-caused hazards fall into the following categories:

- Man-made hazards include acts of terrorism and cyber threats. These hazards are intentional, criminal, malicious acts.
- Technological hazards are incidents that arise from human activities such as the manufacture, transportation, storage and use of hazardous materials. These are accidental incidents with unintended consequences.

This report does not address human-caused hazards to the Roseville water treatment facilities, because the City evaluated those facilities in a separate report per EPA requirements. Information on that evaluation is available from the Roseville City Manager's office. In 2003, with input from the City of Roseville, Placer County conducted a State Homeland Security Assessment Survey to review terrorism vulnerabilities, personnel available to respond, and equipment needed. The resulting information is classified and available only to first responders at the time of an emergency (per state and federal laws).

DEFINITIONS

Acts of Terrorism—The unlawful use or threatened use of force or violence against people or property with the intention of intimidating or coercing societies or governments. Terrorism is either foreign or domestic, depending on the origin, base, and objectives of the terrorist or organization.

Technological Hazards—Hazards from accidents associated with human activities such as the manufacture, transportation, storage and use of hazardous materials.

Weapons of Mass Destruction—Chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and explosive weapons associated with terrorism.

Hazardous Material—A substance or combination of substances that, because of quantity, concentration, physical, chemical, or infectious characteristics, may cause or contribute to an increase in mortality or an increase in serious irreversible or incapacitating reversible illness, or pose a present or potential hazard to human life, property, or the environment. Hazardous waste is included in the City's working definition.

15.1.1 Man-Made Hazards

Terrorism and Weapons of Mass Destruction

The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) categorizes terrorism in the United States as one of two types:

- Domestic terrorism involves groups or individuals whose terrorist activities are directed at elements of our government or population without foreign direction. The 1995 bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah federal building in Oklahoma City is an example of domestic terrorism. The FBI is the primary response agency for domestic terrorism. The FBI coordinates domestic preparedness programs and activities of the United States to limit acts posed by terrorists including the use of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs).
- International terrorism involves groups or individuals whose terrorist activities are foreign-based and/or directed by countries or groups outside the United States, or whose activities transcend national boundaries. Examples include the 1997 bombing of Mobil Oil's headquarters, the 1983 bombing of the U.S. Capitol, the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center, and the September 11, 2001 attacks at the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.

The three key elements to defining a terrorist event are as follows:

- Activities involve the use of illegal force.
- Actions are intended to intimidate or coerce.
- Actions are committed in support of political or social objectives.

As detailed in the City's Terrorism Contingency Plan, at least three important considerations distinguish terrorism hazards from other types of hazards:

- In the case of chemical, biological and radioactive agents, their presence may not be immediately obvious, making it difficult to determine when and where they may have been released, who has been exposed, and what danger is present for first responders and emergency medical technicians.
- There is limited scientific understanding of how these agents affect the population at large.
- Terrorism evokes strong emotional reactions, ranging from anxiety to fear to anger to depression.

Those involved with terrorism response, including public health and public information staff, are trained to deal with the public's emotional reaction swiftly as response to the event occurs. The area of the event must be clearly identified in all emergency alert messages to prevent those not affected by the incident from overwhelming local emergency rooms and response resources, thereby reducing service to those actually affected. The public will be informed clearly and frequently about what government agencies are doing to mitigate the impacts of the event. The public will also be given clear directions on how to protect the health of individuals and families.

FEMA defines terrorism as the use of weapons of mass destruction, including biological, chemical, nuclear and radiological weapons; arson, incendiary, explosive and armed attacks; industrial sabotage and intentional hazardous materials releases; agro-terrorism; and cyber-terrorism (FEMA 386-7). The following are potential methods used by terrorists that could affect the City of Roseville as a direct target or collaterally:

- | | |
|----------------------|---|
| • Conventional bomb | • Arson/incendiary attack |
| • Biological agent | • Armed attack |
| • Chemical agent | • Cyber-terrorism (see the cyber threats section of this profile) |
| • Nuclear bomb | • Agro-terrorism |
| • Radiological agent | • Intentional hazardous material release. |

Table 15-1 provides a hazard profile summary for terrorism-related hazards. Most terrorist events in the United States have been bombing attacks, involving detonated or undetonated explosive devices, tear gas, pipe bombs, and firebombs.

Table 15-1. Event Profiles for Terrorism

Hazard	Application Mode ^a	Hazard Duration ^b	Static/Dynamic Characteristics ^c	Mitigating and Exacerbating Conditions ^d
Conventional Bomb	Detonation of explosive device on or near target; delivery via person, vehicle, or projectile.	Instantaneous; additional secondary devices, or diversionary activities may be used, lengthening the duration of the hazard until the attack site is determined to be clear.	Extent of damage is determined by type and quantity of explosive. Effects generally static other than cascading consequences, incremental structural failure, etc.	Overpressure at a given standoff is inversely proportional to the cube of the distance from the blast; thus, each additional increment of standoff provides progressively more protection. Terrain, forestation, structures, etc. can provide shielding by absorbing and/or deflecting energy and debris. Exacerbating conditions include ease of access to target; lack of barriers and shielding; poor construction; and ease of concealment of device.
Chemical Agent	Liquid/aerosol contaminants dispersed using sprayers or other aerosol generators; liquids vaporizing from puddles/containers; or munitions.	Hours to weeks, depending on the agent and the conditions in which it exists.	Contamination can be carried out of the initial target area by persons, vehicles, water, and wind. Chemicals may be corrosive or otherwise damaging over time if not remediated.	Air temperature can affect evaporation of aerosols. Ground temperature affects evaporation of liquids. Humidity can enlarge aerosol particles, reducing inhalation hazard. Precipitation can dilute and disperse agents but can spread contamination. Wind can disperse vapors but also cause target area to be dynamic. The micro-meteorological effects of buildings and terrain can alter travel and duration of agents. Shielding in the form of sheltering in place can protect people and property from harmful effects.
Arson/Incendiary Attack	Initiation of fire or explosion on or near target via direct contact or remotely via projectile.	Generally minutes to hours.	Extent of damage is determined by type and quantity of device, accelerant, and materials present at or near target. Effects generally static other than cascading consequences, incremental structural failure, etc.	Mitigation factors include built-in fire detection and protection systems and fire-resistive construction techniques. Inadequate security can allow easy access to target, easy concealment of an incendiary device, and undetected initiation of a fire. Non-compliance with fire and building codes, as well as failure to maintain existing fire protection systems, can substantially increase the effectiveness of a fire weapon.
Armed Attack	Tactical assault or sniping from remote location, or random attack based on fear, emotion, or mental instability.	Generally minutes to days.	Varies based on the perpetrators' intent and capabilities.	Inadequate security can allow easy access to target, easy concealment of weapons, and undetected initiation of an attack.
Biological Agent	Liquid or solid contaminants dispersed using sprayers/ aerosol generators or by point or line sources such as munitions, covert deposits, and moving sprayers.	Hours to years, depending on the agent and the conditions in which it exists.	Depending on the agent used and the effectiveness with which it is deployed, contamination can be spread via wind and water. Infection can spread via humans or animals.	Altitude of release above ground can affect dispersion; sunlight is destructive to many bacteria and viruses; light to moderate wind will disperse agents but higher winds can break up aerosol clouds; the micro-meteorological effects of buildings and terrain can influence aerosolization and travel of agents.

Hazard	Application Mode ^a	Hazard Duration ^b	Static/Dynamic Characteristics ^c	Mitigating and Exacerbating Conditions ^d
Agro-terrorism	Direct, generally covert contamination of food supplies or introduction of pests and/or disease agents to crops and livestock.	Days to months.	Varies by type of incident. Food contamination events may be limited to specific distribution sites, whereas pests and diseases may spread widely. Generally no effects on built environment.	Inadequate security can facilitate adulteration of food and introduction of pests and disease agents to crops and livestock.
Radiological Agent	Radioactive contaminants dispersed using sprayers/ aerosol generators, or by point or line sources such as munitions.	Seconds to years, depending on material used.	Initial effects will be localized to site of attack; depending on meteorological conditions, subsequent behavior of radioactive contaminants may be dynamic.	Duration of exposure, distance from source of radiation, and the amount of shielding between source and target determine exposure to radiation.
Nuclear Bomb	Detonation of nuclear device underground, at the surface, in the air, or at high altitude.	Light/heat flash and blast/shock wave last for seconds; nuclear radiation and fallout hazards can persist for years. Electromagnetic pulse from a high-altitude detonation lasts for seconds and affects only unprotected electronic systems.	Initial light, heat, and blast effects of a subsurface, ground or air burst are static and determined by the device's characteristics and employment; fallout of radioactive contaminants may be dynamic, depending on meteorological conditions.	Harmful effects of radiation can be reduced by minimizing the time of exposure. Light, heat, and blast energy decrease logarithmically as a function of distance from seat of blast. Terrain, forestation, structures, etc. can provide shielding by absorbing and/or deflecting radiation and radioactive contaminants.
Intentional Hazardous Material Release (fixed facility or transportation)	Solid, liquid, and/or gaseous contaminants released from fixed or mobile containers	Hours to days.	Chemicals may be corrosive or otherwise damaging over time. Explosion and/or fire may be subsequent. Contamination may be carried out of the incident area by persons, vehicles, water and wind.	Weather conditions directly affect how the hazard develops. The micro-meteorological effects of buildings and terrain can alter travel and duration of agents. Shielding in the form of sheltering in place can protect people and property from harmful effects. Non-compliance with fire and building codes, as well as failure to maintain existing fire protection and containment features, can substantially increase the damage from a hazardous materials release.

- Application Mode**—Application mode describes the human acts or unintended events necessary to cause the hazard to occur.
- Duration**—Duration is the length of time the hazard is present. For example, a chemical warfare agent such as mustard gas, if unremediated, can persist for hours or weeks under the right conditions.
- Dynamic or Static Characteristics**—These characteristics of a hazard describe its tendency, or that of its effects, to either expand, contract, or remain confined in time, magnitude, and space. For example, the physical destruction caused by an earthquake is generally confined to the place in which it occurs, and it does not usually get worse unless aftershocks or other cascading failures occur; in contrast, a cloud of chlorine gas leaking from a storage tank can change location by drifting with the wind and can diminish in danger by dissipating over time.
- Mitigation and Exacerbating Conditions**—Mitigating conditions are characteristics of the target and its physical environment that can reduce the effects of a hazard. For example, earthen berms can provide protection from bombs; exposure to sunlight can render some biological agents ineffective; and effective perimeter lighting and surveillance can minimize the likelihood of someone approaching a target unseen. In contrast, exacerbating conditions are characteristics that can enhance or magnify the effects of a hazard. For example, depressions or low areas in terrain can trap heavy vapors, and a proliferation of street furniture (trash receptacles, newspaper vending machines, mail boxes, etc.) can provide hiding places for explosive devices.

Source: FEMA 386-7

The effects of terrorism can vary from loss of life and injuries to property damage and disruptions in services such as electricity, water supplies, transportation, or communications. Terrorist acts may have an immediate effect or a delayed effect. Terrorists often choose targets that offer limited danger to themselves and areas with relatively easy public access. Foreign terrorists look for visible targets where they can avoid detection before and after an attack such as international airports, large cities, major special events, and high-profile landmarks.

In dealing with intentional human-caused hazards, the unpredictability of human beings must be considered. People with a desire to perform criminal acts may seek out targets of opportunity that may not fall into established lists of critical areas or facilities. The City of Roseville first responders train not only to respond to organized terrorism events, but also to respond to random acts by individuals who, for a variety of reasons ranging from fear to emotional trauma to mental instability, may choose to harm others and destroy property.

While education, heightened awareness, and early warning of unusual circumstances may deter crime and terrorism, intentional acts that harm people and property are possible at any time. Public safety entities must react to the incident, locate, isolate and neutralize further damage, and conduct investigation to bring criminals to justice.

Cyber Threats

A cyber threat is an intentional and malicious crime that compromises the digital infrastructure of a person or organization, often for financial or terror-related reasons. Such attacks vary in nature and are perpetrated using digital mediums or sometimes social engineering to target human operators. Generally, attacks last minutes to days, but large-scale events and their impacts can last much longer. As information technology continues to grow in capability and interconnectivity, cyber threats become increasingly frequent and destructive. In 2014, internet security teams at Symantec and Verizon indicated that nearly 1 million new pieces of malware—malicious code designed to steal or destroy information—were created every day (Harrison 2015).

Cyber threats differ by motive, attack type and perpetrator profile. Motives range from the pursuit of financial gain to political or social aims. Cyber threats are difficult to identify and comprehend. Types of threats include using viruses to erase entire systems, breaking into systems and altering files, using someone's personal computer to attack others, or stealing confidential information. The spectrum of cyber risks is limitless, with threats having a wide-range of effects on the individual, community, organizational, and national threat (FEMA 2013).

This risk assessment includes cyber attacks and cyberterrorism under the inclusive hazard of cyber threats. The terms often are used interchangeably, though they are not the same. While all cyberterrorism is a form of cyber attack, not all cyber attacks are cyberterrorism.

Cyber Attacks

Public and private computer systems are likely to experience a variety of cyber attacks, from blanket malware infection to targeted attacks on system capabilities. Cyber attacks specifically seek to breach IT security measures designed to protect an individual or organization. The initial attack is followed by more severe attacks for the purpose of causing harm, stealing data, or financial gain. Organizations are prone to different types of attacks that can be either automated or targeted in nature. Table 15-2 describes the most common cyber attack mechanisms faced by organizations today.

Since 2013, a new type of cyber-attack is becoming increasingly common against individuals and small- and medium-sized organizations. This attack is called cyber ransom. Cyber ransom occurs when an individual downloads ransom malware, or ransomware, often through phishing or drive-by download, and the subsequent execution of code results in encryption of all data and personal files stored on the system. The victim then receives a message that demands a fee in the form of electronic currency or cryptocurrency, such as Bitcoin, for the decryption code (Figure 15-1).

Table 15-2. Common Mechanisms for Cyber Attacks

Type	Description
Socially Engineered Trojans	Programs designed to mimic legitimate processes (e.g. updating software, running fake antivirus software) with the end goal of human-interaction caused infection. When the victim runs the fake process, the Trojan is installed on the system.
Unpatched Software	Nearly all software has weak points that may be exploited by malware. Most common software exploitations occur with Java, Adobe Reader, and Adobe Flash. These vulnerabilities are often exploited as small amounts of malicious code are often downloaded via drive-by download.
Phishing	Malicious email messages that ask users to click a link or download a program. Phishing attacks may appear as legitimate emails from trusted third parties.
Password Attacks	Third party attempts to crack a user's password and subsequently gain access to a system. Password attacks do not typically require malware, but rather stem from software applications on the attacker's system. These applications may use a variety of methods to gain access, including generating large numbers of generated guesses, or dictionary attacks, in which passwords are systematically tested against all of the words in a dictionary.
Drive-by Downloads	Malware is downloaded unknowingly by the victims when they visit an infected site.
Denial of Service Attacks	Attacks that focus on disrupting service to a network in which attackers send high volumes of data until the network becomes overloaded and can no longer function.
Man in the Middle	Man-in-the-Middle attacks mirror victims and endpoints for online information exchange. In this type of attack, the attacker communicates with the victims, who believe they are interacting with a legitimate endpoint website. The attacker is also communicating with the actual endpoint website by impersonating the victim. As the process goes through, the attacker obtains entered and received information from both the victim and endpoint.
Malvertising	Malware downloaded to a system when the victim clicks on an affected ad.
Advanced Persistent Threat (APT)	An attack in which the attacker gains access to a network and remains undetected. APT attacks are designed to steal data instead of cause damage.

Source: Danielson 2015

**Figure 15-1. Pop-Up Message Indicating Ransomware Infection**

With millions of threats created each day, the importance of protection against cyber attacks becomes a necessary function of everyday operations for individuals, government facilities, and businesses. The increasing dependency on technology for vital information storage and the often automated method of infection means higher stakes for the success of measurable protection and education.

Cyberterrorism

Cyberterrorism is the use of computers and information, particularly over the Internet, to recruit others to an organization's cause, cause physical or financial harm, or cause a severe disruption of infrastructure service. Such disruptions can be driven by religious, political, or other motives. Like traditional terrorism tactics, cyberterrorism seeks to evoke very strong emotional reactions, but it does so through information technology rather than a physically violent or disruptive action. Cyberterrorism has three main types of objectives (Kostadinov 2012):

- **Organizational**—Cyberterrorism with an organizational objective includes specific functions outside of or in addition to a typical cyber attack. Terrorist groups today use the internet on a daily basis. This daily use may include recruitment, training, fundraising, communication, or planning. Organizational cyberterrorism can use platforms such as social media as a tool to spread a message beyond country borders and instigate physical forms of terrorism. Additionally, organizational goals may use systematic attacks as a tool for training new members of a faction in cyber warfare.
- **Undermining**—Cyberterrorism with undermining as an objective seeks to hinder the normal functioning of computer systems, services, or websites. Such methods include defacing, denying, and exposing information. While undermining tactics are typically used due to high dependence on online structures to support vital operational functions, they typically do not result in grave consequences unless undertaken as part of a larger attack. Undermining attacks on computers include the following (Waldron 2011):
 - Directing conventional kinetic weapons against computer equipment, a computer facility, or transmission lines to create a physical attack that disrupts the reliability of equipment.
 - Using electromagnetic energy, most commonly in the form of an electromagnetic pulse, to create an electronic attack against computer equipment or data transmissions. By overheating circuitry or jamming communications, an electronic attack disrupts the reliability of equipment and the integrity of data.
 - Using malicious code directed against computer processing code, instruction logic, or data. The code can generate a stream of malicious network packets that disrupt data or logic by exploiting vulnerability in computer software, or a weakness in computer security practices. This type of cyber attack can disrupt the reliability of equipment, the integrity of data, and the confidentiality of communications (Wilson 2008)
- **Destructive**—The destructive objective for cyberterrorism is what organizations fear most. Through the use of computer technology and the Internet, the terrorists seek to inflict destruction or damage on tangible property or assets, and even death or injury to individuals. There are no cases of pure cyberterrorism as of the date of this Plan.

15.1.2 Technological Hazards

Technological hazards are associated with human activities such as the manufacture, transportation, storage and the use of hazardous materials. Incidents related to these hazards are assumed to be accidental, with unintended consequences. Technological hazards in Roseville can be categorized as follows:

- Hazardous materials incidents
- Power utility losses
- Data and telecommunications disruptions

- Water and wastewater disruption
- Air and transportation accidents
- Infrastructure threats.

Hazardous Materials Incidents

Hazardous materials are present in nearly every city and county in the United States in facilities that produce, store, or use them. For example, water treatment plants use chlorine on-site to eliminate bacterial contaminants. Hazardous materials are transported along interstate highways and railways daily. Even the natural gas used in every home and business is a dangerous substance when a leak occurs. Except for severe weather and flooding, hazardous materials incidents are the hazards most likely to affect the City of Roseville.

Title 49 of the CFR lists thousands of hazardous materials, including gasoline, insecticides, household cleaning products, and radioactive materials. State regulated substances that have the greatest probability of adversely impacting the community are listed in the CCR, Title 19. The following are the most common type of hazardous material incidents:

- **Fixed-Facility Hazardous Materials Incident**—This is the uncontrolled release of materials from a fixed site capable of posing a risk to health, safety and property. It is possible to identify and prepare for a fixed-site incident because federal and state laws require those facilities to notify state and local authorities about what is being used or produced at the site.
- **Hazardous Materials Transportation Incident**—A hazardous materials transportation incident is any event resulting in uncontrolled release of materials during transport that can pose a risk to health, safety, and property. Transportation incidents are difficult to prepare for because there is little if any notice about what materials could be involved should an accident happen. Hazardous materials transportation incidents can occur anywhere, although most occur on major federal or state highways or major rail lines. In addition to materials such as chlorine that are shipped throughout the country by rail, thousands of shipments of radiological materials, mostly medical materials and low-level radioactive waste, travel by ground transportation across the United States. Many incidents occur in sparsely populated areas and affect very few people. There are occasions, however, of accidents in areas with much higher population densities, such as the January 6, 2005 train accident in Graniteville, South Carolina, that released chlorine gas killing nine, injuring 500, and causing the evacuation of 5,400 residents.
- **Interstate Pipeline Hazardous Materials Incident**—There are a significant number of interstate natural gas, heating oil, and petroleum pipelines running through California. These are used to provide natural gas to utilities in California and to transport these materials from production facilities to end users.

Power Utility Losses

A power failure is any interruption or loss of electrical service due to disruption of power generation or transmission caused by an accident, sabotage, natural hazards, equipment failure, or fuel shortage. These interruptions can last anywhere from a few seconds to several days. Power failures are considered significant only if the local emergency management organization is required to coordinate basic services such as the provision of food, water, and heating as a result. Power failures are common with severe weather and winter storm activity. However, for medically dependent residents, a power failure can present a life-threatening situation.

The City of Roseville Electric Utility is responsible for operating and maintaining the electrical transmission and distribution system in Roseville. The City supplies electricity to about 56,000 residential and business customers within the service area according to the 2014 Roseville Electric Annual Report. The distribution lines and substations deliver 324 megawatts during peak demand period from June through September.

Roseville Electric has the highest reliability in the country for municipal utilities of its size, due in large part to a redundant system with sophisticated interconnection between the facilities and immediate notification should failure occur along the distribution system. Through its load management program and load shedding agreements with large, local electric users, the City of Roseville avoided any outages during electric crises and brownouts that affected some parts of California in 2000 and 2001.

Roseville has taken a proactive approach to maintaining its reliability standards by building a local generation source—the Roseville Energy Park. The Roseville Energy Park is a natural-gas-fired, combined-cycle electrical generating facility located on an 8.9-acre site adjacent to the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant. Since operations began in 2007, the state-of-the-art, 160-megawatt power generation facility generates enough energy to meet 40 percent of the community’s electricity needs.

Data and Telecommunications Disruptions

The loss of data and/or telecommunications is often a secondary hazard to natural and other human-caused hazards. Data and telecommunications provide a primary method for service to the community by the government and the private sector. A loss of data and telecommunications could result in loss of emergency dispatch capabilities, emergency planning services, infrastructure monitoring capabilities, access to statistical data, and loss of financial and personnel records. Losing the primary method of communication for emergency responders (radio) would severely disable their ability to respond in a timely and effective manner.

Water and Wastewater Disruption

Water or wastewater disruption is a secondary impact from a natural disaster or intentional act. The City of Roseville receives surface water from the Folsom Reservoir, a 1 million-acre-foot multi-purpose facility east of the City. A breach in the dam or the pipelines that carry water to the City’s Water Treatment Plant on Barton Road in Granite Bay would have significant temporary impacts on the City until alternative water sources, including water from other regional purveyors and groundwater, are pumped and treated. Long-term disruption of the water source from Folsom Lake would have significant impacts on residences and businesses in Roseville should demand exceed secondary supplies and water conservation measures not provide enough relief to reduce demand to equal the secondary supplies.

Disruption of the City’s wastewater collection and regional wastewater treatment plants at Dry Creek and Pleasant Grove Creek would also have significant citywide and regional impacts. Such disruption could result if the system were to be overwhelmed by a significant storm or discharge of materials in such quantities that the treatment plant could not adequately treat the waste. Natural hazards such as earthquake or flood, major power outages, or terrorism directed at the facilities and systems could disrupt the process of collecting and treating millions of gallons of waste. Wastewater treatment plants may also have emergencies internal to the plant such as oxygen deficiencies that render them incapable of treating waste. The disruption of service may also have significant environmental impacts on the waterways adjacent to the treatment plants.

Air and Transportation Accidents

Air and transportation accidents are incidents involving air or rail passengers resulting in death or serious injury. The region has a number of airports, including the Sacramento International Airport, as well as several smaller county or municipal airports and private air strips that enhance the potential for an air disaster.

Roseville features several major transportation routes, including Interstate 80 and Highway 65, both of which run through portions of the City. The potential for transportation accidents that block ingress, egress, and movement through the City is significant, as is the likelihood of hazardous material incidents resulting from a traffic accident.

15.1.3 Civil Disorder

Civil disorder refers to incidents that disrupt a community to the degree that law enforcement intervention is required to maintain public safety. These incidents are generally associated with controversial political, judicial, or economic issues and may occur at any time of the year, although statistics indicate that they are more frequent during summer. While Roseville has no history of civil disorder, large public gatherings associated with concerts or sports events have overburdened local law enforcement and fire protection resources in the past.

The effects of civil disorder vary with the type, severity, scope, and duration of event. Essential services (e.g., electricity, water, public transportation, communications) may be disrupted or property damage, injury and loss of life may occur. Facilities most at risk are government buildings, schools, utilities and correctional facilities.

15.2 HAZARD PROFILE

15.2.1 Past Events

State of California

Terrorism Events

According to the Governor's Office of Emergency Services Terrorism Response Plan, California has had a long history of defending the public against domestic and foreign terrorists. Domestic terrorist groups in California have been focused on political or social issues, while the limited internationally based incidents have targeted the state's immigrant communities due to foreign disputes. Advanced technologies and communication have allowed these groups to become more sophisticated and better organized, with remote members linked electronically.

Technological Hazard Incidents

No comprehensive source exists for technological hazard incidents in California. Given the complex system of transportation networks, the large population, and the number of businesses in California, incidents occur on a regular basis throughout the state, as reported by the news media.

Region

Terrorism Events

In 2005, development projects in Placer County were the subject of arson activity by an individual who claimed to be from the Earth Liberation Front or ELF, a splinter group of Earth First!, a radical environmental activist movement. ELF is a somewhat active domestic terrorism group that says it uses eco-sabotage to protect the Earth and to seek revenge on "those who are destroying the Earth and its inhabitants."

On December 3, 1999, the FBI arrested two anti-government militia members who planned a bomb attack at the Suburban Propane facility in Elk Grove, CA. The alleged plot involved a plan to blow up the Suburban Propane site, which stores about 24 million gallons of liquefied propane and is located one mile from residential homes. According to the Sacramento Bee, the plot resulted in heightened on-site security and a year-long investigation resulting in the two arrests.

Technological Hazard Incidents

Placer County and its incorporated cities have experienced many accidental hazardous materials incidents. Accidents involving high pressure gas lines in the County have caused injury and property damage. An underground Kinder Morgan pipeline failed in 2002, causing a significant spill of diesel fuel within a Rocklin

neighborhood adjacent to where the breach occurred (Former Roseville Fire Department Battalion Chief Jeff Carman, pers. com).

Air and Transportation Accidents

The Sacramento region was once the location of three large military installations: the Sacramento Army Depot, Mather Air Force Base and McClellan Air Force Base. All three have been decommissioned and transferred to civilian uses. The only active military installation is Beale Air Force Base, located to the north near Yuba City, California. A review of McClellan Fire Department history prior to the base closure identifies several responses to accidents near Roseville (see Table 15-3).

Table 15-3. Accidents Responded to by McClellan Fire Department, 1950-1980s

Timeframe	Incident
Early 1950s	Apparatus responded to Code 3 alarm at Travis Air Force Base for B-29 crash that involved a nuclear weapon
October 29, 1951	B-29 making an emergency landing crashed and caught fire on Runway 16 injuring 11 crewmen. One firefighter died.
Mid-1950s	EC-121 crashed near Watt Avenue and U Street in Sacramento
Mid-1960s	F-104 crashed next to Haggin Oaks Golf Course.
April 28, 1973	McClellan Fire Department responded to mutual aid at Roseville Rail Yard fire
1982	Multiple alarm fire including a chemical warehouse. Toxic smoke column closed Interstate 80 for several hours
Early 1980s	HH-53 helicopter crashed near PFE Road during an air show at McClellan Air Force Base. The helicopter was attempting a refueling operation with a C-130 refueler when the hose became entangled in the rotor.
Early 1980s	F-111 crashed near Woodland

Source: McClellan Fire Department History

While the risk of military aircraft accidents in the area has been reduced with the closure of McClellan Air Force Base, which was the closest military base to the City of Roseville, the region is not immune to air transportation accidents. On February 16, 2000, an aircraft crashed after take-off from the Sacramento Mather Airport in Rancho Cordova, California. The cargo flight was bound for Dayton, Ohio and all three crewmembers were killed. The cause of the accident was a mechanical failure. The aircraft crashed into an automobile salvage yard.

Local

Air and Transportation Accidents

On February 12, 2006, a Glasair II-S FT kit plane crashed into a home at 1302 Longfellow Drive in Roseville (see Figure 15-2). The pilot was reported to be performing aerial acrobatics when he lost control of the plane and it crashed. The pilot, his passenger, and a resident in the house were killed, and the home was determined to be a total loss. The fire spread to an adjacent home and caused significant damage, however the residents escaped injury.



Figure 15-2. February 12, 2006 Aircraft Crash into Residence

Arson Events

On October 21, 2010, an arsonist set fire to the Roseville Galleria Mall that caused an estimated \$55 million in property damage (see Figure 15-3). Police responded to the mall after a call from the tenant at GameSpot. They said a young male had entered, said he had a gun, and told them to get out. When police arrived, the male, who did not have a gun, had locked himself in the store. Once barricaded, he started a fire. The blaze destroyed an entire section of the mall, which is a core of the Sacramento economy. With over 240 stores operated by Westfield, the mall – built in 2000 and renovated in 2008 for \$270 million – has generated \$3.2 million in annual sales tax for the region. Reasons for the arson are unknown. The suspect suffered from mental illness.



Figure 15-3. October 21, 2010 Arson Fire at Galleria Mall

Terrorism Events

Terrorism incidents in Roseville have been limited to individuals seeking to cause damage at Roseville schools. Pipe bombs have been left at a school facility in one past occurrence. No WMDs have been used in a terrorist attack in Roseville.

Technological Hazard Incidents

The City of Roseville has had a number of accidental incidents at the Roseville Rail Yard, private businesses and City facilities. The Fire Department has been called to both the Oakmont High School pool and the Roseville Aquatics Center for chlorine leaks. Sewage spills have occurred on occasion and overflowed into the City's creeks. Roseville Rail Yard accidents have included derailments and leaks of toxic chemicals from transporting hazardous materials in the wrong type of railcars.

The worst human-caused disaster in Roseville's history occurred on April 28, 1973 when a train loaded with munitions bound for Vietnam caught fire in the Roseville Yard (see Figure 15-4). No lives were lost, but significant damage to property in Roseville and jurisdictions in Sacramento County occurred during the 18 hours of explosions. In 1997, a number of unexploded bombs were discovered at the yard during construction of a modernization project (see Figure 15-5).

Roseville's history parallels that of the transcontinental railroad. The federal government passed the act to build the transcontinental railroad in 1862 and shortly thereafter the Central Pacific Railroad was started in Sacramento in 1863. A northern route for the first transcontinental rail line was selected when the South seceded from the Union during the Civil War, and Trustees Charles Crocker, Mark Hopkins, Collis P. Huntington and Leland Stanford started construction on this northern line. The line extended from Sacramento to Rocklin by May 1864 and then construction across the Sierra Nevada Mountains began.

The first structure in Roseville was built in 1864 to serve as a freight and passenger depot for the fledgling railroad. In December 1905, a decision by the Central Pacific Railroad to move the division headquarters from Rocklin to Roseville meant a development boom for Roseville. The junction of the Central Pacific Railroad and the California Central, a north-south line became Roseville, where the largest artificial ice plant in the world operated to keep California's fruit and vegetables fresh as they were transported by rail car to the East. The Pacific Fruit Exchange Ice Plant operated from 1908 to 1974 when all of Southern Pacific's 21,000 rail cars were self-refrigerating.

During wartime, Roseville was a hub of activity as troops and war materials moved through the Roseville rail yards. Thousands of munitions shipments moved through Roseville during World Wars I and II, the Korean and Vietnam conflicts, and Desert Storm.

The largest human-caused disaster in the local area occurred on April 28, 1973 when a wooden floor in a munitions boxcar caught fire from brake shoe sparks. A train engine pulling 103 cars, including 21 Department of Defense freight cars with 7,056 Mark 81 bombs, was loaded at the Navy's ammunition depot in Hawthorne, Nevada on their way to western ports and the Vietnam War.

As the train pulled in to the Roseville yard just west of the Roseville city limits, one of the cars caught fire and the flames spread, igniting other freight cars on the tracks, which were 21 rails wide. Nearly every car was loaded with cargo including paint, lumber, and fertilizer. The most dramatic explosions occurred when cars carrying liquid propane caught fire resulting in explosions that blew out windows five miles away and could be heard 100 miles away. Metal and wood was thrown 3,000 feet into the air.

The result was a series of explosions that caused damages of more than \$5.6 million in Roseville and the neighboring communities of Citrus Heights, Antelope, and North Highlands. No lives were lost, but over 100 people were treated for assorted cuts and bruises caused by broken glass and flying debris.

After 18 hours of explosions, Army munitions teams recovered 1,200 unexploded bombs scattered around the area and collected another 300 from rail cars. Aerial photographs from that time show a railroad smoldering and piled with twisted track, shattered cars, and scraps of metal from bomb casings. Much of the debris was buried in the 10-foot-deep craters left by the blast.

Milestones & Memories: the Story of Roseville, California, 1850-2000 by Leonard "Duke" Davis



Figure 15-4. 1973 Roseville Rail Yard Disaster

In 1997, Union Pacific Railroad began work on a \$130 million project to modernize the Roseville train yard, including significant automation improvements and the replacement of 86 miles of track with 136 miles of new track.

During project grading, backhoe operators uncovered a Mark 81 bomb intact. Bomb disposal experts from Moffett Field in Mountain View, California were flown in by the Sacramento Sheriff's Department to dispose of the bomb, which they do by digging a pit and exploding the ordnance. When another eight bombs were discovered at the western end of the yard in Antelope, California unexploded ordnance experts from Moffett Field were called back and made the decision to place the bombs in pits and build berms around them. The Sacramento County Sheriff evacuated 300 to 400 homes near the rail yard, and at 2 a.m. blew up the bombs. The explosions shattered windows, cracked walls, and rained shrapnel through the roofs of nearby homes

In all, recovered materials included 16 unexploded MK 81 bombs; 11 partial fragments containing explosive residue; 8,625 pounds (4.31 tons) of bomb fragments; and 131,560 pounds (65.78 tons) of ferrous material. Experts found the bombs were not fused (armed), making them less likely to accidentally detonate. The bombs not destroyed on-site were packaged and transported to a facility in Colfax, Louisiana for detonation.



Figure 15-5. 1997 Bomb Discovery

With growth in the region and in trips through the region to tourist destinations such as the ski resorts at Lake Tahoe, the number of traffic accidents has been steadily increasing. Fatal traffic accidents since 2009 are shown in Table 15-4. Truck with trailer accidents account for a small percentage of the City's reported traffic accidents, but they represent the highest potential for hazardous materials incidents on roadways in the City of Roseville.

Table 15-4. Traffic Accident Counts—2009 to 2014

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Vehicles Involved in Fatal Accidents	10	8	8	12	10	1
Fatalities	6	6	5	6	2	1

Source: <http://www.city-data.com/accidents/acc-Roseville-California.html>

15.2.2 Location

Large population centers, high visibility tourist attractions, and critical infrastructure accessible to the public present security challenges of an ongoing nature in California. The network of highways, railways, ports and airports used to transport significant amounts of hazardous materials poses a significant technological hazards threat. Hazardous materials incidents may occur anywhere in Placer County. Multiple incidents may happen simultaneously, and all typically require a multi-agency, multi-jurisdictional response. The following sections describe the local areas with the greatest likelihood of hazardous materials incidents, as identified in the *Roseville Hazardous Materials Contingency Plan*.

Transportation Routes

The following transportation facilities have the potential to be affected by human-caused hazards:

- Interstate 80 and State Route 65 bisect the City.
- The J.R. Davis Yard in Roseville, the largest train yard west of the Mississippi, is a major Union Pacific switching center built in 1907 (see Figure 15-6). The 850-acre yard includes 136 miles of track. The site includes a former railcar rebuilding facility, the Antelope Yard, fueling areas, and diesel servicing facilities. The site has been designated as contaminated by the federal government, with substances including volatile organics, chlorinated solvents, polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons, and heavy metals present due to decades of continuous use as a railroad repair and switching facility. Remediation is ongoing at the site.
- Sacramento International Airport in northwestern Sacramento County operates continuously with two major runways and thousands of passengers traveling via commercial and private airlines. Several major airlines operate out of Sacramento International Airport, with most flying light- to medium-weight passenger jets. Approach and takeoff patterns are usually over rural farmland; however, occasionally patterns are adjusted over more populated locations including Roseville. The City is more than 20 miles from Sacramento International Airport and is not in the direct flight path for the airport, although planes do cross Roseville continuously at high altitudes.
- Additional airports within a 20-mile radius of Roseville include the Lincoln and Auburn Airports in Placer County, Beale Air Force Base (34 miles to the north and the closest active military installation), McClellan Airfield, and the Yuba County airport. The instrument-landing approach to Runway 16 at McClellan crosses a portion of the western edge of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Area. Aircraft on approach fly as low as 1,600 feet at Baseline Road (approximately 4 miles from the runway threshold). Aircraft using McClellan Airpark include aircraft as large as Boeing 747 and 707 aircraft, in addition to Coast Guard C-130s. Additionally, the National Guard flies T-38 aircraft and Blackhawk helicopters out of Mather Air Force Base.
- Sutter Roseville Medical Center maintains a helistop for critically injured patients flown to the hospital. At one time, the facility was limited to accepting one helicopter. If another patient was being transported

to the medical center, the Roseville Fire Department had to respond to the helipad and emergency medical personnel were on standby should anything occur with more than one helicopter using the helipad. The landing area has been expanded and now the helistop has the capacity to accept more than one helicopter at any one time.

- Emergency and public safety helicopter traffic as well as media aircraft and small commercial aircraft frequently fly over the interstates to respond to emergencies and provide public information via local news media.
- Roseville has a number of established truck routes with a higher potential for hazardous material incidents to occur as a result of traffic incidents, as shown in Figure 15-7.



Figure 15-6. The J.R. Davis Yard in Roseville, the Largest Train Yard West of the Mississippi




Figure 15-7. Roseville Truck Routes with High Potential for Hazardous Materials Incidents

Pipelines

The Kinder Morgan company owns 3 miles of pipelines generally parallel to the Union Pacific railroad tracks in Roseville that transport high volumes of natural gas through the City (Figure 15-8 shows the company's national pipelines). Other natural gas pipelines run along Interstate 80 with connections between Roseville and Chico. The route to Chico travels through residential areas from the tank farm in Rocklin. The trans-Sierra route from the tank farm in Rocklin to Reno roughly follows the same track as Interstate 80. Pacific Gas and Electric maintains natural gas pipelines in and through Roseville as well.




Figure 15-8. Kinder Morgan National Pipeline Map

Business and Industrial Areas

Retail, manufacturing and light industrial firms near State Route 65 (northeastern Roseville and the Sunset Industrial Area of Rocklin) are areas of concern. These facilities have the highest concentration of hazardous materials at fixed facilities in Roseville due to their manufacturing operations. Each business is required to file a detailed, confidential plan with the Roseville Fire Department regarding materials on-site and safety measures taken to protect the public.

Agricultural

Accidental releases of pesticides, fertilizers, and other agricultural chemicals may be harmful to both humans and the environment. Agricultural pesticides are transported daily in and around Roseville en route to their destination in rural areas of Placer County.

Illegal Drug Operations

Illegal operations such as laboratories for methamphetamine pose a significant hazard. Laboratory residues are often dumped along roadways or left in rented hotel rooms, creating a serious health hazard to unsuspecting individuals and to the environment.

Illegal Dumping Sites

Hazardous wastes such as used motor oil, solvents, or paint are occasionally dumped in remote areas of Placer County and Roseville or along roadways, creating a potential health hazard to unsuspecting individuals and to the environment.

Radioactive Materials

Licensed carriers transport radioactive materials along several transportation routes (Interstate 80 and the railroads) through the City of Roseville. The City is notified in advance of these shipments and commits resources as a standby measure should an accident occur.

15.2.3 Frequency

Terrorism

As of 2014, California's economy was the largest of any state in the U.S. Placer County's proximity to the state capitol presents unique conditions for terrorist attacks. The transportation, energy, and communications systems that cross the county have impacts on the local, regional, and even national economy. In general, the risks of a terrorist event involving a WMD are as follows:

- **Chemical**—The risk of a chemical event is present in the City of Roseville. The agricultural community in Placer County uses and stores significant amounts of chemicals for peaceful and productive means that could be used in destructive ways.
- **Explosives**—Pipe bomb and suspicious package events have occurred in Placer County and Roseville in the past. While none of the events has been identified as a WMD, the elements necessary to construct a WMD are readily available. Additionally, the agricultural communities maintain sufficient products and quantities for use in explosive events.
- **Radiological/Nuclear**—The major transportation arteries for vehicles or rail that cross through or near the City of Roseville contribute to the risk of a radiological event. Such products can pass unknown through any one of the regional transportation corridors.
- **Biological**—Anthrax incidents that occurred in the U.S. in October 2001 demonstrate the potential for spreading terror through biological WMDs. The introduction of Newcastle disease in the United States demonstrates how an agent can be introduced to livestock, causing harm to public health and the economy.
- **Combined Hazards**—WMD agents can be combined to have a greater total effect. When combined, the impacts of the event can be immediate and longer-term. Casualties will likely suffer from both immediate and long-term burns and contamination. Given the risks associated with chemical agents in Placer County and the City of Roseville, the possibility exists for such a combined event to occur.

Technological

Hazardous material incidents may occur at any time in the City of Roseville, given the presence of transportation routes bisecting the City, the location of businesses and industry that use hazardous materials, the presence of scattered illegitimate businesses such as clandestine drug laboratories at any given time, and the improper disposal of hazardous waste.

15.2.4 Severity

The severity of human-caused hazards could range from a minor transportation accident or power outage to a full-scale terrorist attack.

The term mass casualty incident (MCI) is often applied to transportation accidents involving air and rail travel, as well as multi-vehicle highway accidents. However, MCIs may also result from hazardous materials incidents or acts of violence, such as shootings or hostage situations. Effects may include serious injuries, loss of life, and associated property damage.

Because large numbers of patients may be involved, significant MCIs may tax local emergency medical and hospital resources, and therefore require a regional response. MCIs may occur throughout the City, day or night, at any time of the year: Interstate 80, State Route 65, and State Route 49 offer the potential for MCIs because of the heavy volume of traffic, although no highway or surface street in the City is exempt from this hazard.

The railroad tracks traversing Placer County, carrying Amtrak passengers as well as freight, also face the risk of an MCI, as do the air corridors above the county. Adverse weather may play a role in roadway, air, or rail accidents. MCIs may also result from acts of violence or terrorism, which could include a chemical, biological or radiological incident, contaminating persons and requiring mass decontamination.

In Placer County, an MCI is defined as any incident with three or more fatalities or critically injured. The first responders, including Roseville Fire, Roseville Police, and emergency room staffs at the local hospitals, follow the same protocol for an MCI whether the number of dead and injured is three, 30 or 300. Mutual aid is requested should Roseville be unable to respond appropriately with available personnel and equipment.

15.2.5 Warning Time

According to the Roseville Terrorism Contingency Plan, only 5 percent of all terrorism incidents are preceded by a warning. In the case of a technological hazard, accidents occur without predictability under circumstances that give responders little time to prepare.

15.3 SECONDARY HAZARDS

The largest secondary impact caused by human-caused hazards would be economic. Economic impacts from human-caused hazards are described in Section 15.5.5.

15.4 EXPOSURE

The risk assessment for this hazard is based on a facility's criticality and physical vulnerability:

- Criticality is a measure of the potential consequence of an accidental or terrorist event as well as the attractiveness of the facility to a potential adversary or threat. The criticality for each critical facility is based on the factors shown in Table 15-5.
- Vulnerability is a measure of the physical opportunity for an accident or an adversarial attack. This assessment takes into consideration physical design, existing countermeasures, and site layout. The vulnerability for each critical facility is based on the criteria shown in Table 15-6.

Table 15-5. Criticality Factors

Criterion	Low Criticality	Medium Criticality	High Criticality
Awareness^a	Not known/Neighborhood	City/Region/County	State/National
Hazardous Materials^b	None / limited and secure	Moderate to large and secure	Large, minimum or no security
Collateral Damage Potential^c	None or low	Moderate/immediate area or within 1 mile radius	High/immediate area or within 1 mile radius

Site Population ^d	0 – 300	301 – 1,000	1,001 or greater
Public/ Emergency Function ^e	No emergency function, or could be used for emergency function in the future	Support emergency function—redundant site	Emergency function—critical service with or without redundancy

- Awareness—How aware is the public of the existence of the facility, site, system, or location?
- Hazardous Materials—Are flammable, explosive, biological, chemical and/or radiological materials present on site?
- Collateral Damage Potential—What are the potential consequences for the surrounding area if the asset is attacked or damaged?
- Site Population—What is the potential for mass casualties, based on the capacity of the facility.
- Public or Emergency Functions—Does the facility perform a function during an emergency? Is this facility or function capable of being replicated elsewhere?

Table 15-6. Vulnerability Criteria

Criterion	Low Vulnerability	Medium Vulnerability	High Vulnerability
Accessibility^a	Remote location, secure perimeter, tightly controlled access	Controlled access, protected or unprotected entry	Open access, unrestricted, patrolling security, sign restrictions
Automobile Proximity^b	Not within 75' – 100'	Not within 25' – 50'	Adjacent or not within 10'
Asset Mobility^c	Moves or is relocated frequently	Moves or is relocated occasionally	Permanent/Fixed
Proximity to other Critical Facilities^d	Greater than 1.5 – 2 miles	Greater than 3/4 - 1 mile	Within 1/2 – 3/4 mile
Secure Design^e	No areas for concealment of packages, air intakes are on roof, access ways are not under the structure.	Area of concealment present, greater than 25' from the structure; Air intakes located at least 10' above ground, may have under structure access drives.	Areas of concealment within 25', air intakes at ground level, under structure access drives.

- Accessibility—How accessible is the facility or site to the public?
- Automobile Proximity—How close can an automobile get to the facility? How vulnerable is the facility to a car bomb attack?
- Asset Mobility—Is the facility or asset's location fixed or mobile? If mobile, how often is it moved, relocated, or repositioned?
- Proximity to other critical facilities—If the facility is close to other critical facilities then there could be an increased probability of the facility receiving collateral damage.
- Secure design—General evaluation of areas of obstruction, air intake locations, parking lot and road design and locations and other site design aspects.

15.4.1 Population

A human-caused hazard event could range from an isolated accident to a coordinated attack by multiple agents upon multiple targets. Large-scale incidents have the potential to kill or injure many citizens in the immediate vicinity, and may also affect people a relative distance from the initial event. Variables affecting exposure for a WMD attack and a hazardous material accident include the physical and chemical properties of the WMD, the ambient temperature, wind speed, wind direction, barometric pressure, and humidity.

Computer models are used by Roseville's Hazardous Materials teams to provide general data to first responders to advise evacuations or sheltering in place. With so many variables to determine "toxic endpoints" as defined by the California Environmental Protection Agency, distances are difficult to forecast. In general, those close to the City's transportation corridors or businesses with acutely hazardous materials are more at risk for some sort of effect. Each chemical incident will be different and the scenarios are too numerous to describe in this Plan.

Hazardous materials pose a significant risk to emergency response personnel. All potential first responders and follow-on emergency personnel in the City of Roseville currently are and will be properly trained to the level of emergency response actions required of their individual position at the response scene. Hazardous materials also pose a serious long-term threat to public health and safety, property and the environment.

15.4.2 Property

According to the City of Roseville's 2035 General Plan, there were 49,998 housing units in the City as of 2010. Single-family detached residential units account for 75.7 percent of the total developed residential units in Roseville according to the City's current General Plan. The total number of units by type of dwelling unit is shown in Table 15-7.

Table 15-7. Residential Dwelling Units in the City of Roseville as of 2012

Type of Unit	Existing Citywide Units
Single Family	35,809
Mobile Home	491
Multi-Family (>=3 units attached)	10,988
Total	47,288

Source: City of Roseville 2035 General Plan, Housing Element

Roseville has over 27 million square feet of developed non-residential land uses covering over 3,000 acres city-wide. A majority of this development has occurred since the mid-1980s when the specific plan process was established and large tracts of land were entitled for development. Roseville and Placer County are among the fastest growing communities in California, making them a higher profile target for terrorism. New development has been the target of arson fires and eco-terrorism in the County.

15.4.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

There are no high profile federal or state buildings in Roseville. Critical facilities are limited to City facilities, Placer County facilities, and other government facilities such as the U.S. Post Office, private utility infrastructure and administrative offices, and medical facilities. Roseville's civic facilities are designed to welcome the public, with convenient parking and customer service areas. Except for the Roseville Police Facility, there are limited secure areas that are restricted to the public. Based on the criticality factors and vulnerability criteria described above, these facilities are all at risk because of their accessibility, automobile accessibility, and lack of a secure or hardened design.

Several of Roseville's critical emergency response facilities are located adjacent to the Roseville Rail Yard and pressurized underground pipelines, including the Roseville Civic Center, a primary location for City staff and services (see Figure 15-9), the Roseville Fire Department, which houses administration functions in Fire Station No. 1, and the City's emergency operations center. Significant regional critical facilities such as the Placer County courts and the main office for the U.S. Post Office are also close to the rail yard.



Figure 15-9. Roseville Civic Center

Several factors make gathering places such as the Roseville Civic Center vulnerable to human-caused hazards:

- All are accessible to the general public, to benefit aesthetically pleasing design and customer service.
- Design features, including types of building materials, and screened enclosures for mechanical equipment and solid waste, limit visibility and may contribute to the damage incurred should an intentional or accidental event occur.
- Automobile access is required in the design of most buildings in Roseville, with disabled access parking and easily accessible parking a valued feature.
- Most high population centers do not feature any limitations to access by the public or vehicles, although restricted access to large employment center sites with acutely hazardous materials is built into the design at these facilities.

15.4.4 Environment

The risk of human-caused hazards to the environment is considerable. Hazardous materials spilled along roads or railways could easily pollute rivers, streams, wetlands, riparian areas and adjoining fields. Other hazardous materials released into the air could severely impact plant and animal species. The City of Roseville recognizes this risk and has taken steps to reduce the risk exposure to the natural environment. By reducing the risk exposure to the built environment, the City will also mitigate potential losses to the natural environment.

15.5 VULNERABILITY

15.5.1 Population

Although human-caused hazards have not resulted in a large number of deaths in this area, this type of hazard can be deadly and widespread. Injuries and casualties were not estimated for this hazard. Any individuals exposed to human-caused hazards are considered to be at risk, particularly those working as first responder professionals.

15.5.2 Property

All structures in Roseville are physically vulnerable to a human-caused hazard. The emphasis on accessibility, the opportunity for roof access, driveways underneath some structures, unmonitored areas, the proximity of many structures to transportation corridors and underground pipelines, and the potential for a terrorist to strike any structure randomly all have an impact on the vulnerability of structures. Specific vulnerabilities are on file with the Roseville Fire Department as part of a State Homeland Security Assessment Survey and surveys conducted to complete this mitigation plan.

15.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

Most critical facilities and infrastructure in Roseville would be vulnerable to human-caused hazards, including utilities, data and telecommunications systems, and transportation facilities.

15.5.4 Environment

The environment vulnerable to a human-caused hazard is the same as the environment exposed to the hazard. While human-caused disasters have caused significant damage to the environment, estimating damage can be difficult. Loss estimation platforms such as HAZUS-MH are not equipped to measure environmental impacts of these types of hazards. The best gauge of vulnerability of the environment would be a review of damage from past human-caused hazard events. Loss data for damage to the environment were not available at the time of this Plan update. Capturing this data from future events could be beneficial in measuring the vulnerability of the environment for future updates.

15.5.5 Economic impacts

Economic impacts from human-caused hazards could be significant. The cost of a terrorist act would be felt in terms of loss of life and property, disruption of business activity and long-term emotional impacts. Recovery would take significant resources at the local level.

Utility losses could cause a reduction in employment, wholesale and retail sales, utility repairs, and increased medical risks. The City may lose sales tax and property taxes, and the finances of private utility companies and the businesses that rely on them would be disrupted.

The economic impact of data and telecommunications losses can be great, as computer security breaches, crime conducted via the world wide web such as identity theft, and many more forms of human-caused economic losses occur daily. Millions of dollars are lost each year as criminals and cyberterrorists steal sensitive information and funds from individuals and organizations.

The economic impacts would be significant if a transportation facility were rendered impassable. The loss of a roadway or railway would have serious effects on the City's economy and ability to provide services. Loss of travel routes on Interstate 80 or State Route 65 would result in loss of commerce, and may impact the City's ability to provide emergency services to its citizens by delaying response times or limiting routes for equipment such as fire apparatus, police vehicles, and ambulances. Fuel deliveries would also be impacted.

The effects of re-routed traffic could also have a serious impact on local roadways. For example, the closure of the roadway at Folsom Dam has resulted in severe local traffic and the closure of businesses in downtown Folsom due to lack of traffic along the Dam Road route. Heavy traffic on routes through central Roseville already occur at peak commute times when Interstate 80 is congested. Traffic control may burden the City's Public Works Department. Mass transit services would be impacted as routes may be delayed or forced to be detoured, causing economic impacts on Roseville transit and on those who ride buses in Roseville.

15.6 FUTURE TRENDS IN DEVELOPMENT

The potential for human-caused hazards in Roseville is not likely to lessen or prohibit development in Roseville. The threat of human-caused hazards and the availability of Homeland Security Funds will influence future development of the City's critical facilities. Multi-purpose facilities such as the Mahany Library (which also includes a community center and the public access studio) can be used as both an emergency response command center on the west side of Roseville and an information center to inform the public through the internet and broadcast facilities that will be on site.

15.7 REVIEW OF EXISTING ORDINANCES, PROGRAMS, AND PLANS

15.7.1 City of Roseville Emergency Response Plan

Adopted on July 21, 2004 and updated in 2010, the Roseville Emergency Operations Plan addresses the planned response to emergency situations associated with natural disasters, technological (human-caused) emergencies, and war emergency operations in or affecting the City of Roseville. The plan is an operational plan as well as a reference document for pre-emergency planning and emergency operations. It establishes the following:

- An emergency management organization to mitigate any significant emergency or disaster affecting the City of Roseville
- Policies, responsibilities and procedures to protect the health and safety of citizens, public and private property, and the environment from the effects of natural and human-caused emergencies and disasters
- Operational concepts and procedures associated with field response to emergencies, emergency operations center activities, and the recovery process
- A framework for implementing the Standardized Emergency Management System in Roseville.

The Emergency Operations Plan outlines the natural and human-caused hazards most likely to occur in Roseville. It provides significant detail for each responding section assigned to City staff and mutual aid agencies prior to an emergency—management, operations, planning, logistics and finance. Roseville's Emergency Preparedness Manager conducts periodic tabletop and simulated exercises in conjunction with the Placer County Office of Emergency Services and affiliated agencies such as Sutter Roseville Medical Center and Kaiser Permanente Medical Center to ensure that staff is prepared and adequate resources are in place prior to any incident.

City of Roseville departments and other agencies providing emergency response within the City will review this plan at least annually in association with the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Steering Committee. A comprehensive review and subsequent gap analysis report was conducted on the Roseville Emergency Operations Plan in conjunction with the 2016 hazard mitigation planning process. Prioritized recommendations for revisions were provided to the City of Roseville.

15.7.2 City of Roseville Terrorism Contingency Plan

The City of Roseville Terrorism Contingency Plan was prepared in 2004 with grant funds provided through Cal OES by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. The plan was prepared in collaboration with the Placer

County Office of Emergency Services, Placer County staff and representatives of the six incorporated cities in the Placer County Operational Area. The Terrorism Plan provides an overview of how the Emergency Operations Plan will be activated, how resources will be organized, and how staff will respond with state and federal resources. Specifically, the Terrorism Plan has the following provisions:

- Identifies how local, state, and federal response resources are integrated.
- Establishes a common response protocol to terrorist threats and events.
- Implements existing mutual aid programs.
- Outlines a unified strategic plan for all responders.

The Terrorism Plan is on file with the City of Roseville Fire Department. The City's Emergency Response Manager conducts training for all those assigned responsibilities as part of the plan in addition to coordinating with the Placer County Office of Emergency Services and other agencies charged with protecting the public in the event of a terrorist attack.

15.7.3 City of Roseville Hazardous Materials Contingency Plan

The Hazardous Materials Contingency Plan, completed in September 2004, identifies non-terrorist related hazardous materials responsibilities in order for the City to prepare, respond and recover from an event. The objectives of the Hazardous Materials Plan are as follows:

- Establish policies and responsibilities for protecting the health and safety of the general population and visitors in the City of Roseville and surrounding communities, the environment, and public and private property from the effects of accidental hazardous materials incidents.
- Identify the emergency response organizations that are responsible for managing hazardous materials incidents in or near the City of Roseville.
- Establish operational concepts for staffing, training, operating and supporting the City of Roseville hazardous materials team. The Hazardous Materials Plan is coordinated with the Placer Operational Interagency Response Team Hazard Plan.
- Direct all individuals, agencies, and departments referenced in the Hazardous Materials Plan to develop standard operating procedures and emergency response checklists that are consistent with the Hazardous Materials Plan and the City's Emergency Operations Plan.

15.7.4 State of California Certified Unified Program Agency

The City of Roseville is a State of California Certified Unified Program Agency. This designation identifies the City as a licensing agency for six hazardous-material-related programs. It enables the City of Roseville to implement its own hazardous materials emergency response program. Mutual aid agreements are also in place for incident response. Each business that responds yes to any of the following questions must submit a Unified Program Consolidated Form with facility information to the Roseville Fire Department:

- **Hazardous Materials**—Do you have on-site hazardous materials at or above 55 gallons for liquids, 500 pounds for solids, or 200 cubic feet for compressed gases, or the applicable threshold for an extremely hazardous substance specified in federal law; or do you handle radiological materials in quantities for which an emergency plan is required pursuant to applicable law?
- **Underground Storage Tank**—Do you have on-site underground storage tanks?
- **Above-Ground Storage Tank**—Do you have on-site above-ground storage tanks for storage of petroleum?
- **Hazardous Waste**—Do you operate a facility that generates, recycles, or treats hazardous waste, among other activities?

The Fire Department requires existing and proposed businesses to submit lists of hazardous materials they use. The list is maintained by the Fire Department Life Safety/Hazardous Materials Officer and updated periodically.

15.7.5 Roseville Police Department

Following the provisions and emergency response, mitigation, and recovery structure of the State Emergency Management System, the federally mandated National Incident Management System, and the National Response Plan, the Roseville Police Department is prepared to meet the challenge of intentional criminal acts, including acts of terrorism, as well as technological, accidental, or natural hazards in the following ways:

- Activation of local emergency response plans using multi-disciplinary resources, including but not limited to regional municipal and county law enforcement, the Joint Terrorism Task Force overseen by the FBI, the Department of Justice Anti-Terrorism Information Center, state and federal military personnel, and private resource agencies
- Deployment of local tactical resources to mitigate human-caused acts of terrorism or intentional business disruption, including SWAT, hostage negotiators, rapid containment team, the tactical communications team, and explosive ordnance personnel as necessary
- Use of the Crime Scene Investigations Unit for post-incident evidence collection and investigation
- Intake, processing, analysis, and investigation of all incidents with the potential for large-scale impact in a professional, timely manner.

15.7.6 Roseville Public Safety Communications

Communications personnel are prepared to take the following actions:

- Appropriately recognize and document citizens' reports of suspicious activity.
- Deploy appropriate resources to prevent, investigate, mitigate, and provide recovery services following incidents of human caused hazards, as well as natural and technological disasters.
- Coordinate resource management of personnel, equipment, and facilities during established crisis incidents.
- Work within the framework of the State Emergency Management System to provide emergency communications to field units and emergency operations personnel during emergency events.
- Deploy mutual aid assistance in support of local, state, and national entities during crisis incidents.
- Provide life-saving pre-arrival instructions on emergency medical incidents, both large-scale and of an individual nature.

15.7.7 Roseville Fire Department

Training

Roseville Fire Department personnel are highly trained to handle all aspects of emergency service. All first response personnel are trained in incident command, advanced firefighting skills, basic life support, essential rescue skills, and basic hazardous materials response. All first response personnel are trained to meet or exceed the following state training certification levels: Firefighter I & II, CPR, Emergency Medical Technician I, Hazmat First Responder Operations Decon and ICS 200.

To support these first responders, specialized teams of personnel are trained and certified in tower rescue, above/below grade rescue, confined space rescue, trench rescue, technical rescue, swift water rescue, dive rescue, specialized hazardous materials response, hazardous materials railcar and tank truck response, terrorism response, multi-casualty management, and advanced life support.

The department's staffing includes a full-time training officer who oversees the Fire Training Division. In addition to the training officer, the department draws from a cadre of state certified ICS, fire, EMS, hazmat and technical rescue instructors to conduct regular training exercises to maintain and enhance competency of personnel in all aspects of emergency response. The department also sends personnel to the National Fire Academy, California Specialized Training Institute, Hazmat Continuing Challenge and other off site programs for advanced certifications and training.

The Fire Department maintains a state-of-the-art training facility within the city limits. The Fire Training Center includes two classrooms, a six-story burn tower, command center and other specialized training props such as above- and below-grade vaults, tanks, cargo tanks and a rail tank car. The Roseville Fire Training Center has been state certified as a regional fire academy and for Hazardous Materials Technician / Specialist, Urban Search and Rescue Systems and Confined Space training.

In addition to training in-service response personnel, the Roseville Fire Training Center hosts a regional fire academy in cooperation with Sierra College. The Roseville Fire Training Center also provides regional training to other fire agencies, some of which are under contract with the Department of Homeland Security. Regular regional training includes the Hazardous Materials Technician / Specialist series, Low Angle Rope Rescue, Trench Rescue, Confined Space Rescue, and Urban Search and Rescue Systems I.

Response Time and Mutual Aid

The Roseville Fire Department is a fully functional agency that primarily provides fire suppression and emergency medical services for the urban environment of the City. The department operates eight stations. The department has eight paramedic engine companies, with a minimum staffing of three, two paramedic truck companies with a minimum staffing of four, and one battalion chief. The department also operates a hazardous materials response unit (cross-staffed the truck company); five grass/wildland units, and one technical rescue unit (cross-staffed by engine companies). The department maintains four reserve engines and one reserve truck.

The Fire Department has established a Standards of Response Coverage Plan that includes a travel time standard of 4 minutes from the time the apparatus leaves the station to the arrival of the first engine on scene. Due to significant growth in the City, additional fire stations are needed to achieve this response time. Fire Station 9 opened in May 2013 to serve the new development anticipated in West Roseville.

The City of Roseville has mutual aid agreements with local fire departments and districts in surrounding Placer County and Sacramento County. These personnel cooperate in the same training program as the City firefighters to ensure a high level of competency even with borrowed resources. The department participates in the statewide mutual aid system to bring additional resources from anywhere in California or the nation if this level of aid does not meet the incident needs.

Hazardous Materials Response

Hazardous Materials Listing

All hazardous materials handlers that store in excess of 55 gallons of liquid, 500 pounds of solids, or 200 cubic feet of gas are required to submit Hazardous Materials Management Business Plans to the Roseville Fire Department. These plans provide emergency contact information, site-specific chemical inventories, and vicinity and facility maps. Facilities storing materials that are "acutely" hazardous and in excess of the quantities in CCR, Title 19, Tables I, II or III must submit a more comprehensive Risk Management Plan, which includes off-site consequences analysis, maintenance, and training programs, and an executive summary. Owners/operators of above-ground tanks containing in excess of 660 gallons of petroleum hydrocarbons (or an aggregate quantity of 1,320 gallons) must comply with the California Aboveground Petroleum Storage Act, which requires the preparation of a spill prevention, control, and countermeasure plan.

Development Review Process

The Fire Department reviews any development proposal that may be impacted by or cause an impact related to the storage, handling, or disposal of hazardous materials. A Hazardous Materials Management Plan and, if necessary, a Risk Management Prevention Plan are required as part of the development process per state law. When considering any use, the City analyses the use of toxic or hazardous materials requiring the filing of a business plan for emergency response pursuant to Section 25503.5 of the California Health and Safety Code or materials identified in Section 5194, Title 8 of the CCR. All users must submit a list of hazardous and toxic materials with a qualified discussion of potential chronic and acute long-term health effects, including effects on children, and effects from acute short-term or chronic long-term exposure.

In addition, a plan must be submitted specifying procedures for mitigating the emissions of toxic substances and groundwater monitoring and for identifying methods of hazardous waste disposal. All projects must be reviewed for compliance with the Placer County Hazardous Waste Management Plan.

Intergovernmental Coordination

The Roseville Fire Department works cooperatively with other local and state agencies in a coordinated effort to inform and educate the public regarding the storage, handling, and disposal of household hazardous materials. This includes continued coordination with the Placer County Hazardous Materials Response Teams.

Hazardous Waste Drop-off

The City of Roseville partners with public and private entities to remove household hazardous waste from Roseville's waste stream. The disposals include the following:

- **Household Hazardous Waste Collection**—The Western Placer Waste Management Authority provides a collection service for household hazardous waste. Residents can transport waste to the Authority's facility north of Roseville or schedule a pickup through the Roseville Solid Waste Division.
- **Used Electronic Equipment**—The Materials Recovery Facility accepts old televisions and other electronic waste.
- **Used Motor Oil Recycling**—There are six locations in Roseville designated for used motor oil recycling drop-off.
- **Sharps (or Needles)**—Roseville residents who use medical needles for in-home care are encouraged to purchase sharps containers, which hold 100 needles, at a nominal cost from several drug stores in the City. Residents are asked to dispose of all medical needles and containers properly so they do not enter the waste stream.

Interagency Cooperation for Emergency Response

The City of Roseville Fire Department responds in accordance with the City of Roseville Hazardous Materials Emergency Response Plan to hazardous materials emergencies. Both the California Highway Patrol and the City of Roseville have developed a Hazardous Materials Emergency Plan that discusses the participants' responsibilities, organization and operation to be complied with in the event of a hazardous materials emergency, including clean-up and decontamination procedures.

Hazardous Materials Truck Route

The City of Roseville does not have specific truck routes for hazardous materials. The City does have established truck routes in the city limits, and in the event hazardous materials are to be transported within the city limits, a permit is required from the Roseville Police Department. Typically, trucks with bulk deliveries of hazardous materials use State Route 65 to Blue Oaks Boulevard and then access any of the north-south corridors, including

Washington Boulevard, Industrial Avenue, and Foothills Boulevard where local businesses use hazardous materials in their business activities.

Routes for hazardous materials are coordinated with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the California Highway Patrol, and the Roseville Police, Fire, and Public Works Departments.

Since Blue Oaks Boulevard remains incomplete, there is a risk of hazardous material being transported on bulk trucks through residential areas to reach the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant and the Energy Park. The same is true for transportation of hazardous material to the Booth Road plant, but chlorine gas is no longer used for disinfection there (nor at other water plants serving Roseville).

Hazardous Materials Fee Program

The Roseville Fire Department has adopted a fee schedule for hazardous material permitting, storage, use, handling, and generation. The department also charges for fire and life safety inspections, plan review, and miscellaneous activities such as a Hazardous Materials Business Plan Review.

15.8 SCENARIO

Two human-caused hazard scenarios could have a significant impact on the City of Roseville:

- The first scenario would involve hazardous materials being transported via rail or highway (Interstate 80) across the planning area. The release of hazardous materials via intentional or unintentional means could impact large population centers within the City. Advance knowledge of these shipments and their contents would play a role in preparedness for this scenario, thus reducing its potential impact. The biggest issue in response to hazardous material is material identification and containment.
- The second scenario would be a terrorist event at a large gathering place such as a mall or event center. Terrorist events happen with little or no warning. With a population in excess of 120,000 people, Roseville does possess potential targets for terrorist activities. The City has taken steps to assess these sites as well as probable scenarios in its Terrorism Contingency Plan.

15.9 ISSUES

Future actions needed at the local level to address human-caused hazards include but are not limited to the following:

- Continue all facets of emergency preparedness training for police, fire, public works, and city manager/public information staff in order to respond quickly in the event of a human-caused disaster. Enhance awareness training for all City employees to recognize threats or suspicious activity in order to prevent an incident from occurring.
- Continue all facets of the City's hazardous materials team training and response through commitment of resources from the Fire Department budget and the addition of funding through the Sacramento Regional Homeland Security budget.
- Continue to improve response times for public safety throughout the City so as to reduce exposure to human-caused incidents. The City will maintain appropriate staffing levels of public safety personnel to address vulnerabilities identified in this chapter.
- Train first responders and all appropriate City staff to implement protocols contained in the City of Roseville Terrorism Response Plan.
- Continue to implement the City of Roseville Hazardous Materials Contingency Plan with enhancements as warranted by the type of uses in the City and new technologies in preventing hazardous materials incidents.

- Continue to work proactively with Union Pacific Railroad regarding the following:
 - Placards and labeling of containers
 - Emergency plans and coordination
 - Standardized response procedures
 - Notification of the types of materials being transported through Roseville on at least an annual basis
 - Random inspections of transporters as allowed by Union Pacific
 - Installation of mitigating techniques along the rail yard at critical locations
 - Routine hazard communication initiatives
 - Enhancing security along the rail corridor should the alert system go higher than Orange
 - Continuously looking to the use of safer alternative products to conduct rail transport operations.
- Continue regular testing of the alarm system along the Union Pacific railroad tracks in Central Roseville.
- Utilize Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) in future planning efforts as well as enhancing existing infrastructure and buildings to prevent or mitigate human-cause incidents. CPTED is an urban planning design process that integrates crime prevention with neighborhood design and community development. CPTED is based on the theory that the proper design and effective use of the built environment can reduce crime and the fear of crime and improve the quality of life. CPTED creates an environment where the physical characteristics, building layout, and site planning allow inhabitants to become key agents in ensuring their own security.
- Work with the private sector to enhance and create Business Continuity Plans in the event of an emergency.
- Relocate or construct a redundant Emergency Operations Center farther from the Roseville Rail Yard and floodplain.
- Maintain an emergency services information line that the public can contact 24 hours a day during an emergency incident to ask questions of emergency staff.
- Coordinate with all Roseville school districts to ensure that their emergency preparedness plans include preparation for human-caused incidents.
- Encourage local businesses to adopt Information Technology and telecommunications recovery plans.
- Promote 72-hour self-sufficiency through the Emergency Preparedness Manager's efforts, the Roseville website, Roseville Coalition of Neighborhood Associations, and other media.
- Continue to share the human-caused hazard risk and preparedness presentation given at the public meetings and City Council workshop as part of this preparedness effort.
- Maintain the on-line Citizens Advisory Panel of 2,400 households and periodically e-mail emergency preparedness information including human-caused hazard preparedness instructions and reminders.

Future actions needed at the regional level to address human-caused hazards include but are not limited to the following:

- Participate in regional, state and federal efforts to gather terrorism information at all levels and keep public safety officials briefed at all times regarding any local threats. Staff will then further develop response capabilities based on emerging threats.
- Participate in the Cal OES Disaster Resistant California annual conference and other training sessions sponsored by regional, state and federal agencies.
- Participate in regional training exercises per the requirements of Homeland Security Presidential Directive #8 in support of national preparedness. These training exercises, sponsored by the Sacramento Regional Office of Homeland Security, will test and evaluate the ability to coordinate the activities of city, county and state government first responders, volunteer organizations and the private sector in responding to terrorism and technological hazards. The trainings will enhance interagency coordination,

provide training to staff, test response and recovery capabilities, and activate the National Incident Management System and the mutual aid system.

- Review existing automatic/mutual aid agreements with other public safety agencies to identify opportunities for enhancement.

16. PLANNING AREA RISK RANKING

A risk ranking was performed for the hazards of concern described in this Plan. This risk ranking assesses the probability of each hazard’s occurrence as well as its likely impact on the people, property, and economy of the planning area. When available, estimates of risk were generated with data from Hazus-MH or GIS analysis using methodologies promoted by FEMA. For hazards of concern with less robust datasets, qualitative assessments were used. The results are used in establishing mitigation priorities.

The climate change hazard was not ranked because its impacts are factored into each individual hazard and thus are peripherally included in this assessment. The human-health and human-caused hazards were not ranked because they are not considered natural hazards.

16.1 PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE

The probability of occurrence of a hazard is indicated by a probability factor based on likelihood of annual occurrence:

- High—Hazard event is likely to occur within 25 years (Probability Factor = 3)
- Medium—Hazard event is likely to occur within 100 years (Probability Factor =2)
- Low—Hazard event is not likely to occur within 100 years (Probability Factor =1)
- No exposure—There is no probability of occurrence (Probability Factor = 0)

The assessment of hazard frequency is generally based on past hazard events in the area. Table 16-1 summarizes the probability assessment for each hazard of concern for this Plan.

Table 16-1. Probability of Hazards		
Hazard Event	Probability (high, medium, low)	Probability Factor
Dam Failure	Low	1
Drought	High	3
Earthquake	High	3
Flooding	Medium	2
Landslide	Low	1
Severe Weather	High	3
Wildfire	High	3

16.2 IMPACT

Hazard impacts were assessed in three categories: impacts on people, impacts on property and impacts on the local economy. Numerical impact factors were assigned as follows:

- **People**—Values were assigned based on the percentage of the total *population exposed* to the hazard event. The degree of impact on individuals will vary and is not measurable, so the calculation assumes for

simplicity and consistency that all people exposed to a hazard because they live in a hazard zone will be equally impacted when a hazard event occurs. An element of subjectivity can be used in assigning values for impacts on people. Impact factors were assigned as follows:

- High—50 percent or more of the population is exposed to a hazard (Impact Factor = 3)
 - Medium—25 percent to 49 percent of the population is exposed to a hazard (Impact Factor = 2)
 - Low—25 percent or less of the population is exposed to the hazard (Impact Factor = 1)
 - No impact—None of the population is exposed to a hazard (Impact Factor = 0)
- **Property**—Values were assigned based on the percentage of the total *property value exposed* to the hazard event:
 - High—30 percent or more of the total assessed property value is exposed to a hazard (Impact Factor = 3)
 - Medium—15 percent to 29 percent of the total assessed property value is exposed to a hazard (Impact Factor = 2)
 - Low—14 percent or less of the total assessed property value is exposed to the hazard (Impact Factor = 1)
 - No impact—None of the total assessed property value is exposed to a hazard (Impact Factor = 0)
 - **Economy**—Values were assigned based on the percentage of the total *property value vulnerable* to the hazard event. Values represent estimates of the loss from a major event of each hazard in comparison to the total assessed value of the property exposed to the hazard. For some hazards, such as wildfire, landslide and severe weather, vulnerability was considered to be the same as exposure due to the lack of loss estimation tools specific to those hazards. Loss estimates separate from the exposure estimates were generated for the earthquake and flood hazards using Hazus-MH.
 - High—Estimated loss from the hazard is 20 percent or more of the total exposed property value (Impact Factor = 3)
 - Medium—Estimated loss from the hazard is 10 percent to 19 percent of the total exposed property value (Impact Factor = 2)
 - Low—Estimated loss from the hazard is 9 percent or less of the total exposed property value (Impact Factor = 1)
 - No impact—No loss is estimated from the hazard (Impact Factor = 0)

Each category of impact was assigned a weighting factor to reflect its significance: impact on people was given a weighting factor of 3; impact on property was given a weighting factor of 2; and impact on the economy was given a weighting factor of 1. Table 16-2, Table 16-3 and Table 16-4 summarize the impacts for each hazard.

Table 16-2. Impact on People from Hazards

Hazard Event	Impact (high, medium, low)	Impact Factor	Multiplied by Weighting Factor (3)
Dam Failure	High	3	9
Drought ^a	None	0	0
Earthquake	High	3	9
Flooding	Low	1	3
Landslide	Low	1	3
Severe Weather	High	3	9
Wildfire	Medium	2	6

a. All people in the planning area would be exposed to drought, but the impact on the safety of individuals is expected to be minimal.

Table 16-3. Impact on Property from Hazards

Hazard Event	Impact (high, medium, low)	Impact Factor	Multiplied by Weighting Factor (2)
Dam Failure	High	3	6
Drought ^a	None	0	0
Earthquake	High	3	6
Flooding	Low	1	2
Landslide ^b	Low	0	0
Severe Weather	High	3	6
Wildfire	High	3	6

a. All properties in the planning area would be exposed to drought, but the impact on properties is expected to be minimal.

b. Impact on property is less than 0.5% and thus registers as 0.

Table 16-4. Impact on Economy from Hazards

Hazard Event	Impact (high, medium, low)	Impact Factor	Multiplied by Weighting Factor (1)
Dam Failure	High	3	3
Drought	Low	1	1
Earthquake	Low	1	1
Flooding	Low	1	1
Landslide	Low	1	1
Severe Weather	Low	1	1
Wildfire	Low	0	0

16.3 RISK RATING AND RANKING

The risk rating for each hazard was determined by multiplying the probability factor by the sum of the weighted impact factors for people, property and operations, as summarized in Table 16-5.

Based on these ratings, a priority of high, medium or low was assigned to each hazard. The hazards ranked as being of highest concern are earthquake, severe weather, and wildfire. Hazards ranked as being of medium concern are flood and dam failure. The hazards ranked as being of lowest concern are drought and landslide. Table 16-6 shows the hazard risk ranking.

Table 16-5. Hazard Risk Rating

Hazard Event	Probability Factor	Sum of Weighted Impact Factors	Total (Probability x Impact)
Dam Failure	1	18	18
Drought	3	1	3
Earthquake	3	16	48
Flooding	2	6	12
Landslide	1	4	4
Severe Weather	3	16	48
Wildfire	3	12	36

Table 16-6. Hazard Risk Ranking

Hazard Ranking	Hazard Event	Category
1	Severe Weather	High
2	Earthquake	High
3	Wildfire	High
4	Dam Failure	Medium
5	Flood	Medium
6	Landslide	Low
7	Drought	Low

Part 3. Mitigation Strategy

17. GUIDING PRINCIPLE, GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND PREVIOUS ACTION STATUS

Hazard mitigation plans must identify goals for reducing long-term vulnerabilities to identified hazards (44 CFR Section 201.6(c)(3)(i)). For the purposes of this Plan, goals and objectives are defined as follows:

- **Goals** are general guidelines that explain what is to be achieved. They are usually broad-based, policy-type statements, long-term, and represent global visions. Goals help define the benefits that the Plan is trying to achieve. The success of the hazard mitigation plan should be measured by the degree to which its goals have been met (that is, by the actual benefits in terms of hazard mitigation).
- **Objectives** are short-term aims which, when combined, form a strategy or course of action to meet a goal. Unlike goals, objectives are specific and measurable.

After establishing a guiding principle for this hazard mitigation plan, the City of Roseville developed goals and objectives for the initial plan through discussions, research, and meetings of the Steering Committee and based on input from stakeholders and the public. Information for this process was garnered from the public involvement strategy, the risk assessment, and review of the California and Placer County hazard mitigation plans.

The Steering Committee identified seven goals, working from a catalog of goal statements created through review of other similar plans and FEMA planning guidance. Once the goals were established, objectives that meet multiple goals were selected through a similar exercise.

For the 2016 Plan, the Steering Committee reviewed the goals and objectives established for the previous plan to determine if they still fulfill the vision of reducing risk in the planning area. It was determined that the goals and objectives are still relevant to the vision.

17.1 GUIDING PRINCIPLE

A guiding principle or a mission statement for a plan is a written declaration of the plan's core purpose and focus. It normally remains unchanged over time, regardless of a change to the plan's goals or objectives. Though not required for DMA compliance, the incorporation of a guiding principle provides a clear, singular message that can be a focal point throughout all facets of the planning process. The City of Roseville developed the following guiding principle for 2016 to be carried through to subsequent updates to the hazard mitigation plan:

Through community partnerships, establish a plan to reduce vulnerability to hazards in order to protect the health, safety, welfare, and economy of the City.

17.2 GOALS

The goals for the 2016 Plan, consistent with the hazards identified in this plan, are as follows:

- G-1: Protect lives and reduce injury.
- G-2: Promote hazard mitigation as an integrated policy.

- G-3: Protect the continuity of local government to ensure no significant disruption of services during or due to a disaster.
- G-4: Improve community emergency management preparedness, collaboration and outreach.
- G-5: Minimize or reduce damage to property, including critical facilities.
- G-6: Develop and implement mitigation strategies that optimize public funds in an efficient and cost-effective way.
- G-7: Monitor and support the natural environment's capacity to deal with the impacts of natural hazards, taking into account the potential impacts of global climate change.

17.3 OBJECTIVES

The Steering Committee selected the objectives listed in Table 17-1 to meet multiple goals. The objectives serve as a stand-alone measurement of a mitigation action rather than as a subset of a goal. Achievement of the objectives is a measure of the effectiveness of a mitigation strategy. The objectives are also used to help establish priorities.

Table 17-1. Objectives for 2011 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan

Objective Number	Objective Statement	Goals for which it can be applied
O-1	Consider the impacts of hazards on future land uses in the City of Roseville by coordinating with other planning mechanisms such as the General Plan and land-use code development.	1, 2, 5, 7
O-2	Protect and sustain reliable local emergency operations and communication facilities during and after disasters.	1, 3, 4
O-3	Develop new or enhance existing early warning response systems and plans.	1, 3, 4, 5
O-4	Seek to enhance emergency response capabilities through improvements to infrastructure and City programs.	1, 4, 5
O-5	Enhance the understanding of all present and future hazards that impact the City of Roseville and the risk they pose.	1, 3, 4, 5, 7
O-6	Seek mitigation projects that provide the highest degree of hazard protection at the least cost.	1, 5, 6
O-7	Seek to update information on natural, environmental, and human-caused hazards, vulnerabilities, and mitigation measures by coordinating planning efforts and creating partnerships with appropriate local, private, county, state, and federal agencies.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7
O-8	Seek to implement codes, standards, and policies that will protect life and property, including natural habitat, from the impacts of hazards within the City of Roseville.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6
O-9	Educate the public on preparedness for and mitigation of potential impacts of hazards on the City of Roseville.	1, 2, 4
O-10	Support efforts to retrofit, purchase, or relocate structures in high hazard areas, including those known to be repetitively damaged.	3, 5, 6

17.4 STATUS OF PREVIOUS ACTIONS

The City of Roseville develops an annual Progress Report which includes the status of previous actions. This Progress Report details completed actions as well as those actions added outside of the 5-year update cycle. A copy of the 2015 Progress Report is located in Appendix B.

18. MITIGATION ALTERNATIVES

Catalogs of hazard mitigation alternatives were developed that present a broad range of alternatives to be considered for use in the planning area, in compliance with 44 CFR (Section 201.6(c)(3)(ii)). One catalog was developed for each hazard of concern evaluated in this Plan. The catalogs present alternatives that are categorized in two ways:

- By who would have responsibility for implementation:
 - Individuals (personal scale)
 - Businesses (corporate scale)
 - Government (government scale).
- By what the alternative would do:
 - Manipulate the hazard
 - Reduce exposure to the hazard
 - Reduce vulnerability to the hazard
 - Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard.

Hazard mitigation actions recommended in this Plan were selected from among the alternatives presented in the catalogs. The catalogs provide a baseline of mitigation alternatives that are backed by a planning process, are consistent with the established goals and objectives, and are within the capabilities of the City of Roseville to implement. Some of these actions may not be feasible based on the selection criteria identified for this Plan. The purpose of the catalog was to provide a list of what could be considered to reduce risk of the flood hazard within the planning area. Actions in the catalog that are not included for the action plan were not selected for one or more of the following reasons:

- The action is not feasible.
- The action is already being implemented.
- There is an apparently more cost-effective alternative.
- The action does not have public or political support.

The catalogs for each hazard are presented in Table 18-1 through Table 18-9.

Table 18-1. Alternatives to Mitigate the Dam Failure Hazard

Personal-Scale	Corporate-Scale	Government-Scale
• Manipulate the hazard: ○ None • Reduce exposure to the hazard: ○ Relocate out of dam failure inundation areas. • Reduce vulnerability to the hazard: ○ Elevate home to appropriate levels. • Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard: ○ Learn about risk reduction for the dam failure hazard. ○ Learn the evacuation routes for a dam failure event. ○ Educate yourself on early warning systems and the dissemination of warnings.	• Manipulate the hazard: ○ Remove dams. ○ Remove levees. ○ Harden dams. • Reduce exposure to the hazard: ○ Replace earthen dams with hardened structures. • Reduce vulnerability to the hazard: ○ Flood-proof facilities within dam failure inundation areas. • Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard: ○ Educate employees on the probable impacts of a dam failure. ○ Develop a continuity of operations plan.	• Manipulate the hazard: ○ Remove dams. ○ Remove levees. ○ Harden dams. • Reduce exposure to the hazard: ○ Replace earthen dams with hardened structures ○ Relocate critical facilities out of dam failure inundation areas. ○ Consider open space land use in designated dam failure inundation areas. • Reduce vulnerability to the hazard: ○ Adopt higher regulatory floodplain standards in mapped dam failure inundation areas. ○ Retrofit critical facilities within dam failure inundation areas. • Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard: ○ Map dam failure inundation areas. ○ Enhance emergency operations plan to include a dam failure component. ○ Institute monthly communications checks with dam operators. ○ Inform the public on risk reduction techniques ○ Adopt real-estate disclosure requirements for the re-sale of property located within dam failure inundation areas. ○ Consider the probable impacts of climate in assessing the risk associated with the dam failure hazard. ○ Establish early warning capability downstream of listed high hazard dams. ○ Consider the residual risk associated with protection provided by dams in future land use decisions.

Table 18-2. Alternatives to Mitigate the Drought Hazard

Personal-Scale	Corporate-Scale	Government-Scale
• Manipulate the hazard: ○ None • Reduce exposure to the hazard: ○ None • Reduce vulnerability to the hazard: ○ Drought-resistant landscapes ○ Reduce water system losses ○ Modify plumbing systems (through water saving kits) • Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard: ○ Practice active water conservation	• Manipulate the hazard: ○ None • Reduce exposure to the hazard: ○ None • Reduce vulnerability to the hazard: ○ Drought-resistant landscapes ○ Reduce private water system losses • Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard: ○ Practice active water conservation	• Manipulate the hazard: ○ Groundwater recharge through stormwater management • Reduce exposure to the hazard: ○ Identify and create groundwater backup sources • Reduce vulnerability to the hazard: ○ Reduce water system losses ○ Distribute water saving kits ○ Increase use of recycled water ○ Diversify water supply diversion points • Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard: ○ Public education on drought resistance ○ Identify alternative water supplies for times of drought; mutual aid agreements with alternative suppliers ○ Implement drought contingency plan ○ Develop criteria “triggers” for drought-related actions ○ Improve accuracy of water supply forecasts

Table 18-3. Alternatives to Mitigate the Earthquake Hazard

Personal-Scale	Corporate-Scale	Government-Scale
• Manipulate the hazard: ○ None • Reduce exposure to the hazard: ○ Locate outside of hazard area (off soft soils) • Reduce vulnerability to the hazard: ○ Retrofit structure (anchor house structure to foundation) ○ Secure household items that can cause injury or damage (such as water heaters, bookcases, and other appliances) ○ Build to higher design • Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard: ○ Practice “drop, cover, and hold” ○ Develop household mitigation plan, such as creating a retrofit savings account, communication capability with outside, 72-hour self-sufficiency during an event ○ Keep cash reserves for reconstruction ○ Become informed on the hazard and risk reduction alternatives available. ○ Develop a post-disaster action plan for your household	• Manipulate the hazard: ○ None • Reduce exposure to the hazard: ○ Locate or relocate mission-critical functions outside hazard area where possible • Reduce vulnerability to the hazard: ○ Build redundancy for critical functions and facilities ○ Retrofit critical buildings and areas housing mission-critical functions • Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard: ○ Adopt higher standard for new construction; consider “performance-based design” when building new structures ○ Keep cash reserves for reconstruction ○ Inform your employees on the possible impacts of earthquake and how to deal with them at your work facility. ○ Develop a continuity of operations plan	• Manipulate the hazard: ○ None • Reduce exposure to the hazard: ○ Locate critical facilities or functions outside hazard area where possible • Reduce vulnerability to the hazard: ○ Harden infrastructure ○ Provide redundancy for critical functions ○ Adopt higher regulatory standards • Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard: ○ Provide better hazard maps ○ Provide technical information and guidance ○ Enact tools to help manage development in hazard areas (e.g., tax incentives, information) ○ Include retrofitting and replacement of critical system elements in capital improvement plan ○ Develop strategy to take advantage of post-disaster opportunities ○ Warehouse critical infrastructure components such as pipe, power line, and road repair materials ○ Develop and adopt a continuity of operations plan ○ Initiate triggers guiding improvements (such as <50% substantial damage or improvements) ○ Further enhance seismic risk assessment to target high hazard buildings for mitigation opportunities. ○ Develop a post-disaster action plan that includes grant funding and debris removal components.

Table 18-4. Alternatives to Mitigate the Flooding Hazard

Personal-Scale	Corporate-Scale	Government-Scale
• Manipulate the hazard: ○ Clear storm drains and culverts ○ Use low-impact development techniques • Reduce exposure to the hazard: ○ Locate outside of hazard area ○ Elevate utilities above base flood elevation ○ Use low-impact development techniques • Reduce vulnerability to the hazard: ○ Raise structures above base flood elevation ○ Elevate items within house above base flood elevation ○ Build new homes above base flood elevation ○ Flood-proof structures • Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard: ○ Buy flood insurance ○ Develop household plan, such as retrofit savings, communication with outside, 72-hour self-sufficiency during and after an event	• Manipulate the hazard: ○ Clear storm drains and culverts ○ Use low-impact development techniques • Reduce exposure to the hazard: ○ Locate critical facilities or functions outside hazard area ○ Use low-impact development techniques • Reduce vulnerability to the hazard: ○ Build redundancy for critical functions or retrofit critical buildings ○ Provide flood-proofing when new critical infrastructure must be located in floodplains • Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard: ○ Keep cash reserves for reconstruction ○ Support and implement hazard disclosure for sale of property in risk zones. ○ Solicit cost-sharing through partnerships with others on projects with multiple benefits.	• Manipulate the hazard: ○ Maintain drainage system ○ Institute low-impact development techniques on property ○ Dredging, levee construction, and providing regional retention areas ○ Structural flood control, levees, channelization, or revetments. ○ Stormwater management regulations and master planning ○ Acquire vacant land or promote open space uses in developing watersheds to control increases in runoff • Reduce exposure to the hazard: ○ Locate or relocate critical facilities outside of hazard area ○ Acquire or relocate identified repetitive loss properties ○ Promote open space uses in identified high hazard areas via techniques such as: planned unit developments, easements, setbacks, greenways, sensitive area tracks. ○ Adopt land development criteria such as planned unit developments, density transfers, clustering ○ Institute low impact development techniques on property ○ Acquire vacant land or promote open space uses in developing watersheds to control increases in runoff • Reduce vulnerability to the hazard: ○ Harden infrastructure, bridge replacement program ○ Provide redundancy for critical functions and infrastructure ○ Adopt regulatory standards such as freeboard standards, cumulative substantial improvement or damage, lower substantial damage threshold; compensatory storage, non-conversion deed restrictions. ○ Stormwater management regulations and master planning. ○ Adopt “no-adverse impact” floodplain management policies that strive to not increase the flood risk on downstream communities. • Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard: ○ Produce better hazard maps ○ Provide technical information and guidance ○ Enact tools to help manage development in hazard areas (stronger controls, tax incentives, and information) ○ Incorporate retrofitting or replacement of critical system elements in capital improvement plan ○ Develop strategy to take advantage of post-disaster opportunities ○ Warehouse critical infrastructure components ○ Develop and adopt a continuity of operations plan ○ Consider participation in the Community Rating System ○ Maintain and collect data to define risks and vulnerability ○ Train emergency responders ○ Create an elevation inventory of structures in the floodplain ○ Develop and implement a public information strategy ○ Charge a hazard mitigation fee ○ Integrate floodplain management policies into other planning mechanisms within the planning area. ○ Consider the probable impacts of climate change on the risk associated with the flood hazard ○ Consider the residual risk associated with structural flood control in future land use decisions ○ Enforce National Flood Insurance Program ○ Adopt a Stormwater Management Master Plan

Table 18-5. Alternatives to Mitigate the Landslide Hazard

Personal-Scale	Corporate-Scale	Government-Scale
• Manipulate the hazard: ○ Stabilize slope (dewater, armor toe) ○ Reduce weight on top of slope ○ Minimize vegetation removal and the addition of impervious surfaces. • Reduce exposure to the hazard: ○ Locate structures outside of hazard area (off unstable land and away from slide-run out area) • Reduce vulnerability to the hazard: ○ Retrofit home • Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard: ○ Institute warning system, and develop evacuation plan ○ Keep cash reserves for reconstruction ○ Educate yourself on risk reduction techniques for landslide hazards	• Manipulate the hazard: ○ Stabilize slope (dewater, armor toe) ○ Reduce weight on top of slope • Reduce exposure to the hazard: ○ Locate structures outside of hazard area (off unstable land and away from slide-run out area) • Reduce vulnerability to the hazard: ○ Retrofit at-risk facilities • Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard: ○ Institute warning system, and develop evacuation plan ○ Keep cash reserves for reconstruction ○ Develop a continuity of operations plan ○ Educate employees on the potential exposure to landslide hazards and emergency response protocol.	• Manipulate the hazard: ○ Stabilize slope (dewater, armor toe) ○ Reduce weight on top of slope • Reduce exposure to the hazard: ○ Acquire properties in high-risk landslide areas. ○ Adopt land use policies that prohibit the placement of habitable structures in high-risk landslide areas. • Reduce vulnerability to the hazard: ○ Adopt higher regulatory standards for new development within unstable slope areas. ○ Armor/retrofit critical infrastructure against the impact of landslides. • Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard: ○ Produce better hazard maps ○ Provide technical information and guidance ○ Enact tools to help manage development in hazard areas: better land controls, tax incentives, information ○ Develop strategy to take advantage of post-disaster opportunities ○ Warehouse critical infrastructure components ○ Develop and adopt a continuity of operations plan ○ Educate the public on the landslide hazard and appropriate risk reduction alternatives.

Table 18-6. Alternatives to Mitigate the Severe Weather Hazard

Personal-Scale	Corporate-Scale	Government-Scale
• Manipulate the hazard: ○ None • Reduce exposure to the hazard: ○ None • Reduce vulnerability to the hazard: ○ Insulate house ○ Provide redundant heat and power ○ Insulate structure ○ Plant appropriate trees near home and power lines (“Right tree, right place” National Arbor Day Foundation Program) • Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard: ○ Trim or remove trees that could affect power lines ○ Promote 72-hour self-sufficiency ○ Obtain a NOAA weather radio. ○ Obtain an emergency generator.	• Manipulate the hazard: ○ None • Reduce exposure to the hazard: ○ None • Reduce vulnerability to the hazard: ○ Relocate critical infrastructure (such as power lines) underground ○ Reinforce or relocate critical infrastructure such as power lines to meet performance expectations ○ Install tree wire • Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard: ○ Trim or remove trees that could affect power lines ○ Create redundancy ○ Equip facilities with a NOAA weather radio ○ Equip vital facilities with emergency power sources.	• Manipulate the hazard: ○ None • Reduce exposure to the hazard: ○ None • Reduce vulnerability to the hazard: ○ Harden infrastructure such as locating utilities underground ○ Trim trees back from power lines ○ Designate snow routes and strengthen critical road sections and bridges • Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard: ○ Support programs such as “Tree Watch” that proactively manage problem areas through use of selective removal of hazardous trees, tree replacement, etc. ○ Establish and enforce building codes that require all roofs to withstand snow loads ○ Increase communication alternatives ○ Modify land use and environmental regulations to support vegetation management activities that improve reliability in utility corridors. ○ Modify landscape and other ordinances to encourage appropriate planting near overhead power, cable, and phone lines ○ Provide NOAA weather radios to the public

Table 18-7. Alternatives to Mitigate the Wildfire Hazard

Personal-Scale	Corporate-Scale	Government-Scale
• Manipulate the hazard: ○ Clear potential fuels on property such as dry overgrown underbrush and diseased trees • Reduce exposure to the hazard: ○ Create and maintain defensible space around structures ○ Locate outside of hazard area ○ Mow regularly • Reduce vulnerability to the hazard: ○ Create and maintain defensible space around structures and provide water on site ○ Use fire-retardant building materials ○ Create defensible spaces around home • Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard: ○ Employ techniques from the National Fire Protection Association's Firewise Communities program to safeguard home ○ Identify alternative water supplies for fire fighting ○ Install/replace roofing material with non-combustible roofing materials.	• Manipulate the hazard: ○ Clear potential fuels on property such as dry underbrush and diseased trees • Reduce exposure to the hazard: ○ Create and maintain defensible space around structures and infrastructure ○ Locate outside of hazard area • Reduce vulnerability to the hazard: ○ Create and maintain defensible space around structures and infrastructure and provide water on site ○ Use fire-retardant building materials ○ Use fire-resistant plantings in buffer areas of high wildfire threat. • Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard: ○ Support Firewise community initiatives. ○ Create /establish stored water supplies to be used for firefighting.	• Manipulate the hazard: ○ Clear potential fuels on property such as dry underbrush and diseased trees ○ Implement best management practices on public lands. • Reduce exposure to the hazard: ○ Create and maintain defensible space around structures and infrastructure ○ Locate outside of hazard area ○ Enhance building code to include use of fire resistant materials in high hazard area. • Reduce vulnerability to the hazard: ○ Create and maintain defensible space around structures and infrastructure ○ Use fire-retardant building materials ○ Use fire-resistant plantings in buffer areas of high wildfire threat. ○ Consider higher regulatory standards (such as Class A roofing) ○ Establish biomass reclamation initiatives • Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard: ○ More public outreach and education efforts, including an active Firewise program ○ Possible weapons of mass destruction funds available to enhance fire capability in high-risk areas ○ Identify fire response and alternative evacuation routes ○ Seek alternative water supplies ○ Become a Firewise community ○ Use academia to study impacts/solutions to wildfire risk ○ Establish/maintain mutual aid agreements between fire service agencies. ○ Create/implement fire plans ○ Consider the probable impacts of climate change on the risk associated with the wildfire hazard in future land use decisions

Table 18-8. Alternatives to Mitigate Health Hazards

Personal-Scale	Corporate-Scale	Government-Scale
• Manipulate the hazard: ○ None • Reduce exposure to the hazard: ○ Eliminate or reduce environments on private property that favor mosquito infestation • Reduce vulnerability to the hazard: ○ Immunization • Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard: ○ Get informed	• Manipulate the hazard: ○ None • Reduce exposure to the hazard: ○ Eliminate or reduce environments on private property that favor mosquito infestation • Reduce vulnerability to the hazard: ○ Immunize employees • Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard: ○ Inform employees on human health hazards	• Manipulate the hazard: ○ Mosquito abatement • Reduce exposure to the hazard: ○ Eliminate or reduce environments on public property that favor mosquito infestation • Reduce vulnerability to the hazard: ○ Immunize employees • Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard: ○ Collaborate with the Placer County Health Department to ensure the health and welfare of the community ○ Public education on mosquito abatement and general human health issues

Table 18-9. Alternatives to Mitigate Human-Cause Hazards

Personal-Scale	Corporate-Scale	Government-Scale
• Manipulate the hazard: ○ None • Reduce exposure to the hazard: ○ None • Reduce vulnerability to the hazard: ○ None • Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard: ○ Increase awareness of vulnerability to threats ○ Neighborhood watch program ○ Keep informed ○ Develop an emergency response plan ○ Report suspicious activities	• Manipulate the hazard: ○ None • Reduce exposure to the hazard: ○ Incorporate anti-terrorism and security mitigation measures in site and layout design of facilities ○ Consider site security in landscape design of facilities • Reduce vulnerability to the hazard: ○ Restrict access by implementing controlled access zones ○ Increase security measures ○ Install physical barriers around critical facilities ○ Employ parking restrictions as a means to reduce vulnerability • Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard: ○ Become a partner (stakeholder) in mitigation and prevention ○ Educate employees ○ Develop an emergency response plan ○ Develop a Continuity of Operations Plan ○ Use liberal signage techniques to inform and increase capability of users of facilities	• Manipulate the hazard: ○ None • Reduce exposure to the hazard: ○ Construct new critical facilities with clear zones. ○ Retrofit existing critical facilities • Reduce vulnerability to the hazard: ○ Restrict access by implementing controlled access zones ○ Reduce single-point vulnerabilities such as: redundancy for critical lifelines and infrastructure ○ Install physical barriers around critical facilities ○ Provide regular education to personnel regarding cyber attacks • Increase the ability to respond to or be prepared for the hazard: ○ Educate public on threats and vulnerability ○ Enhance emergency response capability by contingency planning for specific events based on identified vulnerabilities ○ Consider performance-based zoning as a land use alternative to mitigate impacts of human-caused hazards ○ Employ Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED techniques in design of public facilities ○ Consider providing incentives for mitigation ○ Develop a City THIRA ○ Establish secure communications between multiple entities to communicate sensitive information.

19. ACTION PLAN AND IMPLEMENTATION

19.1 HAZARD MITIGATION ACTION PLAN

The Steering Committee reviewed the catalogs of hazard mitigation alternatives and selected actions to be included in a hazard mitigation action plan. The selection of actions was based on the risk assessment of identified hazards of concern and the defined Roseville hazard mitigation goals and objectives. Table 19-1 lists the recommended hazard mitigation actions that make up the action plan. The timeframe indicated in the table is defined as follows:

- Short Term = to be completed in 1 to 5 years
- Long Term = to be completed in greater than 5 years
- Ongoing = currently being funded and implemented under existing programs.

Table 19-1. Action Plan

Hazards Addressed	Funding Options	Timeframe	Objectives Met	In Previous Plan? (# from previous plan)
Lead Agency: Central Services Department				
Action #F-20—Retrofit the City's Downtown library by sealing the exterior and installing a flood door to protect against flood damage should Dry Creek overflow the existing floodwall.				
Flood	Grant funding (PDM, HMGP, and FEMA) based on benefits exceeding costs	Long term	6, 10	Yes (F-21)
Lead Agency: City Council				
Action #HC-3—Seek to establish appropriate staffing levels of public safety personnel to address vulnerabilities identified through an incremental targeted study that provides immediate needs as well as anticipated needs in 1 year, 5 years, and 10 years.				
Human-Caused	General Fund	Short term	2, 4	Yes (HC-3)
Lead Agency: City Manager's Office				
Action #HH-3—Collaborate with the Placer County Mosquito Abatement District to review resource protection policies that conflict with human health protection in the City of Roseville and work to resolve these policy issues				
Human Health	Currently budgeted for under the General Fund	Short term	5, 6, 7, 9	Yes (HH-3)
Lead Agency: Public Affairs & Communications Department				
Action #HH-2—Support the public education efforts of the Placer County Health Department and the Placer Mosquito Abatement District				
Human Health	Currently budgeted for under the General Fund	Short term	5, 6, 7, 9	Yes (HH-2)
Action #MH-2—Continue to maintain the hazard mitigation page on City website that provides following types of information:				
• The Hazard Management Plan and its progress reports • Hazard-specific information • Mitigation information by hazard, with specific emphasis on private property • Emergency response and warning information • Links to county, state, and federal related agencies				
	General Fund; PDM grant funding	Short term	2, 3, 5, 6, 9	Yes (MH-2)
Lead Agency: Development Services Department				
Action #EQ-1—Perform building-specific, structural seismic vulnerability assessment of City-owned critical facilities constructed prior to 1980 (including infrastructure). Included in this assessment will be recommended mitigation alternatives that meet goals and objectives of this Plan.				
Earthquake	General Fund; Possible grant funding under PDM program	Long term	5, 10	Yes (EQ-1)
Action #EQ-2—Incorporate earthquake mitigation measures for private property into existing City-sponsored outreach programs such as printed media and the City's website.				
Earthquake	City General fund	Short term	1, 9, 10, 11	Yes (EQ-2)
Action #EQ-3—Reassess the overall vulnerability to the earthquake hazard using the best available science and technology as it becomes available. State-sponsored programs, Seismic Hazards Mapping Act, and future FEMA-sponsored initiatives are anticipated to create a wealth of knowledge regarding this hazard that did not exist during the preparation of this Plan.				
Earthquake	General Fund; Possible grant funding under PDM program	Short term	1, 5, 7, 9	Yes (EQ-3)
Action #F-1—The City shall designate all areas identified as the 100-year floodplain. The boundaries of the 100-year floodplain shall be as specified in the floodplain designations section of this component of the City's General Plan. Floodplain areas shall be preserved as specified in the open space and conservation element. Such preservation may include required dedication to the City. If needed, modify the City's ordinances to include floodplain use regulations consistent with the goals, policies, and implementation measures of the safety, land use, open space and conservation, and parks and recreation elements of the City's General Plan.				
Flood	Currently funded by General Fund allocation	Long term	1, 6, 7	Yes (F-1)

Hazards Addressed	Funding Options	Timeframe	Objectives Met	In Previous Plan? (# from previous plan)
Action #F-2—Refer any development proposal that has a direct or indirect impact on flood protection to Public Works for comment. In addition, forward such proposals to other agencies as applicable, including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, California Central Valley Flood Protection Board, FEMA, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Placer County Resource Conservation District, and Placer County Flood Control District. Consider the comments of the agencies during the development review process.				
Flood	Currently funded by General Fund allocation	Short term	1, 5, 7	Yes (F-2)
Action #F-9—Ensure that future specific plans and specific plan amendments are consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan. The specific plans shall include the designation and preservation of floodplain areas and adjacent habitat. Provisions shall be incorporated to ensure that public infrastructure, utilities, and emergency services remain functional during flood conditions. Such infrastructure and facilities include water, sewer and gas mains, telephone and electric lines, streets and bridges, hospitals, and fire and police stations. Financing mechanisms shall be explored to fund necessary flood protection improvements and maintenance. Development agreements may be used to secure implementation and funding provisions. (Specific plans have 100% cost recovery by developers).				
Flood	Specific plans have 100% cost recovery by developers	Long term	1, 6, 7, 8	Yes (F-9)
Action #F-11—Require a master drainage plan as part of the approval process for all specific plans and large development projects as determined by the Public Works director. The master drainage plan should consider cumulative regional drainage and flooding mitigation. The plan's intent is to ensure that the overall rate of runoff from a project does not exceed predevelopment levels. If necessary, this objective shall be achieved by incorporating run-off control measures to minimize peak flows and/or assistance in financing or otherwise implementing comprehensive drainage plans.				
Flood	General Fund; Developer-based funding under specific plan requirements	Long term	1, 6, 8	Yes (F-11)
Action #LS-2—Continue to implement policies adopted by the General Plan that promote open space land uses within identified steep slope areas of Roseville. The City of Roseville Northeast Roseville Specific Plan and Stoneridge Specific Plans include the identified steep slope areas within Roseville. Both Plan Areas have continuing development.				
Landslide	General Fund; Developer-based funding and specific plan requirements	Short term	1, 6, 8	Yes (LS-2)
Action #MH-1—Continue to maintain Office of Emergency Services certification of all City inspectors for post-disaster damage assessment.				
Multi-Hazard	General Fund	Short term	2, 7	Yes (MH-1)
Lead Agency: Environmental Utilities Department (EUD)				
Action #D-1—Perform a groundwater recharge feasibility study to determine the most cost-effective way to replenish groundwater resources within Roseville.				
Drought	Water utility funds; General fund; Developer-based funding under specific plan requirements	Long term	5, 6	Yes (D-1)
Action #D-2—Implement aquifer storage and recovery program that uses direct injection technique in areas identified as appropriate.				
Drought	Water Construction Fund	Long term	6, 8	Yes (D-2)
Action #D-3—Continue to implement the Environmental Utility Department's recycled water program and seek all opportunities to expand its coverage, currently focusing on urban growth areas. The City pumps recycled water through a system of purple pipes completely separate from potable (drinking water) pipes. The City pumps the recycled water to customers such as streetscapes, golf courses and parks, where it irrigates turf and shrubs. Using recycled water for uses such as landscape irrigation reduces demand on the potable water system, creating a more reliable water supply for the entire City. Recycled water is not subject to the effects of drought.				
Drought	Water utility rates, developer-based fees under specific plan requirements	Short term	6, 8	Yes (D-3)
Action #D-4—Promote active water conservation techniques and strategies to private property owners through Roseville-sponsored outreach projects such as printed media and the City's website.				
Drought	Currently funded by General Fund allocation	Short term	5, 9	Yes (D-4)
Action #HC-5—Address vulnerabilities identified in vulnerability assessment of water facilities performed by the Environmental Utilities Department in response to EPA initiative.				
Human-Caused	EUD CIP, and EPA grant funding	Long term	5, 7	Yes (HC-5)

Hazards Addressed	Funding Options	Timeframe	Objectives Met	In Previous Plan? (# from previous plan)
Action #SW-4—Enhance and implement strategies for debris management and removal during severe weather events.				
	General Fund	Short term	6, 8	Yes (SW-5)
Lead Agency: Information Technology Division				
Action #HC-9—Protect the City's data, technology infrastructure and staff against malicious cyber-attacks and Cyber terrorism, such as but not limited to:				
• Identity Theft • Virus/Malware/Ransomware/Spyware/Spam/Phishing • Network and system attacks • Web site hacking • Denial-of-service attacks				
Human-Caused	General Fund	Short term	2, 5, 7	Yes (HC-9)
Action #MH-7—Strive to maintain high availability of essential communication services				
Multi-Hazard	EUD CIP, General Fund	Ongoing	2, 3, 4, 7	Yes (MH-7)
Action #MH-8—Secure the City's physical locations that contain technology infrastructure				
Multi-Hazard	EUD CIP, General Fund	Ongoing	2, 3, 4, 7	Yes (MH-8)
Lead Agency: Parks, Recreation & Libraries Department: Open Space Division				
Action #F-12—Continue the Parks, Recreation & Libraries Department's regular creek maintenance program within the City's creeks and floodplain areas. This program clears and removes debris that could contribute to blockage and flooding and may include the removal of silt. This is only done in areas of high risk to flood damage or where property or facilities are threatened by flooding.				
Flood	Currently funded by General Fund allocation	Ongoing	8	Yes (F-12)
Action #F-21—Continue the Tree Mitigation Fund program administered by the Open Space Division in conjunction with non-profit organizations. The planting of oak trees in the open spaces adjacent to riparian zones increases infiltration and slows storm water surges.				
Flood	General Fund	Ongoing	1, 5, 7, 9	Yes (F-22)
Action #F-22—Manage beaver dam sites for flood control protection and habitat restoration after dam removal. One primary issue is impacts to floodwater capacity of creeks. Part of the desired comprehensive approach to beaver management includes establishment of quantitative and qualitative "carrying capacity," including acre-feet of flood capacity lost. Implement a standard monitoring and reporting process to track beaver dam locations, population, and impacts. Gain regulatory approval for beaver management techniques such as biological control and habitat manipulation using the most benign options first.				
Flood	Currently funded by General Fund allocation	Ongoing	1, 6, 8	Yes (F-23)
Action #WF-1—Continue "Goat Grazing" program for removal of grassland in areas of Roseville potentially vulnerable to wildfire. Implement goat grazing in City open space and preserve areas for fire and invasive plant species management and native plant restoration.				
Wildfire	General Fund; Community Facilities District funding; PDM grant funding	Ongoing	6, 9	Yes (WF-2)
Action #MH-4—Implement an "Adopt an Open Space" program in coordination with the open space management program. Develop "adoption contracts" with neighborhoods, organizations, businesses, etc., describing the level of stewardship and the terms of the "adoption." Publicize these activities through online resource directory and other media to encourage participation.				
Multi-Hazard	General Fund; Community Facilities District funding; PDM grant funding	Short term	1, 5, 7, 9	Yes (MH-4)
Action #MH-5—Develop and disseminate best practices information to private property owners whose land is adjacent to open space areas describing stewardship opportunities and owners' role in preserving beneficial uses of open space areas (including vernal pool grassland and creek or riparian uses). Offer classes to provide in-depth information, such as demonstration projects, techniques for ecologically friendly weed abatement and vegetation control, and creating a backyard habitat compatible with open space areas.				
Multi-Hazard	General Fund; PDM grant funding	Short term	1, 5, 7, 9	Yes (MH-5)
Action #MH-6—Work with the Roseville City School District, local high school districts, and non-profit organizations to promote ecology-oriented curricula and stewardship activities. Identify resource and administrative barriers that may be limiting schools' abilities to more actively participate in stewardship, and work collaboratively to identify solutions.				
Multi-Hazard	General Fund; PDM grant funding	Long term	1, 5, 7, 9	Yes (MH-6)

Hazards Addressed	Funding Options	Timeframe	Objectives Met	In Previous Plan? (# from previous plan)
Lead Agency: Police and Fire Department				
Action #DF-1—Create a dam failure element for the City's emergency response plan that includes a phased warning protocol in response to the findings of the Folsom Dam Containment Dike Risk Assessment.				
Dam Failure	General Fund; Department of Homeland Security (DHS) grant funding	Short term	2, 3, 4, 9	Yes (DF-1)
Action #F-19—Implement recommendation of Downtown Roseville Specific Plan to relocate the Public safety Building				
Flood	Grant funding (PDM, HMGP, and FEMA) based on benefits exceeding costs	Short term	6, 10	Yes (F-20)
Action #HC-1—Commit support to initiatives within the Sacramento-Roseville-Arden-Arcade Metropolitan Statistical Area; continue to seek funding from other federal sources to fund its initiatives				
Human-Caused	General Fund	Short term	2, 7	Yes (HC-1)
Action #HC-2—Enhance emergency response capability of City by contingency planning for specific events based on identified vulnerabilities.				
Human-Caused	General Fund; DHS grant funding	Short term	2, 3, 4, 9	Yes (HC-2)
Action #HC-4—Prepare a site-specific vulnerability assessment of City- owned critical facilities that use the best available science and technology with regards to human-caused hazards.				
Human-Caused	General Fund; DHS grant funding	Short term	2, 5, 7	Yes (HC-4)
Action #HH-1—Continue to collaborate with the Placer County Health Department to ensure the health and welfare of the community				
Human Health	Currently budgeted for under the General Fund	Short term	5, 6, 7, 9	Yes (HH-1)
Action #SW-3—Continue education/outreach programs to improve winter preparedness and minimize loss of life or injury.				
	General Fund	Short term	6, 9	Yes (SW-4)
Action #WF-2—Enhance existing City public outreach programs to include information on fire safety, defensible spaces, and areas of concern.				
Wildfire	General Fund; Grant funding under PDM program and HMGP	Short term	6, 9	Yes (WF-3)
Action #MH-3—Establish/maintain a post-disaster action plan to be part of the City Emergency operations plan that will include following elements:				
• Procedures for public information • Post-disaster damage assessment • Grant writing • Code enforcement • Redundant operations				
Multi-Hazard	General Fund; PDM Grant Funding	Short term	2, 3, 4, 7	Yes (MH-3)
Lead Agency: Public Works Department				
Action #F-3—Continue City participation in the National Flood Insurance Program and the Community Rating System (CRS). Seek CRS classification improvements within capabilities of City programs, including adoption and administration of FEMA-approved ordinances and flood insurance rate maps (FIRM).				
Flood	Currently funded by General Fund allocation	Short term	1, 5, 9	Yes (F-3)
Action #F-4—Maintain Roseville's compliance and good standing under the National Flood Insurance program.				
	General Fund	Short term	2, 3, 4, 5, 10	Yes (F-4)
Action #F-5—Continue the City's outreach program to flood-prone property owners and the citizens of Roseville, to help make them aware of the flood threat and how best to deal with them.				
Flood	Currently funded by General Fund allocation	Short term	5, 9	Yes (F-5)

Hazards Addressed	Funding Options	Timeframe	Objectives Met	In Previous Plan? (# from previous plan)
Action #F-6—Continue to pursue a regional approach to flood issues by remaining actively involved in the Placer County Flood Control District. This involvement includes cooperation in the development of a comprehensive regional database. Continue to participate in regional flooding studies, including the Auburn Creek/Coon Creek/Pleasant Grove Creek flood mitigation plan and the Dry Creek watershed flood control plan.				
Flood	Currently funded by General Fund allocation	Long term	1, 5, 7	Yes (F-6)
Action #F-7—Continue City coordination with other agencies on issues of flood control. Coordination between the City and adjacent jurisdictions occurs through several mechanisms, including distribution of development proposals for review and comment. Continue City cooperation with federal, state, and local agencies, including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, California Central Valley Flood Protection Board, FEMA, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Placer County Resource Conservation District, and the Placer County Flood Control District.				
Flood	Currently funded by General Fund allocation	Short term	1, 5, 7	Yes (F-7)
Action #F-8—Continue to develop, implement, and expand the Flood Alert and Early Warning Program systems and integrate the systems with other local jurisdictions to form a regional warning program.				
Flood	General Fund; Possible grant funding (PDM, HMGP, and Flood Mitigation Assistance)	Long term	2, 3	Yes (F-8)
Action #F-10—Monitor and regularly update City flood studies, modeling, and associated land use, zoning, and other development regulations at a minimum of every 5 years or whenever information becomes available that would significantly modify previous data. New information could include new studies, change in City policy, consideration of a major development project or specific plan, or implementation of a flood control project.				
Flood	General Fund; FEMA map modernization; Developer-based funding and specific plan requirements	Long term	1, 5, 7	Yes (F-10)
Action #F-13—Continue annual inspection and maintenance program of City storm drain systems. Review after every major storm system function and performance. This program removes debris that could contribute to blockage of the storm drain system.				
Flood	Currently funded by General Fund allocation and; gas tax	Short term	8	Yes (F-13)
Action #F-14—Complete the final two phases of the Cirby/Linda/Dry Creek flood control project (Phase 1 and 2). Five of the seven phases of this project have been completed at a cost of about \$18,000,000. The basis for determining viability of this project will be a benefit /cost analysis to determine if project meets federal grant eligibility requirements.				
Flood	General Fund; Impact fees; Grant funding (PDM and HMGP) based on benefits exceeding costs	Long term	6, 8, 10	Yes (F-14)
Action #F-15—Analyze alternative improvements to the Cirby/Linda/Dry Creek flood control project that may be cost effective in the flood-prone areas of Roseville:				
• Dry Creek from Darling Way to Riverside Avenue • Area on Dry Creek upstream of Folsom Road in the Columbia Avenue/Marilyn Avenue/Bonita Street area • Linda Creek near Champion Oaks Drive/Samoa Way/Hurst Way area • Cirby Creek in the Trimble Way/Zien Court area				
Flood	General Funds; Developer-based funds, grant funding (PDM, HMGP, and FEMA) based on benefits exceeding costs	Long term	6, 8, 10	Yes (F-15)
Action #F-16—Replace the Huntington Drive/Cirby Creek culvert with a bridge to protect Queens Court/Huntington Drive area. The Public Works Department oversees this project.				
Flood	General Fund; CIP, developer-based funds, grant funding (PDM, HMGP, and FEMA) based on benefits exceeding costs	Long term	6, 10	Yes (F-16)
Action #F-17—Divert the main drainage storm drain system down Crestmont Avenue to Cirby Way and then into Dry Creek so that the existing system will not exceed capacity. If system capacity is exceeded, the intersection on Cirby Way and Crestmont Avenue and nearby homes will flood during major flood events.				
Flood	General Fund; CIP, developer-based funds, grant funding (PDM, HMGP, and FEMA) based on benefits exceeding costs	Short term	6, 10	Yes (F-17)

Hazards Addressed	Funding Options	Timeframe	Objectives Met	In Previous Plan? (# from previous plan)
Action #F-18—Continue to promote and sponsor programs to buy out, relocate, and flood-proof existing flood-prone structures within Roseville.				
Flood	Grant funding (PDM, HMGP, and FEMA) based on benefits exceeding costs	Short term	6, 10	Yes (F-18)
Action #F-23 – Develop the City’s multi-use, multi-benefit stormwater retention project within the Pleasant Grove Creek Watershed, the Reason Farms Stormwater Retention Project.				
Flood	Developer-based funds, grant funding (PDM, HMGP, and FEMA) based on benefits exceeding costs	Long term	6, 10	No
Action #HC-10 – Improve evacuation transportation routes within the City of Roseville by removing traffic constrictions.				
Human Caused	Developer-based funds, grant funding (PDM, HMGP, and FEMA) based on benefits exceeding costs	Long term	6, 10	No
Action #LS-1—Once California Geological Survey completes soils mapping for the Roseville vicinity under the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act, reassess landslide hazard using best available data to gauge the true vulnerability to this hazard.				
Landslide	General Fund; Developer-based funding and specific plan requirements; Possible grant funding under PDM program	Long term	1, 5, 7	Yes (LS-1)
Lead Agency: Roseville Electric				
Action #HC-6—Maintain compliance with California Energy Commission (“CEC”) license conditions for the operations of the Roseville Energy Park (“REP”) with respect to Hazardous Material Management				
Human-Caused	EUD CIP, General Fund	Short term	5, 7	Yes (HC-6)
Action #HC-7—Maintain compliance with state and local laws and regulations for the operation of the Roseville Power Plant #2.				
Human-Caused	EUD CIP, General Fund	Long term	2, 5, 7	Yes (HC-7)
Action #HC-8—Maintain compliance with North American Electric Reliability Corporation mandatory reliability standards related to plant operation, sabotage reporting and critical infrastructure protection (cyber security).				
Human-Caused	EUD CIP, General Fund	Short term	2, 5, 7	Yes (HC-8)
Action #SW-1—Continue the Shade Tree Program, an energy conservation rebate program provided by Roseville Electric				
Severe Weather	Roseville Electric operational budget	Short term	7, 9	Yes (SW-2)
Action #SW-2—Continue ongoing line clearing and weed abatement of electrical utility facilities in order to reduce public exposure to vegetation hazards and maintain higher reliability during severe weather conditions.				
Severe Weather	CIP	Short term	2	Yes (SW-3)
Action #SW-5—Continue to operate the Roseville Energy Park to support the City’s electrical requirements and maintain service continuity during severe weather events.				
Severe Weather	EUD CIP, General Fund	Short term	5, 7	Yes (SW-6)
Action #SW-6— Continue to operate Roseville Power Plant #2 to support the City’s electrical requirements and maintain service continuity during severe weather events.				
Severe Weather	General Fund	Short term	5, 7	Yes (SW-7)

19.1.1 Benefit-Cost Review

The action plan must be prioritized according to a benefit/cost analysis of the proposed projects and their associated costs (44 CFR, Section 201.6(c)(3)(iii)). The benefits of proposed projects were weighed against estimated costs as part of the project prioritization process. The benefit/cost analysis was not of the detailed variety required by FEMA for project grant eligibility under the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) and Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) grant program. A less formal approach was used because some projects may not be implemented for up to 10 years, and associated costs and benefits could change dramatically in that time. Therefore, a review was performed of the apparent benefits versus the apparent cost of each project. Parameters were established for assigning subjective ratings (high, medium, and low) to the costs and benefits of these projects.

Cost ratings were defined as follows:

- **High**—Existing funding will not cover the cost of the project; implementation would require new revenue through an alternative source (for example, bonds, grants, and fee increases).
- **Medium**—The project could be implemented with existing funding but would require a re-apportionment of the budget or a budget amendment, or the cost of the project would have to be spread over multiple years.
- **Low**—The project could be funded under the existing budget. The project is part of or can be part of an ongoing existing program.

Benefit ratings were defined as follows:

- **High**—Project will provide an immediate reduction of risk exposure for life and property.
- **Medium**—Project will have a long-term impact on the reduction of risk exposure for life and property, or project will provide an immediate reduction in the risk exposure for property.
- **Low**—Long-term benefits of the project are difficult to quantify in the short term.

Using this approach, projects with positive benefit versus cost ratios (such as high over high, high over medium, medium over low, etc.) are considered cost-beneficial and are prioritized accordingly.

For many of the strategies identified in this action plan, the City may seek financial assistance under the HMGP or PDM programs, both of which require detailed benefit/cost analyses. These analyses will be performed on projects at the time of application using the FEMA benefit-cost model. For projects not seeking financial assistance from grant programs that require detailed analysis, the City reserves the right to define “benefits” according to parameters that meet the goals and objectives of this Plan.

19.1.2 Action Plan Prioritization

Table 19-2 lists the priority of each action, based on the qualitative benefit-cost review, the number of plan objectives achieved, and the availability of funding:

19.1.3 Analysis of Mitigation Actions

Each recommended action was classified based on the hazard it addresses and the type of mitigation it involves. Table 19-3 shows the classification based on this analysis.

19.2 ADOPTION

A hazard mitigation plan must include documentation of formal adoption by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting federal approval of the plan (44 CFR Section 201.6.c.5). This Plan will be submitted to Cal OES and the ISO prior to adoption for a pre-adoption review. Once the Plan has been determined to comply with the criteria specified under the DMA, Cal OES will forward it to FEMA Region IX for review and approval.

ISO is responsible for determining compliance for the CRS program. Since this Plan will be a key element in the City meeting the prescribed requirements for a CRS rating of Class 1, ISO will be asked to review the Plan for CRS Activity 510 compliance. Once pre-adoption approval has been granted by Cal OES, FEMA Region IX and the ISO, the City will initiate its process to formally adopt the Plan.

Table 19-2. Prioritization of Mitigation Actions

Action #	# of Objectives Met	Benefits	Costs	Do Benefits Equal or Exceed Costs?	Is project Grant Eligible?	Can Project be Funded under Existing Programs/ Budgets?	Priority (High, Med., Low) ^a
DF-1	4	High	Low	Yes	Yes	Yes	High
D-1	2	Medium	Low	Yes	No	Yes	Medium
D-2	2	Medium	Medium	Yes	No	Yes	Medium
D-3	2	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High
D-4	2	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High
EQ-1	2	Medium	Medium	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medium
EQ-2	4	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High
EQ-3	4	Medium	Low	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medium
F-1	3	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High
F-2	3	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High
F-3	3	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High
F-4	5	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High
F-5	2	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High
F-6	3	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High
F-7	3	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High
F-8	2	High	Medium	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medium
F-9	3	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High
F-10	3	High	Medium	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medium
F-11	3	Medium	Medium	Yes	No	Yes	Medium
F-12	1	High	Medium	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medium
F-13	3	Medium	Low	Yes	No	Yes	Medium
F-14	3	High	High	Yes	Yes	No	Low
F-15	3	Medium	Medium	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medium
F-16	2	High	High	Yes	Yes	No	Low
F-17	2	High	Medium	Yes	Yes	No	Medium
F-18	2	High	Medium	Yes	Yes	No	Medium
F-19	2	Medium	High	No	Yes	No	Low
F-20	2	High	High	Yes	Yes	No	Low
F-21	4	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High
F-22	3	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High
F-23	2	High	High	Yes	Yes	No	Medium
LS-1	3	Low	Low	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low
LS-2	3	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High
SW-1	2	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High
SW-2	1	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High
SW-3	2	Medium	Low	Yes	No	Yes	Medium
SW-4	2	Medium	Medium	Yes	No	Yes	Medium
SW-5	2	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High
SW-6	2	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High
WF-1	2	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High
WF-2	2	Medium	Low	Yes	No	Yes	Medium
MH-1	2	Medium	Low	Yes	No	Yes	Medium

Action #	# of Objectives Met	Benefits	Costs	Do Benefits Equal or Exceed Costs?	Is project Grant Eligible?	Can Project be Funded under Existing Programs/ Budgets?	Priority (High, Med., Low) ^a
MH-2	5	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High
MH-3	4	Medium	Low	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medium
MH-4	4	Medium	Low	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medium
MH-5	4	Medium	Low	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medium
MH-6	4	Medium	Low	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medium
MH-7	4	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High
MH-8	4	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High
HC-1	2	Medium	Low	Yes	No	Yes	Medium
HC-2	4	Medium	Low	Yes	No	Yes	Medium
HC-3	2	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High
HC-4	3	Medium	Medium	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medium
HC-5	2	High	High	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low
HC-6	2	High	Low	Yes	Yes	Yes	High
HC-7	3	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High
HC-8	3	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High
HC-9	3	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High
HC-10	2	High	High	Yes	Yes	No	Medium
HH-1	4	Medium	Low	Yes	No	Yes	Medium
HH-2	2	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High
HH-3	4	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High

a. Priorities defined as follows:

- High Priority—A project that meets multiple objectives, has benefits that exceed cost, has funding secured or is an ongoing project and meets eligibility requirements for the HMGP or PDM grant program. High priority projects can be completed in the short term (1 to 5 years).
- Medium Priority—A project that meets goals and objectives, that has benefits that exceed costs, and for which funding has not been secured but that is grant eligible under HMGP, PDM or other grant programs. Project can be completed in the short term, once funding is secured. Medium priority projects will become high priority projects once funding is secured.
- Low Priority—A project that will mitigate the risk of a hazard, that has benefits that do not exceed the costs or are difficult to quantify, for which funding has not been secured, that is not eligible for HMGP or PDM grant funding, and for which the time line for completion is long term (1 to 10 years). Low priority projects may be eligible for other sources of grant funding from other programs.

Table 19-3. Analysis of Mitigation Actions

Hazard	Actions That Address the Hazard, by Mitigation Type ^a					
	Prevention ^a	Property Protection ^b	Public Education and Awareness ^c	Natural Resource Protection ^d	Emergency Services ^e	Structural Projects ^f
Dam Failure					DF-1	
Drought	D-1, D-2, D-3, D-4					
Earthquake	EQ-3	EQ-1	EQ-2			
Flooding	F-1, F-2, F-3, F-4, F-6, F-7, F-9, F-10, F-11, F-21, F-22	F-13, F-18, F-19, F-20	F-5	F-1, F-21, F-22, F-23	F-8, F-12	F-14, F-15, F-16, F-17, F-23
Landslide	LS-1, LS-2					
Severe Weather	SW-1, SW-6	SW-2, SW-4	SW-3		SW-5	
Wildfire	WF-1		WF-2			
Multiple Hazards	MH-2, MH-3, MH-4	MH-8	MH-5, MH-6	MH-4	MH-1, MH-7	
Health Hazards	HH-1, HH-2		HH-2			
Human-Caused Hazards	HC-3, HC-5, HC-6, HC-7, HC-8, HC-9	HC-4			HC-1, HC-2, HC-3, HC-8, HC-10	

- a. **Prevention**—Government, administrative or regulatory actions that influence the way land and buildings are developed to reduce hazard losses. Includes planning and zoning, floodplain laws, capital improvement programs, open space preservation, and stormwater management regulations.
- b. **Property Protection**—Modification of buildings or structures to protect them from a hazard or removal of structures from a hazard area. Includes acquisition, elevation, relocation, structural retrofit, storm shutters, and shatter-resistant glass.
- c. **Public Education and Awareness**—Actions to inform citizens and elected officials about hazards and ways to mitigate them. Includes outreach projects, real estate disclosure, hazard information centers, and school-age and adult education.
- d. **Natural Resource Protection**—Actions that minimize hazard loss and preserve or restore the functions of natural systems. Includes sediment and erosion control, stream corridor restoration, watershed management, forest and vegetation management, and wetland restoration and preservation.
- e. **Emergency Services**—Actions that protect people and property during and immediately after a hazard event. Includes warning systems, emergency response services, and the protection of essential facilities.
- f. **Structural Projects**—Actions that involve the construction of structures to reduce the impact of a hazard. Includes dams, setback levees, floodwalls, retaining walls, and safe rooms.

Simultaneous with this process, the draft action plan will be sent to the following agencies with a request for review and comment:

- Placer County Office of Emergency Services
- City of Rocklin
- Sacramento County Department of Water Resources
- California Department of Water Resources
- City of Citrus Heights
- Placer County Flood Control District.

Final FEMA approval was granted on [REDACTED], 2016. The Roseville City Council adopted the Plan through Resolution ###-## on [REDACTED], 2016. A copy of the resolution is provided in Figure 19-1. The City of Roseville is considered eligible for the benefits afforded under the Disaster Mitigation Act as of this date.

Insert When Available

Figure 19-1. Resolution Adopting the Roseville Hazard Mitigation Plan

19.3 PLAN MAINTENANCE STRATEGY

A hazard mitigation plan must present a plan maintenance process that includes the following (44 CFR Section 201.6(c)(4)):

- A method and schedule for monitoring, evaluating, and updating the mitigation plan
- A process for incorporating the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms, such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate
- A strategy for continuing public participation through the plan maintenance process.

This section details the formal process that will ensure that the hazard mitigation plan remains an active and relevant document and that the City of Roseville maintains its eligibility for applicable funding sources. The plan maintenance process includes a schedule for monitoring and evaluating the Plan annually and producing an updated plan every five years. This section also describes how public participation will be integrated throughout the plan maintenance and implementation process. It explains how the mitigation strategies outlined in this Plan will be incorporated into existing planning mechanisms and programs, such as comprehensive land-use planning processes, capital improvement planning, and building code enforcement and implementation. The Plan's format allows sections to be reviewed and updated when new data become available, resulting in a plan that will remain current and relevant.

Pursuant to 44CFR 201.6(c)(4)(i), the following matrix provides a synopsis of responsibilities for plan monitoring, evaluation, and update which are discussed in further detail in sections 19.3.1 to 19.3.4 of this Plan:

Task	Approach	Timeline	Lead Responsibility	Support Responsibility
Monitoring	Preparation of status updates and action implementation tracking as part of submission to the Steering Committee for annual progress report. Deputy City Manager or Designee is responsible for initiating status updates with identified secondary responsibility departments.	Annual (July-September)	Deputy City Manager or Designee	• Central Service Dept. • City Council • City Manager's Office • Public Affairs/Communication Dept. • Development Services Dept. • Environmental Utilities Dept. • Information Technology Div. • Parks/Rec/Libraries: Open Space Div. • Police and Fire Dept. • Public Works Dept. • Roseville Electric
Evaluation	Review the status of previous actions as submitted by the monitoring task lead and support entities noted above to assess the effectiveness of the plan; complete and finalize the Annual Progress Report.	Annual (September) – prior to CRS recertification process on October 1	Planning Team • City Manager's Office • Public Works • Fire Dept. • Development Svcs • Technical Consultant	Steering Committee • City Manager's Office • Public Works • Fire Dept. • Development Svcs • Communications • Public Volunteers • Local businesses/organizations

Task	Approach	Timeline	Lead Responsibility	Support Responsibility
Update	The Planning Team will call the Steering Committee to reconvene, at a minimum, every 5 years to guide a comprehensive update to review and revise the Plan.	Every 5 years or upon comprehensive update to General Plan or major disaster	Planning Team • City Manager's Office • Public Works • Fire Dept. • Development Svcs • Technical Consultant	Steering Committee • City Manager's Office • Public Works • Fire Dept. • Development Svcs • Communications • Public Volunteers • Local businesses/organizations

19.3.1 Plan Implementation

The hazard mitigation plan includes a range of action items to reduce losses from hazard events. Together, the action items provide a framework for activities that the City can choose to implement over the next five years. The effectiveness of the Plan depends on the incorporation of the action items into existing City plans, policies, and programs.

The Roseville City Manager's Office and the Development Services Department will be jointly responsible for monitoring the Plan's implementation and maintenance through existing City programs. The Deputy City Manager or designated appointee will assume lead responsibility for facilitating plan implementation and maintenance meetings. Although the City Manager's Office will have primary department responsibility for review, coordination, and promotion, plan implementation and evaluation will be a shared responsibility among all departments and agencies identified as lead agencies in the mitigation action plan (see Chapter).

19.3.2 Steering Committee

The Steering Committee is a volunteer body that contributed greatly to the development of the initial and updated plans. The initial committee oversaw the development of the initial plan and made recommendations on key elements of the Plan, including a maintenance strategy. An oversight committee with representation similar to the initial Steering Committee then took an active role in the maintenance strategy. By maintaining progress reports, and keeping the Plan dynamic, Roseville was able to successfully complete many of the actions identified in the initial action plan. A reactivated Steering Committee then oversaw development of the 2011 and 2016 Plan updates.

A Steering Committee of not more than 14 members, as determined by the Roseville City Manager's Office, should remain involved in key elements of the proposed maintenance strategy. The Steering Committee will convene annually to perform annual reviews of the updated plan and its implementation. The make-up of this Steering Committee will strive for no less than 50 percent representation from citizens, citizen groups, and stakeholders within the planning area. Previous and existing members will be given the option to remain involved in the process.

A technical subcommittee with a make-up similar to the subcommittee used for initial plan development could be used in the plan maintenance strategy, at the discretion of the planning team and the Steering Committee.

19.3.3 Annual Progress Report

The minimum task of the annual Steering Committee meetings will be the evaluation of the progress of the 2016 Plan. This review will include the following:

- Summary of any hazard events that occurred during the prior year and their impact on the planning area
- Review of successful mitigation actions identified in the 2016 Plan
- Brief discussion about why targeted strategies were not completed
- Re-evaluation of the action plan to determine if the timeline for identified projects needs to be amended (such as changing a long-term project to a short-term project because of funding availability)
- Recommendations for new projects
- Changes in or potential for new funding options (grant opportunities)
- Impacts of any other planning programs or actions in the City that involve hazard mitigation

The planning team created a template to guide the Steering Committee in preparing a progress report during the previous planning process. The Steering Committee will provide feedback to the planning team on items included in the template. The planning team will continue to use this progress report template to prepare a formal annual report on the progress of the 2016 Plan. This report will be used as follows:

- Posted on the City website on the page dedicated to the hazard mitigation plan
- Announced on multiple social media platforms
- Provided to the local media through a press release
- Presented to the Roseville City Council
- Provided as part of the CRS annual re-certification package.

The CRS program requires an annual recertification to be submitted by October 1 of every calendar year for which the community has not received a formal audit. To meet this recertification timeline, the planning team will strive to complete the progress report process between June and September every year.

19.3.4 Plan Update

Section 201.6.d.3 of 44 CFR requires that local hazard mitigation plans be reviewed, revised if appropriate, and resubmitted for approval in order to remain eligible for benefits awarded under the DMA. The City of Roseville intends to update its hazard mitigation plan on a 5-year cycle. This cycle may be accelerated to less than 5 years based on the following triggers:

- A Presidential Disaster Declaration that impacts the City of Roseville
- A hazard event that causes loss of life
- A comprehensive update of the City of Roseville General Plan

It will not be the intent of this update process to start from scratch and develop a complete new hazard mitigation plan. Based on needs identified by the planning team, this update will, at a minimum, include the following elements:

- The update process will be convened through a Steering Committee.
- The hazard risk assessment will be reviewed and updated using best available information and technologies.
- The action plan will be reviewed and revised to account for any actions completed, dropped, or changed and to account for changes in the risk assessment or new City policies identified under other planning mechanisms, as appropriate (such as the General Plan).
- The draft update will be sent to appropriate agencies and organizations for comment.

- The public will be given an opportunity to comment on the update prior to adoption.
- The Roseville City Council will adopt the updated Plan.

19.3.5 Continuing Public Involvement

The public will continue to be apprised of hazard mitigation actions through the City website and by providing copies of the annual progress reports to the media. Copies of the 2016 Plan will be distributed to the Roseville City Library System. Upon initiation of the update process, a new public involvement strategy will be initiated based on guidance from the Steering Committee. This strategy will be based on the needs and capabilities of the City at the time of the update. At a minimum, this strategy will include the use of local media outlets within the planning area.

19.3.6 Incorporation into Other Planning Mechanisms

The City began planning for the impacts of hazards through the Safety Element of its 1992 General Plan. The hazard mitigation plan update process provided the City with an opportunity to review and expand on policies contained in the General Plan. The City views the General Plan and the hazard mitigation plan as complementary documents that work together to reduce risk exposure to the citizens of Roseville. A comprehensive update to the General Plan will trigger an update to the hazard mitigation plan. Many of the ongoing recommendations identified in the 2016 Plan are programs recommended by the General Plan. Processes and programs that the City will coordinate with the hazard mitigation plan recommendations include the following:

- City emergency response plan
- Capital improvement programs
- Roseville municipal code
- Community design guidelines
- Stormwater management program

Some action items do not need to be implemented through regulation. Instead, these items can be implemented through the creation of new educational programs, continued interagency coordination, or improved public participation.

Plan Integration During the 2011 RMHMP Performance Period

The 2011 RMHMP identified 24 actions related to plan integration. Due to the nature of plan integration, these actions were identified as ongoing initiatives and were carried over into the 2016 Plan update. Plan integration actions remain ongoing, as they serve as a benchmark for annual progress reporting and encourage the use of the Plan as a living document. During the performance period of the 2011 plan, 23 of the identified actions resulted in measurable plan integration of 2011 RMHMP goals, risk assessment, or recommendations into the following plans and programs:

- Specific Plans and Specific Plan Amendments
- Master Drainage Plan requirements for Specific Plans
- Groundwater Environmental Impact Report
- Water Recycling Master Plan
- Debris Management Plan (Completed in conjunction with the 2016 planning process)

Specific information regarding how each of these plans and programs integrated 2011 RMHMP information is available in the 2015 Progress Report located in Appendix B.

Plan Integration for the 2016 Mitigation Action Plan

Implementation of the 2016 mitigation action plan has and will continue to enhance and expand the integration efforts of the 2011 Plan. Inter-agency coordination occurred through involvement by local, regional, state and federal stakeholders involved in and consulted with during the planning process. This coordination is expected to continue through Steering Committee activities, annual progress reporting, implementation coordination, and the continued public engagement.

As the plan is implemented, all City agencies will use information from this updated plan as the best available science and data on natural hazards impacting the City of Roseville. 24 actions related to plan integration have been recommended for continued implementation in this Plan.

REFERENCES

- Cal-Adapt. 2016. <http://cal-adapt.org/> Exploring California's Climate Change Research.
- California Department of Water Resources (CA DWR). 2013. <http://www.water.ca.gov/waterplan/> The California Water Plan
- CA DWR. 2016. <http://www.water.ca.gov/climatechange/> Climate Change
- CA DWR. 2016a. <http://www.water.ca.gov/damsafety/FAQAnswer/index.cfm> Frequently Asked Questions
- California Department of Finance. 2016. <http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/e-1/> Population Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State – January 1, 2015 and 2016
- California Emergency Management Agency, et al. 2012. http://resources.ca.gov/docs/climate/APG_Understanding_Regional_Characteristics.pdf California Adaptation Planning Guide: Understanding Regional Characteristics.
- CAL FIRE. 2012. <http://frap.cdf.ca.gov/>. California Department of Forestry and Fire Prevention. 2012. Fire and Resource Assessment Program. Website mapping and data, 2012.
- Danielson, Tess. 2015. <http://www.businessinsider.com/ransomware-is-everywhere-but-this-software-can-save-you-2015-10> How to avoid the curse of Ransomware.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 1982. <http://www.archives.gov/federal-register/codification/executive-order/11988.html> Executive Order 11988-Floodplain management
- FEMA. 2001. Understanding Your Risks; Identifying Hazards and Determining your Risks. FEMA (386-2). August 2001
- FEMA. 2002. Getting Started; Building support for Mitigation Planning; FEMA (386-1). September 2002
- FEMA. 2003. Developing the Mitigation Plan; Identifying Mitigation Actions and Implementing Strategies. FEMA (386-3). April 2003
- FEMA. 2003. Integrating Manmade Hazards into Mitigation Planning. FEMA (386-7). September 2003
- FEMA. 2004. <http://www.damsafety.org/media/Documents/PDF/fema-333.pdf> Federal Guidelines for Dam Safety
- FEMA. 2007. FEMA, National Flood Insurance Program, Community Rating System; CRS Coordinator's Manual FIA-15/2007 OMB No. 1660-0022
- FEMA. 2013. <http://www.fema.gov/news-release/2013/10/18/be-cyber-smart-stay-cyber-secure> Be Cyber Smart, Stay Cyber Secure
- FEMA. 2015. <https://www.fema.gov/national-dam-safety-program> National Dam Safety Program

- FEMA. 2016. <https://www.fema.gov/disasters> Disaster Declarations
- FEMA. 2016a. <http://www.fema.gov/what-mitigation> What is Mitigation?
- Harrison, Virginia. 2015. <http://money.cnn.com/2015/04/14/technology/security/cyber-attack-hacks-security/>. CNN Money
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2014. <http://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/wg2/> Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability
- International Strategy for Disaster Reduction. 11/11/2008. “Disaster Risk Reduction Strategies and Risk Management Practices: Critical Elements for Adaptation to Climate Change”
- Iverson, R.M., 2004, Granular avalanches across irregular three-dimensional terrain: 1. theory and computation, Journal of Geophysical Research, v. 109, F01014, doi: 10.1029/2003JF000085. 14 p.
- Kostadinov, Dimitar. 2012. <http://resources.infosecinstitute.com/cyberterrorism-distinct-from-cybercrime/> Cyberterrorism Defined
- Michigan Tech University. n.d. <http://www.geo.mtu.edu/UPSeis/intensity.html> How Are Earthquake Magnitudes Measured?
- National Archives. 2016. <http://www.archives.gov/federal-register/codification/executive-order/11990.html> Executive Order 11990 -Protection of wetlands
- NASA. 2016. <http://climate.nasa.gov/vital-signs/carbon-dioxide/> Global Climate Change – Vital Signs of the Planet. Carbon Dioxide.
- NASA. 2015. <http://www.nasa.gov/audience/forstudents/5-8/features/nasa-knows/what-is-climate-change-58.html> What are Climate and Climate Change?
- NASA. 2004. http://www.nasa.gov/home/hqnews/2004/jul/HQ_04252_glaciers.html Retreating Glaciers Spur Alaskan Earthquakes
- NOAA. 2016. <https://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/stormevents/>. NOAA, National Climatic Data Center website, Storm Events Database
- Northern California Earthquake Data Center. 2014. UC Berkeley Seismological Laboratory. Dataset. doi:10.7932/NCEDC.
- Office of Federal Lands Highway. United States Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration. 2016. <https://flh.fhwa.dot.gov/programs/erfo/> Emergency Relief for Federally Owned Roads (ERFO)
- Office of the Press Secretary. 2015. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/01/30/executive-order-establishing-federal-flood-risk-management-standard-and-> Executive Order – Establishing a Federal Flood Risk Management Standard and a Process for Further Soliciting and Considering Stakeholder Input
- Placer County. 2016. Placer County Local Hazard Mitigation Plan Update.
- Placer County Office of Economic Development. 2014. Placer County Economic and Demographic Profile.

- Rickenmann, Dieter and Weber, Daniel. 2000. ftp://ftp.wsl.ch/pub/rickenmann/Rickenmann-pdf/2000/Rickenmann-Weber-2000_DFHM.pdf Debris Flow Hazards Mitigation: Mechanics, Prediction, and Assessment.
- Roseville. 2015. City of Roseville General Plan 2035.
- Roseville. 2015a. Urban Water Management Plan.
- Roseville. 2010. http://www.roseville.ca.us/visiting/history_of_roseville/default.asp History of Roseville on City of Roseville Website, accessed 2016
- Roseville. n.d. <https://www.roseville.ca.us/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=18782> Sustainability Efforts
- Roseville. 2010a. <https://roseville.ca.us/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=18854> Special Presentation – City of Roseville Communitywide Sustainability Action Plan.
- Savage, S. B., and K. Hutter. 1991. Dynamics of avalanches of granular materials from initiation to run-out. Part 1: Analysis, Acta Mech., 86, 201–223, doi:10.1007/BF01175958.
- Seattle Office of Emergency Management. 2014. <http://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/Emergency/PlansOEM/SHIVA/SHIVAv6.3Final.pdf> Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Assessment.
- Spatial Hazard Events and Losses Database for the United States maintained by the University of South Carolina's (USC) Hazard Research Lab
- United States Army Corps of Engineers. 2011. http://planning.usace.army.mil/toolbox/library/ERs/ER1100_2_1156_28Oct11.pdf Safety of Dams - Policies and Procedures
- United States Census. 2010. Data from 2010 U.S. Census. U.S. Census Bureau.
- United States Census. 2016. <http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml> American FactFinder
- United States Department of Transportation. n.d. <https://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/projdev/tdmmitig2.asp> Mitigation of Environmental Impacts
- United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2013. <https://www3.epa.gov/climatechange/glossary.html> Glossary
- United States Global Change Research Program. 2009. <https://nca2009.globalchange.gov/> Global Change Impacts in the United States: 2009 Report
- United States Geological Survey (USGS). 1989. http://pubs.usgs.gov/gip/earthq4/severity_text.html The Severity of an Earthquake. U.S. Government Printing Office: 1989-288-913.
- USGS. 2008. An Atlas of ShakeMaps for Selected Global Earthquakes. U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2008-1236. Prepared by Allen, T.I., Wald, D.J., Hotovec, A.J., Lin, K., Earle, P.S. and Marano, K.D.
- USGS. 2010. PAGER—Rapid Assessment of an Earthquake's Impact. U.S. Geological Survey Fact Sheet 2010-3036. September 2010.
- USGS. n.d. <http://landslides.usgs.gov/learn/l101.php> Landslides 101

Washington Department of Ecology. 2014. <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/landslides/about/about.html>
Puget Sound Landslides The website of the Washington Department of Ecology.

Weather Channel. 2016. <https://weather.com/weather/monthly/l/USCA0957:1:US> Roseville

Wilson, C. 2008. Botnets, Cybercrime, and Cyberterrorism. Federation of American Scientists.

GLOSSARY

ACRONYMS

Cal EMA—California Emergency Management Agency
CAL FIRE—California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
Cal OES—California Office of Emergency Services
CBC—California Building Code
CCR—California Code of Regulations
CDBG-DR—Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery grants
CEQA—California Environmental Quality Act
CIP—Capital Improvements Plan
CFR—Code of Federal Regulations
CPTED—Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design
CRS—Community Rating System
DFIRM—Digital Flood Insurance Rate Map
DHS—Department of Homeland Security
DMA —Disaster Mitigation Act
DWR—Department of Water Resources
EOP—Emergency Operations Plan
EPA—U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ESA—Endangered Species Act
EUD—Environmental Utilities Department
FEMA—Federal Emergency Management Agency
FIRM—Flood Insurance Rate Map
FRAP—Fire and Resource Assessment Program
GIS—Geographic Information System
HAZUS-MH—Hazards, United States-Multi Hazard
HMGP—Hazard Mitigation Grant Program
IBC—International Building Code
MCI—Multi-Casualty Incident
MM—Modified Mercalli Scale
MND—Mitigated Negative Declaration
NEHRP—National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program

NFIP—National Flood Insurance Program
NIMS—National Incident Management System
NOAA—National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
OES—Office of Emergency Services
OSPOMP—Open Space Preserve Overarching Management Plan
PCFCD—Placer County Flood Control District
PCWA—Placer County Water Agency
PDM—Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant Program
PGA—Peak Ground Acceleration
RMC—Roseville Municipal Code
SARS—Severe acute respiratory syndrome
SEMS—Standardized Emergency Management System
SFHA—Special Flood Hazard Area
SJWD—San Juan Water District
SPI—Standardized Precipitation Index
STEMI—ST-elevation myocardial infarction
UBC—Uniform Building Code
ULOP—Urban Level of Flood Protection
USBR—U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
USGS—United States Geological Survey
VHF—Viral Hemorrhagic Fevers
WMD—Weapon of Mass Destruction
WNV—West Nile Virus

DEFINITIONS

100-Year Flood: The term “100-year flood” can be misleading. The 100-year flood does not necessarily occur once every 100 years. Rather, it is the flood that has a 1 percent chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year.. Thus, the 100-year flood could occur more than once in a relatively short period of time. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) defines it as the 1 percent annual chance flood, which is now the standard definition used by most federal and state agencies and by the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).

Acre-Foot: An acre-foot is the amount of water it takes to cover 1 acre to a depth of 1 foot. This measure is used to describe the quantity of storage in a water reservoir. An acre-foot is a unit of volume. One acre foot equals 7,758 barrels; 325,829 gallons; or 43,560 cubic feet. An average household of four will use approximately 1 acre-foot of water per year.

Act of Terrorism: According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), an act of terrorism is “a violent act or an act dangerous to human life, in violation of the criminal laws of the United States or of any state, to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social goals.” Acts of terrorism are intentional, criminal, and malicious and can be foreign or domestic, depending on the origin, base, and objectives of the terrorist or organization. Acts of terrorism can involve the use of weapons of

mass destruction, arson, and incendiary, explosive, and armed attacks; industrial sabotage and intentional hazardous materials releases; agro-terrorism; and cyber-terrorism.

Asset: An asset is any man-made or natural feature that has value, including, but not limited to, people; buildings; infrastructure, such as bridges, roads, sewers, and water systems; lifelines, such as electricity and communication resources; and environmental, cultural, or recreational features such as parks, wetlands, and landmarks.

Base Flood: The flood having a 1% chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year, also known as the “100-year” or “1% chance” flood. The base flood is a statistical concept used to ensure that all properties subject to the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) are protected to the same degree against flooding.

Basin: A basin is the area within which all surface water – whether from rainfall, snowmelt, springs, or other sources – flows to a single water body or watercourse. The boundary of a river basin is defined by natural topography, such as hills, mountains, and ridges. Basins are also referred to as “watersheds” and “drainage basins.”

Benefit: A benefit is a net project outcome and is usually defined in monetary terms. Benefits may include direct and indirect effects. For the purposes of benefit-cost analysis of proposed mitigation measures, benefits are limited to specific, measurable, risk reduction factors, including reduction in expected property losses (buildings, contents, and functions) and protection of human life.

Benefit/Cost Analysis: A benefit/cost analysis is a systematic, quantitative method of comparing projected benefits to projected costs of a project or policy. It is used as a measure of cost effectiveness.

Benioff Earthquake: Sometimes called “deep quakes,” these occur in the Pacific Northwest when the Juan de Fuca plate breaks up underneath the continental plate, approximately 30 miles beneath the earth’s surface.

Building: A building is defined as a structure that is walled and roofed, principally aboveground, and permanently fixed to a site. The term includes manufactured homes on permanent foundations on which the wheels and axles carry no weight.

Capability Assessment: A capability assessment provides a description and analysis of a community’s current capacity to address threats associated with hazards. The assessment includes two components: an inventory of an agency’s mission, programs, and policies, and an analysis of its capacity to carry them out. A capability assessment is an integral part of the planning process in which a community’s actions to reduce losses are identified, reviewed, and analyzed, and the framework for implementation is identified. The following capabilities were reviewed under this assessment:

- Legal and regulatory capability
- Administrative and technical capability
- Fiscal capability

Certified Unified Program Agency: An agency (such as the City of Roseville) certified to act as a licensing agency for six hazardous materials-related programs. The Certified Unified Program Agency enables the City of Roseville to implement its own hazardous materials emergency response program. Mutual aid agreements are also in place for incident response. Each business that deals with hazardous materials generally must submit a Unified Program Consolidated Form with facility information to the Roseville Fire Department.

Civil Disorder: Civil disorder results from incidents intended to disrupt a community to the degree that law enforcement intervention is required to maintain public safety. Civil disorder is generally associated with controversial political, judicial, or economic issues and events and may occur at any time, although statistics indicate that civil disorder is more frequent during the summer months. Although the City of Roseville does not

have a history of civil disorder or rioting, large public gatherings, often associated with concerts or sports events, have overburdened local law enforcement and fire protection resources in the past. The effects of civil disorder and riots vary and depend on the type of event and its severity, scope, and duration. Essential services (such as electricity, water, public transportation, and communications) may be disrupted, and property damage, injuries, and loss of life may occur.

Communicable Disease: For the purposes of this Plan, communicable diseases include severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), flu, small pox, and diseases carried by insects. Diseases carried by insects include plague (fleas), encephalitis, malaria, West Nile virus (mosquitoes), and Lyme disease (ticks).

Community Rating System (CRS): The CRS is a voluntary program under the NFIP that rewards participating communities (provides incentives) for exceeding the minimum requirements of the NFIP and completing activities that reduce flood hazard risk by providing flood insurance premium discounts.

Critical Facility: A critical facility is vital to the City's ability to provide essential services and protect life and property. Loss of a critical facility would result in a severe economic or catastrophic impact. Under the Roseville hazard mitigation plan definition, critical facilities include the following:

- Police stations, fire stations, vehicle and equipment storage facilities, and emergency operations centers needed for disaster response before, during, and after hazard events
- Public and private utilities and infrastructure vital to maintaining or restoring normal services to areas damaged by hazard events
- Hospitals, nursing homes, and housing likely to contain occupants who may not be sufficiently mobile to avoid death or injury during a hazard event
- Structures or facilities that produce, use, or store highly volatile, flammable, explosive, toxic, and/or water-reactive materials

Crustal Earthquake: Crustal quakes occur at a depth of 5 to 10 miles beneath the earth's surface and are associated with fault movement within a surface plate.

Dam: A dam is any artificial barrier or controlling mechanism that can or does impound 10 acre-feet or more of water.

Dam Failure: Dam failure refers to a partial or complete breach in a dam (or levee) that impacts its integrity. Dam failures occur for a number of reasons, such as flash flooding, inadequate spillway size, mechanical failure of valves or other equipment, freezing and thawing cycles, earthquakes, and intentional destruction.

Debris Avalanche: Volcanoes are prone to debris and mountain rock avalanches that can approach speeds of 100 mph.

Debris Flow: Dense mixtures of water-saturated debris that move down-valley; looking and behaving much like flowing concrete. They form when loose masses of unconsolidated material are saturated, become unstable, and move down slope. The source of water varies but includes rainfall, melting snow or ice, and glacial outburst floods.

Debris Slide: Debris slides consist of unconsolidated rock or soil that has moved rapidly down slope. They occur on slopes greater than 65 percent.

Depth of Flooding: The depth of flooding is difference between regulatory flood elevation and the elevation of the lowest grade adjacent to a structure.

Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA); The DMA is Public Law 106-390 and is the latest federal legislation enacted to encourage and promote proactive, pre-disaster planning as a condition of receiving financial assistance under the Robert T. Stafford Act. The DMA emphasizes planning for disasters before they occur. Under the DMA, a pre-disaster hazard mitigation program and new requirements for the national post-disaster hazard mitigation grant program (HMGP) were established.

Drainage Basin: A basin is the area within which all surface water (whether from rainfall, snowmelt, springs, or other sources) flows to a single water body or watercourse. The boundary of a river basin is defined by natural topography, such as hills, mountains, and ridges. Drainage basins are also referred to as “watersheds” and “basins.” The City of Roseville is located within portions of two major drainage basins: the Pleasant Grove Creek Basin and the Dry Creek Basin. Pleasant Grove Creek and its tributaries drain most of the western and central areas of the City, and the Dry Creek Basin and its tributaries drain the remainder of the City. The Dry Creek system has year-round flows in its major watercourses, and the Pleasant Grove Creek system is intermittent, with only seasonal flows. As a result, portions of the City lie within a flood hazard area. However, since 1950, there have been no reports of structural flood damage along Pleasant Grove Creek and there are presently no structures subject to flooding within the Pleasant Grove Creek Basin.

Drought: Drought is a period of time without substantial rainfall or snowfall from one year to the next. Drought can also be defined as the cumulative impacts of several dry years or a deficiency of precipitation over an extended period of time, which in turn results in water shortages for some activity, group, or environmental function. A hydrological drought is caused by deficiencies in surface and subsurface water supplies. A socioeconomic drought impacts the health, well being, and quality of life or starts to have an adverse impact on a region. Drought is a normal, recurrent feature of climate and occurs almost everywhere.

Duration: For the purposes of this Plan, duration is defined as the length of time that a hazard occurs. For example, the duration of a tornado can be minutes, but release of a chemical warfare agent such as mustard gas can persist for hours or weeks if not remediated.

Earthquake: An earthquake is defined as a sudden slip on a fault, volcanic or magmatic activity, and sudden stress changes in the earth that result in ground shaking and radiated seismic energy. Earthquakes can last from a few seconds to over 5 minutes, and have been known to occur as a series of tremors over a period of several days. The actual movement of the ground in an earthquake is seldom the direct cause of injury or death. Casualties may result from falling objects and debris as shocks shake, damage, or demolish buildings and other structures.

Exposure: Exposure is defined as the number and dollar value of assets considered to be at risk during the occurrence of a specific hazard.

Extent: The extent is the size of an area affected by a hazard.

Fire Behavior: Fire behavior refers to the physical characteristics of a fire and is a function of the interaction between the fuel characteristics (such as type of vegetation and structures that could burn), topography, and weather. Variables that affect fire behavior include the rate of spread, intensity, fuel consumption, and fire type (such as underbrush versus crown fire).

Fire Frequency: Fire frequency is the broad measure of the rate of fire occurrence in a particular area. An estimate of the areas most likely to burn is based on past fire history or fire rotation in the area, fuel conditions, weather, ignition sources (such as human or lightning), fire suppression response, and other factors.

Flash Flood: A flash flood occurs with little or no warning when water levels rise at an extremely fast rate

Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM): FIRMs are the official maps on which the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has delineated the Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA).

Flood Insurance Study: A report published by the Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration for a community in conjunction with the community's Flood Insurance rate Map. The study contains such background data as the base flood discharges and water surface elevations that were used to prepare the FIRM. In most cases, a community FIRM with detailed mapping will have a corresponding flood insurance study.

Floodplain: Any land area susceptible to being inundated by flood waters from any source. A flood insurance rate map identifies most, but not necessarily all, of a community's floodplain as the Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA).

Floodway: Floodways are areas within a floodplain that are reserved for the purpose of conveying flood discharge without increasing the base flood elevation more than 1 foot. Generally speaking, no development is allowed in floodways, as any structures located there would block the flow of floodwaters.

Floodway Fringe: Floodway fringe areas are located in the floodplain but outside of the floodway. Some development is generally allowed in these areas, with a variety of restrictions. On maps that have identified and delineated a floodway, this would be the area beyond the floodway boundary that can be subject to different regulations.

Fog: Fog refers to a cloud (or condensed water droplets) near the ground. Fog forms when air close to the ground can no longer hold all the moisture it contains. Fog occurs either when air is cooled to its dew point or the amount of moisture in the air increases. Heavy fog is particularly hazardous because it can restrict surface visibility. Severe fog incidents can close roads, cause vehicle accidents, cause airport delays, and impair the effectiveness of emergency response. Financial losses associated with transportation delays caused by fog have not been calculated in the United States but are known to be substantial.

Freeboard: Freeboard is the margin of safety added to the base flood elevation.

Frequency: For the purposes of this Plan, frequency refers to how often a hazard of specific magnitude, duration, and/or extent is expected to occur on average. Statistically, a hazard with a 100-year frequency is expected to occur about once every 100 years on average and has a 1 percent chance of occurring any given year. Frequency reliability varies depending on the type of hazard considered.

Fujita Scale of Tornado Intensity: Tornado wind speeds are sometimes estimated on the basis of wind speed and damage sustained using the Fujita Scale. The scale rates the intensity or severity of tornado events using numeric values from F0 to F5 based on tornado wind speed and damage. An F0 tornado (wind speed less than 73 miles per hour [mph]) indicates minimal damage (such as broken tree limbs), and an F5 tornado (wind speeds of 261 to 318 mph) indicates severe damage.

General Plan: California state law requires that every county and city prepare and adopt a comprehensive long-range plan to serve as a guide for community development. The plan must consist of an integrated and internally consistent set of goals, policies, and implementation measures. In addition, the plan must focus on issues of the greatest concern to the community and be written in a clear and concise manner. City actions, such as those relating to land-use allocation, annexations, zoning, subdivision and design review, redevelopment, and capital improvements, must be consistent with such a plan. The City of Roseville's general plan serves these purposes. As the principle planning document that directs the City's growth and land use, the general plan is as an integral part of the Roseville hazard mitigation plan. A technical update to Roseville's general plan was completed in January 2003.

Goal: A goal is a general guideline that explains what is to be achieved. Goals are usually broad-based, long-term, policy-type statements and represent global visions. Goals help define the benefits that a plan is trying to achieve.

The success of the Roseville hazard mitigation plan, once implemented, should be measured by the degree to which its goals have been met (that is, by the actual benefits in terms of actual hazard mitigation).

Geographic Information System (GIS): GIS is a computer software application that relates data regarding physical and other features on the earth to a database for mapping and analysis.

Hazard: A hazard is a source of potential danger or adverse condition that could harm people and/or cause property damage. Natural hazards include floods, winds, and earthquakes. Man-made hazards include acts of terrorism and hazardous material spills.

Hazardous Material: A hazardous material is a substance or combination of substances that (1) can cause or contribute to an increase in mortality or serious irreversible or incapacitating reversible illnesses, or (2) pose a present or potential hazard to human life, property, or the environment. Hazardous materials could cause these effects because of their quantity, concentration, or physical, chemical, or infectious characteristics. Hazardous waste is included in the City's working definition of hazardous material.

Hazardous Material Incident: This type of incident involves the accidental or intentional release of hazardous materials to the environment. Such incidents typically occur as fixed facility incidents or transportation incidents. It is possible to identify and prepare for a fixed facility incident because federal and state laws require facilities to notify state and local authorities about hazardous materials used or produced at the facility. Transportation incidents are more difficult to prepare for because there is little (if any) notice about the materials involved. Except for severe weather and flooding, hazardous materials incidents are the most likely hazards to affect the City of Roseville.

Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP): Authorized under Section 202 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, the HMGP is administered by FEMA and provides grants to states, tribes, and local governments to implement hazard mitigation actions after a major disaster declaration. The purpose of the program is to reduce the loss of life and property due to disasters and to enable mitigation activities to be implemented as a community recovers from a disaster

Hazards U.S. Hazard (HAZUS-MH) Loss Estimation Program: HAZUS-MH is a GIS-based program used to support the development of risk assessments as required under the DMA. The HAZUS-MH software program assesses risk in a quantitative manner to estimate damages and losses associated with natural hazards. HAZUS-MH is FEMA's nationally applicable, standardized methodology and software program and contains modules for estimating potential losses from earthquakes, floods, and wind hazards. HAZUS-MH has also been used to assess vulnerability (exposure) for other hazards facing Roseville.

Hydraulics: Hydraulics is the branch of science or engineering that addresses fluids (especially water) in motion in rivers or canals, works and machinery for conducting or raising water, the use of water as a prime mover, and other fluid-related areas.

Hydrology: Hydrology is the analysis of waters of the earth. For example, a flood discharge estimate is developed by conducting a hydrologic study.

Intensity: For the purposes of this Plan, intensity refers to the measure of the effects of a hazard.

Inventory: The assets identified in a study region comprise an inventory. Inventories include assets that could be lost when a disaster occurs and community resources are at risk. Assets include people, buildings, transportation, and other valued community resources.

Landslide: Landslides can be described as the sliding movement of masses of loosened rock and soil down a hillside or slope. Fundamentally, slope failures occur when the strength of the soils forming the slope exceeds the pressure, such as weight or saturation, acting upon them.

Large Gathering Places: For the purposes of this Plan, such places are defined as follows:

- Any facility listed as a Type A-2.1 in the California Uniform Building Code (UBC) because it has an assembly room with an occupant load of 300 or more without a stage (34 locations in Roseville)
- Any buildings listed as E-1 used for educational purposes through the 12th grade by 50 or more persons for more than 12 hours per week or 4 hours any 1 day (29 buildings in Roseville)
- Any facility likely to have an occupancy of greater than 300, such as a large employment centers, retail centers, cultural centers, and places of worship

Lightning: Lightning is an electrical discharge resulting from the buildup of positive and negative charges within a thunderstorm. When the buildup becomes strong enough, lightning appears as a “bolt,” usually within or between clouds and the ground. A bolt of lightning instantaneously reaches temperatures approaching 50,000°F. The rapid heating and cooling of air near lightning causes thunder. Lightning is a major threat during thunderstorms. In the United States, 75 to 100 Americans are struck and killed by lightning each year (see <http://www.fema.gov/hazard/thunderstorms/thunder.shtm>).

Liquefaction: Liquefaction is the complete failure of soils, occurring when soils lose shear strength and flow horizontally. It is most likely to occur in fine grain sands and silts, which behave like viscous fluids when liquefaction occurs. This situation is extremely hazardous to development on the soils that liquefy, and generally results in extreme property damage and threats to life and safety.

Local Government: Any county, municipality, city, town, township, public authority, school district, special district, intrastate district, council of governments (regardless of whether the council of governments is incorporated as a nonprofit corporation under State law), regional or interstate government entity, or agency or instrumentality of a local government; any Indian tribe or authorized tribal organization, or Alaska Native village or organization; and any rural community, unincorporated town or village, or other public entity.

Magnitude: Magnitude is the measure of the strength of an earthquake, and is typically measured by the Richter scale. As an estimate of energy, each whole number step in the magnitude scale corresponds to the release of about 31 times more energy than the amount associated with the preceding whole number value.

Mass movement: A collective term for landslides, mudflows, debris flows, sinkholes and lahars.

Mitigation: A preventive action that can be taken in advance of an event that will reduce or eliminate the risk to life or property.

Mitigation Actions: Mitigation actions are specific actions to achieve goals and objectives that minimize the effects from a disaster and reduce the loss of life and property.

Nolte Future Floodplain: The Nolte Future Floodplain is the portion of the regulatory floodplain based on the Roseville City of Roseville Floodplain Analysis published by Nolte and Associates in August 1986. This analysis used hydrologic parameters that better represented the observed flooding scenarios that caused flooding in Roseville. The study also used hydrologic parameters based on projected growth for the region assuming total development of the watershed instead of existing conditions used by FEMA. This approach generated a floodplain area greater than that reflected of on the FIRM for portions of Roseville. Although this study was never formally adopted, it is used by the City as the best available information for regulatory and land- use programs such as the specific plan program and improvement standards.

Objective: For the purposes of this Plan, an objective is defined as a short-term aim that, when combined with other objectives, forms a strategy or course of action to meet a goal. Unlike goals, objectives are specific and measurable.

Peak Ground Acceleration: Peak Ground Acceleration (PGA) is a measure of the highest amplitude of ground shaking that accompanies an earthquake, based on a percentage of the force of gravity.

Preparedness: Preparedness refers to actions that strengthen the capability of government, citizens, and communities to respond to disasters.

Presidential Disaster Declaration: These declarations are typically made for events that cause more damage than state and local governments and resources can handle without federal government assistance. Generally, no specific dollar loss threshold has been established for such declarations. A Presidential Disaster Declaration puts into motion long-term federal recovery programs, some of which are matched by state programs, designed to help disaster victims, businesses, and public entities.

Probability of Occurrence: The probability of occurrence is a statistical measure or estimate of the likelihood that a hazard will occur. This probability is generally based on past hazard events in the area and a forecast of events that could occur in the future. A probability factor based on yearly values of occurrence is used to estimate probability of occurrence.

Regulatory Floodplain: This term refers to an area regulated by the City of Roseville as floodplain through its land-use regulations and improvement standards. It includes areas identified by FEMA and published on FIRMs and additional areas identified by Roseville as being susceptible to flooding. These areas are delineated based on detailed hydrologic and hydraulic floodplain modeling that meets or exceeds FEMA criteria for mapping and modeling floodplains. The flood event used to delineate these boundaries is referred to as “the regulatory flood” in this Plan to differentiate it from the “base flood” used by FEMA. The City of Roseville designates the 100-year floodplain area on its land-use map in accordance with best available floodplain information as determined by the Public Works Director. In many portions of the City, the Nolte Future Floodplain (May 1987) has been used to designate floodplain boundaries. When Nolte Future Floodplain information does not exist or does not represent the best available information, new floodplain information is generated by the project proponent. New floodplain information is generally developed (1) consistent with build-out development assumptions used by the Nolte Future Floodplain analysis, and (2) in compliance with the most recent Placer County floodplain manual. Floodplain boundaries can normally be terminated where the 100-year floodplain narrows to a width of 200 feet or less and where the associated drainage area is less than 300 acres. Precise termination of boundaries must be approved by the Public Works Director.

Repetitive Loss Property: Any NFIP-insured property that, since 1978 and regardless of any changes of ownership during that period, has experienced:

- Four or more paid flood losses in excess of \$1000.00; or
- Two paid flood losses in excess of \$1000.00 within any 10-year period since 1978 or
- Three or more paid losses that equal or exceed the current value of the insured property.

Return Period (or Mean Return Period): This term refers to the average period of time in years between occurrences of a particular hazard (equal to the inverse of the annual frequency of occurrence).

Riverine: Of or produced by a river. Riverine floodplains have readily identifiable channels. Floodway maps can only be prepared for riverine floodplains.

Risk: Risk is the estimated impact that a hazard would have on people, services, facilities, and structures in a community. Risk measures the likelihood of a hazard occurring and resulting in an adverse condition that causes

injury or damage. Risk is often expressed in relative terms such as a high, moderate, or low likelihood of sustaining damage above a particular threshold due to occurrence of a specific type of hazard. Risk also can be expressed in terms of potential monetary losses associated with the intensity of the hazard.

Risk Assessment: Risk assessment is the process of measuring potential loss of life, personal injury, economic injury, and property damage resulting from hazards. This process assesses the vulnerability of people, buildings, and infrastructure to hazards and focuses on (1) hazard identification; (2) impacts of hazards on physical, social, and economic assets; (3) vulnerability identification; and (4) estimates of the cost of damage or costs that could be avoided through mitigation.

Risk Ranking: This ranking serves two purposes, first to describe the probability that a hazard will occur, and second to describe the impact a hazard will have on the people, property, and economy of Roseville. Risk estimates for the City are based on the methodology that the City used to prepare the risk assessment for this Plan. The following equation shows the risk ranking calculation:

$$\text{Risk Ranking} = \text{Probability} + \text{Impact (people + property + economy)}$$

Robert T. Stafford Act: The Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, Public Law 100-107, was signed into law on November 23, 1988. This law amended the Disaster Relief Act of 1974, Public Law 93-288. The Stafford Act is the statutory authority for most federal disaster response activities, especially as they pertain to FEMA and its programs.

Sinkhole: A collapse depression in the ground with no visible outlet. Its drainage is subterranean. It is commonly vertical-sided or funnel-shaped.

Slab: This refers to one or more layers of snow in which the grains are bonded together. A slab initially fails over a large area instead of at a single point.

Special Flood Hazard Area: The base floodplain delineated on a Flood Insurance Rate Map. The SFHA is mapped as a Zone A in riverine situations and zone V in coastal situations. The SFHA may or may not encompass all of a community's flood problems

Stakeholder: Business leaders, civic groups, academia, non-profit organizations, major employers, managers of critical facilities, farmers, developers, special purpose districts, and others whose actions could impact hazard mitigation.

Steering Committee: The Steering Committee is the Roseville City Council-approved group that oversaw all phases of the hazard mitigation plan's development. The members of this committee included key city personnel, citizens, and other stakeholders from within the planning area.

Stream Bank Erosion: Stream bank erosion is common along rivers, streams and drains where banks have been eroded, sloughed or undercut. However, it is important to remember that a stream is a dynamic and constantly changing system. It is natural for a stream to want to meander, so not all eroding banks are "bad" and in need of repair. Generally, stream bank erosion becomes a problem where development has limited the meandering nature of streams, where streams have been channelized, or where stream bank structures (like bridges, culverts, etc.) are located in places where they can actually cause damage to downstream areas. Stabilizing these areas can help protect watercourses from continued sedimentation, damage to adjacent land uses, control unwanted meander, and improvement of habitat for fish and wildlife.

Steep Slope: Different communities and agencies define it differently, depending on what it is being applied to, but generally a steep slope is a slope in which the percent slope equals or exceeds 25%. For this study, steep slope is defined as slopes greater than 33%.

Subduction Zone Earthquake: This type of quake occurs along two converging plates, attached to one another along their interface. When the interface between these two plates slips, a sudden, dramatic release of energy results, propagated along the entire fault line.

Sustainable Hazard Mitigation: This concept includes the sound management of natural resources, local economic and social resiliency, and the recognition that hazards and mitigation must be understood in the largest possible social and economic context.

Technical Subcommittee: This City of Roseville group convened to provide guidance, support, and feedback to the planning team during all phases of Roseville hazard mitigation plan development. The technical subcommittee consisted of key staff from City departments integral to implementing City programs pertinent to hazard mitigation.

Technological Hazard: A technological hazard arises from human activities such as the manufacture, transportation, storage, and use of hazardous materials. Technological hazards are assumed to be accidental in nature, with unintended consequences.

Thunderstorm: A thunderstorm is a storm with lightning and thunder produced by cumulonimbus clouds. Thunderstorms usually produce gusty winds, heavy rains, and sometimes hail. Thunderstorms are usually short in duration (seldom more than 2 hours). Heavy rains associated with thunderstorms can lead to flash flooding during the wet or dry seasons.

Tornado: A tornado is a violently rotating column of air extending between and in contact with a cloud and the surface of the earth. Tornadoes are often (but not always) visible as funnel clouds. On a local scale, tornadoes are the most intense of all atmospheric circulations, and winds can reach destructive speeds of more than 300 mph. A tornado's vortex is typically a few hundred meters in diameter, and damage paths can be up to 1 mile wide and 50 miles long.

Vulnerability: Vulnerability describes how exposed or susceptible an asset is to damage. Vulnerability depends on an asset's construction, contents, and the economic value of its functions. Like indirect damages, the vulnerability of one element of the community is often related to the vulnerability of another. For example, many businesses depend on uninterrupted electrical power. Flooding of an electric substation would affect not only the substation itself but businesses as well. Often, indirect effects can be much more widespread and damaging than direct effects.

Water Supply Strategy: A water supply strategy is a comprehensive approach to ensure water reliability for Roseville's customers. The City has a diverse set of water supply options, including surface water contracts, recycled water, and groundwater wells to ensure that even after a period of dry years, a combination of available water supplies and water conservation measures will ensure that the community has adequate water. The City has contracts for surface water with three agencies

Watershed: A watershed is an area that drains downgradient from areas of higher land to areas of lower land to the lowest point, a common drainage basin.

Weapon of Mass Destruction (WMD): WMDs include chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and explosive weapons associated with terrorism.

West Nile Virus: West Nile virus is a recent natural hazard affecting California. Mosquitoes transmit this potentially deadly disease to livestock and humans alike. West Nile virus first struck the northern hemisphere in Queens, New York, in 1999 and killed four people. In 2003, all 50 states warned of an outbreak from any of the 30 mosquito species known to carry it. From 62 severe cases in 1999, confirmed human cases of the virus spread

to 39 states in 2002 and killed 284 people. Less than 1 percent of those infected develop severe illness. People over 50 years of age appear to be at high risk for the severe aspects of the disease.

Wildfire: These terms refer to any uncontrolled fire occurring on undeveloped land that requires fire suppression. The potential for wildfire is influenced by three factors: the presence of fuel, topography, and air mass. Fuel can include living and dead vegetation on the ground, along the surface as brush and small trees, and in the air such as tree canopies. Topography includes both slope and elevation. Air mass includes temperature, relative humidity, wind speed and direction, cloud cover, precipitation amount, duration, and the stability of the atmosphere at the time of the fire. Wildfires can be ignited by lightning and, most frequently, by human activity including smoking, campfires, equipment use, and arson.

Windstorm: Windstorms are generally short-duration events involving straight-line winds or gusts exceeding 50 mph. These gusts can produce winds of sufficient strength to cause property damage. Windstorms are especially dangerous in areas with significant tree stands, exposed property, poorly constructed buildings, mobile homes (manufactured housing units), major infrastructure, and aboveground utility lines. A windstorm can topple trees and power lines; cause damage to residential, commercial, critical facilities; and leave tons of debris in its wake.

Zoning Ordinance: The zoning ordinance designates allowable land use and intensities for a local jurisdiction. Zoning ordinances consist of two components: a zoning text and a zoning map.

City of Roseville 2016 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan

Appendix A. Public Outreach Materials

City of Roseville Survey: 2016 Hazard Mitigation Plan Update Questionnaire

1. Survey Introduction

City of Roseville Hazard Mitigation Questionnaire

A range of natural and man-made disasters can affect any community. The City of Roseville works diligently to mitigate threats and prepare for disasters, and has been recognized nationally for its level of excellence in the area of hazard mitigation. This ensures our community minimizes the impact of adversity and can recover as quickly as possible.

To remain at this high level of preparedness, we need your help to identify and plan for future disasters. Data collected through this survey will help the City of Roseville Multi-Hazard Mitigation Committee:

- Assess our residents' level of awareness regarding disasters;
- Determine areas vulnerable to various types of disasters;
- Coordinate activities to reduce the risk of injury or property damage in the future; and,
- Update the City of Roseville Hazard Mitigation Plan.

The City of Roseville Hazard Mitigation Plan is required to be updated every five years by the federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000.

The Plan details the risks of both natural and manmade hazards in Roseville and includes programs and projects that can help reduce the exposure of City residents and businesses should an event occur in Roseville. The Plan also makes the City eligible for federal pre-disaster and post-disaster assistance. The City has been very successful to date in securing funds for projects in Roseville to lessen the risks associated with natural hazards in Roseville.

This survey consists of three sets of questions: The first section consists of demographic information that will be used in evaluating the responses to the questionnaire. The second section is about the potential hazards near you and whether your knowledge of potential hazards influenced your decision to choose where you live. The last section is about your experience and knowledge of natural and manmade hazards in general, and steps your household has taken to prepare for disasters.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in the 2016 Hazard Mitigation Questionnaire!

City of Roseville Survey: 2016 Hazard Mitigation Plan Update Questionnaire

2. About You

First, please tell us about yourself. This information will aid the City's Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan Steering Committee in evaluating the responses to this questionnaire. The answers will be used only for the preparation of this Plan and will not be provided to any other group or interest.

1. How much is your gross household income?

- ☐ \$20,000 or less ☐ \$75,000 to \$99,999
☐ \$20,001 to \$49,999 ☐ \$100,000 or More
☐ \$50,000 to \$74,999

2. Do you work in Roseville?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Please indicate the primary language spoken in your household.

- ☐ English ☐ Other Indo-European Language
☐ Spanish ☐ Asian and Pacific Island Languages
☐ Other (please specify)

4. Which of the following digital media outlets do you subscribe to receive news and information about the City of Roseville?

Select all that apply.

- ☐ Facebook ☐ E-mail and/or text messages
☐ Twitter ☐ Alert Roseville
☐ Nextdoor
☐ Other (please specify)

City of Roseville Survey: 2016 Hazard Mitigation Plan Update Questionnaire

3. Location

Please tell us about where you live and if the potential impacts of natural or manmade hazards influenced your decision.:

* 5. Do you live in Roseville?

☐ Yes

☐ No

6. Do you own or rent your place of residence?

☐ Own

☐ Rent

7. How long have you lived in at your current residence?

☐ Less than a year

☐ 11 – 15 years

☐ 1 – 2 years

☐ 16 – 20 years

☐ 3 – 5 years

☐ More than 20 years

☐ 6 – 10 years

☐ I don't live in Roseville

* 8. When you moved into your home, did you consider the impact a natural or human-caused disaster could have on your home?

☐ Yes

☐ No

* 9. Was the presence of a natural hazard risk zone (e.g., dam failure zone, flood zone, landslide hazard area, high fire risk area) disclosed to you by a real estate agent, seller, or landlord before you purchased or moved into your home?

☐ Yes

☐ No

* 10. Is your residence located in or near a FEMA designated floodplain?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Not Sure

11. Is your residence located in a dam failure zone?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Not sure

* 12. Do you have flood insurance?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Not Sure

* 13. Is your residence located near an earthquake fault?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Not Sure

* 14. Do you have earthquake insurance?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Not Sure

* 15. Is your property located in an area at risk for wildfires?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Not Sure

16. Have you ever had problems securing homeowners or renters insurance due to risks from hazards?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If "yes," what hazard was the cause of the difficulty?

17. Do you support policies to restrict or prohibit development in designated hazard zones?

☐ Yes

☐ No

* indicates a question that requires an answer.

City of Roseville Survey: 2016 Hazard Mitigation Plan Update Questionnaire

4. Hazard Knowledge

The next set of questions is about your experience and knowledge of natural and manmade hazards and steps your household has taken to prepare for disasters:

18. Which of the following natural hazard events have you or has anyone in your household experienced within the past 20 years in Roseville? (Check all that apply)

☐ Dam Failure

☐ Extreme Heat

☐ Severe Weather (wind, lightning, winter storm, etc.)

☐ Drought

☐ Flood

☐ Wildfire

☐ Earthquake

☐ Freeze

☐ None

☐ Epidemic/Pandemic (flu, avian flu, H1N1, West Nile)

☐ Landslide & Other Earth Movements (non-seismic induced landslides and earth movements; subsidence; sinkholes; geologic hazard)

☐ Other (please specify)

* 19. How concerned are you about the following natural hazards in Roseville? (Please check one for each hazard)

	Not concerned	Somewhat concerned	Concerned	Very concerned	Extremely concerned
Dam Failure	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Drought	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Earthquake	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Epidemic/Pandemic (flu, avian flu, H1N1, West Nile, Ebola)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Extreme Heat	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Flood	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Freeze	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Landslide & Other Earth Movements (non-seismic induced landslides and earth movements;subsidence;sinkholes;geologic hazard)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Severe Weather (wind, lightning, winter storm, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Wildfire	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other Natural Hazard	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

If you are concerned about a natural hazard not listed above, please specify.

* 20. How concerned are you with the following manmade hazards in Roseville? (Check all that apply)

	Not concerned	Somewhat concerned	Concerned	Very concerned	Extremely concerned
Energy Shortage	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Act of Terrorism	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Hazardous Materials Release	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Cyber Threats	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other Human-Caused Hazard	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

If you are concerned about a human-caused hazard not listed above, please specify.

- * 21. The FEMA website - Ready.gov - provides important information on how to prepare you and your family in the event of a disaster.

How prepared is your household for a natural or human-caused hazard event? (Check one)

- ☐ Not at all Prepared ☐ Well Prepared
☐ Somewhat Prepared ☐ Very Well Prepared
☐ Adequately Prepared

- * 22. How would you expect to be notified in case of an immediate threat caused by a natural or human-caused hazard.

Select all that apply.

- ☐ Television ☐ Facebook ☐ Nextdoor
☐ Radio ☐ Twitter ☐ Alert Roseville
☐ Other (please specify)

23. FEMA suggests that households have at least 3 days of food, water, and vital supplies (e.g. medications) in hand in the event of a disaster. How many days of food, water, and vital supplies does your family have on hand in the event of a disaster?

- ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10 ☐ None

24. How prepared are you to get along without electricity or natural gas for one to five days?

- ☐ Not at all prepared ☐ Somewhat prepared ☐ Very prepared

25. Where would you expect to find useful information to help you be prepared?

Select all that apply.

- ☐ Television ☐ City of Roseville Public Library
☐ Internet ☐ Public government meetings
☐ Social Media ☐ Schools/academic institutions
☐ Newspaper/magazine
☐ Other (please specify)

26. Which of the following steps has your household already undertaken to prepare for a natural or manmade disaster?

Select all that apply.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| ☐ Received first aid/CPR training | ☐ Community Emergency Response Training (CERT) | ☐ Stored flashlights and batteries |
| ☐ Made a fire escape plan | ☐ Prepared a disaster supply kit | ☐ Stored a battery-powered radio |
| ☐ Designated a meeting place | ☐ Installed smoke detectors on each level of the house | ☐ Stored a fire extinguisher |
| ☐ Identified utility shutoffs | ☐ Stored food and water | ☐ Stored medical supplies (first aid kit, medications) |

☐ Other (please specify)


27. Please provide any additional comments you would like to share with the City of Roseville Planning Team.

* indicates a question that requires an answer.

28. If you would like to receive information regarding upcoming public events and other participatory opportunities regarding hazard mitigation, please provide your email address below.

Q1 How much is your gross household income?


Answered: 641 Skipped: 30



Answer Choices	Responses	
\$20,000 or less	3.28%	21
\$20,001 to \$49,999	13.73%	88
\$50,000 to \$74,999	19.03%	122
\$75,000 to \$99,999	21.53%	138
\$100,000 or More	42.43%	272
Total		641

Q2 Do you work in Roseville?


Answered: 650 Skipped: 21



Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	41.23%	268
No	58.77%	382
Total		650

Q3 Please indicate the primary language spoken in your household.


Answered: 662 Skipped: 9



Answer Choices	Responses	
English	97.43%	645
Spanish	0.60%	4
Other Indo-European Language	0.00%	0
Asian and Pacific Island Languages	0.60%	4
Other (please specify)	1.36%	9
Total		662

**Q4 Which of the following digital media outlets do you subscribe to receive news and information about the City of Roseville?
Select all that apply.**


Answered: 658 Skipped: 13



Answer Choices	Responses	
Facebook	58.97%	388
Twitter	9.42%	62
Nextdoor	63.37%	417
E-mail and/or text messages	69.45%	457
Alert Roseville	37.39%	246
Other (please specify)	4.10%	27
Total Respondents: 658		

Q5 Do you live in Roseville?


Answered: 646 Skipped: 25



Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	97.68%	631
No	2.32%	15
Total		646

Q6 Do you own or rent your place of residence?


Answered: 641 Skipped: 30



Answer Choices	Responses	
Own	88.46%	567
Rent	11.54%	74
Total		641

Q7 How long have you lived in at your current residence?


Answered: 642 Skipped: 29



Answer Choices	Responses	
Less than a year	8.41%	54
1 – 2 years	12.93%	83
3 – 5 years	19.94%	128
6 – 10 years	18.22%	117
11 – 15 years	14.33%	92
16 – 20 years	10.44%	67
More than 20 years	15.58%	100
I don't live in Roseville	0.16%	1
Total		642

Q8 When you moved into your home, did you consider the impact a natural or human-caused disaster could have on your home?


Answered: 646 Skipped: 25



Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	57.12%	369
No	42.88%	277
Total		646

Q9 Was the presence of a natural hazard risk zone (e.g., dam failure zone, flood zone, landslide hazard area, high fire risk area) disclosed to you by a real estate agent, seller, or landlord before you purchased or moved into your home?


Answered: 646 Skipped: 25



Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	35.29%	228
No	64.71%	418
Total		646

Q10 Is your residence located in or near a FEMA designated floodplain?


Answered: 646 Skipped: 25



Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	4.49%	29
No	55.11%	356
Not Sure	40.40%	261
Total		646

Q11 Is your residence located in a dam failure zone?


Answered: 642 Skipped: 29



Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	1.71%	11
No	60.75%	390
Not sure	37.54%	241
Total		642

Q12 Do you have flood insurance?


Answered: 646 Skipped: 25



Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	6.19%	40
No	83.90%	542
Not Sure	9.91%	64
Total		646

Q13 Is your residence located near an earthquake fault?


Answered: 646 Skipped: 25



Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	1.39%	9
No	51.39%	332
Not Sure	47.21%	305
Total		646

Q14 Do you have earthquake insurance?


Answered: 646 Skipped: 25



Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	7.74%	50
No	82.66%	534
Not Sure	9.60%	62
Total		646

Q15 Is your property located in an area at risk for wildfires?


Answered: 646 Skipped: 25



Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	7.59%	49
No	74.77%	483
Not Sure	17.65%	114
Total		646

Q16 Have you ever had problems securing homeowners or renters insurance due to risks from hazards?


Answered: 641 Skipped: 30



Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	0.47%	3
No	99.53%	638
Total		641

Q17 Do you support policies to restrict or prohibit development in designated hazard zones?


Answered: 623 Skipped: 48



Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	88.60%	552
No	11.40%	71
Total		623

Q18 Which of the following natural hazard events have you or has anyone in your household experienced within the past 20 years in Roseville? (Check all that apply)

Answered: 556 Skipped: 115




Answer Choices	Responses	
Dam Failure	0.00%	0
Drought	66.19%	368
Earthquake	16.55%	92
Epidemic/Pandemic (flu, avian flu, H1N1, West Nile)	8.99%	50
Extreme Heat	40.47%	225
Flood	15.11%	84
Freeze	27.88%	155

City of Roseville Survey: 2016 Hazard Mitigation Plan Update Questionnaire

Landslide & Other Earth Movements (non-seismic induced landslides and earth movements;subsidence;sinkholes;geologic hazard)	1.08%	6
Severe Weather (wind, lightning, winter storm, etc.)	44.06%	245
Wildfire	6.83%	38
None	19.96%	111
Other (please specify)	2.52%	14
Total Respondents: 556		

**Q19 How concerned are you about the following natural hazards in Roseville?
(Please check one for each hazard)**

Answered: 562 Skipped: 109




	Not concerned	Somewhat concerned	Concerned	Very concerned	Extremely concerned	Total	Weighted Average
Dam Failure	64.76% 351	22.51% 122	8.86% 48	2.03% 11	1.85% 10	542	1.54
Drought	7.10% 38	12.15% 65	25.42% 136	32.52% 174	22.80% 122	535	3.52
Earthquake	32.15% 172	38.88% 208	20.00% 107	5.98% 32	2.99% 16	535	2.09
Epidemic/Pandemic (flu, avian flu, H1N1, West Nile, Ebola)	28.01% 149	31.58% 168	25.38% 135	8.46% 45	6.58% 35	532	2.34
Extreme Heat	24.54% 132	27.14% 146	26.02% 140	15.99% 86	6.32% 34	538	2.52

City of Roseville Survey: 2016 Hazard Mitigation Plan Update Questionnaire

Flood	38.14% 201	32.83% 173	18.98% 100	6.07% 32	3.98% 21	527	2.05
Freeze	52.31% 272	29.23% 152	12.50% 65	4.04% 21	1.92% 10	520	1.74
Landslide & Other Earth Movements (non-seismic induced landslides and earth movements;subsidence;sinkholes;geologic hazard)	60.30% 319	25.33% 134	8.70% 46	3.21% 17	2.46% 13	529	1.62
Severe Weather (wind, lightning, winter storm, etc.)	30.78% 165	35.45% 190	22.95% 123	7.65% 41	3.17% 17	536	2.17
Wildfire	50.37% 270	25.19% 135	14.18% 76	5.22% 28	5.04% 27	536	1.89
Other Natural Hazard	53.80% 262	25.05% 122	13.76% 67	3.08% 15	4.31% 21	487	1.79

**Q20 How concerned are you with the following manmade hazards in Roseville?
(Check all that apply)**


Answered: 562 Skipped: 109



	Not concerned	Somewhat concerned	Concerned	Very concerned	Extremely concerned	Total	Weighted Average
Energy Shortage	28.30% 150	37.55% 199	22.83% 121	7.36% 39	3.96% 21	530	2.21
Act of Terrorism	16.76% 90	30.54% 164	26.63% 143	16.95% 91	9.12% 49	537	2.71
Hazardous Materials Release	15.92% 85	32.02% 171	26.97% 144	15.17% 81	9.93% 53	534	2.71
Cyber Threats	15.99% 86	29.93% 161	28.07% 151	17.47% 94	8.55% 46	538	2.73
Other Human-Caused Hazard	25.20% 125	29.84% 148	25.81% 128	11.49% 57	7.66% 38	496	2.47

Q21 The FEMA website - Ready.gov - provides important information on how to prepare you and your family in the event of a disaster. How prepared is your household for a natural or human-caused hazard event? (Check one)


Answered: 562 Skipped: 109



Answer Choices	Responses	
Not at all Prepared	17.08%	96
Somewhat Prepared	49.82%	280
Adequately Prepared	22.78%	128
Well Prepared	7.83%	44
Very Well Prepared	2.49%	14
Total		562

Q22 How would you expect to be notified in case of an immediate threat caused by a natural or human-caused hazard. Select all that apply.


Answered: 562 Skipped: 109



Answer Choices	Responses	
Television	83.81%	471
Radio	69.93%	393
Facebook	53.02%	298
Twitter	11.57%	65
Nextdoor	57.12%	321
Alert Roseville	58.72%	330
Other (please specify)	16.55%	93
Total Respondents: 562		

Q23 FEMA suggests that households have at least 3 days of food, water, and vital supplies (e.g. medications) in hand in the event of a disaster. How many days of food, water, and vital supplies does your family have on hand in the event of a disaster?

Answered: 556 Skipped: 115




Answer Choices	Responses	
1	6.83%	38
2	14.39%	80
3	21.76%	121
4	7.73%	43
5	13.67%	76

City of Roseville Survey: 2016 Hazard Mitigation Plan Update Questionnaire

6	2.52%	14
7	11.51%	64
8	1.08%	6
9	0.54%	3
10	16.19%	90
None	3.78%	21
Total		556

Q24 How prepared are you to get along without electricity or natural gas for one to five days?


Answered: 558 Skipped: 113



Answer Choices	Responses	
Not at all prepared	26.16%	146
Somewhat prepared	58.60%	327
Very prepared	15.23%	85
Total		558

Q25 Where would you expect to find useful information to help you be prepared? Select all that apply.


Answered: 560 Skipped: 111



Answer Choices	Responses	
Television	55.36%	310
Internet	91.79%	514
Social Media	46.79%	262
Newspaper/magazine	39.29%	220
City of Roseville Public Library	33.57%	188
Public government meetings	29.64%	166
Schools/academic institutions	18.39%	103
Other (please specify)	7.68%	43
Total Respondents: 560		

Q26 Which of the following steps has your household already undertaken to prepare for a natural or manmade disaster? Select all that apply.

Answered: 558 Skipped: 113



Answer Choices	Responses
Received first aid/CPR training	58.42% 326
Made a fire escape plan	38.89% 217
Designated a meeting place	29.57% 165
Identified utility shutoffs	53.94% 301
Community Emergency Response Training (CERT)	3.76% 21

City of Roseville Survey: 2016 Hazard Mitigation Plan Update Questionnaire

Prepared a disaster supply kit	26.52%	148
Installed smoke detectors on each level of the house	93.55%	522
Stored food and water	64.16%	358
Stored flashlights and batteries	78.49%	438
Stored a battery-powered radio	39.25%	219
Stored a fire extinguisher	65.59%	366
Stored medical supplies (first aid kit, medications)	70.25%	392
Other (please specify)	4.12%	23
Total Respondents: 558		

**Q27 Please provide any additional
comments you would like to share with the
City of Roseville Planning Team.**

Answered: 65 Skipped: 606

Q28 If you would like to receive information regarding upcoming public events and other participatory opportunities regarding hazard mitigation, please provide your email address below.

Answered: 223 Skipped: 448

From: City of Roseville <Roseville@public.govdelivery.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 1, 2016 8:59 AM
To:
Subject: City of Roseville News - March 1, 2016



Downtown Roseville update

It will be a busy couple years for city building projects in Downtown Roseville. All of the projects are part of the Downtown Specific Plan designed through a community visioning process in 2009. The highly popular Vernon Street Town Square and roundabout at Washington Boulevard and Oak Street are examples of projects already completed in accordance with the plan.

Current projects include an office building at 316 Vernon Street, the Oak Street Parking facility, a new downtown Fire Station, three pedestrian bridges and bike trail connections through downtown.

[Find out more](#)



Leaks can run, but they can't hide! Every day during Fix a Leak Week, visit the Roseville Utility Exploration Center to learn where water-wasting leaks hide around home, and learn how to fix them. Use a dye tablet to find toilet leaks, get your hands on a variety of sprinklers, and enter for a chance to win a smart timer or other water-saving technology. Best of all, it is free.

For more information call 916-746-1550 or [visit the Fix A Leak Week page.](#)



Roseville explores creating waste into energy

Work is underway right now to develop a project that would one day help power one of the city's wastewater treatment plants or provide fleet vehicle fuel using Compressed Natural Gas (CNG). This project is in its infancy and more work is needed to see this effort become a reality. But we're hard at work behind the scenes to bring this project online within the next three to five years.

[For more information](#)

Two guides, tons of fun!

Winter/Spring 2016
January-May



Summer 2016
June-August



Download them now at roseville.ca.us/guide



Affordable Housing Information & Workshop

The City of Roseville Affordable Housing Program is offering down payment assistance for qualified households to purchase affordable homes at a new Lennar community in West Roseville.

The City and Lennar will host an affordable housing workshop to provide more information about the program, **5:30 p.m., Wednesday, March 9** in the Roseville City Council Chambers, 311 Vernon Street in Roseville.

[Find out more.](#)



Do you know your risk...

...when it comes to flood, earthquake or any natural or man made disaster here in Roseville? Do you and your family have a three day supply ...of food and water should a disaster occur?

While a range of natural and man-made disasters can affect any community, the City of Roseville is always taking steps to reduce the risk to residents and businesses. We need your input to remain prepared and ensure our community can recover as quickly as possible, should a disaster occur. [Please help us by taking a few minutes to complete this community survey](#)



Apply for up to \$200 toward a new commuter bike

Apply for an opportunity to receive up to \$200 toward a new commuter bike. Bucks for Bikes helps commuters start using an active, clean, traffic-relieving mode of travel—bicycling! **Submit your application by 5 p.m., Monday, March 21.** This is made possible by the City of Roseville and Placer County Transportation Planning Agency.

[Find out more.](#)



Superhero Storytime

We are all super heroes! Visit the Martha Riley Library on the 4th Tuesday of the month through May and we'll explore the everyday superheroes of our city. From 1-1:30 p.m., Miss Lisa will guide us through stories, songs, and activities to discover the super hero in you. Then, come explore the Utility Exploration Center from 1:30 - 2 p.m. to discover play time with special activities to help practice your superhero skills. These fun events are free.

For more information call 916-746-1550.



UPCOMING CITY MEETINGS

Meeting agendas and minutes

City Council Meeting - 7 p.m., Wednesday, March 2

Planning Commission Meeting - 7 p.m., Thursday, March 10

Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting - 7 p.m., Monday, March 7

Transportation Commission Meeting - 7 p.m., Tuesday, March 15

Public Utilities Commission Meeting - 7 p.m., Tuesday, March 22

Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan Steering Committee Meeting - 5:30 p.m., Tuesday, March 1, Civic Center Meeting Rooms 1 & 2

Unless otherwise noted, Council and Commission meetings are held in the Roseville City Council Chambers at 311 Vernon Street. Meetings held in the City Council Chambers can be viewed [live online](#) or later [on demand](#).



If we can't reach you, we can't alert you. Sign up now.

311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA 95678

(916) 774-5200 | www.roseville.ca.us



[Unsubscribe/Update profile](#)

From: City of Roseville <Roseville@public.govdelivery.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2016 8:33 AM
To:
Subject: City of Roseville News - August 2, 2016



Roseville named 11th healthiest city in U.S.

Roseville is the 11th healthiest city in the United States, according to Niche.com.

The ranking provides a comprehensive assessment of the general levels of health among residents in Roseville.

This grade takes into account key indicators of personal health, such as smoking, excessive alcoholic consumption, rates of obesity, as well as the availability and proximity of fitness facilities, doctors, and mental health practitioners, in an attempt to measure an area's performance in health and fitness.

[You can read more about the rankings here.](#)



Roseville among 25 safest cities in the country

Roseville has been ranked among the 25 safest cities in the US! [Niche.com](#) ranked U.S. cities over 100,000 population for safety, based on FBI crime statistics.

Roseville Police Chief Daniel Hahn said, "It takes more a good police department to create a safe city. It also takes city leaders who put public safety first; and a community that won't settle for anything less, and is willing to get involved to make it happen. We're very blessed in Roseville to have all three."

[See the rankings here.](#)



Roseville recognized as national flood protection leader

FEMA has again been recognized Roseville as the national leader in flood preparation. Roseville is the only city in the country to hold FEMA's top flood control rating. Roseville's top rating means flood insurance discounts of up to 45% for residents and businesses.

[Find out more](#)



National Night Out is tonight

National Night Out is considered America's night out against crime.

We encourage you to lock your home and connect with your neighbors at one of the 40 National Night Out community events in Roseville.

Not sure if your neighborhood is hosting an NNO party? Visit the Roseville Coalition of Neighborhood Associations website at www.RCONA.org to contact your neighborhood association.

[Find out more](#)



Talk trash with Curby

You know where trash comes from, but where does it go? Join the Utility Exploration Center **Saturday, August 27** for free family fun at Curby's Waste-a-Palooza!

Fight the unflushables in the Sewer Swim, defend against Trashville and talk trash with Curby to test your knowledge in our quiz show. Challenge yourself in the game room where you can reuse, rethink, recycle and help knock out excess waste.

Grab a water repair LEGO® City set for just \$10 (while supplies last) in the activity room for a fun build-it activity!

[Find out more](#)




Tired of the traffic backups?

Traffic is one of the topics we hear most about from you. There is a plan to raise about \$1.6 billion to fund highway projects, public transit expansion, local street maintenance and improvements including Highway 65 widening and the Highway 65 / I-80 interchange.

With other funding being more difficult to obtain, a ballot measure to increase retail sales tax by a half percent to raise funds for transportation improvements in Placer County was placed on the November 8, 2016, presidential general election ballot by the Placer County Board of Supervisors.

[Find out more](#)



Street resurfacing ahead for parts of Roseville

Resurfacing is scheduled to begin late summer/fall for residential streets in the Foothills/Junction and West Park neighborhoods.

Some more heavily traveled roads in Roseville will also be resurfaced this summer. [The specific roads and schedule can be found here.](#)

Regular roadway maintenance reduces the need for major costly street repairs in the future by protecting Roseville streets.

[Check out this short video](#) to learn more about how we prioritize road maintenance.



Tri County Job Fair to be held August 18

The Tri County Job Fair provides an excellent opportunity for job seekers to meet with businesses within the region and demonstrate their qualifications. This year's event will be held from **9 a.m. - noon, Thursday, August 18 at William Jessup University.**

[For more information and to register](#)

Learn about planned changes to 916 area code

The 916 area code we use in Roseville is expected to use up its available prefixes by December 2018. The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) will be holding a public meeting to discuss proposed changes and to get public feedback on their plan at **1 p.m., Tuesday, August 16** in the Roseville Civic Center's Meeting Rooms 1 & 2.

The CPUC is proposing adding an additional area code to the region. The proposal would allow current customers to keep their area code. Beginning in June 2018, customers requesting new phone numbers may be assigned a new area code.

[Find out more](#)

Comment on city's Draft Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan

You are invited to review and provide comments on the 2016 City of Roseville Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan.

This plan details the risks of both natural and manmade hazards in Roseville and includes programs and projects to help reduce the exposure of city residents and businesses should an event occur. By having a plan in place, Roseville is eligible for federal pre-disaster and post-disaster assistance.

Input on the plan can be submitted through Friday, August 19, 2016.

[View the plan and find out more](#)



UPCOMING CITY MEETINGS

[Meeting agendas and minutes](#)

City Council Meeting - 7 p.m., Wednesday, August 3

Planning Commission Meeting - 7 p.m., Thursday, August 11

Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting - September meeting canceled

Transportation Commission Meeting - August meeting canceled

Public Utilities Commission Meeting - 7 p.m., Tuesday, August 23

Unless otherwise noted, Council and Commission meetings are held in the Roseville City Council Chambers at 311 Vernon Street. Meetings held in the City Council Chambers can be viewed [live online](#) or later [on demand](#).



If we can't reach you, we can't alert you. Sign up now.

311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA 95678

(916) 774-5200 | www.roseville.ca.us



[Unsubscribe/Update profile](#)

This email was sent to hdyda@roseville.ca.us using GovDelivery, on behalf of: City of Roseville · 311 Vernon St. Roseville · CA 95678

powered by
govDELIVERY
get the word out.

From: City of Roseville <Roseville@public.govdelivery.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 9:18 AM
To:
Subject: City of Roseville News - August 16, 2016



Be safe heading back to school

All Roseville-area high school and elementary schools will be back in session this week. That means traffic around those schools will be congested.

[Read on for a refresher course on back-to-school safety.](#)

Walking or biking to school is a great idea. To combat the common fear that walking to school isn't safe, City of Roseville traffic engineers and the Safe Routes to School Coordinators have designated safe routes for students of all ages and abilities.

[Learn about our Safe Routes to School program](#)

Fall 2016 Recreation Guide Now Available!

Download it today | roseville.ca.us/guide

Unemployment rate drops to 3.8 percent in Roseville



The unemployment rate in Roseville is in the lowest 4 percent in the state, 20th of 482 cities in California.

"The leading job sector is healthcare, and healthcare-related businesses," said Roseville Economic Development Director Chris Robles.

"We have Kaiser, the largest employer in the city, and then Sutter is also one of our top employers. Then we have Adventist Health, which is also a significant employer in the city. Their west coast headquarters are here in Roseville."

"A part of Roseville's economic growth is correlated with education levels; namely a more educated work force. The local population over age 25 with a bachelor's degree or higher was over 39 percent as of 2014 – a growth margin of 5 percent since 2010, correlating with the increase in educated workforce members and growing employment figures."

[Read more in this article from the Roseville Press Tribune.](#)

TOWN SQUARE CONCERT SERIES 2016



**AUG
20**

FOREIGNER UNAUTHORIZED

Classic Rock



Talking traffic

Traffic is one of the topics we hear most about from you. There is a plan to raise about \$1.6 billion to fund highway projects, public transit expansion, local street maintenance and improvements including Highway 65 widening and the Highway 65 / I-80 interchange.

With other funding being more difficult to obtain, a ballot measure to increase retail sales tax by a half percent to raise funds for transportation improvements in Placer County was placed on the November 8, 2016, presidential general election ballot by the Placer County Board of Supervisors.

[Find out more](#)



CURBY'S WASTE-A-PALOOZA

SATURDAY, AUGUST 27
10AM - 2PM | FREE EVENT

Woodcreek Oaks widening project workshop

We invite you to a community workshop to learn more about the Woodcreek Oaks Widening Project. The project team will be available to answer questions in an informal format.

Exhibits showing the project features and anticipated schedule will be on display.

Wednesday, August 24

5 - 7 p.m.

Martha Riley Library, Reading Room 3
1501 Pleasant Grove Blvd

The proposed project will widen the segment of Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard, from Crimson Ridge way south to 600 feet north of Pleasant Grove Boulevard, into the median to a four lane road.

This project also proposes to widen the bridge over the south branch of Pleasant Grove Creek to accommodate the additional roadway.

The new Campus Oaks development will widen Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard from Blue Oaks Blvd south to Crimson Ridge Way, and is expected to be constructed by the end of 2016.

[Find out more](#)





Trail resurfacing this week

Portions of Roseville trails system will be resurfaced this week. Notices of the upcoming closures will be posted at the trail entrances. While the resurfacing is underway, barricades will mark where the trails are closed. After the resurfacing is complete and the trail has reopened to the public, striping and sweeping will be performed.

[Find out more](#)

Street resurfacing ahead for parts of Roseville


Resurfacing is scheduled to begin late summer/fall for residential streets in the Foothills/Junction and West Park neighborhoods.

Some more heavily traveled roads in Roseville will also be resurfaced this summer. [The specific roads and schedule can be found here.](#)

Regular roadway maintenance reduces the need for major costly street repairs in the future by protecting Roseville streets.

[Check out this short video](#) to learn more about how we prioritize road maintenance.





Tri County Job Fair to be held August 18

The Tri County Job Fair provides an excellent opportunity for job seekers to meet with businesses within the region and demonstrate their qualifications. This year's event will be held from **9 a.m. - noon, Thursday, August 18** at William Jessup University.

[For more information and to register](#)



Comment on city's Draft Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan

You are invited to review and provide comments on the 2016 City of Roseville Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan.

This plan details the risks of both natural and manmade hazards in Roseville and includes programs and projects to help reduce the exposure of city residents and businesses should an event occur. By having a plan in place, Roseville is eligible for federal pre-disaster and post-disaster assistance.

Input on the plan can be submitted through Friday, August 19, 2016.

[View the plan and find out more](#)



UPCOMING CITY MEETINGS

[Meeting agendas and minutes](#)

City Council Meeting - 7 p.m., Wednesday, August 17

Planning Commission Meeting - 7 p.m., Thursday, August 25

Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting - September meeting canceled

Transportation Commission Meeting - August meeting canceled

Public Utilities Commission Meeting - 7 p.m., Tuesday, August 23

Senior Commission Workshop - 11 a.m., Tuesday, August 23 at Maidu Community Center

Unless otherwise noted, Council and Commission meetings are held in the Roseville City Council Chambers at 311 Vernon Street. Meetings held in the City Council Chambers can be viewed [live online](#) or later [on demand](#).



If we can't reach you, we can't alert you. Sign up now.

311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA 95678

(916) 774-5200 | www.roseville.ca.us



[Unsubscribe/Update profile](#)

This email was sent to hdyda@roseville.ca.us using GovDelivery, on behalf of: City of Roseville · 311 Vernon St. Roseville · CA 95678

powered by
govDELIVERY
get the word out.

City of Roseville 2016 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan

Appendix B. 2015 Progress Report



Roseville Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan 2015 PROGRESS REPORT

Reporting Period

August 2014 through July 2015

Background

Following a tradition of progressive and innovative planning, the City of Roseville City Council approved an update to the Roseville Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan (RMHMP) on January 3, 2011. The RMHMP details the City's vision for reducing risk from all hazards, identifying resources, information, and strategies for risk reduction. In accordance with requirements of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000, the City completed a 10-month process to update its 2005 RMHMP in a way that provided as many tangible benefits for the City as possible from a single planning effort. These benefits are associated with grant funding eligibility and maintaining the nation's only Class 1 rating under FEMA's Community Rating System (CRS). The plan was approved by FEMA Region IX for compliance with Section 201.6, Chapter 44 of the Code of Federal Regulations on March 28, 2011. By completing this process, the City complied with the Disaster Mitigation Act and maintained eligibility for hazard mitigation grant funding opportunities afforded under the Robert T. Stafford Act. The plan is available to the public through the City of Roseville Public Library online at the following website:

https://www.roseville.ca.us/fire/preparedness/hazard_mitigation_plan.asp

Benefits of Mitigation Planning

Maintenance of this plan enables the City of Roseville to pursue hazard mitigation grant funding administered by FEMA under the Robert T Stafford Act. A FEMA-approved Hazard Mitigation Plan is a principal prerequisite for this funding. Roseville has leveraged funding from this program in the past to significantly reduce the City's risk associated with natural hazards.

Summary Overview of the Plan's Progress

The performance period for the Hazard Mitigation Plan began on March 28, 2011, with FEMA's final approval. The initial performance period for this plan is 5 years, with an update anticipated before March 2016. As of the most recent reporting period, the performance period is 82 percent complete. The Hazard Mitigation Plan identified 63 hazard mitigation initiatives to be pursued during the 5-year performance period. As of the most recent reporting period, the following progress can be reported:

- 51 out of 63 initiatives (81%) reported ongoing action toward completion.
- 10 out of 63 initiatives (16%) reported no action taken.
- 1 out of 63 initiatives (2%) was completed.
- 1 initiative was removed due to elimination of a program.

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide the Roseville City Council, stakeholders and citizens an annual update on implementation of the action plan identified in the RMHMP. The objective of the annual evaluation is to ensure a continuous planning process that keeps the RMHMP dynamic and responsive to the needs of the stakeholders. This report was prepared by the planning team. It was reviewed and confirmed by the RMHMP Steering Committee, in accordance with Section 7.4 of the Plan, at the Steering Committee's annual meeting on November 3, 2015. This report discusses the following:

- Natural hazard events that have occurred within the last year
- Changes in risk exposure within the planning area
- Mitigation success stories
- Review of the action plan
- Changes in capability in the planning area that could impact plan implementation
- Recommendations for changes/enhancement

The RMHMP Steering Committee

The update to the RMHMP was overseen by a steering committee appointed by the Roseville City Council and made up of stakeholders in the planning area. During the plan's development, the Steering Committee agreed that it would remain as a body to oversee the maintenance of the plan as established in Chapter 7. The Steering Committee continues to exist and function as organized in its established ground rules. At a minimum, it provides technical review and oversight on development of the annual progress report. It is anticipated the Steering Committee's role in overall plan implementation will evolve, based on the hazard mitigation needs of the city. Annual turnover in its membership is monitored via the progress report. For this reporting period, the Steering Committee membership is as indicated in Table 1.

TABLE 1 2015 STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS		
Name	Title	Jurisdiction or Agency
Rob Jensen	Acting City Manager	City Manager's Office
Jason Rizzi	Emergency Preparedness Manager	Fire Department
Wayne Wiley	Associate Planner	Development Services Dept.
Carl Walker	Senior Engineer/Floodplain Manager	Public Works Dept.
Helen Dyda	Public Information Specialist	Communications Dept.
Grace Keller	Resident	Community Emergency Response Team
Erik Angle	Emergency Preparedness Program	Sutter Roseville Medical Center
Brenette Macintosh	Safety Officer	Consolidated Communications
Mark Lacher	Risk Manager	Consolidated Communications
Mark Smith	Resident	RCONA Treasurer
Rod Rodriguez	Senior Emergency Services Specialist	Placer County OES
Rick Stalker	Stalker & Burnett RE Group	Placer County Association of Realtors
Michael Algots	Manager - Hazardous Materials	Union Pacific Railroad

Natural Hazard Events in the Planning Area

During the reporting period, the following hazard events affected the planning area:

- Due to the continuation of drought conditions, in May 2015, the City of Roseville announced further water-use restrictions for Roseville water customers. The restrictions were placed in response to Governor Brown's Executive Order and the State Water Resources Control Board's drought emergency action requiring a 25 percent statewide water-use reduction goal. In order to meet the State's goal, City of Roseville water customers were required to reduce water consumption by 28 percent over their use in 2013. For residential customers, the most noticeable change includes watering day restrictions for outdoor irrigation. Watering days for residential turf will be limited to two days per week, Monday and Friday only, before 10 a.m. and after 8 p.m. Commercial customers will have watering days limited to Monday and Thursday.

In addition to restricted watering days, Roseville also incorporated additional water-use reduction strategies to achieve more water savings:

- Water waste is prohibited.
- Washing hardscape is prohibited, unless for health and safety concerns.
- New or expanded landscape is limited to drought tolerant trees, shrubs and ground-cover irrigated on a drip irrigation system.
- Fountains, ponds and decorative pools must be drained (unless ponds contain fish.)
- Covers are required for all new pools and spas.
- Low volume drip irrigation systems that irrigate at less than two gallons per hour are exempt from day of week watering restrictions.
- December 10-12, 2014: Over a three-day period, from December 10th to December 12, 2014, The National Weather Service forecasted a major winter storm to impact Northern California. All reasonable data from the National Weather Service estimated that the City of Roseville would receive 3.6 inches of rain from the storm event. Additionally, severe winds were forecasted to be a major factor in the event. In preparation of the storm event, the City of Roseville Fire Department chose to activate a Limited Emergency Operations Center (LEOC) at the Fire Department Administrative Headquarters, located at 401 Oak Street. The LEOC was staffed for a 36-hour period. The Placer County Office of Emergency Services was also activated during the storm event.

Changes in Risk Exposure in the Planning Area

The RMHMP update addressed the probable impact of the following natural hazard events in the City of Roseville:

- | | |
|---------------|------------------------|
| • Dam failure | • Human-caused hazards |
| • Drought | • Human health hazards |
| • Earthquake | • Severe weather |
| • Flood | • Wildland fire |
| • Landslides | |

There was an F-0 tornado occurrence during the reporting period. Damage associated with the event was minimal. The occurrence of this event should be acknowledged in future updates to the risk assessment for

this plan. There were no other events during the reporting period that would alter or change the probability of occurrence or ranking of risk for the natural hazards addressed by the RMHMP.

Mitigation Success Stories

During the current reporting period, the City had a number of mitigation success stories that reflect the City's commitment to multi-hazard mitigation and the philosophy that the City Council and staff are responsible for the good stewardship of City resources.

Deployment of Everbridge Notification System and Alert Roseville

Using a Homeland Security grant, the City, along with Placer, Sacramento, and Yolo counties, implemented the Everbridge Mass Notification system. This is a robust and popular system that is used globally. The system will be used for both emergency and non-emergency notification of the public. In preparation for the deployment, over 100 city staff members from 13 city departments were trained in its use. Special courses were designed for public safety officials, including dispatchers, fire department chief officers, and police managers.

"Alert Roseville" (aka "Opt-In") went live in August 2014. This internet site was established to help members of the public register their contact information into the Everbridge system. A significant media and outreach program was developed to advertise the importance of getting this information from the public. The "Opt-In" portal will be explained at every public education event the Fire Department attends. Currently approximately 2,050 public members are signed up in the "Opt-In" portion of Everbridge. A significant increase is anticipated with the aggressive outreach program. To make this system really effective, the City will actively pursue getting those residents with primary cell phone service signed up to the Everbridge system. This is a high priority for the City.

Emergency Operation Center Drills, Incident Activations, and Training

Establishment of the Emergency Management Team

In October 2014, the City of Roseville established the Emergency Management Team, which is a standing committee, whose mission is to plan and prioritize emergency preparedness activities, training, and facilities of the City's Emergency Management Organization. The Emergency Management is comprised of at least one member of each City department and meets monthly to:

- Develop the organizational framework for implementation of the California Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) and the National Incident Management System (NIMS) within the City of Roseville.
- Ensure that each City department has the resources and training to function effectively in the roles outlined in the City's Emergency Operations Plan (EOP).
- Plan and develop a minimum of two Emergency Operations Center (EOC) exercises annually.
- Develop and maintain EOC facilities that provide an effective location to conduct EOC operations.
- Develop and maintain technology resources within the EOC necessary to gather and disseminate information effectively.

Preseason Flood Coordination

On October 30, 2014, City Floodplain Management staff presented the 2014-15 Preseason Flood Coordination and Severe Weather Plan Update to the City's Emergency Management Team. The update

included information on the 2014-15 winter weather outlook from the Climate Prediction Center and an overview of the changes to the City's Flood Warning & Response Plan. The most significant change to the Flood Warning & Response Plan was the addition of a Floodwall & Levee Failure component to the Plan.

EOC Activation—Levee Failure Exercise

On May 11, 2015, City Emergency Management staff conducted a four-hour EOC activation drill. This exercise was a full activation of the Emergency Management Organization, including Department Operations Centers (DOC). The exercise centered on a levee failure scenario, which included the flooding of an assisted living facility. This exercise emphasized the need for multiple Incident Actions Plans from various City departments.

Roseville Galleria Exercise

On May 27, 2015 the Roseville and Rocklin Regional SWAT Team, Roseville Rapid Containment Team, Explosive Ordnance Disposal Team, Placer County Special Enforcement Team, FBI and Roseville Fire Department's Tactical Medics, conducted a full scale training exercise at the Roseville Galleria. This was the third straight year Roseville's Public Safety teams and the Galleria have come together for critical incident planning and response training. This year's exercise was designed to address responses to improvised explosive devices by Public Safety and Galleria personnel.

The drill required unified command for organizing and deploying resources, coordinated response to multiple threats, and the ability to establish inter-operable communications across the agencies. Each FBI Field Office across the country was required to conduct a similar drill in coordination with local resources and our city was selected by FBI-Sacramento to be the lead partner agency out of all of the cities in the Sacramento FBI Field Office which covers most of the Central Valley from Fresno up to Oregon. Our drill was the first drill conducted in the country under this training requirement and was monitored from FBI HQ in Washington DC.

MCI 2015—Countywide First Responder Exercise

On June 17, 2015 the Roseville Police and Fire Department, Rocklin Fire, South Placer Fire, American Medical Response, the National Guard, the Officer of Emergency Services and the Sutter Roseville Medical Center all participated in a regional planning and training exercise at Sutter Roseville. The exercise was centered on a mock helicopter crash. Public Safety's planning and training objectives included the development of a unified command structure as identified by the Incident Command Structure as well as planning and response to security needs on the hospital's grounds.

Terrorism Threat Assessments

On May 7, 2014 Roseville Police Department staff performed a threat assessment of Roseville Electric's Power Plant, consisting of a "real-world" "vulnerability and site security test at that location with unsuspecting employees Electric personnel.

A similar terrorism threat assessment was conducted in October 2014 at the Civic Center as well as Roseville Fire Station #1. Locations for the threat assessment were expanded to include Fire Stations #2, #5, and #9. Roseville Police Department plans to conduct future assessments for Fire Stations #3 and #4 in July and August of 2015.

Community Preparedness Education

In support of Homeland Security Presidential Directive/HSPD-8, the Sutter-Roseville Medical Center (SRMC) Emergency Preparedness Program rolled out the "Emergency Preparedness and You" community education program. This program focused on how individuals can be safe and prepared when disasters

strike. A version of this program was also rolled-out to healthcare staff, to provide staff readiness and add resiliency. To date, the SRMC Emergency Preparedness Program has provided training for over two hundred students.

Reorganization of the Emergency Operations Center

The City's Emergency Preparedness Manager, working closely with the Central Services and Information Technology—GIS staff, have revised the layout of the City's Emergency Operations Center, and have included new technology to assist with the presentation and dissemination of geographic information during an EOC activation. Computers with access to GIS data and overhead projector displays have replaced the use of ineffective Plexiglas-topped tables and grease pens to supplement Planning Section briefings within the EOC. The new technology also allows for better communication between the EOC and the City's Department Operation Centers, located throughout the City.

Department of Water Resources—Flood Fight Methods Training

On March 18, 2015 State of California Department of Water Resources staff provided a one-day Flood Fight Methods training exercise for the City's Public Works—Street Maintenance and Park Maintenance—Open Space Division staff. The Flood Fight Methods training is designed to assist public agencies with the implementation of corrective temporary methods utilized while combatting flood-related problems. The training consisted of four hours of classroom presentation and an afternoon of instruction on the techniques used to construct various sandbag structures and erosion protection methods.

Sutter Roseville Medical Center (SRMC)

Sutter Roseville Medical Center (SRMC) prides itself in the quality it provides in the realm of patient care and excelling above national standards and best practice. The **SRMC Emergency Preparedness Program** is no different. Disasters strike daily all over the globe. California is no exception. For the benefit of the staff, patients, visitors and the community and with the strong support of our leadership and the Emergency Preparedness Committee, SRMC continues on the ongoing journey of Emergency Preparedness and quality best practices. In the past year, SRMC has demonstrated the following in **Mitigation Success Stories** in Emergency Preparedness:

- **Master Exercise Practitioner (MEP) Certification:** The SRMC EP Coordinator completed the national level certification from FEMA/DHS as that of **Master Exercise Practitioner (MEP)**. With this this certifies that the coordinator has obtained and demonstrated competency in high level of disaster exercise design, from Table Top; functional and Full Scale Disaster Exercise. Due to the difficulty in being accepted into this program and the challenge of the program, as of now there are only 2,300 individuals certified with MEP in the country.
- **National Level Instructor Certification:** The SRMC EP Coordinator completed the national level certification from FEMA/DHS as that of a national level **Certified Instructor**. The course is conducted in two phases: fundamental principles and applied principle. During the fundamental principles phase participants receive an overview of adult learning, task analysis, risk and hazard analysis, learning objectives and lesson plans, communication skills, instructional delivery and multimedia, testing and evaluations, and after action reviews. Then, during the applied principles phase, participants put these lessons into practice through a series of practice training sessions. With this this certifies that the coordinator has obtained and demonstrated competency and the ability to interact and instruct adult learners.
- **Disaster Education:** Sutter Roseville Medical Center (SRMC) EP Program prides itself on education. Our education program for 2015 is holding 45 courses on Emergency Preparedness and has also worked with TEEK and FEMA for bringing their courses and staff here to teach as well. The EP Program coordinator had the honor of teaching a lecture at the FEMA National Training

Center in February of 2014 and March 2015 teaching lectures at the Emergency Nurse's Association (ENA) and Association of Critical Care Nurses (AACN) conference in April 2014 and July 2015. Annually in December, SRMC hosts the EMS-a-Palooza educational event at the facility. Speakers from all aspects of emergency care, from Trauma, Burns and Pediatrics, provide presentations to not only Sutter Health staff but all of our hospitals throughout the region and our EMS community partners. The Emergency Preparedness Program Coordinator for Sutter Roseville Medical Center which provided an in-depth lecture on **Active Shooter Response for EMS and Healthcare.**

- **Disaster Exercises:** Sutter Roseville Medical Center (SRMC) held 20 Disaster exercises in the past year. These exercises are based on the identified Risks from our annual Hazard Vulnerability Assessment (HVA). Some exercises worthy of note due to their exceptional Interagency Cooperation and Participation were:
 - **2014 Ebola Response Exercise:** This tested the facility's ability to manage victims infected by the Ebola Virus Disease. This drill assisted in the designing and development of the EVD Response Training Program for SRMC.
 - **2015 Helipad Emergency Response Blackhawk Crash Exercise:** As SRMC is the Primary Receiving facility for the Air National Guard with back country rescues, SRMC held a two-day Full Scale Exercise which tested our ability to manage not only a surge of victims from a massive earthquake caused landslide but also a crash onto the helipad of a Medical Blackhawk Helicopter. This exercise had the participation with Roseville Fire Department, Rocklin Fire Department, Roseville Police Department and the California Air National Guard.
- **Emergency Preparedness Development- Hospital Incident Command System (HICS) Update:** The SRMC Emergency Preparedness Coordinator was selected by the California Emergency Management Authority (EMSA) to be a member of the national level committee that assisted in the development and review of the Hospital Incident Command System 2014 Updates. These updates are utilized all across the country at hospitals for incident response.
- **Emergency Preparedness Development- Hazardous Materials and Decontamination for Healthcare Facilities Course Update:** The SRMC Emergency Preparedness Coordinator was selected by the California State Training Institute (CSTI) to be a member of the committee that assisted in the development and review of the Hazardous Materials and Decontamination for Healthcare Facilities 2014 Course updates. These updates are utilized all across the country at hospitals for hazardous materials incident response. Additionally, portions of the plan from SRMC in regards to Vulnerable Populations was included in the teaching materials as **Best Practice** examples.
- **Emergency Preparedness Development- Management of Aggressive Behavior (MAB) Program and Course Update:** The SRMC Emergency Preparedness Coordinator, with Regional Safety and Security, on management and development team for the new and updated Violence in the Workplace Training Course and Policy Development and representing Sutter Health at CalOSHA Meetings. This will ensure the facility and Sutter Health is compliant with HSC 1257.8 and 1257.9 and with the new AB 1299 and drafted potential changes that were submitted to Cal OSHA related to SB 1299.
- **Community Involvement- Placer County Emergency Medical Control Committee Chair:** The SRMC Emergency Preparedness Coordinator is the co-chair of the Placer County Emergency Medical Control Committee. In this role, the chair coordinates meetings with all responders from the Placer County Region and reviews and approves policies and procedures for the region.
- **Community Involvement-City of Roseville Police and Fire Safety Fair:** The SRMC Emergency Preparedness Coordinator partnered with the City of Roseville Police Department and the city of Roseville Fire Department for their Second Annual City of Roseville Police and Fire Safety Fair. In this SRMC EP Program and SRMC had a booth on Emergency Preparedness, Safety and the medical center itself. On this day, over 500 brochures, coloring books on safety and emergency preparedness

were handed out. Also, 300 Bike Safety Lights were handed out as well. Due to our active participation, the City of Roseville Police Department donated \$500.00 back to our Foundation to be used for Trauma or emergency Services.

2014 Ebola Response

Emerging Infectious diseases, such as the 2014 Ebola virus outbreak, can significantly impact the health and safety of the citizens of Roseville. With the outbreak being monitored for a potential spread to California, the Roseville Fire Department (RFD) worked cooperatively with its regional partners to develop operational procedures and to obtain the necessary equipment to respond safely if necessary. The RFD continues to be proactive with its regional partners on training, protective equipment and is prepared to respond to an Ebola outbreak, or any other emerging infectious disease.

Oil Train Response Plan

The City of Roseville is situated in a rail corridor that connects the Sierra Nevada Mountains to the San Francisco Bay. With the increased production of crude oil in North America, shipments have increased in recent years with the commodity currently traveling through the City of Roseville. The Roseville Fire Department (RFD) working with cooperating agencies throughout Placer and Nevada Counties developed an operational plan to respond to a rail emergency involving crude oil transport. The plan is maintained by the county of Placer Office of Emergency Services and is incorporated in regional training exercises.

Review of the Action Plan

This section reviews the action plan and lists the status of each initiative from the hazard mitigation plan, grouped by the agency or department responsible for its completion. The action plan matrix in Table 2 provides the following information:

- Initiative number and brief summary; initiative numbers are coded by hazard type as follows:
 - DF = dam failure
 - D = drought
 - EQ = earthquake
 - F = flood
 - HC = human-caused hazards
 - HH = human health hazards
 - LS = landslides
 - SW = severe weather
 - WF = wildland fire
 - MH = multiple hazards
- Indication of whether any action has been taken
- Current timeline
- Indication of whether the project priority has changed
- Status (complete, ongoing or no progress)
- Comments, including the following information:
 - Was any element of the initiative carried out during the reporting period?
 - If no action was completed, why?
 - Is the timeline for implementation for the initiative still appropriate?
 - If the initiative was completed, does it need to be changed or removed from the action plan?

Part 4 of the plan provides detailed descriptions of each initiative and the prioritization process.

**TABLE 2.
ACTION PLAN MATRIX**

Action Taken?	Timeline	Priority Changed?	Comment (Describe progress or changed priority)	Status
Central Services Department Initiatives				
Initiative #F-21—Retrofit the city’s Downtown library by sealing the exterior and installing a flood door to protect against flood damage should Dry Creek overspill the existing floodwall.				
No	Long Term	No	No action was completed on this initiative during the reporting period. Priority and time line remain as assigned. Project priority should be changed to medium and time line should be changed to long-term pending the identification of funding for this project.	No Progress
City Council Initiatives				
Initiative #HC-3—Seek to establish appropriate staffing levels of public safety personnel to address vulnerabilities identified.				
Yes	Short Term	No	The Police and Fire Chiefs meet quarterly with the City Manager to discuss staffing levels and needs based on current trends, population growth, and calls for service. The Police Department Completed a “Request for Proposals,” titled, Roseville Police Department Staffing Study. This RFP requested a professional, independent firm to assess the adequacy of current staffing levels for both sworn and non-sworn staff in the police department, and a sound methodology to project future staffing. Police and City Attorney staff reviewed the submittals and conducted interviews. The PD selected Matrix Consulting to complete the Staffing Study, which was approved by the City Council in October, 2015. The study is scheduled to commence in November, 2015.	Ongoing
City Manager’s Office Initiatives				
Initiative #HH-3—Collaborate with the Placer County Mosquito Abatement District to review resource protection policies that conflict with human health protection in the City of Roseville and work to resolve these policy issues				
Yes	Short Term	No	The Placer Mosquito Abatement District and Roseville Environmental Coordinator is working together to both protect open space and wetland areas while limiting the amount of habitat for mosquitoes and vectors.	Ongoing
Public Affairs & Communications Department Initiatives				
Initiative #HH-2—Support the public education efforts of the Placer County Health Department and the Placer Mosquito Abatement District				
Yes	Short Term	No	The City supports the public education efforts of the Health Department and Mosquito Abatement District through print, government access television, social media channels, and web materials. The City has also had significant assistance from the District on public outreach efforts for rodent control through presentations at neighborhood meetings. The Placer Mosquito Abatement District purchased a building in Roseville at 2021 Opportunity Drive and moved a majority of the operations to Roseville. This will enhance the availability of resources in closer proximity to Roseville residents and the mosquito-breeding areas west of Roseville.	Ongoing

**TABLE 2.
ACTION PLAN MATRIX**

Action Taken?	Timeline	Priority Changed?	Comment (Describe progress or changed priority)	Status
Initiative #MH-2—Continue to maintain the hazard mitigation page on City website that provides following types of information:				
• The Hazard Management Plan and its progress reports • Hazard-specific information • Mitigation information by hazard, with specific emphasis on private property • Emergency response and warning information • Links to county, state, and federal related agencies				
Yes	Short Term	No	This is an on-going action. The City continues to maintain its website as specified in the plan maintenance section of the plan. The website can be viewed at: http://www.roseville.ca.us/fire/preparedness/hazard_mitigation_plan.asp	Ongoing
Development Services Department Initiatives				
Initiative #EQ-1—Perform building-specific, structural seismic vulnerability assessment of City- owned critical facilities constructed prior to 1980 (including infrastructure). Included in this assessment will be recommended mitigation alternatives that meet goals and objectives of this plan.				
No	Long Term	Yes	Major construction on any city-owned building would require an assessment of the seismic vulnerability. The City will be applying for a Planning Grant under FEMA’s various Hazard Mitigation Grant programs. This initiative will be included in the scope of work for updating the risk assessment to the plan. Priority should be changed to medium while timeline should be changed to long-term	No Progress
Initiative #EQ-2—Incorporate earthquake mitigation measures for private property into existing City-sponsored outreach programs such as printed media and the City’s website.				
Yes	Short Term	No	The California Building Officials (CALBO) website has consumer web pages and one in particular regarding Seismic Safety. The site will be upgraded and improved over time with more value to the average consumer regarding measures to improve earthquake safety.	Ongoing
Initiative #EQ-3—Reassess the overall vulnerability to the earthquake hazard using the best available science and technology as it becomes available. State-sponsored programs, Seismic Hazards Mapping Act, and future FEMA-sponsored initiatives are anticipated to create a wealth of knowledge regarding this hazard that did not exist during the preparation of this plan.				
Yes	Short Term	No	Council has updated the maps for the Roseville area. The Public Works Department and Building Division anticipate review and implementation of the new mapping in conjunction with the International Building Council in 2008. The seismic risk assessment of the plan was updated using FEMA’s enhanced HAZUS model (MR04) during the plan update process. The 2010 California Building Code based upon the International Building Code has been adopted by the City.	Ongoing

**TABLE 2.
ACTION PLAN MATRIX**

Action Taken?	Timeline	Priority Changed?	Comment (Describe progress or changed priority)	Status
Initiative #F-1—The City shall designate all areas identified as the 100-year floodplain. The boundaries of the 100-year floodplain shall be as specified in the floodplain designations section of this component of the city’s general plan. Floodplain areas shall be preserved as specified in the open space and conservation element. Such preservation may include required dedication to the City. If needed, modify the City’s ordinances to include floodplain use regulations consistent with the goals, policies, and implementation measures of the safety, land use, open space and conservation, and parks and recreation elements of the City’s general plan.				
Yes	Long Term	No	The city continued to implement its ongoing protocols and standard for identifying, mapping, and preserving the 100 yr floodplain during this reporting period. This initiative will continue to be implemented on an on-going basis, with a high priority. To comply with the new state Urban Level of Flood Protection, the City has contracted with a qualified engineering firm to determine the 200-year water surface elevation for the City’s streams and areas that could potentially be inundated with 3 feet or more of floodwater during a 200-yr storm event.	Ongoing
Initiative #F-2—Refer any development proposal that has a direct or indirect impact on flood protection to Public Works for comment. In addition, forward such proposals to other agencies as applicable, including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, California Central Valley Flood Protection Board, FEMA, California Department of Fish and Game, Placer County Resource Conservation District, and Placer County Flood Control District. Consider the comments of the agencies during the development review process.				
Yes	Short Term	No	The city continued to implement its ongoing protocols and standard for reviewing flooding impacts that may be caused by new developments and forward such developments to other agencies as applicable during this reporting period. This initiative will continue to be implemented on an ongoing basis, with a high priority. The PCFCD has completed a region-wide update of the Dry Creek Watershed Flood Control Plan in November 2011.	Ongoing
Initiative #F-9—Ensure that future specific plans and specific plan amendments are consistent with the goals and policies of the general plan. The specific plans shall include the designation and preservation of floodplain areas and adjacent habitat. Provisions shall be incorporated to ensure that public infrastructure, utilities, and emergency services remain functional during flood conditions. Such infrastructure and facilities include water, sewer and gas mains, telephone and electric lines, streets and bridges, hospitals, and fire and police stations. Financing mechanisms shall be explored to fund necessary flood protection improvements and maintenance. Development agreements may be used to secure implementation and funding provisions. (Specific plans have 100% cost recovery by developers).				
Yes	Long Term	No	The city continued to implement its protocols and standard for reviewing proposed public infrastructure, utilities, and other emergency services so that they would remain functional during flood during this reporting period. This initiative will continue to be implemented on an ongoing basis, with a high priority. The Sierra Vista and Creekview Specific Plans were adopted by the City. The Amoruso Ranch and Placer Ranch Specific Plans are currently begin processed. The areas designated as floodplain and/or natural resource conservation areas will be preserved as permanent open space, consistent with General Plan policy and this action item.	Ongoing

**TABLE 2.
ACTION PLAN MATRIX**

Action Taken?	Timeline	Priority Changed?	Comment (Describe progress or changed priority)	Status
Initiative #F-11—Require a master drainage plan as part of the approval process for all specific plans and large development projects as determined by the Public Works director. The master drainage plan should consider cumulative regional drainage and flooding mitigation. The plan’s intent is to ensure that the overall rate of runoff from a project does not exceed predevelopment levels. If necessary, this objective shall be achieved by incorporating run-off control measures to minimize peak flows and/or assistance in financing or otherwise implementing comprehensive drainage plans.				
Yes	Long Term	No	Master Drainage plans and flood studies have been prepared for the Sierra Vista and Creekview Specific Planning areas. The City is working with developers to prepare these studies for the Amoruso Ranch and Placer Ranch Specific Plans. The priority and timeline for this initiative will remain as assigned	Ongoing
Initiative #LS-2— Continue to implement policies adopted by the general plan that promote open space land uses within identified steep slope areas of Roseville. The City of Roseville Northeast Roseville Specific Plan and Stoneridge Specific Plans include the identified steep slope areas within Roseville. Both plan areas have continuing development.				
Yes	Short Term	No	The City of Roseville Northeast Roseville Specific Plan and Stoneridge Specific Plans include the identified steep slope areas within Roseville. Both plan areas have continuing development. When individual projects are submitted, for example a housing development along a ravine in the Stoneridge area, all City development departments and the Fire Department enforce the General Plan, Specific Plan, City construction standards and individual project conditions to protect the steep slope open space that is dedicated to the City as part of the final maps for the projects.	Ongoing
Initiative #MH-1—Continue to maintain Office of Emergency Services certification of all City inspectors for post-disaster damage assessment.				
Yes	Short Term	No	All building inspectors are certified by the Office of Emergency Services and have been recertified this year. The Building Division will continue to make sure staff keeps their certifications updated and that the certifications are documented per the International Accreditation requirements.	Ongoing

**TABLE 2.
ACTION PLAN MATRIX**

Action Taken?	Timeline	Priority Changed?	Comment (Describe progress or changed priority)	Status
Environmental Utilities Department Initiatives				
Initiative #D-1—Perform a groundwater recharge feasibility study to determine the most cost-effective way to replenish groundwater resources within Roseville.				
Yes	Long Term	No	The City completed a program-wide Environmental Impact Report review under the California Environmental Quality Act requirements. The Environmental Impact Report was adopted by the City Council on March 21, 2012. The City received an operating permit from the State Water Quality Control Board in 2012. The City has implemented this action by injecting excess treated surface water into two existing wells in 2013 and is constructing two additional groundwater wells with partial grant funding by the California Department of Water Resources. A long term ASR operations plan is being developed. The City is also the lead agency within the Western Placer Groundwater Management Plan area.	Ongoing
Initiative #D-2—Implement aquifer storage and recovery program that uses direct injection technique in areas identified as appropriate.				
Yes	Long Term	No	EU has implemented this action by injecting treated drinking water into two wells in early 2013. Two more wells will be completed in 2014 to increase the injection capabilities, and a long term ASR operations plan is being developed.	Ongoing
Initiative #D-3—Continue to implement the Environmental Utility Department’s recycled water program and seek all opportunities to expand its coverage, currently focusing on urban growth areas. The City pumps recycled water through a system of purple pipes completely separate from potable (drinking water) pipes. The City pumps the recycled water to customers such as streetscapes, golf courses and parks, where it irrigates turf and shrubs. Using recycled water for uses such as landscape irrigation reduces demand on the potable water system, creating a more reliable water supply for the entire City. Recycled water is not subject to the effects of drought.				
Yes	Short Term	No	A Water Recycling Master Plan has been developed and is being implemented. This includes expanding recycled water in the region as well as finding opportunities in the existing service areas. Recycled water is considered as a resource in all new development areas being considered.	Ongoing
Initiative #D-4—Promote active water conservation techniques and strategies to private property owners through Roseville-sponsored outreach projects such as printed media and the City’s website.				
Yes	Short Term	No	Conservation efforts are an ongoing initiative of the Water Division and have been increased and accelerated in all areas due to the unprecedented drought conditions facing the state.	Ongoing
Initiative #F-19—Set back and raise the sewer ponds levees at the Dry Creek Sewer Plant so raw sewage will not enter Dry Creek.				
Yes	Short Term	No	The construction of the Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plan Levee Relocation Project was completed in November 2011.	Complete

**TABLE 2.
ACTION PLAN MATRIX**

Action Taken?	Timeline	Priority Changed?	Comment (Describe progress or changed priority)	Status
Initiative #HC-5—Address vulnerabilities identified in vulnerability assessment of water facilities performed by the Environmental Utilities Department in response to EPA initiative.				
Yes	Long Term	No	A Water System Security CIP was completed several years ago by the Environmental Utilities Department and continues to be updated as new facilities come on line. The project enhanced the physical security of water facilities with video monitoring and access control. Timeline for this initiative has been changed from long-term to on-going.	Ongoing
Initiative #SW-5—Enhance and implement strategies for debris management and removal during severe weather events.				
Yes	Short Term	No	No change in the debris management and removal strategy that adopted in 2009. The Parks and Open Space Divisions implemented an Emergency action plan for storm situations. The Open Space Division Department purchased a new bucket truck this fiscal year that aids in the removal of hazardous and storm damaged trees.	Ongoing
Information Technology Department Initiatives				
Initiative #HC-9—Protect the city’s data, technology infrastructure and staff against malicious cyber-attacks and Cyber terrorism, such as but not limited to:				
• Identity Theft • Virus/Malware/Spyware/Spam • Network and system attacks • Web site hacking • Denial-of-service attacks				
Yes	Short Term	No	The Information Technology Department uses several strategies and technologies to combat Cyber-attacks including: • Anti-phishing capability • Internet content filtering • PCI-DSS compliance • Virus, malware, spyware and spam scanning • Perimeter firewalls report and prevent intrusions • Secure authentication • Encryption • EOC Cyber Security Incident Exercises	Ongoing

**TABLE 2.
ACTION PLAN MATRIX**

Action Taken?	Timeline	Priority Changed?	Comment (Describe progress or changed priority)	Status
Initiative #MH-7—Strive to maintain high availability of essential communication services				
Yes	Short Term	No	For the Communication and Information Systems: The city has multiple, fully functional data centers which provide redundant hardware infrastructure. In the event of an extended outage; procedures are in place to restore essential communication and information services. The city’s primary radio system has redundant components throughout. In addition the Police and Fire departments have alternative and independent systems in case the primary system fails. One of the current production data centers is scheduled to be relocated at the end of the 2016 calendar year. This move will reduce the risk of flooding as it moves the critical technology infrastructure further away from the nearby creek. The City is at present, working on an enterprise wide Business Impact Analysis study. This report will look at all information systems and services to evaluate and rank the level of impact to the City. This Business Impact Analysis report will be the primary input to developing a revised, more comprehensive Disaster Recovery/Business Continuity Plan.	Ongoing
Initiative #MH-8—Secure the city’s physical locations that contain technology infrastructure				
Yes	Short Term	No	Both of the cities data centers are armed with perimeter alarm systems and internal and external security cameras. Also access to these sites is restricted to a limited number of city employees. In addition, vendors and visitors will be required to sign in and be escorted.	Ongoing
Parks and Recreation Department Open Space Division Initiatives				
Initiative #F-12—Continue the Parks and Recreation Department’s regular creek maintenance program within the City’s creeks and floodplain areas. This program clears and removes debris that could contribute to blockage and flooding and may include the removal of silt. This is only done in areas of high risk to flood damage or where property or facilities are threatened by flooding.				
Yes	Long Term	No	The city continued to implement its ongoing protocol of inspecting and maintaining its creeks and streams during the reporting period. The Department of Fish and Wildlife executed a five-year Routine Maintenance Agreement with the City in April 2010 for work that is ongoing this summer. During the reporting period, the City of Roseville worked with the Placer County Resource Conservation District to remove Red Sesbania from stream segments within the Dry Creek basin. This initiative will continue to be implemented on an ongoing basis, with a high priority. The City will continue to seek grant funding opportunities from FEMA and state agencies, when available, to assist in funding Arundo eradication along infested stream channels in the Dry Creek watershed.	Ongoing

**TABLE 2.
ACTION PLAN MATRIX**

Action Taken?	Timeline	Priority Changed?	Comment (Describe progress or changed priority)	Status
Initiative #F-22—Continue the Tree Mitigation Fund program administered by the Open Space Division in conjunction with non-profit organizations. The planting of oak trees in the open spaces adjacent to riparian zones increases infiltration and slows storm water surges.				
Yes	Short Term	No	The Tree Mitigation program for native oak woodland restoration uses oak mitigation funds for projects in the open spaces. Over 7000 trees have been planted to date.	Ongoing
Initiative #F-23—Manage beaver dam sites for flood control protection and habitat restoration after dam removal. One primary issue is impacts to floodwater capacity of creeks. Part of the desired comprehensive approach to beaver management includes establishment of quantitative and qualitative “carrying capacity,” including acre-feet of flood capacity lost. Implement a standard monitoring and reporting process to track beaver dam locations, population, and impacts. Gain regulatory approval for beaver management techniques such as biological control and habitat manipulation using the most benign options first.				
Yes	Short Term	No	The Park Maintenance—Open Space Division continues to use a Geographical Information Systems (GIS) database for tracking beaver dam locations and coordinates beaver removal per the City’s Beaver Management Policy and Nuisance Abatement Ordinance.	Ongoing
Initiative #WF-2—Continue “Goat Grazing” program for removal of grassland in areas of Roseville potentially vulnerable to wildfire. Implement goat grazing in City open space and preserve areas for fire and invasive plant species management and native plant restoration.				
Yes	Short Term	No	The Fire Department and the Open Space Division continue working together to implement a goat grazing program. Approximately 400 goats have been utilized for the grazing of open space preserves. Goats provide an innovative, environmentally sensitive way to reduce fire fuel load by keeping open space vegetation under control. Projects completed in 2012-2013 include the open space area located east of Dry Creek near Lincoln Estates to Linda Creek. Grazing reduces fuel load by removing thatch and thinning woody plants and also removes non-native vegetation.	Ongoing
Initiative #MH-4—Implement an “Adopt an Open Space” program in coordination with the open space management program. Develop “adoption contracts” with neighborhoods, organizations, businesses, etc., describing the level of stewardship and the terms of the “adoption.” Publicize these activities through online resource directory and other media to encourage participation.				
Yes	Long Term	No	During the reporting period, the City has implemented an “Adopt a Creek” program. The Adopt a Creek program is administered by the City’s Park Maintenance—Open Space Division. The City publicizes the program at the following website: http://www.roseville.ca.us/eu/stormwater_management/public_involvement_opportunities.asp	Ongoing

**TABLE 2.
ACTION PLAN MATRIX**

Action Taken?	Timeline	Priority Changed?	Comment (Describe progress or changed priority)	Status
Initiative #MH-5—Develop and disseminate best practices information to private property owners whose land is adjacent to open space areas describing stewardship opportunities and owners’ role in preserving beneficial uses of open space areas (including vernal pool grassland and creek or riparian uses). Offer classes to provide in-depth information, such as demonstration projects, techniques for ecologically friendly weed abatement and vegetation control, and creating a backyard habitat compatible with open space areas.				
No	Short Term	Yes	No actions towards the completion of this initiative were completed during the reporting period. This will continue to be a short-term initiative with a high priority pending funding.	No Progress
Initiative #MH-6—Work with the Roseville City School District, local high school districts, and non-profit organizations to promote ecology-oriented curricula and stewardship activities. Identify resource and administrative barriers that may be limiting schools’ abilities to more actively participate in stewardship, and work collaboratively to identify solutions.				
No	Short Term	No	No actions towards the completion of this initiative were completed during the reporting period. This will continue to be an ongoing initiative with a medium priority pending funding.	No Progress
Police and Fire Department Initiatives				
Initiative #DF-1—Create a dam failure element for the City’s emergency response plan that includes a phased warning protocol in response to the findings of the Folsom Dam Containment Dike Risk Assessment.				
Yes	Short Term	Yes	The City of Roseville and the Placer County Office of Emergency Services has obtained a grant from the California Department of Water Resources to fund revisions to the City’s and County’s Dam Failure Emergency Response Plan under the DWR Flood Emergency Response Project grant program. The funding will assist in creating a dam failure element in the City’s Emergency Response Plan during the next year.	Ongoing
Initiative #F-20—Implement recommendation of Downtown Roseville Specific Plan to relocate the Public safety Building				
Yes	Short Term	No	The City plans to grade the parking lot and building pad for the future relocation of Fire Station #1 in 2014. The fire station will be relocated from it’s current location at the intersection of Oak Street and Grant Street to the intersection of Oak Street and Lincoln Street. Building construction is planned to begin in 2015.	Ongoing
Initiative #HC-1—Commit support to Sacramento Urban Area Security Initiative; continue to seek funding from other federal sources to fund its initiatives				
Yes	Short Term	No	Roseville hosts various training courses designed to support the regional Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) program. The City hosts a lot of classes for the UASI and they provide us with free seats in the classes in return. The Fire Chief continues to participate on the Joint Terrorism task Force Executive Committee (JTTF). The Police Department continues to support and participate in the Joint Terrorism Task Force by having three officers identified as liaisons to the Sacramento Regional Threat Assessment Center (SacRTAC). These officers communicate with the SacRTAC and disseminate security unclassified information to Roseville officers.	Ongoing

**TABLE 2.
ACTION PLAN MATRIX**

Action Taken?	Timeline	Priority Changed?	Comment (Describe progress or changed priority)	Status
Initiative #HC-2—Enhance emergency response capability of City by contingency planning for specific events based on identified vulnerabilities.				
Yes	Short Term	No	The Fire Department’s Hazmat Team has completed one Type I recertification since 2006 and is currently in the process of going through another one right now. The City’s Training Division has determined that all new employees who are required to have the basic and intermediate level of ICS training (ICS 100, 200, 700, 800) obtain training and certification through FEMA’s Online Emergency Management Institute’s Independent Study program. Certificates are provided at the completion of the courses, and maintained in the form of individual transcripts by FEMA. Audits for compliance are completed by the training division annually. Those employees required to have advanced level ICS courses (ICS 300, 400) have been identified by the City’s Training Division based on NIMS requirements. ICS 300-400 training is provided annually in multiple 16-hour blocks. The FEMA exercise mandates have been met and exceeded. In October of 2009, the H1N1 virus EOC activation was completed and included the activation of a South Placer Point of Distribution (POD) for the H1N1 virus vaccination. In May of 2010, the EOC was activated for the “MCI 2010 Homeland Security Exercise” comprising of the cities of Roseville, Rocklin and surrounding jurisdictions. In 2011, the City participated in the “Golden Guardian” full scale exercise that was hosted by California Emergency Management Agency (CalEMA). This scenario centered on a catastrophic release of Folsom Lake due to a dam failure. In 2012 the EOC staff conducted an enhanced tabletop exercise that practiced Continuity of Operations Plans (COOP). The exercise scenario included a major explosion of a natural gas main in the Civic Center area. Again in 2012, the city participated and hosted the “MCI 2012 Homeland Security Exercise” that included a major chemical release with a fast moving vapor cloud into neighboring jurisdictions. This was a full scale exercise with a complete activation of the entire EOC staff.	Ongoing
Initiative #HC-4—Prepare a site-specific vulnerability assessment of City- owned critical facilities that use the best available science and technology with regards to human-caused hazards.				
Yes	Short Term	No	Through the California Emergency Management Agency, Critical Infrastructure Protection Section and the 2008 Buffer Zone Protection Program, an assessment of the Sutter Roseville Medical Center was conducted. While SRMC is not city-owned, it is designated the City’s medical provider.	Ongoing

**TABLE 2.
ACTION PLAN MATRIX**

Action Taken?	Timeline	Priority Changed?	Comment (Describe progress or changed priority)	Status
Initiative #HH-1—Continue to collaborate with the Placer County Health Department to ensure the health and welfare of the community				
Yes	Short Term	No	The City Manager’s Office, Fire Department, and Communications Division collaborate with the Placer County Health Department on issues that affect the health and welfare of Roseville residents and visitors.	Ongoing
Initiative #SW-4—Continue education/outreach programs to improve winter preparedness and minimize loss of life or injury.				
Yes	Short Term	No	Educational materials are included on the city’s web site on an ongoing basis, as well as a weekly tip sheet sent to all local media (print/broadcast). Web content is available to any viewer with a personal computer and Internet access. Typically there is also at least one city-authored column in the Roseville Press-Tribune on this topic per year—which reaches 40,000 readers.	Ongoing
Initiative #WF-3—Enhance existing City public outreach programs to include information on fire safety, defensible spaces, and areas of concern.				
Yes	Short Term	No	The Fire Department continually evaluates the efficiency and effectiveness of its public education programs. Comparison with other accredited fire agencies reveals that our performance standards meet those of other agencies. Outreach efforts include seasonal safety messages through the media and City website. Public education programs have been reduced, with the primary focus being assembly type presentations at several elementary schools. The fire department has taken an active role in the Neighborhood Association Meetings by having the on-duty staff to attend when possible. This allows the department to update it’s citizens on various services and programs, as well as allows the citizens to voice any questions or concerns they have.	Ongoing
Initiative #MH-3—Establish/maintain a post-disaster action plan to be part of the City Emergency operations plan that will include following elements:				
• Procedures for public information • Post-disaster damage assessment • Grant writing • Code enforcement • Redundant operations				
No	Short Term	No	No action was taken on this initiative during the reporting period. The City is still committed to completing this action in the performance period of the plan. However, the City will pursue grants to complete this task.	No Progress

**TABLE 2.
ACTION PLAN MATRIX**

Action Taken?	Timeline	Priority Changed?	Comment (Describe progress or changed priority)	Status
Public Works Department Initiatives				
Initiative #F-3—Continue City participation in the National Flood Insurance Program and the Community Rating System (CRS). Seek CRS classification improvements within capabilities of City programs, including adoption and administration of FEMA-approved ordinances and flood insurance rate maps (FIRM).				
Yes	Short Term	No	The City of Roseville continued to participate in the CRS program, and re-certified its participation during the reporting period. The City's CRS Class I classification became effective on October 1, 2006. Flood Insurance policy holders within the City for property owners in flood areas will receive up to a 45% premium reduction based on the classification. Roseville is the first and only CRS Class 1 community in the nation. This initiative will continue to be implemented on an ongoing basis, with a high priority. The City has maintained its Class 1 rating through the reporting period.	Ongoing
Initiative #F-4—Maintain Roseville's compliance and good standing under the National Flood Insurance program.				
Yes	Short Term	No	A Community Assistance Visit (CAV) was last performed on the City of Roseville on November 1, 2011. The CAV is the principle means by which FEMA monitors a community's NFIP compliance. This CAV found that the City was in full compliance and in is in good standing under the NFIP.	Ongoing
Initiative #F-5—Continue the City's outreach program to flood-prone property owners and the citizens of Roseville, to help make them aware of the flood threat and how best to deal with them.				
Yes	Short Term	No	This is an on-going action that is a part of the City's CRS program.	Ongoing
Initiative #F-6—Continue to pursue a regional approach to flood issues by remaining actively involved in the Placer County Flood Control District. This involvement includes cooperation in the development of a comprehensive regional database. Continue to participate in regional flooding studies, including the Auburn Creek/Coon Creek/Pleasant Grove Creek flood mitigation plan and the Dry Creek watershed flood control plan.				
Yes	Long Term	No	The City continued to be actively involved in the Placer County Flood Control District (PCFCD) and participate in regional flooding studies during this reporting period. Staff from the Floodplain Management Division attends the meetings on a monthly basis and a Councilmember serves on the District Board. The PCFCD is developing the Antelope Creek Flood Control Project, which is a regional flood control project, located within the City of Roseville. City staff will be assisting the PCFCD with the development and construction of the regional flood control project, scheduled for construction in 2015. This initiative will continue to be implemented on an ongoing basis, with a high priority.	Ongoing

**TABLE 2.
ACTION PLAN MATRIX**

Action Taken?	Timeline	Priority Changed?	Comment (Describe progress or changed priority)	Status
Initiative #F-7—Continue City coordination with other agencies on issues of flood control. Coordination between the City and adjacent jurisdictions occurs through several mechanisms, including distribution of development proposals for review and comment. Continue City cooperation with federal, state, and local agencies, including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, California Central Valley Flood Protection Board, FEMA, California Department of Fish and Game, Placer County Resource Conservation District, and the Placer County Flood Control District.				
Yes	Short Term	No	The City continued to coordinate with other outside agencies on issues of flood control during this reporting period. The coordination typically occurs on a project-by-project basis and agencies are included in the meetings based on their particular jurisdiction or expertise. This initiative will continue to be implemented on an on-going basis, with a high priority. The City is also actively involved with the State's new Flood-Safe program.	Ongoing
Initiative #F-8—Continue to develop, implement, and expand the Flood Alert and Early Warning Program systems and integrate the systems with other local jurisdictions to form a regional warning program.				
Yes	Long Term	No	The City continues to develop, implement, and expand the Flood Alert system. New "ALERT" software was installed and the Flood Warning web site was updated. During the reporting period, the City and the Placer County Flood Control District applied a State Department of Water Resources Flood Emergency Response Projects grant to upgrade the Flood Alert System data transmission system to the "ALERT-2" protocol. While the grant application was not successful during the current grant cycle, the City and PCFCD will apply for funding in future grant cycles. This initiative will continue to be implemented on an ongoing basis with a high priority.	Ongoing
Initiative #F-10—Monitor and regularly update City flood studies, modeling, and associated land use, zoning, and other development regulations at a minimum of every 5 years or whenever information becomes available that would significantly modify previous data. New information could include new studies, change in City policy, consideration of a major development project or specific plan, or implementation of a flood control project.				
Yes	Long Term	No	The City has updated the Pleasant Grove Creek flood studies. The City also participated with the 2011 update to PCFCD's Dry Creek flood study. The studies have also determined the 200-year WSE to comply with the implementation of the Urban Level of Flood Protection criteria. The priority and timeline for this initiative will remain as assigned.	Ongoing
Initiative #F-13—Continue annual inspection and maintenance program of City storm drain systems. Review after every major storm system function and performance. This program removes debris that could contribute to blockage of the storm drain system.				
Yes	Short Term	No	The City continued to implement its ongoing protocol of inspecting and maintaining its storm drain system during the reporting period. This initiative will continue to be implemented on an ongoing basis with a high priority.	Ongoing

**TABLE 2.
ACTION PLAN MATRIX**

Action Taken?	Timeline	Priority Changed?	Comment (Describe progress or changed priority)	Status
Initiative #F-14—Complete the final two phases of the Cirby/Linda/Dry Creek flood control project (Phase 1 and 2). Five of the seven phases of this project have been completed at a cost of about \$18,000,000. The basis for determining viability of this project will be a benefit /cost analysis to determine if project meets federal grant eligibility requirements.				
No	Long Term	No	No actions towards the completion of this initiative were completed during the reporting period. This will continue to be a long-term initiative with a low priority pending funding.	No Progress
Initiative #F-15—Analyze alternative improvements to the Cirby/Linda/Dry Creek flood control project that may be cost effective in the flood-prone areas of Roseville: • Dry Creek from Darling Way to Riverside Avenue • Area on Dry Creek upstream of Folsom Road in the Columbia Avenue/Marilyn Avenue/Bonita Street area • Linda Creek near Champion Oaks Drive/Samoa Way/Hurst Way area • Cirby Creek in the Trimble Way/Zien Court area				
No	Long Term	No	No actions towards the completion of this initiative were completed during the reporting period. This will continue to be a long-term initiative with a low priority pending funding. The City continues to pursue opportunities to acquire flood prone properties and remove them from the floodplain as a viable alternative to structural flood control.	No Progress
Initiative #F-16—Replace the Huntington Drive/Cirby Creek culvert with a bridge to protect Queens Court/Huntington Drive area. The Public Works Department oversees this project.				
No	Long Term	Yes	The City is continuing to research grants that may be available for this project. The City has the 25% match for the project. The priority for this project has been changed to medium and the time line has been changed to long term pending the identification of funding for this project.	No Progress
Initiative #F-17—Divert the main drainage storm drain system down Crestmont Avenue to Cirby Way and then into Dry Creek so that the existing system will not exceed capacity. If system capacity is exceeded, the intersection on Cirby Way and Crestmont Avenue and nearby homes will flood during major flood events.				
Yes	Short Term	No	Funds were allocated for this initiative in the 07/08 capital improvements budget but were diverted to fix a culvert on Atlantic Street in downtown Roseville rather than replacing this culvert. A portion of the project, consisting of the 48-inch outfall into Linda Creek and the storm drain pipe crossing South Cirby Way at the intersection of Piedmont Way, was constructed in 2010. The priority and timeline for this initiative will remain as assigned. Funding was replaced with the approval of the FY 2011/12 budget.	Ongoing
Initiative #F-18—Continue to promote and sponsor programs to buy out, relocate, and flood-proof existing flood-prone structures within Roseville.				
Yes	Short Term	No	The City will continue to pursue the acquisition of additional target properties with a high priority. The City has targeted the property on Riverside Dr for grant funding under the FY-2013 HMA grant cycle. Completion of this project will be contingent upon grant award.	Ongoing

**TABLE 2.
ACTION PLAN MATRIX**

Action Taken?	Timeline	Priority Changed?	Comment (Describe progress or changed priority)	Status
Initiative #LS-1—Once California Geological Survey completes soils mapping for the Roseville vicinity under the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act, reassess landslide hazard using best available data to gauge the true vulnerability to this hazard.				
No	Long Term	No	There was no mapping performed by CAGS in the Roseville vicinity under the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act during the reporting period. Time line and priority for this project will remain unchanged, pending action by CAGS.	No Progress
Roseville Electric Initiatives				
Initiative #HC-6—Maintain compliance with California Energy Commission (“CEC”) license conditions for the operations of the Roseville Energy Park (“REP”) with respect to Hazardous Material Management				
Yes	Short Term	No	The operation of the REP is in compliance with the CEC license conditions including the preparation of a Business Plan and a Risk Management Plan (RMP) submitted to the City’s Fire Department and the CEC. In addition, a Vulnerability Assessment has been prepared and Site Security measures have been implemented to ensure that neither the REP site nor a shipment of hazardous material is the target of unauthorized access.	Ongoing
Initiative #HC-7—Maintain compliance with state and local laws and regulations for the operation of the Roseville Power Plant #2.				
Yes	Long Term	No	All operating and compliance permits are being maintained by the power generation staff. Compliance with state and local laws is an ongoing practice.	Ongoing
Initiative #HC-8—Maintain compliance with North American Electric Reliability Corporation mandatory reliability standards related to plant operation, sabotage reporting and critical infrastructure protection (cyber security).				
Yes	Short Term	No	Establishing compliance through development, implementation and adherence to policies and procedures	Ongoing
Initiative #SW-1—Continue ongoing program of conversion of overhead utilities to underground service.				
Yes	Short Term	No	This Program is no longer being implemented by the City. Action should be removed from action plan at the next update.	No Progress
Initiative #SW-2—Continue the Shade Tree Program, an energy conservation rebate program provided by Roseville Electric				
Yes	Short Term	No	Although temporarily suspended due to the drought, this ongoing program will continue upon reactivation to offer Roseville residents a rebate for trees that they select, purchase and plant at their own convenience. Rebates are limited to 6 trees per household and available to Roseville Electric customers only.	Ongoing
Initiative #SW-3—Continue ongoing line clearing and weed abatement of electrical utility facilities in order to reduce public exposure to vegetation hazards and maintain higher reliability during severe weather conditions.				
Yes	Short Term	No	This is an ongoing program of Roseville Electric to both protect the public from hazards and to maintain the reliability of electricity service to Roseville Electric’s more than 56,000 customers.	Ongoing

**TABLE 2.
ACTION PLAN MATRIX**

Action Taken?	Timeline	Priority Changed?	Comment (Describe progress or changed priority)	Status
Initiative #SW-6—Continue to operate the Roseville Energy Park to support the City’s electrical requirements and maintain service continuity during severe weather events.				
Yes	Short Term	No	The Roseville Energy Park (REP), which opened in October 2007, is producing power and provides additional electric support to meet the City’s electrical needs. In the event of a transmission line outage, the REP will help maintain electric service continuity. The Operations Department’s Emergency Action Plan (EAP) specifically addresses severe weather operations in Section 5.9. The severe weather EAP will ensure continuity of operations while securing the safety of personnel and equipment.	Ongoing
Initiative #SW-7— Continue to operate Roseville Power Plant #2 to support the City’s electrical requirements and maintain service continuity during severe weather events.				
Yes	Short Term	No	Roseville Power Plant #2 is operated from the Roseville Energy Park Control Room. The Operations Department’s Emergency Action Plan (EAP) specifically addresses severe weather operations in Section 5.9. The severe weather EAP will ensure continuity of operations while securing the safety of personnel and equipment.	Ongoing

Planning Area Changes That May Impact Plan Implementation

The planning area for the City changed with the adoption of 3 new Specific plans. The impacts of these changes will be addressed at the next update to this plan.

Recommendations for Changes or Enhancements

Based on the review of this report by the RMHMP Steering Committee, the following recommendations will be noted for future updates or revisions to the plan.

- The Information Technology Department has recommended that Initiatives MH-3 and MH-7 be combined into a single initiative
- Include information on the potential impacts of the Biggerts/Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act in annual mailings to floodplain residents.
- Continue to hold a pre-rainy season meeting with all key departments and stakeholders, such as the meeting held on December 10, 2013 to review the City’s Flood Warning & Response Plan.
- Continue to train with WebEOC to enhance communication with the county. Continue to offer classes prior to every EOC exercise; last year over 100 city staff received a WebEOC refresher class.
- Try to better forecast impacts on city storm drains from debris accumulations.
- Consider training in street closure in a flood scenario for street workers.

- Data from stream gauges was not a representation of actual emergencies in the field. During flooding events, field observers should be deployed to known street flooding locations, even if no gauge information indicates flooding at those locations.
- Continue to evaluate (and add as appropriate) new social media channels, which have proven essential for public and media communication in emergencies.
- The growth of recreational access to and residential units adjacent to the Pleasant Grove Creek oak forest in the Woodcreek, Crocker Ranch, and Fiddymont Farms neighborhoods increases the frequency, risk, and human impact of wildland fires. These increases may require fire and safety personnel reviews of first responder vehicle access to newly populated sections of the creek, updates of resident fire emergency notification and evacuation procedures, and creation or updates of interagency coordination procedures for resident relocation.
- Create different wording for the WebEOC initiative
- Enhance the drought hazard profile based on new information available on current drought situation in CA.
- Enhance human caused hazard profile to include discussion on cyber-terrorism.
- Create separation between natural and non-natural hazards of concern in part II of the plan

Public review notice: *The contents of this report are considered to be public knowledge and have been prepared for total public disclosure. Copies of the report have been provided to the Roseville City Council and local media outlets. The report is also posted on the City of Roseville Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan website. Any questions or comments regarding the contents of this report should be directed to:*

Jason Rizzi
 City of Roseville
 311 Vernon St.
 Roseville, CA 95678
 (916) 774-5802
jrizzi@roseville.ca.us

City of Roseville 2016 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan

Appendix C. Steering Committee Meeting Information

MEETING SUMMARY

Date of Meeting: November 3, 2015

Subject: 1st Steering Committee (SC) meeting

Project Name: City of Roseville Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan –Update

In Attendance: **Steering Committee-** Grace Keller (Chair), Rob Jensen, Jason Rizzi, Wayne Wiley, Carl Walker, Brian Jacobson (for Helen Dyda), Erik Angle, Brenette Macintosh, Mark Lacher, Rod Rodriguez, Rick Stalker, Jim Williams

Planning Team- Rob Flaner

Not Present: Mark Smith, Michael Algots

Summary Prepared by: Rob Flaner- 11/17/2015

Project No.: 103S4157

Quorum- Yes or No Yes

Item	Action
------	--------

Welcome and Introductions

- Chair, Grace Keller opened the meeting with brief group introduction.
- Round table introductions by all in attendance.
- Agenda was reviewed with no request for changes.
- There were no members of the public present and no public comment received by the Committee.
- Handouts provided included: Agenda, 2015 Progress report, work-plan for the plan update, Steering Committee ground rules, table of contents from the 2011 Multi-hazard mitigation plan.

Why are you here? Purposes for planning

Rob Flaner, the City's planning consultant from Tetra Tech, Inc. provided the committee and overview of the drivers for a hazard mitigation plan, and the Steering Committee's role in the process. There are 2 principle drivers for the City having a hazard mitigation plan; the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA) and the Community Rating System (CRS).

- **The DMA-** Federal legislation that stipulates that communities must have an approved all hazard mitigation plan to eligible for certain federal grant programs administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The City of Roseville has leveraged many of these grant programs in the past and wanted to continue to be eligible to pursue that funding, so it developed its hazard mitigation plan.
 - **The CRS-** This is a FEMA program that is part of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) that rewards participating communities for exceeding the minimum requirements of the NFIP
-

Item	Action
by lowering the costs of flood insurance in participating communities. Communities are rated on a scale of 1-10, with class 1 being the best with up to a 45% reduction in flood insurance premiums. The City of Roseville is the nation's highest rated community, and the only CRS class 1. To achieve that designation, the City need to have a mitigation plan that met very prescriptive planning requirements So utilizing these 2 drivers, the City developed its 1st hazard mitigation plan in 2005. That plan was updated in 2010, which is now being updated with this process. FEMA and CRS require that these plans be reviewed and updated every 5 years. Each of the planning processes were overseen bay steering committee made up of community stakeholders city officials. This plan update process will follow suit and has been scripted to meet CRS class 1 planning requirements. <u>2015 Annual progress report</u> The City has prepared a 2015 annual progress report for the 2011 Multi-hazard Mitigation plan in accordance with the plan maintenance chapter (chapter 7) of the plan. The progress report provides and overview of the plan and provides a status report of the 63 initiatives that were identified in the 2011 plan. The performance period for the Hazard Mitigation Plan began on March 28, 2011, with FEMA's final approval. The initial performance period for this plan is 5 years, with an update anticipated before March 2016. As of the most recent reporting period, the performance period is 82 percent complete. The Hazard Mitigation Plan identified 63 hazard mitigation initiatives to be pursued during the 5-year performance period. As of the most recent reporting period, the following progress can be reported: • 51 out of 63 initiatives (81%) reported ongoing action toward completion. • 10 out of 63 initiatives (16%) reported no action taken. • 1 out of 63 initiatives (2%) was completed. • 1 initiative was removed due to elimination of a program. The SC review the progress report, and made the following recommendations for changes before transmittal to City Council: • Add a short write-up on the Ebola exercise conducted during the reporting period to the hazard events section. • Add a short write-up about the City's "Oil by Rail" plan in the mitigation success story section of the plan. • Rob was asked to provide an overview of all the recommended changes/enhancements for the plan from the prior progress reports to the SC at the next meeting.	Erik Angle will write a paragraph about the Ebola exercise Jason Rizzi will write a paragraph about the Oil by Rail Plan Rob Flaner will provide a summary of all the annual recommendations from the annual plans to the next meeting

Item	Action
After the discussion on the progress report, the SC approved the report as amended for transmittal to City Council (Motion – Jason Rizzi, Second – Rob Jensen). Carl Walker will present the Progress Report to Council via GIM on or before December 16 th .	Carl Walker will present the Progress Report to Council via GIM on or before December 16th

2015/2016 Plan Update Work plan

Rob went over the scope of work for the plan update. The handout provided to the SC was the actual contact scope of work from Tetra Tech's contract with the City. The work plan is broken down in to 6 phases:

- Phase 1-Organize and review
- Phase 2-Update/Enhance the Risk Assessment
- Phase 3-Engage the Public
- Phase 4- PPI Framework
- Phase 5-Assemble the updated Plan
- Phase 6- Plan Adoption

The current plan will expire on March 28, 2016. Plan expiration is not a big issue, unless the City's current pending grant application for the acquisition of 645 Riverside Dr. is not funded prior to March 28, 2016. This grant application has been held up by FEMA due to procedural requirements. Both Rob and Carl do not believe, that plan expiration will be an issue for this grant, however, they will seek clarification for both CalOES and FEMA Region IX. There may be a need to expedite the timeline for this project based on direction received from FEMA and the State.

Rob and Carl will reach out to CalOES and FEMA region IX to determine if an expedited schedule is warranted in order to process the grant for 645 Riverside Dr.

Steering Committee Ground Rules

Since Steering Committee meetings will be conducted as open public meetings, the SC will need to have established ground rules for operation during the plan update process. The ground rules confirmed by the SC for the last plan update were provided to the SC. Rob went thru each of the components of the ground rules to make sure the current SC understood their application, and to seek input for changes or enhancements. The following changes were recommended by the SC for the 2015/2016 SC ground rules:

- Grace Keller was re-confirmed as Chairperson, and Wayne Wiley was confirmed as Vice-Chairperson for the next performance period of the plan.
- The quorum for the SC will remain as 50% plus 1, which will be 8 members for this plan update process.
- SC members will have the option to designate an alternate and these alternates will have full voting privileges when they attend a SC meeting in the place of a primary SC member. SC members wishing to designate an alternate will inform the planning team by Friday, November 20th.

SC members wishing to designate an alternate should inform planning team by Friday, November 20th, 2015.

Item	Action
- The city's standard protocol for receiving public comment at City Council meetings was incorporated in to the ground rules. - The standard meeting date/time will strive for the 1st Tuesday of each month, from 6:00 to 8:00 PM at the Roseville City offices at 311 Vernon St.	

The SC voted to approve the ground rules as amended (Motion – Rick Stalker, Second – Mark Lacher). Carl will make sure that the final ground rules are posted on the Mitigation Plan website as soon as possible.

Carl to poste the final ground rules on the mitigation plan website.

Hazards of Concern

The table of contents from the last plan illustrating the hazards of concern addressed was provided to the SC as a hand out. Rob explained that local hazard mitigation plans are required to be consistent with the State Hazard Mitigation plan as far as the hazards of concern addressed by a plan. So in other words, id the State plan says that Placer County and the City of Roseville is susceptible to a certain hazard, then the Roseville and Placer County plans should assess those hazards in their individual mitigation plans. The 2011 Roseville Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan assessed: Dam Failure, Drought, Earthquake, Flood, Human Caused hazards, Human health hazards, Landslide, severe weather, and wildfire. These hazards were consistent with the last CA State hazard Mitigation plan.

The Steering Committee was asked to do some homework prior to the next SC meeting as follow:

SC members to do homework as described.

All to read Chapter 11-18 of the 2011 plan and answer the following questions:

- Is there another hazard we need to assess?
- Since California will have Climate Change (Future Conditions) as a stand-alone risk, how should we accomplish that in our plan?

All to read Goal section and answer the following questions:

- Are the Goals still valid?
- Do we need to add any new Goals?

All to review the Annual reports for the last five years.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:00 PM

The next Steering Committee meeting is:



Item	Action
------	--------

November 30th from 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM
Roseville City Hall
311 Vernon St., Roseville, CA 95678

MEETING SUMMARY

Date of Meeting: November 30, 2015

Subject: 2nd Steering Committee (SC) meeting

Project Name: City of Roseville Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan –Update

In Attendance:
Steering Committee- Grace Keller (Chair), Rob Jensen, Jason Rizzi, Wayne Wiley, Carl Walker, Helen Dyda, Erik Angle, Brenette Macintosh, Mark Lacher, Rick Stalker, Jim Williams, Paul Holt, Joe Van Zant
Planning Team- Rob Flaner

Not Present: Mark Smith, Rod Rodriguez, Michael Algots

Summary Prepared by: Rob Flaner- 12/14/2015

Project No.: 103S4157

Quorum- Yes or No Yes

Item	Action
------	--------

Welcome and Introductions

- Vice-Chair, Wayne Wiley opened the meeting with a brief group introduction.
- Round table introductions by all in attendance.
- Agenda was reviewed with no request for changes.
- Meeting summary for Steering Committee (SC) Meeting #1 were reviewed and approved.
- There were no members of the public present and no public comment received by the SC.
- Handouts provided included: Agenda, Meeting #1 summary, example guiding principles and mission statements, the 2012 plan Goals and Objectives, Planning area map for the 2016 plan update, recommendations for changes and enhancements from the 2015 annual progress report.
- Chair, Grace Keller assumed leadership of the meeting upon her arrival.

Progress Report Recommendations

At the last SC meeting, the committee requested to see the changes and enhancement sections from the past progress reports. Rob provided the SC a handout that summarized the notations for changes and enhancements to the plan from the 2012 through 2014 progress reports. Rob led a discussion with the SC on what recommendations for changes or enhancements should be included in the 2015 progress report. The following recommendations were requested by the SC:

Item	Action
• Create different wording for the WebEOC initiative • Enhance the drought hazard profile based on new information available on current drought situation in California. • Enhance the human-caused hazard profile to include a discussion on cyber-terrorism. • Enhance the human health hazard profile to include a discussion on Ebola. • Create separation between natural and non-natural hazards of concern in part II of the plan.	Rob and Carl to final finalize the 2015 progress report for posting on the City website and submittal to City Council

Rob and Carl will finalize the 2015 progress report for posting on the City website and submittal to the City Council

Carl asked the SC to review the planning area map that was provided as a handout. Carl explained to the SC that the planning area for the City has changed dramatically since the initial planning effort in 2005. The City has and will continue to grow that the direction of its General Plan and Specific Planning process. The map handout illustrated the new specific plan areas that will need an assessment in the 2016 update.

Confirm the Hazards of Concern

The SC was asked at the last meeting to review the 2012 Roseville HMP and the 2013 CA State Hazard Mitigation plan and come to this meeting prepared to confirm the hazards of concern to be addressed by the 2016 plan update. After discussion of their observations from this review, the SC confirmed the following hazards of concern for the 2016 plan update, inclusive of the newly identified cyber terrorism and Ebola components of human-caused and human health hazards, respectively:

- Dam Failure
- Drought
- Earthquake
- Flood
- Human caused
 - Terrorism & Weapons of Mass Destruction
 - Technological
 - Civil Disorder
 - ***Cyber terrorism***
- Human Health
 - Influenza
 - Small Pox
 - Viral Hemorrhagic Fevers
 - Plague
 - Tularemia
 - Mosquito-borne Disease
 - Lyme Disease

Item	Action
- Anthrax - Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome - Extreme weather - <i>Ebola</i> • Landslide • Severe Weather • Wildfire-to include a discussion/profile on air quality issues	

Additionally, the 2016 update will include a stand-alone chapter on climate change that will discuss qualitatively the possible impacts of climate change on each of the above hazards of concern. There will be separation created in the plan between the natural and non-natural hazards since they will be profiled and ranked differently. The risk ranking of the plan will only consider the natural hazards of concern.

Guiding Principle/ Vision/Mission Statement

A guiding principle or a mission statement for a plan is a written declaration of a plan's core purpose and focus that normally remains unchanged over time, regardless of a change to the plan's goals or objectives. Rob explained to the SC that the last 2 versions of the Roseville Hazard Mitigation plan did not identify a guiding principle or mission statement. These are not required components for DMA compliance, however, Rob explained to the SC that they are beneficial, as they provide a clear, singular message that can be the focal point for public engagement. Rob explained to the SC that he was unaware as to why the past Steering Committees chose to not identify a guiding principle, however, this SC could identify one for the 2016 update. The SC received a handout that listed several example mission statements from other planning efforts for reference and review. After reviewing the handout, Rob asked the SC if they wanted a guiding principle/ statement for the 2016 plan update. The consensus of the SC agreed on identifying a guiding principle. After discussion, the SC settled on the following guiding principle for the 2016 plan update:

Through community partnerships, establish a plan to reduce vulnerability to hazards in order to protect the health, safety, welfare, and economy of the City.

Confirm Goals

The SC received a handout that listed the 7 goals from the 2012 plan. Rob explained that the initial 2005 plan included 7 goals that were slightly enhanced during the 2012 plan update process. Rob asked the SC to review the 7 goals and identify any additions, deletions, or enhancements to the goals for the 2016 update. One change was requested by the SC. This change involved replacing "maintain, enhance, and restore" with "monitor and support" on Goal #7. The SC confirmed the following goals for the 2016 plan update:

Item	Action
<i>G-1: Protect lives and reduce injury.</i>	
<i>G-2: Promote hazard mitigation as an integrated policy.</i>	
<i>G-3: Protect the continuity of local government to ensure no significant disruption of services during or due to a disaster.</i>	
<i>G-4: Improve community emergency management preparedness, collaboration and outreach.</i>	
<i>G-5: Minimize or reduce damage to property, including critical facilities.</i>	
<i>G-6: Develop and implement mitigation strategies that optimize public funds in an efficient and cost-effective way.</i>	
<i>G-7: Monitor and support the natural environment's capacity to deal with the impacts of natural hazards, taking into account the potential impacts of global climate change.</i>	
<u>Confirm Objectives</u>	
The SC received a handout that listed the 10 objectives from the 2012 plan. Rob explained that the initial 2005 plan included 10 objectives that were slightly enhanced during the 2012 plan update process. Rob asked the SC to review the 10 objectives and identify any additions, deletions, or enhancements to the goals for the 2016 update. The SC requested minor changes to objectives # 5, 7, and 10. The SC confirmed the following objectives for the 2016 plan update:	
<i>O-1: Consider the impacts of hazards on future land uses in the City of Roseville by coordinating with other planning mechanisms such as the general plan and land-use code development.</i>	
<i>O-2: Protect and sustain reliable local emergency operations and communication facilities during and after disasters.</i>	
<i>O-3: Develop new or enhance existing early warning response systems and plans.</i>	
<i>O-4: Seek to enhance emergency response capabilities through improvements to infrastructure and City programs.</i>	
<i>O-5: Enhance the understanding of all present and future hazards that may impact the City of Roseville and the risk they pose.</i>	
<i>O-6: Seek mitigation projects that provide the highest degree of hazard protection at the least cost.</i>	
<i>O-7: Seek to update information on natural, environmental, and human-caused hazards, vulnerabilities, and mitigation measures by coordinating</i>	Carl to post the final Guiding Principle, Goals and Objectives on the City HMP website

Item	Action
<i>planning efforts and creating partnerships with appropriate local, private, county, state, and federal agencies.</i>	
<i>O-8: Seek to implement codes, standards, and policies that will protect life and property, including natural habitat, from the impacts of hazards within the City of Roseville.</i>	
<i>O-9: Educate the public on preparedness for and mitigation of potential impacts of hazards on the City of Roseville.</i>	
<i>O-10: Support efforts to retrofit, purchase, or relocate structures in high hazard areas, including those known to be repetitively damaged.</i>	

Public Involvement Strategy

Discussion on this topic was tabled until the next meeting due to the lack of time.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 PM

The next Steering Committee meeting is:

January 5th from 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM
Roseville City Hall
311 Vernon St., Roseville, CA 95678

MEETING SUMMARY

Date of Meeting: January 5, 2016

Subject: 3rd Steering Committee (SC) meeting

Project Name: City of Roseville Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan –Update

In Attendance:
Steering Committee- Grace Keller (Chair), Jason Rizzi, Wayne Wiley, Carl Walker, Helen Dyda, Erik Angle, Brenette Macintosh, Mark Lacher, Joe Van Zant, Rick Stalker, Michael Algots, Jim Williams, Paul Holt, Dom Casey, Jamie Garret
Planning Team- Rob Flaner, Jessica Cerutti

Not Present: Rob Jensen, Rod Rodriguez

Summary Prepared by: Jessica Cerutti – 01/08/16

Project No.: 103S4157

Quorum- Yes or No Yes

Item	Action
------	--------

Welcome and Introductions

- Chair Grace Keller opened the meeting with a brief group introduction.
- Round table introductions by all in attendance.
- Agenda was reviewed with no request for changes.
- Meeting summary for Steering Committee (SC) Meeting #2 were reviewed and approved.
- There were no members of the public present and no public comment received by the SC.
- Handouts provided included: Agenda, Meeting #2 summary, Critical Facilities definition, Risk Assessment Update, Copy of the City of Roseville 2010 Public Survey.

Risk Assessment Update

Rob opened the discussion on the risk assessment (RA) update by indicating little change. He said that Tetra Tech is still data mining and addressing identified data gaps.

Rob and Carl revealed that they are adjusting the RA to reflect the Preliminary Flood Insurance rate Map (PFIRM) as the best available data for this plan update. Carl explained that the updated RA for flood will use the PFIRM received from FEMA on December 28th as the basis of the flood RA instead of the current effective FIRM. Carl said that the PFIRM provides a new study on Pleasant Grove Creek and will be best suited for inclusion into the 2016 plan update for enhanced future impact assessments.

Item	Action
<u>Public Involvement Strategy</u>	
<i>CRS Requirements</i>	
Rob reviewed the Community Rating System (CRS) requirements for public engagement, noting that the City of Roseville is already fulfilling most requirements through inviting public participation during committee meetings and maintaining a public facing website. He stressed that such initiatives must be maintained and public engagement must continue.	
<i>To survey or not to survey</i>	
Rob presented the SC with the 2010 Roseville HMP public survey and posed the question of whether or not the survey should be updated and distributed for the 2016 initiative. He said that to truly reap the benefits of the survey, the public must be provided a minimum of 30 days to maximize participation. He stressed that distribution of the survey may not necessarily be conducive to the expedited timeline for HMP completion, noting that the current target submission to FEMA is March 2016. This led to a discussion on the ramifications of extending the target submission. Rob mentioned that the City is still able to submit a LOI with an expired plan. Additionally, he said that HMGP approval can take anywhere from 6-8 months after initial submission. Carl noted that the only project that may be affected by an extended submission of the HMP to FEMA would be the acquisition project associated with 645 Riverside. Rob added that the City should be afforded some latitude regarding this project due to the lag in progress caused by CalOES and FEMA. At this point, Carl suggested to extend the HMP process to afford ample time to maximize public participation.	SC to review the previous survey by January 8 and return comments to Jessica.
Grace noted that the Flood Control District and FEMA will be meeting during late January and recommended engaging FEMA to be put on the agenda. Jason followed up by recommending that participating in RCONA meeting may be beneficial for furthering public outreach.	Carl and Jason to introduce the Roseville HMP initiative and public survey to the County CCO meeting, if possible.
<i>PPI Subcommittee</i>	
Rob initiated a discussion regarding the next item on the agenda – the Program for Public Information (PPI). He noted that this is an option for additional CRS credit. Given the City’s current outreach initiatives, Rob said that it makes sense to capture them in a formalized program. He said that the PPI would be an annex to the plan, as the process for PPI planning will extend beyond the 2016 HMP effort. Carl requested additional information regarding the PPI, after which the subcommittee will meet – tentatively at the end of January. The PPI subcommittee is tentatively identified as follows:	Jessica to develop and send an overview of the PPI initiative, inclusive of requirements and considerations.
• Carl Walker • Jason Rizzi • Helen Dyda • Jamie Garrett • Rick Stalker • Paul Holt • Michael Algots	

Item	Action
------	--------

Confirm Critical Facilities Definition

Next, Rob reviewed the previous iterations of the critical facility definitions from the 2005 and 2010 plans. He stated that, at a minimum, the City should use the CRS standard definition. He provided additional examples for review and asked the SC for their views on the definition. The SC agreed that the standard definition should be used with some modification. The following definition was constructed and subsequently approved by the SC with a motion to approve from Joseph Van Zant and a second from Rick Stalker:

A structure or other improvement, public or private, that, because of its function, size, service area, or uniqueness, has the potential to cause serious bodily harm, extensive property damage, or disruption of vital socioeconomic activities if it is destroyed or damaged or if its functionality is impaired. Critical facilities may include, but is not limited to, health and safety facilities, utilities, government facilities, hazardous materials facilities, and transportation infrastructure.

General Plan Update/New CA General Planning Law

Wayne updated the SC on current general Plan initiatives, including a discussion of SB 379. During this discussion, Wayne indicated that SB 379 will require a climate change component beginning with the first plan adopted after January 2017. As a result, the 2016 mitigation planning initiative will not be required to contain climate change, however Rob indicated that the previously discussed climate change chapter will serve as a segue into the post-2017 requirement.

Emergency Operations Plan Review

Rob indicated that the EOP review was currently underway. He stressed that an anticipated gap will include disabilities, access, and functional needs issues given the recent string of Americans with Disabilities Act lawsuits taking place around the country.

Debris Management Plan

Jessica introduced the SC to the debris management planning initiative. She provided the SC with an overview of debris management operations and stressed the need for a strong plan that follows recently updated Public Assistance Program and Policy Guide 10-point Debris Management Plan Checklist. Paul and Mike volunteered to serve on the debris management planning committee given their advanced knowledge of hazardous materials and debris management practices.

Jessica to send out the 10-point Debris Management Checklist for SC review and reference.

Jason to include Paul and Mike in the debris management planning process.

Meeting Summary

Item	Action
------	--------

Carl to send Rick SC contact information

As a final action before meeting adjournment, Rick requested a copy of the SC contact information.

The meeting adjourned at 7:47 PM

The next Steering Committee meeting is:

February 2nd from 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM
Roseville City Hall
311 Vernon St., Roseville, CA 95678

MEETING SUMMARY

Date of Meeting: February 2, 2016
Subject: 4th Steering Committee (SC) meeting
Project Name: City of Roseville Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan –Update
In Attendance:
Steering Committee- Grace Keller (Chair), Jason Rizzi, Wayne Wiley, Carl Walker, Helen Dyda, Brenette Macintosh, Mark Lacher, Joe Van Zant, Rick Stalker, Michael Algots, Jim Williams, Paul Holt, Jaime Garret
Planning Team- Rob Flaner, Jessica Cerutti
Not Present: Rob Jensen, Rod Rodriguez, Erik Angle, Dom Casey
Summary Prepared by: Jessica Cerutti – 02/08/16
Project No.: 103S4157
Quorum- Yes or No Yes

Item	Action
<u>Welcome and Introductions</u>	
- Chair Grace Keller opened the meeting with a brief group introduction. - Agenda was reviewed with no request for changes. - Meeting summary for Steering Committee (SC) Meeting #3 were reviewed and approved. - There were no members of the public present and no public comment received by the SC. - Handouts provided included: Agenda, Meeting #3 summary, Debris Management Plan Checklist, Risk Assessment Update, 2016 Roseville Public Questionnaire, PPI Overview, 2011 Mitigation Catalog.	
<u>Risk Assessment Update</u>	
Rob opened the discussion on the risk assessment (RA) update by thanking Carl for the receipt of additional data, including flood data that provided the missing links on the assessor's data. Rob indicated that this missing data provides a key for making the overall RA more robust. Next, Rob mentioned that there were previous issues with the LiDAR data, stating that the data received was not based on a bare earth model. He then said that Carl was able to acquire the formatted bare earth LiDAR model that FEMA is using for the Preliminary DFRIM, which will further strengthen the RA. Rob next stated that the RA results will be available by the next SC meeting. During the next meeting, these results will be reviewed for the earthquake, flood, and dam failure hazards with all updated inventories. He said that	
	Rob to provide RA results by Feb. 26th

Item	Action
review of this information is key, as it will be the primary deliverable to share with the public. Rob said that Tetra Tech will work towards getting the SC the RA data by Friday, February 26th in order to provide an opportunity for SC review prior to the next meeting. He said that this data will come from Hazus and explained that the RA used a user defined, more specific model than simply using the Hazus pre-identified data. He requested that the SC review the RA methodology from the previous plan in preparation of reviewing the 2016 RA data. Next, Rob talked about the hazard layers, saying that some datasets were provide by the California Geological Survey. He also spoke about the dam failure hazard, reminding the SC that this profile was originally developed during the previous planning process. He said that this hazard focused on analysis and results, but did not include specific mapping due to operational security. The SC agreed that general evacuation and inundation maps with arrows are permissible, but no specific mapping should be used that identifies definitive locations of the dam failure hazard due to security concerns.	SC to review the previous plan methodology for RA in preparation of 2016 RA review.
<u>Public Involvement Strategy</u>	
<i>Survey</i>	
The SC reviewed the final survey for distribution and discussed the timeline for deploying the survey in relation to the remaining timeline for the project. Jason recommended that communications should take the lead on deploying the survey through various means. Helen suggested running the survey for approximately 2 weeks. She also indicated that they would provide a follow up email and post to potential respondents before the survey is closed to remind potential participants to take the survey.	Helen and Jaime to deploy the survey via social media platforms and other channels.
<i>Public Meeting</i>	
Rob then began a discussion on the public meeting. He said that the public meeting is dependent upon the availability of RA data. Grace recommended the use of the Utility Center. Jason said that he would check with the Parks and Rec Department to find out Center availability, but recommended against late March due to Spring Break, noting that many residents will likely be out of town during this time. Helen and Jaime recommended adding an option at the end of the survey where residents could provide their email address to remain informed on upcoming public meetings.	Jessica to add email option to end of survey.
Rob requested information regarding the potential format of the public meeting. The SC agreed that an open house format would be the best. Potential booth participants could include RCONA, Union Pacific, Red Cross, CERT, and others. Jason mentioned the Saturday open houses for the fire department as a potential vehicle for a captive audience. Helen recommended the Earth Day festivities on April 16th as a possible vehicle for the public meeting. In addition, she indicated that the Food Truck Mania event would be an ideal time to advertise for the public meeting	SC will provide input regarding the Planning Team's recommendations for a tentative schedule and begin preliminary event planning in March.

Item	Action
------	--------

Public Involvement - PPI

Carl started the conversation about the PPI by saying that the City would like to make the PPI more of an all hazards program that fulfills CRS requirements while simultaneously providing additional outreach considerations on other hazard issues. Jessica indicated that this is an ideal program, noting that a PPI allows for CRS credit based on topics outside of the six priority topics. She said that these additional topics can be general preparedness, all-hazards based.

Jessica then took the SC through an overview of the PPI development process. She reviewed each of the seven steps, beginning with the establishment of a PPI Committee. She noted that at the previous SC meeting, a list of tentative PPI committee members was discussed. From this list, the final committee will be selected based on CRS requirements.

Jess and Carl to discuss final PPI committee.

Jessica then discussed Step 2 of the process, drawing attention to the need to identify target areas and target audiences. She noted that this next step can only be conducted after the development of the RA which will allow the PPI committee to make a data-based determination on what specific areas to target. She reviewed the rest of the requirements of the PPI, including a reiteration on topics and annual review requirements

Alternatives Analysis

Rob next discussed the alternatives analysis, bringing the SC's attention to the previous Mitigation Catalog. Rob reminded the SC that this catalog development is part of the statutory requirement to develop a comprehensive range of alternatives considered for actions in the plan. He noted that the catalog separates actions into a personal, corporate, and governmental scale and identifies opportunities to reduce risk.

Rob mentioned that the SC did not perform a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Obstacles (SWOO) session during the last planning process (2011 MHMP Update) and asked the SC if they would like to conduct a SWOO session for the 2016 initiative. He reminded the SC that they last SWOO session was held nearly 10 years ago, and that some risks have changed. For example, he noted that during the initial planning process, dam risk was unknown. New RA results will provide a better understanding of the dam hazard and how they relate to SWOO.

Jason requested best practices from other jurisdictions and their SWOO results as a reference, noting that while some risks need to be reassessed as part of the catalog process, others have remained the same. Rob recommended an abbreviated SWOO session during the next SC meeting,

Item	Action
------	--------

for all-hazards, but specifically recommended focusing on newly identified risks, such as dam failure and cyber threats.

Grace asked Rob to conduct a sample SWOO to give the SC an idea of what to expect during the next meeting. Rob used Health Hazards as a sample:

- Strengths
 - Active community, parks and rec, available health programs
- Weaknesses
 - Homeless population
 - Elderly population – unable to call for help, alone in houses
- Opportunities
 - Change in potential funding to establish a program
 - Identify new opportunities to reduce risk
 - Seniors First – visitors already trained, opportunity for coordination
- Obstacles
 - Limited funding
 - Organizational resources lacking

With no further comments, the meeting adjourned at 8:00 PM

The next Steering Committee meeting is:

March 1st from 5:30 PM to 8:00 PM
Roseville City Hall
311 Vernon St., Roseville, CA 95678

MEETING SUMMARY

Date of Meeting: March 1, 2016

Subject: 5th Steering Committee (SC) meeting

Project Name: City of Roseville Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan –Update

In Attendance: **Steering Committee**- Grace Keller (Chair), Jason Rizzi, Wayne Wiley, Carl Walker, Erik Angle, Helen Dyda, Brenette Macintosh, Mark Lacher, Joe Van Zant, Rick Stalker, Michael Algots, Jim Williams, Jaime Garret

Planning Team- Rob Flaner, Jessica Cerutti

Not Present: Rob Jensen, Rod Rodriguez, Dom Casey

Summary Prepared by: Jessica Cerutti – 03/10/16

Project No.: 103S4157

Quorum- Yes or No Yes

Item	Action
------	--------

Welcome and Introductions

- Chair Grace Keller opened the meeting with a brief group introduction.
- Agenda was reviewed with no request for changes.
- Meeting summary for Steering Committee (SC) Meeting #4 were reviewed and approved.
- Two members of the public were presented and invited to comment at this time.
 - Both members of the public expressed interest in the planning process. One indicated an increased interest in understanding the concept of the plan, including how manmade hazard such as cyber are terrorism will be incorporated. SC members offered additional information regarding the background of hazard mitigation planning, including the emphasis on natural hazards.
- Handouts provided included: Agenda, Meeting #4 Summary, Preliminary Risk Assessment Results, and Preliminary Public Information Survey Results.

Risk Assessment Update

Rob opened the discussion on the risk assessment (RA) update by reviewing the essential terminology regarding the risk assessment data provided in the handout. He reminded the SC that FEMA is looking to quantify risk and avoided loss in monetary amounts. He reviewed the definition of assets in General Building Stock and Critical facilities. He noted that general building stock is where residents live and shop on a daily basis while critical infrastructure refers to the definition decided upon by the SC during SC Meeting #2.

Item	Action
Next, Rob reviewed the purpose of HAZUS – the program used to conduct the Roseville risk assessment. He noted that the updated risk assessment used HAZUS 5.1 and updated inventory, including new LiDAR data based on terrain and an updated value of identified assets. Additionally, Rob noted that the updated risk assessment contains new loss estimations for dam failure, earthquake, and flood. Rob said that expected changes occurred with the inclusion of better data, specifically regarding an increased floodplain due to the annexation of Sierra Vista and Creekview and new shake maps for seismic assessment. From there, Rob explained that the actual risk ranking is based on HAZUS outputs on a level 2-user defined level. He explained that this meant that the assessment was conducted on a property-specific level instead of a general block level. Rob noted that this granular level of assessment provides increased capability for informed hazard ranking and overall mitigation planning. Rob next reviewed the results of each hazard run, noting that the assessment is not complete for all anticipated models – particularly for landslide due to soil class discrepancies and the 10-, 50-, and 500-year flood scenarios. Rob noted that outside of flood and earthquake, the other hazards are given an estimate on potential damages in table format due to existing limitations in the HAZUS program. Rob said that the April 16th Earth Day HAZUS work stations will rely on correct information in order to provide information to the public.	

Public Involvement Strategy

Earth Day

Next, Rob reviewed the public outreach strategy, noting that Roseville’s April 16th Earth Day event at Mahany Park will be the foundation for the first public meeting. He explained the format, saying that there will be two HAZUS workstations, easels displaying maps, and hard copies of the survey available for attendees to complete. Carl and Jason discussed the issues associated with displaying information related to the dam failure hazard. Carl noted that the public survey results indicated a need to provide some information on dam failure, but consideration must be made regarding the exposure of potentially sensitive information.

Additionally, Rob requested the involvement of the SC as support staff during the Earth Day activities from 10:00am to 3:00pm. Carl requested that the SC sign up for times in which they would be available to support the initiative. The SC provided an initial schedule to Carl at this time. Carl also suggested the possibility of including a raffle giveaway to encourage participation, noting that an emergency preparedness Go-Bag would be a beneficial prize.

Rob closed the discussion on Earth Day by noting that the SC would not meet during the month of April due to the Earth Day event.

Carl to confirm SC participation in Earth Day activities.

Survey Results

Item	Action
Jessica reviewed the initial survey results. She stressed that the purpose of this survey was twofold: to assess the understanding of hazards at a community level and to assess the specific concerns for the community. She drew attention to the associated handout and noted that Jaime and Helen's public outreach resulted in 653 responses.	
First, Jessica reviewed the respondent top choices for receiving news and information about the City, noting that email and text messaging was the top selection for information, next was the social media platform, Nextdoor, followed Facebook, and Alert Roseville.	
Next, Jessica noted that nearly 98% of respondents live in Roseville, and over half of the respondents work outside of Roseville. Jessica explained that this is a key factor in outreach, as families may be separated during a disaster.	
Jessica noted that while most respondents were aware of their location within or outside of a floodplain, approximately 40% were not sure. She described this as an indication of a need for additional outreach that can be targeted during the development of the PPI. Likewise, a large percentage (approximately 38%) indicated that they were unsure whether their residence was located in a dam failure zone or not.	
Jessica reviewed the assessment of the public top natural hazard threats. Drought was the top hazard threat, followed by extreme temperatures, epidemic, severe weather, earthquake, flood, wildfire, freeze and other hazards. She noted that multiple respondents cited radon as a natural hazard of concern. The SC agreed to take this information into consideration during the next LHMP update and possible include radon exposure as a future hazard of concern.	Tetra Tech to update hazard mitigation Best Practices based on SWOO results.

SWOO Session

Rob led the SC in the conduction of the SWOO Session. He began the session by explaining that the SC will focus on an overall programmatic assessment of Roseville, followed by a hazard specific assessment for the hazards of dam failure and cyber threats.

With no further comments, the meeting adjourned at 8:00 PM

The next Steering Committee meeting is:

August 2nd from 6:00 PM to 8:00PM
Roseville City Hall
311 Vernon St., Roseville, CA 95678

MEETING SUMMARY

Date of Meeting: August 2, 2016

Subject: 6th Steering Committee (SC) meeting

Project Name: City of Roseville Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan –Update

In Attendance:

Steering Committee- Grace Keller (Chair), Jason Rizzi, Wayne Wiley, Carl Walker, Helen Dyda, Erik Angle, Brenette Macintosh, Mark Lacher, Joe Van Zant, Rick Stalker, Michael Algots, Jim Williams,

Public: Michael Zasso

Planning Team- Rob Flaner, Jessica Cerutti

Not Present: Rob Jensen, Rod Rodriguez, Dom Casey, Jaime Garret

Summary Prepared by: Jessica Cerutti – 08/17/2016

Project No.: 103S4157

Quorum- Yes or No Yes

Item	Action
------	--------

Welcome and Introductions

- Chair Grace Keller opened the meeting with a brief group introduction.
- Agenda was reviewed with no request for changes.
- Meeting summary for Steering Committee (SC) Meeting #5 were reviewed and approved.
- There were no public comment received by the SC.
- Handouts provided included: Agenda, Meeting #3 summary, Draft RMHMP.

Project Overview

Rob Flaner began the discussion by indicating that the SC Meeting 6 doubled as a public meeting to review the Draft RMHMP. Carl stated that the public review period started on July 18th and would end on August 19th with an anticipated submittal to CalOES and FEMA by August 29th. From there, Carl said that Approval Pending Adoption is expected by October 18, with a target date to present the plan before City Council on November 2nd.

From there, Rob, provided an overview of the entire process and plan. He noted that this plan is a requirement to apply for certain federal funding programs – namely mitigation programs. Rob noted that the specific process undertaken by the City was driven by Community Rating System (CRS) requirements.

Item	Action
------	--------

Rob continued by explaining that the risk assessment conducted as part of this process is the hub of the mitigation wheel. He said that risk is probability multiplied by impact, and that the resulting ranking allowed the City to compare results and categorize hazards as high, medium, or low risk,

Rob next described the capability assessment. He said that the capability assessment serves a dual purpose. One purpose is to identify existing drivers and support for implementing mitigation strategies. The second purpose is to identify potential deficiencies that could be remedied as a mitigation item. He noted debris management as an example. He explained that the City identified the need for a debris management plan as a result of the previous capability assessment. As a result, a debris management plan was recommended and subsequently completed by the City.

Next, Rob described the importance of goals and objectives. He reminded the SC that this initiative is the third comprehensive update undertaken by the City. He noted that the goals and objectives from the previous plan were carried over into the 2016 plan with some minor adjustments to focus on climate change.

Finally, Carl and Wayne described the process for CEQA, namely the initial study/mitigated negative declaration designation (IS/MND). They indicated that pursuit of the IS/MND was based on the expectation that projects identified in the Plan would undergo a full CEQA review once they are initiated.

Public Involvement Strategy

During the discussion on public engagement, Jessica noted that a large part of the success of Roseville's 2016 public engagement strategy was due to the successful implementation of Nextdoor as an outreach tool. She noted that the survey received a strong response in correlation with Nextdoor releases. Carl thanked the efforts of Helen and Jaime in coordinating the public outreach efforts.

Action Items/Next Steps

- Finalize plan based on public comments
- Submit to CalOES/FEMA for Review

With no further comments, the meeting adjourned at 7:00pm



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8224

File #: 0401-02-02-1

Title: 316 Vernon Office Building - Notice of Completion

Contact: Mike Isom 916-774-5527 misom@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 6.16.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff recommends that the City Council adopt a resolution accepting the construction of the 316 Vernon Street Office Building as complete and authorize the Development Services Director to execute the Notice of Completion.

BACKGROUND

The project is located at 316 Vernon Street in the Downtown Roseville Specific Plan area, directly across Vernon Street from the Roseville Civic Center, and immediately adjacent to the Vernon Street Post Office (see attached location map). The construction contract was awarded to DPR Construction by the City Council on September 2, 2015. The project consisted of construction of a new four-story, ±83,000 square foot City office building with ground floor retail space and related site improvements.

All city departments have made their final inspections of the building and have found the work to be completed in accordance with the construction documents, specifications, and applicable building codes, and is now ready for acceptance by the City Council. Pursuant to Section 2.7 of the design-assist construction contract, the contractor shall guarantee the installation of all improvements for a period of twelve months from December 23, 2016, the date of "Substantial Completion" as defined in the contract terms.

FISCAL IMPACT

The project was funded through the 316 Vernon Street Office Building CIP budget, comprised of a combination of cash from the public facilities and strategic improvement funds, and debt financing in the form of certificates of participation. No general fund monies were used for the project.

The value of the construction contract awarded to DPR Construction was \$21,411,358. The Council also granted the project manager with 2% design contingency/change order authority

(\$428,227). During construction of the project, approximately \$428,227 worth of value-added, owner-requested change orders was processed bringing the final construction cost of 316 Vernon to approximately \$21,839,585. Examples of value-added change orders include higher-efficiency mechanical, electrical, and glazing systems, IT/data center and networking improvements, and the change from steel frame to pre-cast concrete, among others. These change order costs are expected to be recaptured over time through long-term maintenance and operational savings.

The project was completed using slightly more than 100,000 labor hours. The project maintained a perfect safety record with no reportable incidents.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

The project is estimated to have resulted in the following:

- 244 total jobs associated with construction: 154 direct and 90 through indirect and induced activities; and,
- \$33,294,034 in total annual economic output: \$21,000,000 in direct output and another \$11,894,034 through indirect and induced activities.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The Council action of accepting the 316 Vernon Street Office Building as complete will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines §15060(c)(2)). Adoption of the 316 Vernon Street Office Building Notice of Completion does not include the potential for a significant environmental effect, and therefore is not subject to CEQA.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mike Isom, Development Services Manager

Kevin Payne, Development Services Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution No. 17-32

316 Vernon - Notice of Completion and Vicinity Map

RESOLUTION NO. 17-32

ACCEPTING THE PUBLIC WORK KNOWN AS THE 316 VERNON OFFICE BUILDING PROJECT, APPROVING THE “NOTICE OF COMPLETION”, AND AUTHORIZING THE DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE SAID NOTICE ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Roseville as follows:

1. The “Notice of Completion” on file in the City Clerk’s Department relative to that public work known as the 316 Vernon Office Building Project has been approved and the public work accepted.
2. The Development Services Director is hereby authorized and directed to execute said Notice on behalf of the City of Roseville.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20____, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

AFTER RECORDING RETURN TO:
CITY CLERK
311 VERNON STREET
ROSEVILLE, CA 95678

NOTICE OF COMPLETION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the public work known as the City of Roseville's 316 Vernon Office Building Project, was completed and accepted by the City of Roseville on January 18, 2017. The location is indicated on the attached map, marked as Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein by this reference.

The general contractor on said project was DPR Construction, a General Partnership

The surety on said project was Liberty Mutual Insurance Company, a Massachusetts Corporation; Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland, a Maryland Corporation; and, Continental Casualty Company, an Illinois Corporation.

ATTEST:

KEVIN PAYNE
Development Services Director
City of Roseville

SONIA OROZCO, CITY CLERK

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF PLACER)

I, KEVIN PAYNE, being first duly sworn, depose and say: I am the Development Services Director of the City of Roseville, a municipal corporation in the State of California, owner of the property described in the above Notice. I am duly authorized to make this verification for and on behalf of the City of Roseville. I have read the Notice of Completion and know its contents and the facts stated therein are true.

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

Kevin Payne
Development Services Director
City of Roseville

State of California)
County of Placer)


Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on this ____ day of _____, 2017,
by KEVIN PAYNE proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) who appeared before me.

Notary Public in and for said County and State

EXHIBIT A

316 VERNON STREET OFFICE BUILDING

January 18, 2017



VICINITY MAP
NOT TO SCALE



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8222

File #: 0401-02-02-1

Title: 316 Vernon Office Building - Increase in Change Order Authority

Contact: Mike Isom 916-774-5527 misom@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 6.17.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff recommends that the Council adopt a resolution increasing the Development Services Manager's change order authority from 2% to 3% as it relates to the design-assist construction contract with DPR Construction for the 316 Vernon project.

BACKGROUND

On September 2, 2015, the City Council approved a design-assist construction contract with DPR Construction to build the 316 Vernon project. When approving the construction contract, the City Council – by resolution - also granted contingency/change order authority to the Deputy City Manager (now Development Services Manager) in an amount not to exceed 2% above the GMP.

In response to a request for proposals issued by the City in June 2015, DPR submitted a proposal to construct the building with a guaranteed maximum price (GMP) of \$21,411,358. This GMP was based on the 30% schematic design plans and specifications released with the RFP. During construction of the project, four diesel and gasoline underground storage tanks (UST) were unexpectedly discovered, requiring removal/closure of the tanks and remediation of contaminated soil. The total cost associated with UST removal and remediation exceeded \$250,000. The overall project budget carried a contingency to deal with unknown issues such as this; however, such tasks were not anticipated in DPR's scope of work and as a result were not included in DPR's GMP.

Throughout the project, staff and DPR worked to attain enough savings through value engineering measures to capture the unanticipated extra cost associated with tank removal without needing to adjust the GMP. The project team was reasonably confident it would be able to build all planned improvements *and* absorb the cost of UST removal within the original GMP plus 2%. Staff and DPR are continuing to work diligently to ensure this happens; however, as final billings are reconciled, an additional \$140,000 may be required to ensure DPR and its subcontractors are appropriately compensated for work performed on the City's behalf. Therefore, staff respectfully requests the Council approve an increase in the Development Services Manager's change order authority from 2% to 3% to provide necessary flexibility to close out the project.

As previously noted, the overall project budget carried an unknown cost contingency in a separate “bucket” for items such as soil contamination, just not in DPR’s contract. As such, the overall project budget remains unchanged, and no budget adjustment is necessary. By increasing the amount of change order authority from 2% to 3%, no amendment to DPR’s GMP or contract is proposed or required, and the Development Services Manager retains financial discretion as final billings are reviewed and negotiated. As a point of reference, most City projects carry a 5% to 10% contingency.

FISCAL IMPACT

Approval of the increase in change order authority is an accounting exercise that will not increase the project’s overall budget of \$27 million. The project is on track to be completed at a total net cost of approximately \$25.9 million. No general fund monies were used to construct the project.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

The project is estimated to have resulted in the following:

244 total jobs associated with construction: 154 direct and 90 through indirect and induced activities

\$33,294,034 in total annual economic output: \$21,000,000 in direct output and another \$11,894,034 through indirect and induced activities.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The Council action of increasing the amount of change order authority for the 316 Vernon Street Office Building will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines §15060(c)(2)). The proposed action does not include the potential for a significant environmental effect, and therefore is not subject to CEQA.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mike Isom, Development Services Manager

Kevin Payne, Development Services Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution No. 17-30

RESOLUTION NO. 17-30

AMENDING CHANGE ORDER AUTHORITY FOR
316 VERNON OFFICE BUILDING PROJECT

WHEREAS, on September 2, 2015, the City Council approved a Design Assist Construction contract as well as a 2% change order authority, to build the 316 Vernon project; and

WHEREAS, during construction, underground storage tanks were unexpectedly discovered, requiring removal; and

WHEREAS, in order to cover these unexpected costs, staff is requesting an increase in the amount of change order authority from 2% to 3%.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that the City Manager or the Development Services Manager is authorized to approve change orders for the project, consistent with the contract terms, provided that the net cost of all change orders shall not exceed three percent (3%) of the contract price.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8226

File #: 0900-02-02-1

Title: Arc Flash Mitigation for the Dry Creek and Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plants Project - Notice of Completion

Contact: Charles Aycock 916-746-1887 caycock@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 6.18.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff recommends that the City Council accept the Arc Flash Mitigation for the Dry Creek and Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plants project as complete and adopt a resolution authorizing the Environmental Utilities Director to execute the Notice of Completion.

BACKGROUND

A Design Assist contract was awarded to Western Water Constructors, Inc. (WWCI) of Santa Rosa, California on December 06, 2012 for the Arc Flash Mitigation for the Dry Creek and Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plants project. Engineering analysis of the Dry Creek and Pleasant Grove electrical distribution systems was completed, and various mitigation measures were validated against the model. One or more of the following mitigation methods were implemented to reduce the arc flash hazards at each location:

- Adjustment of existing electrical system device parameters;
- Replacement of electrical system devices;
- Upgrade of electrical system devices;
- Implementation of new standard operating procedures.

The contract called for a 60%-40% shared savings if the contractor's total cost of the work was less than the Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP). The difference in cost between actual cost and the GMP was determined to be \$101,063.29; therefore, the contractor received a shared savings payment of \$40,425.32, and the City received a credit of \$60,637.97.

In accordance with the Design Assist contract, the contractor will provide a warranty bond.

FISCAL IMPACT

A construction contract of \$910,126.00 was awarded to WWCI for the project. The total amount of Change Orders implemented throughout the construction project totaled \$173,222.38, which resulted in a total project construction cost of \$1,083,348.38.

The project was funded as a Wastewater Rehabilitation project. The project was funded jointly between City of Roseville and the other South Placer Wastewater Authority (SPWA) Partners. The City's cost share of the construction contract cost was approximately \$687,601.22. The Regional Partners; Placer County and South Placer Municipal Utility District shared in the remaining \$395,747.16 cost.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Not applicable, existing staff will operate the equipment.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The project involved the repair/maintenance of an existing facility. This activity was categorically exempt from CEQA as a Class 1 Exemption (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15301). The Exemption was prepared and no further CEQA action was required.

Respectfully Submitted,

Charles Aycock, EIM Systems Coordinator

Richard Plecker, Environmental Utilities Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution No. 17-37

NOC - Arc Flash Mitigation Project

NOC_Exhibit A_Arc Flash mitigation project

RESOLUTION NO. 17-37

ACCEPTING THE PUBLIC WORK KNOWN AS THE ARC FLASH MITIGATION PROJECT, APPROVING THE “NOTICE OF COMPLETION”, AND AUTHORIZING THE ENVIRONMENTAL UTILITIES DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE SAID NOTICE ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Roseville as follows:

1. The “Notice of Completion” on file in the City Clerk’s Department relative to that public work known as the Arc Flash Mitigation Project has been approved and the public work accepted.
2. The Environmental Utilities Director is hereby authorized and directed to execute said Notice on behalf of the City of Roseville, upon receipt and approval of the warranty bond by the City Attorney’s office.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20____, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

AFTER RECORDING RETURN TO:
CITY CLERK
311 VERNON STREET
ROSEVILLE, CA 95678

NOTICE OF COMPLETION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the public work known as Arc Flash Mitigation for the Dry Creek and Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plants project, was completed and accepted by the City of Roseville on _____. The location is indicated on the attached map, marked as Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein by this reference.

The general contractor on said project was Western Water Constructors, Inc.

The surety on said project was Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland.

ATTEST:

Richard Plecker
Environmental Utilities Director
City of Roseville

SONIA OROZCO, CITY CLERK

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF PLACER)

I, Richard Plecker, being first duly sworn, depose and say: I am the Environmental Utilities Director of the City of Roseville, a municipal corporation in the State of California, owner of the property described in the above Notice. I am duly authorized to make this verification for and on behalf of the City of Roseville. I have read the Notice of Completion and know its contents and the facts stated therein are true.

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.


Richard Plecker
Environmental Utilities Director
City of Roseville

State of California)
County of Placer)

Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on this ____ day of _____, 2016,
by _____ proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s)
who appeared before me.

Notary Public in and for said County and State

EXHIBIT A



PLEASANT GROVE

WASTEWATER PLANT

DRY CREEK
WASTEWATER PLANT



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8201

File #: 0900-02-02-2

Title: Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant Cogeneration Project – Professional Design Services Agreement Amendment
Contact: George Hanson 916-746-1764 ghanson@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 6.19.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff recommends that the City Council adopt a Resolution approving the First Amendment to the Professional Design Services Agreement with Brown and Caldwell for detailed design and Engineering Services during construction of the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant Energy Recovery Project, and authorizing the City Manager to execute the agreement.

BACKGROUND

The City of Roseville owns and operates the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant (PGWWTP) on behalf of the South Placer Wastewater Authority (SPWA) partner agencies. The City is currently working on the PGWWTP Expansion Project which will increase the plant's treatment capability by adding primary clarification and anaerobic digestion of primary solids and waste activated sludge. This increase will provide sufficient capacity to accommodate growth within the Pleasant Grove wastewater shed through 2035. The Expansion Project, being conducted as a separate project, provides an opportunity to add energy recovery facilities at the PGWWTP that would beneficially utilize digester gas (which has a high methane fraction) produced by new treatment processes constructed as part of the Expansion Project.

On January 29 2015, the SPWA Board approved both the initial project funding and a request to retain an engineer to provide initial engineering services for the Energy Recovery Project.

A solicitation for proposals was made on May 18 2015, for design services for the project. On June 19 2015, four proposals were received. The proposal submitted by Brown and Caldwell (B&C) was ranked highest by the Environmental Utilities (EU) Proposal Evaluation Committee.

Upon further review of the project goals, EU staff (staff) determined there were several technology options with varying design costs that could be used to meet those goals. Therefore, to better understand the various options, identify the alternative that will provide the greatest economic and environmental benefits and the associated design effort, a revised project approach was adopted. Staff recommended to City Council at the September 2 2015 meeting, that B&C first conduct an

alternatives/economic analysis and a basis of design study to provide a more precise estimate of the design costs for the preferred project elements. The City Council adopted a resolution at that meeting, authorizing the City Manager to execute an agreement for Professional Design Services, with B&C, in the amount of \$468,908, to conduct the alternatives/economic analysis and basis of design study.

As a part of the revised project approach, staff proposed to present the findings from the alternatives study and cost-benefit analysis to the SPWA Board (at a later date) for consideration to proceed with a complete design and approval for fully funding the energy recovery project. The revised project approach also allowed for staff to negotiate the engineer's full fee to conduct the final design of the project once an estimate of design costs was obtained. Staff would then request City Council approval for a contract amendment to include full design services as part of the B&C scope of work.

At the June 30, 2016 SPWA Board meeting, staff and B&C presented the alternatives/economic analysis for the Energy Recovery Project and the recommended next steps. The SPWA Board gave approval for detailed design work to proceed.

In November, 2016, B&C completed the basis of design study. Amongst the 30 alternatives analyzed, the study identified the utilization of digester gas (primarily) for vehicle fuel as the most economically beneficial option, providing the highest net present value over a 20-year duration. To utilize digester gas (DG) as a vehicle fuel, it is first conditioned to remove contaminants, upgraded to remove carbon dioxide, and compressed to produce renewable compressed natural gas (rCNG), which would be used to fuel the City's solid waste collection vehicles. Additionally, waste gas from the gas upgrading process, which still contains a significant fraction of methane, will be blended with pipeline natural gas as required, and utilized as fuel for stationary power generation. As part of this project, High Strength Waste (HSW) such as food waste and fats, oils and grease (FOG) would be received by the PGWWTP and processed in the digesters to increase DG production.

The Energy Recovery Project facilities would be constructed on City-owned property reserved for wastewater treatment plant infrastructure, adjacent to, and immediately south of the existing PGWWTP. The project would include the following facilities: three microturbines (and a possible future fourth unit), a HSW receiving facility, a food waste pre-processing facility, systems for conditioning and upgrading the DG, a gas fueling station and associated parking.

The microturbines will produce some electrical power to offset a portion of the PGWWTP's power demands and the heat needed for the anaerobic digestion process; thereby making it possible for all the methane generated from the Expansion Project to be consumed and converted to heat and electricity.

The gas fueling station would compress the upgraded DG to create the r(CNG).

Construction of the Energy Recovery Facilities would last approximately 18 months and would begin in late 2017 or early 2018.

The First Amendment scope of work requires the following additional effort:

1. Preparation of 30%, 60% and Final Design Submittals
2. Air Permitting Assistance
3. Grant Assistance
4. Preparation of Cost Estimates
5. Contractor Selection Support
6. Engineering Services During Construction
7. Management of Design and Construction Data

The full scope of services is attached (Refer to the Agreement for the First Amendment to the PDSA: Exhibit A).

FISCAL IMPACT

The additional cost for the work included in this amendment is \$2,276,891. The original contract amount was \$468,908. The revised total contract amount is therefore \$2,745,799. Funding for this work will be covered under the capital improvement projects for the South Placer Wastewater Authority and will be jointly funded between Roseville and the other SPWA Regional Partners (i.e. Placer County and the South Placer Municipal Utility District).

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

There will be no direct economic development impacts or jobs created within the City of Roseville as a result of this project.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not apply to activities that will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines §15061(b)(3)). The proposed contract award for professional design services does not include the potential for a significant environmental effect, and therefore is not subject to CEQA. Appropriate CEQA environmental documentation will be prepared under a separate contract and presented to Council for approval prior to the PGWWTP Energy Recovery Project construction contract authorization.

Respectfully Submitted,

George Hanson, Senior Engineer

Richard Plecker, Environmental Utilities Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution No. 17-15

Agreement

Scope of Services

RESOLUTION NO. 17-15

APPROVING A FIRST AMENDMENT TO PROFESSIONAL DESIGN SERVICES
AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND BROWN AND CALDWELL,
AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE
CITY OF ROSEVILLE

WHEREAS, a first amendment to professional design services agreement for Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant Cogeneration project, by and between the City of Roseville and Brown and Caldwell, has been reviewed by the City Council; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that said first amendment is hereby approved and that the City Manager is authorized to execute it on behalf of the City of Roseville.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

**FIRST AMENDMENT TO
PROFESSIONAL DESIGN SERVICES AGREEMENT**

Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant Cogeneration Project

THIS FIRST AMENDMENT TO PROFESSIONAL DESIGN SERVICES AGREEMENT is made and entered into this ____ day of _____, 20__, by and between the City of Roseville, a municipal corporation (“CITY”), and Brown and Caldwell, a California corporation (“CONSULTANT”); and

W I T N E S S E T H:

WHEREAS, CITY and CONSULTANT previously entered into a Professional Design Services Agreement dated September 2, 2015 (“Agreement”) regarding the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant Cogeneration Project (“Project”); and

WHEREAS, CITY desires to amend the Agreement to include additional services as described in CONSULTANT’s letter/proposal titled “Design and Construction –Period Services for Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant Energy Recovery Project”, dated December 9, 2016, which is attached hereto as Exhibit “A” and incorporated herein by reference; and

WHEREAS, CONSULTANT is willing and able to provide such additional services; and

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties agree as follows:

1. CONSULTANT shall provide additional services as described in Exhibit "A" of this First Amendment to Agreement.

2. Paragraph 2 of the Agreement is amended by adding an additional paragraph to read as follows:

"CITY shall pay two million, two hundred seventy-six thousand, eight hundred ninety-one dollars (\$2,276,891), in consideration of the additional services as set forth in Exhibit "A" to the First Amendment to Agreement. This brings the total not to exceed contract amount to two million, seven hundred forty-five thousand, seven hundred ninety-nine dollars (\$2,745,799)."

3. All other provisions of the Agreement shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the City of Roseville, a municipal corporation, has authorized the execution of this First Amendment to Agreement in duplicate by its City Manager and attested to by its City Clerk under the authority of Resolution No. _____, adopted by the Council of the City of Roseville on the ____ day of _____, 20__, and CONSULTANT has caused this First Amendment to Agreement to be executed.

CITY OF ROSEVILLE, a
municipal corporation

BROWN AND CALDWELL, a
California corporation

BY: _____
ROB JENSEN
City Manager

BY: 
its: Vice President

[SIGNATURES CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE]

ATTEST:

BY: _____
SONIA OROZCO
City Clerk

and

BY: *Gloria Ibarra*
its: *Assistant Secretary*

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

BY: _____
ROBERT R. SCHMITT
City Attorney

APPROVED AS TO SUBSTANCE:

BY: *Richard D. Plecker* FOR
RICHARD D. PLECKER
Environmental Utilities Director

EXHIBIT “A”

Design and Construction-Period Services
for
Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant
Energy Recovery Project

Amendment 1 - Scope of Services and Fee

Prepared for
City of Roseville
December 9, 2016



11020 White Rock Road, Suite 200
Rancho Cordova, California 95670

Scope of Services

The following scope of services has been prepared by Brown and Caldwell (BC) for the Final design and construction-period services for the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant (PGWWTP) Energy Recovery Project. This scope and fee is an amendment to the original scope of work, which was to complete the alternatives analysis of various FOG and Cogeneration alternatives and complete the Basis of Design Report (BODR) for the preferred alternative.

The Amendment 1 scope consists of:

1. Preparation of a 30% design submittal, 60% design submittal, and final design for Contractor RFP
2. Air Permitting Assistance
3. Grant Assistance
4. Preparation of Cost Estimates
5. Engineering services during construction
6. Management of Design and Construction Data

These activities are discussed in more detail in the following sections. Project Schedule assumes a 6-month design period, a 5-month Contractor Request for Proposal and selection period, and a 24-month construction period. Cost summary to complete Amendment 1 scope of services is included in Attachment A.

Phase 005 | 30% Design Submittal

Services provided under this task include project management, construction cost estimate, air permitting assistance, 30% plans and specifications, and grant funding assistance.

Project Management

Scope includes project coordination with the City, the Expansion Project (Kennedy/Jenks), and design team members during this phase of the project. Project risk register will also be updated as the design progresses to the 30% level of completion.

Cost Estimate

An estimate of probable construction cost will be updated from the BODR estimate based on the 30% design.

Air Permitting Assistance: Permit Application Development

This amendment will include continued air permitting services (initiated as part of Task 003 in the preliminary design scope) to include an air permit application that will cover the planned food waste pre-processing facility, high strength waste receiving facility, microturbines and vehicle fueling station.

Collaboration with the Design Team. The Air Permitting team will work closely with the Design team throughout the Energy Recovery Project design process to ensure that the final design will meet the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) permitting requirements, while having the least possible operational and cost impacts.

Collaboration with Kennedy/Jenks. The Air Permitting team will also work closely with Kennedy/Jenks as the Energy Recovery Project and the Digester Project are interrelated.

30% Plans and Specifications

30% Plans and Specifications will be prepared for the Pleasant Grove WWTP Energy Recovery Project for the following facilities:

1. Microturbines - Three microturbines will be installed at the PGWWTP to produce heat and power. Heat produced by the microturbines will be used for digester heating. The power produced by the microturbines will offset plant demands and will not be exported. The microturbines will be fueled by some combination of gas separation system tail gas, natural gas, or digester gas.
2. High Strength Waste Receiving Facility - A new high strength waste receiving facility will be constructed that will include four stainless steel storage tanks, mixing pumps, transfer pumps, heat tracing, and rock trap on a concrete slab. A pipeline will be installed to convey the high strength waste to the new digesters.
3. Food Waste Pre-Processing Facility - A new food waste pre-processing facility will be constructed that would include food waste tipping floor, pre-processing equipment, transfer pumps to the high strength waste storage tanks, and a reject material hopper. The food waste pre-processing operation will be contained within a pre-engineered metal building for odor containment. The building shall accommodate entry and exit of waste delivery vehicles to off load the waste within the building, and will house new electrical gear associated with all project elements. At the City's direction, the building may include a recessed location for the pre-processing equipment for ease of loading.
4. Digester Gas Conditioning and Separation Systems - The Project will include a new digester gas conditioning system and a new gas separation system. The digester conditioning system will remove hydrogen sulfide, siloxanes, and water from the gas. This system will consist of the following individual components:
 - granular iron oxide vessels
 - cooling heat exchangers
 - gas compressor
 - glycol chillers and pumps
 - siloxane removal vessels
 - particulate filters

The gas will be processed by a gas separation system that will use membranes to separate the CO₂ from the methane. The biomethane gas will be suitable for use as vehicle fuel.

Utility natural gas will be blended with tail gas from the gas separation system to be used as fuel for the microturbines.

5. Vehicle Fueling Station - A fueling station will be constructed that will use biomethane generated from the digesters and gas separation process for use as vehicle fuel for the City's solid waste fleet. The gas will be compressed to approximately 4,000 pounds per square inch (psi). This renewable, compressed natural gas will be stored adjacent to the fueling station in high pressure storage tanks and fed to the dispensers for use. The fueling station will also require paving and truck lanes to accommodate garbage disposal vehicles and the gas compression, storage, and drying equipment would be housed inside a security fence.

Grant Funding Assistance

There may be several local, State and Federal grant funding opportunities for this project. This task will include time to identify eligible grant funding, prepare grant applications and coordinate with the City and funding agency. Effort assumes one major grant application for CalRecycle's Organics grant program in January 2017. Additional funding opportunities may be pursued at the direction of the City. Additional budget may be required for subsequent grant funding applications.

Deliverables

- 30% Design Submittal Plans and Specifications (electronic version and 10 half-size copies)
- Risk register (ongoing)
- Action Item Log (ongoing)
- Construction Cost Estimate
- Conduct 30% review workshop and prepare agenda, presentation and minutes

Phase 006 | 60% Design Submittal

Services provided under this task include project management, cost estimate, air permit application and preparation of draft and final 60% Plans and Specifications.

Project Management

Scope includes project coordination with the City, the Expansion Project (Kennedy/Jenks), and design team members during this phase of the project. Project Risk register will also be updated as the design progresses to the 60% Level of completion.

Cost Estimate

An estimate of probable construction cost will be updated from the 30% estimate for the 60% design estimate.

Preparation of the Permit Application: BC's Environmental Services team will prepare the air permit application for an Authority to Construct/Permit to Operate (ATC/PTO) in accordance with the PCAPCD's rules and regulations. The air permit application will contain:

1. A description of the new sources of air pollution. The new cogeneration system, and all of its components, must comply Rule 502, New Source Review (NSR). The NSR rule provides the mechanism for the PCAPCD to issue permits without interfering with efforts to meet the state and federal health-based air quality standards. NSR contains two important requirements – Best Available Control Technology (BACT) and Emissions Offsets. Best Available Control Technology (BACT) is required for new sources that result in certain calculated emissions increases. BACT is evaluated on a source-by-source, pollutant-by-pollutant basis. BACT is, at a minimum, the most stringent control technique or limitation that has been achieved in practice. If a more effective control exists that is both technologically feasible, cost effective, and is contained in an approved implementation plan, the more effective control technique or process may be mandated.
2. Emission Offsets are emissions reductions that are provided to "offset" emission increases from new sources under certain conditions. District Rule 502, Section 303 requires offsets for increases in allowed emissions above certain trigger levels. Offsets may be obtained by purchasing emission reduction credits from another party or by creating offsets through source shutdown or other means of quantifiable emission reductions. Offset purchase can be expensive, so a balance must be struck between the costs of offsets and the costs of

achieving additional emissions reductions. This permitting effort assumes that emissions offsets are not required.

At this time, it does not appear that the new microturbine cogeneration system will trigger any air toxics requirements unique to the PCAPCD. However, BC will estimate emissions of Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) and compare them to the requirements contained in PCAPCD Rule 513. No risk assessment is included in this scope of work.

PCAPCD Interaction

The PCAPCD has a clear process for reviewing permit applications, consisting of an application completeness review followed by a technical review and permit issuance. At any time prior to permit issuance, the PCAPCD can request additional information or evaluation.

1. **PCAPCD Completeness Review Period.** Once the PCAPCD receives the ATC/PTO application for the cogeneration engine, they will review the application and typically respond within 30 working days. PCAPCD's response may deem the application complete and no further information would be required. If the application is deemed incomplete, the PCAPCD will incorporate any comments or questions, which can include a request for additional information, studies, or clarification of operating procedures. Upon receipt of the resubmittal of the application, a new 30 working day period to determine completeness will begin.
2. **BC's response to the PCAPCD's Comments.** Once the PCAPCD's preliminary comments are received, BC will begin responding to their requests. Based on the amount of additional information and clarification needed, the response time could take up to approximately 30 days.
3. **PCAPCD's Final/Technical Review.** After BC submits the information requested in the PCAPCD's initial response, the PCAPCD should deem the application complete and will complete their final review. During this time period, BC will work closely with the PCAPCD to answer any questions or respond to any comments.
4. **Issuance of Authority to Construct (ATC) Permit.** Once the application passes final review, an ATC is issued by the PCAPCD. BC will closely review the ATC to determine whether conditions imposed on the permit are acceptable. If not, BC will inform the PCAPCD as soon as possible and work with them to modify the permit conditions accordingly.

Based on previous experience, a typical air permit application process could take approximately 90 to 180 days from start to finish. However, much of that time is at the discretion of the PCAPCD and is outside of BC's control.

60% Plans and Specifications

BC will incorporate the City's 30% Plans and Specifications comments and will prepare 60% Plans and Specifications. In addition to incorporating city comments, the 60% package will include standard electrical, mechanical and structural installation details, area electrical classification drawings, single line diagrams, schematics, equipment layouts/plans, standard installation details, panel schedules, specifications, and lighting schedules.

It is anticipated that the 60% design will advance the majority of the design drawings to a 60% level of completion. Process and instrumentation diagrams (P&IDs) will be advanced to 95% complete. P&IDs will attempt to show all required equipment, valves, instrumentation, and control signals required for implementation of system control strategies.

The 60% bid package will not include detailed conduit routing plans or plans showing detailed instrument mounting orientations.

A review workshop will be conducted to review the 60% plans and specifications.

Deliverables

- 60% Design Submittal Plans and Specifications (electronic version and 10 half-size copies)
- Risk register (ongoing)
- Action Item Log (ongoing)
- Updated Construction Cost Estimate
- Conduct 60% review workshop and prepare agenda, presentation and minutes

Phase 007 | Final Design Documents

Services provided under this task include project management and preparation of final design documents.

Project Management

Scope includes project coordination with the City and design team members during this phase of the project. Project Risk register will also be updated as the design progresses to the 60% Level of completion.

Finals Plans and Specifications

BC will incorporate the City's (Environmental Utilities) 60% Plans and Specifications comments and the construction contractor review comments **including any RFP-period addenda** and will prepare final plans and specifications for construction of the improvements.

Deliverables

- Final Design Plans and Specifications (electronic version and 10 half-size copies)
- Risk register (ongoing)
- Action Item Log (ongoing)
- Updated Construction Cost Estimate

Phase 007B | Construction Proposal Review and Contractor On-Boarding

BC will support the City's contractor selection process. Scope includes one addendum, as needed, to support the Request for Proposal (RFP) and contractor selection process. BC will assist the City with review and negotiation of the Contractor's guaranteed maximum price.

BC will be responsible for assisting the City with the following tasks:

- Prepare the design assist Contractor RFP (BC will submit a draft for EU and Legal review prior to finalizing the package based on comments from the City)
- Advertise and issue design assist proposal packages utilizing the City's design assist contractor boiler plate (10 hardcopy sets assumed)
- Conduct pre-proposal meeting
- Receive and provide responses to inquiries during proposal period
- Prepare and distribute proposal addenda
- Review proposals received and provide recommendations to the city regarding responsiveness and proposer qualifications
- Perform reference and license checks for the selected proposer

Phase 008 | Engineering Services During Construction

Services provided under this task include project management, design finalization as part of the design-assist delivery model, engineering services during construction, and startup training.

Project Management

Scope includes project coordination with the City and design team members during this phase of the project.

Design Revisions

As part of the design-assist delivery model, BC will update the design based on feedback and collaboration with the Contractor during construction. Changes to the design drawings will be done only upon approval of the owner. We have estimated up to 400 hours engineering and CAD drafting for this effort.

These design revisions will be incorporated into a record set of drawings and specifications during construction and will be provided to the City upon project completion.

Deliverables

- **As-Built** Plans and Specifications (electronic version and 10 half-size copies)

Engineering Services During Construction

BC will support project construction by responding to requests for information, reviewing submittals, and issuing design clarifications. Effort assumes 50 requests for information at 4 hours each; 10 major submittal reviews at 40 hours each; 30 product data submittal reviews at 8 hours each; and 8 design clarifications at 16 hours each.

In addition to specific requests for information, BC assumes an effort of 4 hours per week to attend meetings, visit the site, or answer informal questions for a construction duration of 24 months.

Factory Witness Testing

The microturbine and digester gas upgrading system packages will require factory testing. BC will witness the factory testing for these two packages prior to shipping to site. We have estimated this effort based on one round-trip to Iowa and one round-trip to Southern California for one BC staff.

Startup Training and O&M Manual Update

BC will develop a "system level" training for plant operations and maintenance staff to augment the typical vendor-provided, equipment-specific training. BC's training will share design intent and control theory for overall systems. Training effort assumes three 4-hour trainings. BC will update the City's O&M manual to reflect the new systems.

PLC Programming and SCADA Implementation

BC will provide PLC programming and SCADA/network configuration in accordance with EUD Process Control Standards. This work will integrate the new processes and equipment into the existing plant control system. At this time, we don't know the specific equipment to be installed and the level of effort required for programming and implementation as part of the project. For estimating purposes, we have allocated approximately 1200 hours for this activity and BC will provide PLC and SCADA services up to the budget shown in Attachment A.

Optional Service Phase 009 | Data Management Services During Construction

Database Development and Maximo Interface

BC will expand the design database used during the design phase to accommodate additional asset information required in MAXIMO. Task includes two 2-hour meetings with Roseville computerized maintenance management system (CMMS) and operations staff to define all the asset attribute data requirements needed in MAXIMO.

Collection of Asset Data during Construction

BC will consolidate the design data information collected for the Energy Recovery Project with the design data generated for the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion Project and load this information into a central database. This task assumes up to 2 hours per submittal to enter the data into the database and that BC gets access to the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion Project submittals. We have assumed a total of 50 major equipment submittals that require review to obtain asset data.

Develop PM and Job Plan Integration tools

For assets that require preventative maintenance, BC will develop a template that can be used to load PM and Job Plans into MAXIMO. BC will use the same process that is currently being used on the Echowater project at Regional San.

Prepare PM and Job Plans

BC will prepare new Job Plans and incorporate existing Job plans in MAXIMO and develop the PM plans for the new equipment that will be installed as part of the Energy Recovery and the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion Projects. BC staff will use template to load this information into MAXIMO. Task assumes approximately 50 PM and Job plans and 4 hours to prepare each PM and Job Plan which is based on 50 major equipment submittals. Task also includes time for coordination and loading of the PM and Job Plan templates into MAXIMO.

Optional Service Phase 010 | Technical Services Support

As requested by the CITY, the Brown & Caldwell will provide other technical services to the CITY. Brown and Caldwell will conduct technical analyses, designs, startup and testing support, training assistance, and other related support beyond the limits of the budget established for other tasks included in this AGREEMENT, and as not otherwise identified in this Scope of Work.

Since the scope of the services to be conducted in accordance with this task cannot be firmly defined at this time, this task has been established as an allowance task to be used only at the direction of the CITY. BC will develop a scope of work and budget for each Technical Services request made by the CITY and obtain mutual agreement with the CITY prior to authorization. BC will make efforts to complete requested services within the overall allowance budget established for each authorized task.

Overall Project Assumptions

1. The City will provide safe access to all required areas of the site for the purposes of project preliminary design.
2. The City will make available in a timely manner all drawings, records, and site information obtained relative to the project, including topographical survey, and information related to any and all underground utilities, hazardous materials, easements, permits, geotechnical

- investigations, lab data, environmental surveys, etc. as necessary for completion of the work under the above detailed scope.
3. The cost estimate will be prepared to industry standards based upon the level of detail available at the time of the estimate. The estimate will be subject to many influences including, but not limited to, unknowns and undefined details, price of labor and materials, schedule impacts, unknown or latent conditions of existing equipment or structures, and time or quality of performance by others.
 4. For items that cannot be readily observed during normal site investigation, the design will rely on the accuracy of record drawings and historical records provided by the City. If drawings, data, or historical records are deemed to inaccurate, additional field effort may be required. BC will alert the City if expanded field effort is required.
 5. The initial effort is limited to the hours and cost identified in the attached cost proposal. If the effort to complete the identified tasks exceeds the estimate, the Project Manager will coordinate with the City to identify task efficiencies, scope adjustments, or budget increases.
 6. BC is not responsible for any schedule or cost impacts related to delays caused by protracted reviews, changes in scope of work, or other situations outside of our control.
 7. Air permitting coordination with Kennedy/Jenks will not exceed 80 hours.
 8. City will be responsible for Air permit application as responsible official and for paying permit fees.
 9. The City will be responsible for the cost of the source test firm that actually performs independent tests.
 10. The City will be responsible for the cost of offsets if required.
 11. No air monitoring or sampling of any kind is included.
 12. California Environmental Quality Act requirements are not included.
 13. No health risk assessments are included.
 14. A continuous emissions monitoring system will not be required.
 15. A Title V modification or initiation of a Title V permit is not included.
 16. Response to two rounds of questions from the PCAPCD is included.
 17. Budgeted effort is estimated based on prior experience with air districts. The effort can vary greatly from project to project based on conditions outside of BC's control.
 18. Telephone or communications system is not included.
 19. Not used.
 20. Creation of as built drawings of existing switchgear or motor control centers where modification work might be occurring. Assumption is that as built drawings provided are current, or the Owner will provide electrician to field verify.
 21. Project includes coordinating interconnection agreement with Roseville Electric for parallel operation of Cogen and Utility.
 22. Budget assumes minor changes such as relocating panels within the same room, orientation of mechanical equipment is minor, power distribution topology does not change, major equipment loads do not change.
 23. Design package will not include detailed conduit routing, or plans showing detailed instrument mounting and orientation.
 24. Standard BC specifications will be used for electrical, Instrumentation and control specifications. The City's programming and control standards will be referenced.
 25. Vendor Package systems will have their own PLCs and will provide signals for monitoring by the plant SCADA system.
 26. High Strength waste and food waste pre-processing facility will have 1 PLC for both systems (not vendor supplied).
 27. Not used.
 28. Four on-site meetings for Instrumentation and Control Workshops with Roseville Staff.

29. Compliance with Title 24 not included – scope assumes that the new building is not for continuous occupancy.
30. Not used.
31. Structural design will include performance specifications for, not detailed design of, stairs, grating, catwalks.
32. Contractor will be responsible for design of equipment anchorage based on BC specifications.
33. All structures are supported on spread footings.
34. Structural design will provide a maximum of (2) different pipe/conduit supports.
35. Structural design based on 2013 CBC/ ASCE 7-10/ACI 318-11/AISC 14th edition.
36. Prescriptive code values can be used for wind, seismic loads (no site specific investigation is required for either wind or seismic).
37. Architect will be engaged to provide details and specifications for walls, roof, flashing, windows, sealants, downspouts, doors, and finishes for pre-engineered building and to provide state required code checks for entrance, egress, fire etc.
38. Contractor will design pipe supports for all piping.

Cost Assumptions

- Labor multiplier of 3.20.
- Escalation of 4 percent per year applied to rates based on when tasks/hours occur in the project schedule.
- An associated project cost (APC) of \$8/hour to cover day-to-day project expenses.
- No markups on expenses.
- Five percent proposed markups on subconsultant fees.
- Unspent budget on completed tasks can be reallocated with City approval.
- Cost is managed at project level and not phase level.

Cost Estimate

See Attachment A for labor hour estimate.

Attachment A: Amendment 1 Fee Estimate

Revenue - City of AGAT - Revenue POC and DOWEN Design																															
		\$104.22	\$68.00	\$220.00	\$162.88	\$220.00	\$199.07	\$230.00	\$315.39	\$203.66	\$87.04	\$220.00	\$104.54	\$184.10	\$213.12	\$217.63	\$158.02	\$220.00	\$220.00	\$175.71	\$199.33	\$95.39	\$166.18	\$223.10	\$198.05	\$184.51	\$150.46				
005	30% Design Submittal	108	16	16	16	24	16	62	160	0	64	12	448	40	24	70	400	8	0	80	80	400	80	2	6	37	11				
001	Project Management	24	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
002	Cost Estimate	8	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	37	11				
003	Air Permitting Assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	52	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
004	30% Plans and Specifications	120	0	16	16	24	8	0	160	0	40	0	320	40	24	70	400	8	0	80	80	320	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
005	Grant Funding Assistance	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	0	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
008	60% Design Submittal	236	16	16	16	40	48	43	280	0	64	12	364	80	80	45	400	8	0	80	80	320	80	2	4	38	6				
001	Project Management	24	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
002	Cost Estimate	8	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
003	Air Permitting Assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	43	0	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
004	60% Plans and Specifications	200	0	16	16	40	40	0	280	0	60	0	320	80	60	45	400	8	0	80	80	320	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
007	Final Design Documents	40	8	0	0	0	0	0	40	0	40	0	40	0	0	0	80	0	0	16	0	0	32	2	2	8	2				
****	Final Design Documents	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	0	40	0	40	0	0	0	80	0	0	16	0	0	32	2	2	8	2				
Construction Proposal Review and Contractor on Boarding		40	0	0	0	16	40	0	0	0	0	0	80	0	0	0	40	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
007B	Construction Proposal Review	40	0	0	0	16	40	0	0	0	0	0	80	0	0	0	40	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
008	ESDC	672	48	0	0	0	8	0	236	0	40	24	680	0	0	200	160	8	8	0	20	320	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
001	Project Management	48	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
002	Design Revisions	80	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	120	0	0	0	160	0	0	0	0	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
003	ESDC	416	0	0	0	0	0	0	160	0	0	0	400	0	0	80	0	8	8	0	20	200	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
004	Witness testing	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
005	Startup Training and O&M Manual	40	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	40	0	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
006	PLC/SCADA	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	0	0	80	0	0	0	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
009	Data Management	32	8	0	0	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
001	Database Development	8	2	0	0	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
002	Asset Data Collection	8	2	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
003	Develop PM and Job Plan Tools	8	2	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
004	Prepare PM and Job Plans	8	2	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
010	Technical Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
****	Unanticipated Technical Services Support	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grand Total		1,216	88	32	32	176	112	85	716	0	208	48	1,812	120	84	315	1,080	24	8	178	150	1,256	280	6	12	83	19				



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8198

File #: 0400-04-02-1

Title: Northeast Roseville Specific Plan Parcel 15, Lots 10-14 - Funding Construction and Acquisition Agreement
Contact: Matthew Todd 916-774-5562 mtodd@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 6.20.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Recommend Council to adopt a resolution to approve the Funding Construction and Acquisition Agreement for Stone Point Community Facilities District No. 5 by and by and between the City of Roseville and Taylor Morrison of California, LLC; and authorize the City Manager to execute said agreement.

BACKGROUND

On August 22, 2013, the Planning Commission approved the Design Review Permit (DRP-000461) and Subdivision Tentative Map (SUB-000165) for the NERSP Parcel 15, Lots 10-14, Taylor Morrison Homes. As part of the Conditions of Approval for the project, the developer is required to complete public improvements along the frontages of Stone Point Drive and North Sunrise Avenue, as well as to complete the construction of a public park. These improvements are eligible for reimbursement through the Stone Point Community Facilities District Number 5 (CFD No. 5). As a result, Taylor Morrison Homes must enter into a Funding Construction and Acquisition Agreement with the City to make the funds from CFD No. 5 available for reimbursement for the completion of the required public improvements. The agreement will allocate \$1,500,000.00 of existing funds within CFD No. 5 for potential reimbursements to Taylor Morrison Homes.

FISCAL IMPACT

The actions requested as part of this item will allocate \$1,500,000.00 of existing funds from the Stone Point Community Facilities District No. 5 for potential reimbursement to Taylor Morrison of California, LLC for the completion of the public facilities beyond the scope of their project. This item will have no impact to the City's General Fund.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Note a national economic development study has shown that 1 job is created for every \$92,000.00 invested in public projects.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not apply to activities that will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines §15061(b)(3)). The action of approving a Funding Construction and Acquisition Agreement for the NERSP Parcel 15, Lots 10-14 Taylor Morrison Homes project does not include the potential for a significant environmental effect, and therefore is not subject to CEQA.

Respectfully Submitted,

Matthew Todd, Associate Engineer

Kevin Payne, Development Services Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution No. 17-12

NERSP Parcel 15, Lots 10-14 - Funding Construction and Acquisition Agreement

RESOLUTION NO. 17-12

APPROVING AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND TAYLOR MORRISON OF CALIFORNIA, LLC., AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

WHEREAS, a Funding Construction and Acquisition Agreement regarding Stone Point Community Facilities District No. 5 applicable to NERSP Parcel 15, Lots 10-14 Taylor Morrison Homes, between City of Roseville and Taylor Morrison of California, LLC, has been reviewed by the Council; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that said agreement is approved and that the City Manager is authorized to execute it on behalf of the City of Roseville.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

**FUNDING CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION AGREEMENT
STONE POINT COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 5**

(Applicable to NERSP Parcel 15, Lots 10-14 Taylor Morrison Homes)

This FUNDING CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION AGREEMENT STONE POINT COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 5 (this "Agreement" or "Acquisition Agreement") is made and entered into as of the ____ day of _____, 20__, by and between the **CITY OF ROSEVILLE**, a California chartered municipal corporation (the "City"), and **TAYLOR MORRISON OF CALIFORNIA, LLC**, a California limited liability company ("Developer").

Recitals

A. Developer is an owner of the taxable real property, Stone Point Subdivision Specific Plan Parcel NERSP Parcel 15, Lots 10-14 Taylor Morrison Homes, as described in Exhibit A, attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference ("Property"), and located within the corporate limits of the City and within the Stone Point Community Facilities District No. 5, of the City of Roseville, County of Placer, State of California ("District").

B. Developer proposes to make improvements to the Property (the development of the Property is defined herein as the "Project") as may be required by the Potential Project Approvals (as defined below).

Any previously approved entitlements, including conditions of approval, and other existing and subsequent approvals, if granted by the City, and agreements between Developer and the City in implementation of the Project, as the same may be amended from time to time, are herein collectively referred to as the "Potential Project Approvals."

C. The City has established a community facilities district pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 2.5 (commencing with Section 53311) of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 5 of the California Government Code, commonly known as the "Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982" (the "Act"), over and including the Property for the purpose of paying for certain public facilities which are necessary to the development of the Property, including the issuance of special tax bonds with respect to certain other properties within the District.

D. Section 53313.5 of the California Government Code provides that a community facilities district may finance the purchase of public facilities completed after the adoption of the resolution of formation establishing the community facilities district if the public facilities have been constructed as if they had been constructed under the direction and supervision, or under the authority of, the local agency whose governing body conducted the proceedings for the establishment of the District.

E. The purpose of this Agreement is to provide for funding, construction, and acquisition of such public facilities, including design and expenses incidental thereto, and to provide the terms of any reimbursement to the Developer.

Agreements

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the preceding recitals and the mutual covenants hereinafter contained, the parties agree as follows:

1. The District. The City has established the District in accordance with the California Government Code to (i) finance the construction or acquisition of public facilities, (ii) issue an annual levy of special taxes on all taxable property within the District for the payment of principal and interest on the bonds of the District (for the portion(s) of the District supported by bond proceeds), provision of special taxes in excess of the amount required to satisfy bond obligations ("**Excess Special Taxes**"), and the annual administrative expenses of the City and the District in levying and collecting such special taxes, paying the principal and interest on such bonds and providing for the registration, exchange and transfer of such bonds, including the fees of fiscal agents and paying agents, and any necessary replenishment for the reserve fund for such bonds, accumulation of funds for future bond payments, and (iii) provide for the establishment of an appropriations limit for the District, as such limit may be amended from time to time.

2. Provision of Excess Special Taxes. City shall provide an amount necessary for the Public Facilities as described (with estimated costs) in Exhibits B-1 and B-2; provided, however, that City's total financial contribution shall not exceed One and a Half Million Dollars (\$1,500,000) (the "**Commitment Amount**"), which financial contribution is derived solely from excess special taxes from the special tax levy, for the purpose of paying for the design, construction, and acquisition of the Public Facilities (as hereinafter defined). Developer shall be reimbursed out of the Commitment Amount in accordance with this Agreement.

3. Authorized Facilities. The public facilities authorized for reimbursement (collectively, the "**Public Facilities**" or "**Eligible Facilities**") and the estimated costs thereof are generally described in Exhibits B-1 and B-2, attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference. The Public Facilities described in Exhibits B-1 and B-2 do not require the discretionary approval of the Potential Project Approvals. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, City retains its full and complete discretion with respect to any Project approvals. City shall not be required to pay for any land (real property) costs.

4. Design. Public Facilities to be acquired by the City shall be designed in conformance with all applicable City standards and development requirements. Upon completion of the design of each such Public Facility to the satisfaction of the City and when Developer has paid to the City all applicable plan checking and other fees, the City shall notify Developer that the design of the Public Facility is completed and acceptable to the City. It shall be the responsibility of Developer, not the City, to determine the requirements for

design and construction of Public Facilities to be acquired by or dedicated to other public agencies, and City's acceptance of Developer's design shall not relieve Developer of this responsibility.

Developer may, after obtaining approval of the City, retain the services of design consultants and such other consultants necessary to design the Public Facilities.

Developer shall be reimbursed out of the Commitment Amount for Developer's expenses to include all design, special studies, construction staking, field testing, and construction management not to exceed 3% of the design and construction cost incurred in design and construction of those Public Facilities, as set forth in Exhibits B-1 and B-2, including all applicable plan checking and other fees (excluding entitlement, permit, impact fees) paid by Developer as provided above in this Section, subject to the City's determination of the amount to be so reimbursed pursuant to the terms hereof, and subject to the limitation that reimbursement in all cases is to be made from the Commitment Amount and from no other source. Reimbursement for design and plan check services shall be made in one or more lump sum payments only after City has received and approved all invoices for such services associated with any particular Public Facility.

Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this Section, if the City determines that Developer is not proceeding with the design of the Public Facilities on a reasonable schedule which will enable the City to insure that construction of all of the Public Facilities can be completed within the time specified herein, the City may take over the design of the Public Facilities by giving Developer written notice thereof. Upon receipt of such a notice, Developer shall have sixty (60) days in which to complete such design plans or surrender to the City all plans and specifications which have then been completed or which are in progress.

If the City takes over the design of the Public Facilities as provided above, the City shall reimburse Developer from the Commitment Amount a reasonable amount, reasonably determined by the City, for the expenses incurred by Developer in connection with the design of the Public Facilities which have not previously been reimbursed, provided there are sufficient funds remaining, after payment for the Public Facilities, to do so.

5. Construction for Acquisition. The City shall only be required to acquire from Developer those Public Facilities which will ultimately be owned by the City. Developer shall proceed with the construction of the Public Facilities in accordance with the approved plans and specifications. For construction of Public Facilities under this Section, the Developer shall comply with all of the following requirements to insure that the Public Facilities will be constructed as if they had been constructed under the direction and supervision, or under the authority of the City:

(a) The plans and specifications, the bidding and contract award procedures, and the bidding and contract documents shall be approved by the City Engineer for conformance with City Codes and policy. Prior to the award of contract, Developer shall obtain a minimum of three (3) competitive bids for the construction of the Public Facilities. Bids shall include unit costs for each portion of work as shown in Exhibits B-1 and B-2, and a list of all responsible subcontractors.

(b) Compliance with State Prevailing Wage Laws Required. Developer is required, and the specifications and bid and contract documents shall require all contractors and subcontractors, to pay prevailing wages and to otherwise comply with applicable provisions of the California Labor Code, Government Code, and Public Contracts Code relating to public works projects of cities and/or as may be required by City standards and procedures. This provision shall apply to any and all Public Facilities whether paid for wholly or in part out of Developer, City, or other funds.

(c) All contractors and subcontractors shall be required to provide proof of insurance coverage throughout the term of the construction of the Public Facilities which they will construct in conformance with the City's standard procedures and requirements.

(d) Contractor Registration. Effective March 1, 2015, no contractor or subcontractor may be listed on a bid proposal for the Public Facilities unless registered with the Department of Industrial Relations pursuant to Labor Code section 1725.5. Effective April 1, 2015, no contractor or subcontractor may work on the Public Facilities unless registered with the Department of Industrial Relations pursuant to Labor Code section 1725.5. Developer shall be responsible for ensuring that these contractor registration requirements are adhered to since this project is subject to compliance monitoring and enforcement by the Department of Industrial Relations.

(e) DIR Notification. As required by SB 854, Developer shall notify the Department of Industrial Relations of the project within five (5) days of the award of a contract to a contractor for the Public Facilities.

Developer shall cause the Public Facilities to be constructed in an expeditious manner so that construction of all such Public Facilities shall be completed by October 1, 2017 (the "Public Facilities Completion Date"), unless extended by the Finance Director, or such earlier date as may be required by Potential Project approvals or entitlements.

6. Payment; Cost Overruns; Shortfalls. The City and Developer agree that it is in their mutual best interest for Developer to construct the Public Facilities with the understanding that the City shall acquire those portions of the Public Facilities constructed by Developer as may be paid for out of the Commitment Amount and, if necessary, Developer contributions. Any Public Facilities not acquired with the Commitment Amount, shall nonetheless be constructed by the Developer, as required by the Potential Project Approvals. All cost overruns (actual costs which in aggregate exceed the estimated costs plus any contingencies as may be set forth in Exhibits B-1 and B-2 and/or the Commitment Amount) in the construction of the Public Facilities shall be the responsibility of the Developer. Any cost savings achieved in an element of any of the Public Facilities constructed in whole or in part with the excess special taxes shall be aggregated with all other such savings achieved throughout the District, and shall be used for any other element of the Public Facilities, as approved by the City.

Any unexpended funds within the Commitment Amount above and beyond that necessary for the Public Facilities, as determined by the Finance Director, shall be available, at City's discretion, for any other lawful purpose within the District.

The parties acknowledge that a shortfall may occur between: (a) the eligible costs of the Public Facilities constructed by Developer and (b) the Commitment Amount available for payment of the eligible costs and other potential reimbursement sources (hereafter referred to as the "**Gap Shortfall**"). Developer shall be solely responsible for any Gap Shortfall.

7. Inspection and Approval of Construction. The City shall provide such level of inspection of the progress of construction of the Public Facilities to be constructed by Developer for acquisition by the City as it deems necessary, and its inspectors shall have access to the construction sites at all times for the purpose of conducting their inspection. Developer and its contractors shall cooperate in every way with the City and its inspectors to ensure that they are afforded an adequate opportunity to inspect each and every phase of the progress of construction of each and every such Public Facility. Upon completion of the construction of a Public Facility constructed by Developer, and upon receipt of written notification from City's inspectors that construction thereof has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications thereof and the City's standard requirements, and upon receipt of satisfactory proof, based on the records of Developer and the City and such certifications as the City may require, that the requirements of Section 5 hereof have been satisfied, the City shall notify Developer in writing that the construction of the Public Facility has been satisfactorily completed; provided, however, that Developer, not the City, shall be responsible for determining satisfaction of requirements of other public agencies with respect to the Public Facilities. Upon receiving such notification of a completed Public Facility, Developer shall forthwith file with the County Recorder of the County of Placer a Notice of Completion pursuant to the provisions of Section 3093 of the California Civil Code. Developer shall furnish to the City a duplicate copy of each such Notice of Completion showing thereon the date of filing with the County Records. Developer's obligation to file the Notice of Completion as to any completed Public Facility shall accrue only when City has accepted the Public Facility and has issued a Notice of Completion for such Public Facility. The costs incurred by the City in inspecting and approving the construction of the Public Facilities may be paid or reimbursed from the Commitment Amount or, in City's sole discretion, from any additional excess special tax collected by City.

8. Liens. Upon the expiration of the time for the recording of claims of liens as prescribed by Sections 3115 and 3116 of the California Civil Code, Developer shall provide to the City such evidence or proof as the City shall require that all persons, firms and corporations supplying work, labor, materials, supplies and equipment to the construction of the Public Facilities constructed by Developer for acquisition by the City have been paid, and that no claims of liens have been recorded by or on behalf of any such person, firm or corporation.

9. Acquisition; Retention; and Maintenance. The administrative procedure to implement the foregoing is as follows, and may be subject to revision by the Finance Director and/or Development Services Director upon notice to Developer:

Upon completion of the construction (including any punch list work) of each Public Facility as shown in Exhibits B-1 and B-2 (including any segment or phase as may be described therein), constructed by Developer for acquisition by City, the City shall determine the acquisition price to be paid by the City for the acquisition of the completed Public Facility from Developer. The acquisition price as to each Public Facility shall include the actual cost of construction thereof as determined by the contract prices as set forth in contracts and purchase orders entered into by Developer with its contractors, and suppliers, in accordance with standards and procedures therefor as prescribed by the City. Developer shall furnish to the City such proof of the amounts which Developer contends should be included in the acquisition price for a completed Public Facility as the City shall require, together with lien releases from all contractors and suppliers providing work and materials for the completed Public Facility (Developer may provide proof that such liens have been "bonded over" in accordance with California law), in form satisfactory to the City. The City shall have ten (10) days or as soon thereafter as is practicable to determine the acquisition price. The determination of the City as to the acquisition price for a completed Public Facility shall be final.

Upon determining the acquisition price for a completed Public Facility the City shall promptly notify Developer in writing of such acquisition price. Upon presentation by Developer to the City of such documents, including lien releases (Developer may provide proof that such liens have been "bonded over" in accordance with California law), as the City shall require as to the completed Public Facility the City shall, within ten (10) days thereafter, pay from the Commitment Amount the acquisition price for the completed Public Facility, but in the case of a completed Public Facility less a retention of 150% of the value of "Punch List" work not completed. Upon payment and acceptance of the acquisition price for each completed Public Facility Developer shall have no further claim for payment from the City with respect to the retentions. The City shall hold the retention amount on all Public Facilities acquired until the Punch List work is completed and accepted by City.

The administrative procedure to implement the foregoing is as follows, and may be subject to revision by City upon notice to Developer. Developer shall notify the City Engineer that a Public Facility is complete and shall furnish proof of the amounts to be included in the acquisition price, together with lien releases (Developer may provide proof that such liens have been "bonded over" in accordance with California law). Development Services staff shall then inspect the Public Facility to confirm completion. Development Services staff shall then notify City's Finance Department regarding completion and shall request payment to Developer. Within ten (10) days thereafter, and provided that the improvement has been conveyed to City or irrevocably offered for dedication, invoices for construction have been provided to City, and the particular Public Facility has been signed off by City inspectors, City shall issue payment to Developer in the requested amount, except that Developer shall choose one of the following options prior to release of the final five percent (5%): (1) City shall retain ten percent (5%) of the acquisition price until expiration of the one-year warranty period for the subject Public Facility; or (2) Developer shall obtain a maintenance bond, in a form acceptable to City Attorney, until expiration of the one-year warranty period for the subject Public Facility. Upon expiration of the one-year warranty period, the retention shall be disbursed to Developer or the maintenance bond shall be released, less any amounts utilized by the City for warranty work. Where the City retains any portion of the acquisition price during the one year warranty period, the retainage shall serve as an improvement security in accordance with this Section.

Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this Section, the City will not pay for the acquisition of any Public Facilities unless and until the street, drainage or other utility rights of way where they are located have been, at City's election, dedicated or irrevocably offered to the City for dedication.

Until a Public Facility is acquired by the City, Developer shall maintain it in accordance with City standards, and shall transfer it to the City free of any liens, in good operating condition, and with clear title to the satisfaction of the City Attorney. Upon the acquisition of a Public Facility by the City, the City shall, except as otherwise provided in the Potential Project Approvals, become responsible for its maintenance, subject to any contractor's warranty or maintenance provisions required under this Agreement or under any discretionary approvals.

10. Indemnification; Insurance. To the fullest extent allowed by law, Developer shall defend, indemnify and save and hold harmless the City, the District, and their officers, agents, employees, and volunteers from any and all liability, cost and expense in connection with the construction of the Public Facilities to be constructed by Developer for acquisition by the City, including, but not limited to, liability, costs, expenses, liens, claims notices, and claims arising under this Agreement. Developer shall also defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City, the District, and their officers, agents, employees, and volunteers from any and all liability, cost and expense in connection with the ownership of the Public Facilities to be constructed by Developer for acquisition by the City prior to the time the City accepts the Public Facilities, whether or not such Public Facilities are to be acquired with bond proceeds. Developer shall procure and provide, until construction of all of the Public Facilities to be constructed by Developer is completed and acceptance thereof by the City has occurred, a broad form comprehensive general liability policy of insurance, in a form acceptable to the City, naming the City, the District and their officers, agents, employees, and volunteers as additional insureds, in the amount of \$2,000,000 each occurrence/\$4,000,000 aggregate as to all coverages provided thereby. Before commencing the construction of any Public Facility, Developer shall provide the City with a certification of insurance and endorsement as to such insurance in a form acceptable to the City, and Developer shall upon each renewal of such insurance policy provide the City with a new certificate of insurance with respect thereto.

Developer shall also furnish to the City, prior to commencing the construction of any Public Facility to be constructed by Developer for acquisition by the City, a certificate of insurance evidencing that Developer has procured and has in force a current policy of workers' compensation insurance in compliance with California law as to all workers to be employed by Developer in connection with the design and construction of the Public Facilities. (However, the foregoing is not intended to, and does not, obligate any contractor or other person or entity to maintain workers' compensation insurance where not required by the laws of the State of California.) Developer shall require each person, firm or corporation with whom it contracts in connection with the design and construction of the Public Facilities to provide and maintain such workers' compensation insurance and a broad form, comprehensive general liability insurance policy in the amount hereinabove specified and in a form acceptable to the City. Developer shall provide to the City proof, in such form and at such intervals as set forth below, that each contractor with whom it contracts has procured and is maintaining such insurance.

Upon the execution of each contract with each person, firm or corporation with whom Developer contracts in connection with the design and construction of the Public Facilities and prior to permitting any such person, firm or corporation to commence work under such contract, Developer shall provide to the City a certificate from the insurance providers for each such contractor that the contractor has in force the insurance policies required of it under this Section 10, that the City is named as an additional insured on the broad form comprehensive general liability insurance policy of such contractor, and that the policies will not be canceled, materially modified or allowed to lapse without 30 days written notice to the City.

The premiums paid by Developer for the insurance required by this Section may be included in the acquisition price to be paid by the City for the Public Facilities to be constructed by Developer as an incidental cost.

Developer's responsibility for the defense and indemnity obligations set forth in this Section shall survive the termination or completion of this Agreement for the full period of time allowed by law. The defense and indemnity obligations of this Agreement are undertaken in addition to, and shall not in any way be limited by, the insurance obligations contained in this Agreement.

11. Ownership of Facilities. Notwithstanding that some of the Public Facilities to be constructed by Developer for acquisition by the City may be constructed in dedicated street rights-of-way or on property which has been or will be dedicated or offered for dedication to the City, District or Public Utility, such Public Facilities shall be and remain the property of Developer, and Developer shall be responsible for any loss or damage thereto or liability arising therefrom, until they are acquired by the City or other agencies as provided in the preceding Sections of this Agreement. Such ownership by Developer shall likewise not be affected by any agreement which Developer may enter into with the City pursuant to the provisions of the Subdivision Map Act, Section 66410 et seq. of the California Government Code, which may contain or include provisions with respect to the construction and ownership of public facilities which may seem to be contradictory to the provision of this Agreement, and the provisions of this Section shall control.

12. Improvement Security. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Agreement, Developer shall be required to agree to construct and to secure the construction and completion of construction of the Public Facilities, or portions thereof, as a condition precedent to the approval of subdivision or parcel maps for portions of the Property as required by the City pursuant to Section 66462 and Sections 66499 through 66499.10 of the Government Code.

The aggregate principal amount of the improvement bonds or other security provided by Developer pursuant to this Section shall be reduced by such amount as the City shall determine is appropriate upon receipt of the proceeds from the sale of the Bonds. The amount of the reduction of such aggregate principal amount shall be determined by the City based on the amount of each such improvement bond or other security which relates to the Public Facilities to be constructed or acquired with the proceeds of the sale of the Bonds.

All subdivision and performance bonds shall provide, *inter alia*, that the principal thereof, whether that be Developer or its contractor(s), guarantees that the completed Public Facilities shall be free from defects resulting from faulty workmanship and materials for a period of one year from the date of acceptance by the City, and the obligation of the surety shall extend to the fulfilling of that guarantee. At the end of said one year period and subject to certification of the City Engineer that any defects have been corrected, the obligation of the principal and surety named therein shall cease.

13. Failure to Complete Construction. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this Agreement, if Developer fails to expeditiously prosecute the construction of the Public Facilities to be constructed by Developer for acquisition by the City, the City shall have the right and may elect to take over the construction of such Public Facilities, or any part thereof, if City determines it is necessary for City to so proceed in order to protect the City's interests. If the City elects to so proceed, it shall notify Developer in writing that if Developer does not satisfy the City that construction is proceeding expeditiously on the construction of a Public Facility within sixty (60) days after receipt of such notice, the City will take over the construction of such Public Facilities. If after receiving such a written notification Developer does not satisfy the City that it is proceeding expeditiously to construct that portion of the Public Facilities identified in the written notification to the satisfaction of the City, within sixty (60) days from the date of receipt thereof, Developer shall relinquish to the City all design documents, and shall cooperate with the City to ensure that the construction of the Public Facilities will be completed expeditiously.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this Section, the only sources of funds to be utilized by the City for the construction of any such Public Facilities shall be (i) the Commitment Amount, (ii) any excess special taxes, at City's discretion, (iii) the proceeds of applicable City development fees collected pursuant to the applicable codes, ordinances and policies of the City, (iv) the Developer's subdivision bond or bonds to the extent applicable, (v) any other performance security that may have been provided by the Developer, and (vi) the Developer's and/or contractors' performance bonds. To the extent that the Commitment Amount and such other funds may be insufficient to pay for the construction of a Public Facility which will be constructed by the City pursuant to this Section, the City may either construct only those Public Facilities which can be constructed within the Commitment Amount and such other funds, in City's sole discretion, which are available therefore, or the City may proceed to complete the Public Facilities and charge the Developer's bond or any contractor's bond for the costs thereof.

14. Tax Requirements. The City reserves the right take all actions which, in the opinion of City's bond counsel, are necessary in order to avoid classification of any bonds issued for the District as "arbitrage bonds" or the loss of tax exemption for the bonds for any other reason, regardless that no bond proceeds are involved, reserved, dedicated, or applied to the Public Facilities.

15. Construction of Other Facilities. Developer shall proceed expeditiously with the design and construction of the other improvements and facilities, other than the Public Facilities, which are necessary to the development of the Property and the provision of municipal services within the District and to the residents therein. Such other public improvements and facilities shall be designed and constructed on a schedule which will not delay or interfere in any way with

the design and construction of the Public Facilities. The provisions of this Section shall not supersede those of any other agreement between Developer and the City.

16. Development Schedule. Developer shall also proceed with the development of the Public Facilities with all reasonable diligence to ensure that such development is completed in a reasonable time. If Developer does not so proceed with the development of the Public Facilities, the City may take action as specified in Section 13 hereof and, in addition, may withhold payment of acquisition costs hereunder.

17. Termination. This Agreement may be terminated upon (i) mutual agreement of the parties, or (ii) unilaterally by City, following sixty (60) days' notice to Developer in the event that the Development Services Director determines that there has been a cessation of construction for a minimum period or cumulative period of six (6) months within a calendar year.

18. Binding on Community Facilities District. The District shall automatically become a party to this Agreement to the extent permitted by California law, and all provisions hereof which apply to the City shall also apply to the District. The City Council of the City, acting for the District, shall perform all parts of this Agreement which require performance on the part of the District.

19. Assignment. Developer may not assign this Agreement or any right or duty hereunder without the express written approval of the City. The City may condition any such approval on proof of the financial responsibility and experience of a proposed assignee to undertake and perform the duties and responsibilities of Developer under this Agreement. The City's approval of an assignment of this Agreement and the rights and duties of Developer hereunder shall not be unreasonably withheld.

20. Prompt Action. All consents, approvals and determinations required of either the City or Developer pursuant to this Agreement shall be promptly given or made, and shall not be unreasonably withheld.

21. Unavoidable Delay. Whenever a day is appointed herein on which, or a period of time is appointed within which, Developer is required to do or complete any act, matter, or thing, the time for doing or completion thereof shall be extended by a period of time equal to the number of days on or during which such party is prevented from, or is unreasonably interfered with, the doing or completion of such act directly due to power failure, riots, insurrection, war, fire or acts of God, or by reason of any cause beyond the exclusive and reasonable control of Developer (financial liability excepted).

22. General. This Agreement contains the entire agreement between the parties with respect to the matters herein provided for, and may be amended by a subsequent written agreement signed on behalf of both parties. This Agreement is for the exclusive benefit of the parties and shall not be construed to confer any rights or benefits upon any persons other than the City, the District and the Developer. This Agreement shall, however, inure to the benefit of and be binding upon the successors and assigns of the parties. This Agreement shall be construed and governed by the Constitution and laws of the State of California. Should either party to this

Agreement commence a court action or proceeding against the other party with respect to this Agreement or the design and acquisition or construction of the Public Facilities, the party prevailing in such action or proceeding shall be entitled to receive from the losing party its attorney's fees, expert witness fees, court costs, and other costs incurred by it in prosecuting or defending such action or proceeding. Any action arising out of this Agreement shall be brought in Placer County, California, regardless of where else venue may lie. The captions of the sections of this Agreement are provided for convenience only, and shall not have any bearing on the interpretation of any section hereof. This Agreement may be executed in several counterparts, each of which shall be an original of the same Agreement.

23. Notice. Any and all notices, demands or other communications required or desired to be given hereunder by any party shall be in writing and shall be validly given or made to another party if served either personally or sent via Federal Express or other nationally recognized courier delivery service or if deposited in the United States mail, certified or registered, postage prepaid, return receipt requested. If such notice, demand, or other communication be served personally, service shall be conclusively deemed made at the time of such personal service. If such notice, demand, or other communication be given by mail, or by courier service, such shall be conclusively deemed given upon receipt or first refusal of receipt when addressed to the party to whom such notice, demand, or other communication is to be given as hereinafter set forth:

City of Roseville

Rob Jensen
City Manager
City of Roseville
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

Developer

Taylor Morrison of California, LLC
Jay Pawlek
Vice President
81 Blue Ravine Rd., Suite 220
Folsom, CA 95630

With Copy to:

City Engineer
City of Roseville
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

SIGNATURE PAGE TO FOLLOW

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the City of Roseville, a municipal corporation, has authorized the execution of this Agreement in duplicate by its City Manager and attested to by its City Clerk under the authority of Resolution No. _____, adopted by the Council of the City of Roseville on the ____ day of _____, 20__, and Developer has caused this Agreement to be executed.

CITY:

CITY OF ROSEVILLE,
a municipal corporation:

By: _____
Rob Jensen
City Manager

DEVELOPER:

TAYLOR MORRISON OF CALIFORNIA,
LLC, a California limited liability company:

By:  _____
Jay Pawlek
Vice President

ATTEST:

By: _____
Sonia Orozco
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

By: _____
Robert R. Schmitt
City Attorney

APPROVED AS TO SUBSTANCE:

By:  _____
Dominick Casey
Assistant City Manager

NERSP
Parcel 15, Lots 10-14
Taylor Morrison

Exhibit B-1

Roadway Improvement Cost Estimate

Stone Point Subdivision

MACKAY & SOMPS'
PRELIMINARY OPINION OF COSTS
STONE POINT - COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT
LIST OF AUTHORIZED FACILITIES AND ESTIMATED COST

3/14/2016

*Based on Approved Improvement And Landscape Plans For
Stone Point NERSP Parcel 15 Lots 11A, 11B, & 12*

ITEM	QUANTITY	UNIT	DESCRIPTION	UNIT PRICE	CFD No. 5
I. CFD IMPROVEMENTS					
1.	1	LS	Erosion Control	<u>\$3,500.00</u>	<u>\$3,500</u>
2.	1	LS	Stone Point Drive (Bulb-outs, Sidewalk)	<u>\$54,208.05</u>	<u>\$54,208</u>
3.	1	LS	North Sunrise Avenue (Bus Turnouts)	<u>\$198,424.00</u>	<u>\$198,424</u>
4.	1	LS	Signing & Striping (Stone Point Drive & North Sunrise Avenue)	<u>\$8,382.00</u>	<u>\$8,382</u>
5.	1	LS	Traffic Control	<u>\$45,000.00</u>	<u>\$45,000</u>
6.	1	LS	Landscaping & Monument Signage (Stone Point Drive & North Sunrise Avenue)	<u>\$332,554.78</u>	<u>\$332,555</u>
SUBTOTAL ESTIMATED IMPROVEMENT COSTS					<u>\$642,069</u>
7.	1	LS	Design, Permits, Fees (20%)	<u>\$128,413.77</u>	<u>\$128,414</u>
8.	1	LS	Management Fee (4%)	<u>\$25,682.75</u>	<u>\$25,683</u>
SUBTOTAL ESTIMATED SOFT COSTS					<u>\$154,097</u>
TOTAL ESTIMATED COST					<u>\$796,165</u>

Prepared by the firm of:
MACKAY & SOMPS CIVIL ENGINEERS, INC.
ROSEVILLE CALIFORNIA

Exhibit B-2

Park Improvement Cost Estimate Stone Point Subdivision

**The HLA Group Preliminary Opinion of Costs
Stone Point – Community Facilities District
List of Authorized Facilities and Estimated Costs**

I. Park Improvements:

Item	Quantity	Unit	Description	Unit Price	CFD#5
1.	1	LS	Site Preparation	\$ 40,634.00	\$ 40,634.00
2.	1	LS	Grading & Drainage	103,502.50	103,502.50
3.	1	LS	Lighting & Electrical	49,327.50	49,327.50
4.	1	LS	Hardscape, Site Furnishings	314,874.12	314,874.12
5.	1	LS	Irrigation	154,940.00	154,940.00
6.	1	LS	Planting, Bark & Amendments	41,069.13	41,069.13
7.	1	LS	Maintenance & Warranty	1,741.00	1,741.00
Sub-total Estimated Hard Costs:					\$ 706,088.25

Add Alt	Quantity	Unit	Description	Unit Price	CFD#5
8.	1	LS	Turf Soil Preparation/Amendments	\$ 10,628.48	\$ 10,628.48
9.	1	LS	Sodded Turf	4,317.82	4,317.82
10.	1	LS	Construction Fencing – Ex. Trees	1,928.00	1,928.00
11.	1	LS	Construction Fencing – Park/Open Space	6,362.40	6,362.40
12.	1	LS	Mulch under Ex. Trees	10,841.40	10,841.40
13.	1	LS	Mulch under Ex. Trees	5,593.00	5,593.00
14.	1	LS	Pruning of Ex. Trees	7,960.00	7,960.00
15.	1	LS	Irrigation Audit at Planting	2,600.00	2,600.00
16.	1	LS	Irrigation Audit post Planting	2,600.00	2,600.00
Sub-Total Estimated Add. Alts. Costs:					\$ 52,831.10

Sub-Total All Hard Costs: \$ 758,919.35

10% Contingency: \$ 75,891.94

Total Estimated Hard Cost: \$ 834,811.29

Item	Quantity	Unit	Description**	Unit Price	CFD#5
17.	1	LS	Geotechnical Engineering	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00
18.	1	LS	Landscape Architect	\$ 63,650.00	\$ 63,650.00
19.	1	LS	Civil Engineering	\$ 26,000.00	\$ 26,000.00
20.	1	LS	ECORP (Environmental)	\$ 10,800.00	\$ 10,800.00
Total Estimated Soft Cost:					\$ 105,450.00

TOTAL Park Cost: \$ 940,261.29

Less Credits Received: \$ 264,306.00**

TOTAL Estimated Reimbursable Park Cost: \$ 675,955.29

**per Park Development Agreement for Lot 10A Park and Lot 10B Overlook Sites, NERSP
Parcel 15 – Stone Point, dated January 15, 2014.

Prepared by the firm of:
The HLA Group Landscape Architects & Planners, Inc. - Sacramento, California



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8234

File #: 0704

Title: Recreation Management Software - Professional Services Agreement

Contact: Rendi Hodge 916-774-5240 rhodge@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 6.21.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Recommend Council execute a five-year professional services agreement with PerfectMind Technology, Inc. to host, implement and maintain new recreation management software in the Parks, Recreation & Libraries Department. The total cost of the agreement is \$490,000.00 over five (5) years, including implementation, interface development and integration, annual maintenance and equipment purchases. First year costs total \$200,000.00 and are included in the approved FY2016/17 Parks, Recreation & Libraries Capital Improvement Project Budget. The funds for each year's annual maintenance and support costs will be requested in future budgets.

BACKGROUND

In 1991, the Parks, Recreation & Libraries Department purchased the "CLASS" Recreation Management Software ("CLASS") to assist the Department with processing program registration and facility rentals. These transactions include registration for all of the City's recreation programs and facility reservations for parks, picnics, gyms, sport fields and meeting/banquet rooms.

In December 2013, CLASS's parent company, Active Network, notified its clients that CLASS Recreation Management Software would be discontinued and no longer supported after November 30, 2017. As a result, staff from the Parks, Recreation & Libraries and Information Technology Departments conducted a RFP for Recreation Management Software in spring of 2016. The City received five (5) submittals. The review team evaluated the proposals based on overall system functionality, implementation plan, training, ongoing maintenance and support, references and cost. All five (5) vendors were then invited to provide in depth demonstrations of their systems. Staff identified the top three (3) vendors. Two (2) of the three (3) vendors created test databases for staff analysis. The third vendor provided an additional online demonstration. The systems were then evaluated and ranked based on the demonstrations and test databases.

Staff recommends awarding the contract to PerfectMind Technology, Inc. based on their ability to meet the needs and demands of the Parks, Recreation & Libraries Department. PerfectMind Technology, Inc. is an advanced cloud-based product which provides all the necessary

functionality, plus many additional features as well as mobile applications. The product offers the ability to automate many tasks which are now accomplished manually, from calculating instructor payments to notifying wait-listed customers of availability in programs via email or text. The system would provide enhanced opportunities to communicate and engage with customers. PerfectMind Technology, Inc.'s API platform allows for the ability to quickly add new features, enhancements and customization which provide for greater technological efficiency and future growth.

FISCAL IMPACT

The total cost of the agreement is \$490,000.00 over five (5) years, including implementation, interface development and integration, annual maintenance and equipment purchases. First year costs total \$200,000.00 and are included in the approved FY2016/17 Parks, Recreation & Libraries Capital Improvement Project Budget. The funds for each year's annual maintenance and support costs will be requested in future budgets.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Approval of this request will not create any new jobs.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not apply to activities that will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines §15061(b)(3)). The Recreation Management Software project does not include the potential for a significant environmental effect, and therefore is not subject to CEQA.

Respectfully Submitted,

Rendi Hodge, Administrative Analyst

Dion Louthan, Parks, Recreation & Libraries Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution No. 17-40

PerfectMind PSA (unsigned placeholder)

RESOLUTION NO. 17-40

APPROVING A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT BY AND BETWEEN THE
CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND PERFECTMIND TECHNOLOGY, INC., AND AUTHORIZING
THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF
THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

WHEREAS, a professional services agreement for Recreation Management Software, by and between the City of Roseville and PerfectMind Technology, Inc., has been reviewed by the City Council; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that said agreement is hereby approved and that the City Manager is authorized to execute it on behalf of the City of Roseville, upon receipt and approval of signed agreement by the City Attorney's office; and

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT

Project: Recreation Management Software

THIS AGREEMENT is made and entered into this ____ day of _____, 20__,
by and between the City of Roseville, a municipal corporation ("CITY"), and PerfectMIND, Inc.,
a British Columbia corporation ("CONSULTANT"); and

W I T N E S S E T H:

WHEREAS, CITY desires professional services consisting of recreation management
software solutions; and

WHEREAS, CONSULTANT has prepared a proposal dated February 5, 2016 which
describes the scope of work to be performed by CONSULTANT, the budget for the work, and the
schedule for performance of the work; and

WHEREAS, CONSULTANT is qualified and experienced to provide such professional
services.

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties agree as follows:

1. Services. CONSULTANT shall perform, at the direction of CITY, the scope of
services as described in EXHIBIT "A," at the service levels described in EXHIBIT "B," attached
hereto and incorporated herein by this reference. The services provided by CONSULTANT shall

be in accordance with those portions of its proposal dated February 5, 2016, attached hereto as EXHIBIT “C” and incorporated herein by this reference.

2. Compensation. For its services provided hereunder, CONSULTANT shall be compensated annually based on the Platform Use Fees identified in EXHIBIT “D,” attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference. In addition to Platform Use Fees, CONSULTANT shall be compensated based on the milestones as described in the Fee Payment Schedule identified as EXHIBIT “E,” and additional hourly rates for professional services identified in EXHIBIT “F,” attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference. CONSULTANT represents and warrants that the pricing identified in EXHIBITS “D” and “F” shall remain valid for a period of five (5) years. Sixty days prior to the expiration of such five (5) year pricing, CITY is willing to re-negotiate out-year pricing (increases and/or decreases) based on market fluctuations, for any extension term that may be agreed upon by the parties. The pricing for each successive year will be evaluated based on what CITY deems to be fair and reasonable pricing. Any requests made by CONSULTANT for a price increase must be fully documented utilizing an appropriate Consumer or Producer Price Index or other relevant market data to justify a price change. In its request for price increases CONSULTANT shall cite sources, specific conditions, and document how those conditions affect the cost. Price adjustments will not be automatic. They must be mutually agreed upon by both CITY and CONSULTANT. CITY will review the proposed pricing and determine if it is allowable, fair, reasonable, and in the best interest of CITY to extend the agreement. Total compensation shall not exceed four hundred ninety thousand dollars (\$490,000.00).

CONSULTANT shall submit invoices for its services in accordance with the schedules identified in EXHIBITS “B” and “D.” CITY shall pay invoices within thirty (30) days after receipt, if the services specified in the invoice have been satisfactorily completed.

3. Indemnification. To the fullest extent allowed by law, CONSULTANT shall defend, indemnify, and save and hold harmless CITY, its officers, agents, employees and volunteers from any claims, suits or actions of every name, kind and description brought forth, or on account of, injuries to or death of any person (including but not limited to workers and the public), or damage to property, resulting from or arising out of CONSULTANT's willful misconduct or negligent act or omission while engaged in the performance of obligations or exercise of rights created by this Agreement, except those matters arising from CITY's sole negligence or willful misconduct. The parties intend that this provision shall be broadly construed.

CONSULTANT's responsibility for such defense and indemnity obligations shall survive the termination or completion of this Agreement for the full period of time allowed by law. The defense and indemnity obligations of this Agreement are undertaken in addition to, and shall not in any way be limited by, the insurance obligations contained in this Agreement.

4. Insurance. CONSULTANT agrees to continuously maintain, in full force and effect, the following minimum policies of insurance during the term of this Agreement.

COVERAGE

Workers' Compensation

LIMITS OF LIABILITY

Statutory

Commercial General Liability	\$1,000,000 each occurrence \$2,000,000 aggregate Personal Injury: \$1,000,000 each occurrence \$2,000,000 aggregate
Automobile Liability	\$1,000,000 combined single limit
Professional Liability (errors and omissions)	\$1,000,000 per claim \$2,000,000 aggregate

a. Form. CONSULTANT shall submit a certificate evidencing such coverage for the period covered by this Agreement in a form satisfactory to Risk Management and the City Attorney, prior to undertaking any work hereunder. Any insurance written on a claims made basis is subject to the approval of Risk Management and the City Attorney.

b. Additional Insureds. CONSULTANT shall also provide a separate endorsement form or section of the policy showing CITY, its officers, agents, employees and volunteers as additional insureds for each type of coverage, except for Workers' Compensation and Professional Liability. Such insurance shall specifically cover the contractual liability of CONSULTANT. The additional insured coverage under the CONSULTANT's policy shall be primary and noncontributory, as evidenced by a separate endorsement or section of the policy, and shall not seek contribution from CITY's insurance or self-insurance. In addition, the additional insured coverage shall be at least as broad as the Insurance Services Office ("ISO") CG 20 01 Endorsement. Any available insurance proceeds in excess of the specified minimum insurance coverage requirements and limits shall be available to the additional insureds. Furthermore, the requirements for coverage and limits shall be: (1) the minimum coverage and limits specified in this Agreement; or (2) the full coverage and maximum limits of any insurance proceeds available to the named insureds, whichever is greater.

c. Cancellation/Modification. CONSULTANT shall provide ten (10) days written notice to CITY prior to cancellation or modification of any insurance required by this Agreement.

d. Umbrella/Excess Insurance. The limits of insurance required in this Agreement may be satisfied by a combination of primary and excess insurance. Any excess insurance shall contain or be endorsed to contain a provision that such coverage shall also apply on a primary and noncontributory basis for the benefit of CITY (if agreed to in a written contract) before CITY's own insurance shall be called upon to protect it as a named insured.

e. Subcontractors. CONSULTANT agrees to include in its contracts with all subcontractors the same requirements and provisions of this Agreement, including the indemnity and insurance requirements, to the extent they apply to the scope of the subcontractor's work. Furthermore, CONSULTANT shall require its subcontractors to agree to be bound to CONSULTANT and CITY in the same manner and to the same extent as CONSULTANT is bound to CITY under this Agreement. Additionally, CONSULTANT shall obligate its subcontractors to comply with these same provisions with respect to any tertiary subcontractor, regardless of tier. A copy of CITY's indemnity and insurance provisions will be furnished to the subcontractor or tertiary subcontractor upon request.

f. Self-Insured Retentions. All self-insured retentions ("SIR") must be disclosed to Risk Management for approval and shall not reduce the limits of liability. Policies containing any SIR provision shall provide or be endorsed to provide that the SIR may be satisfied by either the named insured or CITY. CITY reserves the right to obtain a full certified copy of any insurance policy and endorsements. The failure to exercise this right shall not constitute a waiver of such right.

g. Waiver of Subrogation. CONSULTANT hereby agrees to waive subrogation which any insurer of CONSULTANT may acquire from CONSULTANT by virtue of the payment of any loss under a Commercial General Liability or Automobile Liability policy. All Commercial General Liability and Automobile Liability policies shall be endorsed with a waiver of subrogation in favor of CITY, its officers, agents, employees and volunteers for all work performed by CONSULTANT, its employees, agents and subcontractors.

h. Liability/Remedies. Insurance coverage in the minimum amounts set forth herein shall not be construed to relieve CONSULTANT of liability in excess of such coverage, nor shall it preclude CITY from taking such other actions as are available to it under any other provisions of this Agreement or law.

5. Access to Records. Duly authorized representatives of CITY shall have right of access during normal business hours to CONSULTANT's files and records relating to the services performed hereunder, and may review the files and records at appropriate stages during performance of the services.

6. Time is of the Essence. Time is of the essence of this Agreement.

7. Compliance with Laws. CONSULTANT shall comply with all federal, state and local laws, ordinances and policies as may be applicable to the performance of services under this Agreement.

8. Ability to Perform. CONSULTANT agrees and represents that it has the time, ability and professional expertise to perform the services required under this Agreement.

9. Governing Agreement. In the event of any conflict between this Agreement and its EXHIBITS, the provisions of this Agreement shall govern. In the event of any conflict between any of the EXHIBITS, the provisions of the first in order of attachment shall govern.

10. Assignment. CONSULTANT is employed to perform unique personal services. CONSULTANT shall not assign this Agreement without the prior written consent of CITY. However, CONSULTANT may, upon sixty (60) days written notice to CITY, assign this Agreement to a parent, subsidiary, or affiliate, an acquirer of assets, or a successor by merger. CONSULTANT shall not employ or otherwise incur any obligation to pay other specialists or experts for services in connection with this Agreement, without prior written consent of CITY.

11. Independent Contractor. CONSULTANT shall act as an independent contractor, and covenants and agrees that it will conduct itself consistent with such status, that it will neither hold itself out as, nor claim to be, an officer or employee of CITY by reason of this Agreement.

12. Representations and Warranties. CONSULTANT warrants that it has not employed or retained any company or person, other than a bona fide employee working for CONSULTANT, to solicit or secure this Agreement, and that it has not paid or agreed to pay any company or person, other than a bona fide employee, any fee, commission, percentage, brokerage fee, gift or any other consideration, contingent upon or resulting from the award or making of this Agreement. For breach or violation of this warranty, CITY shall have the right to terminate as void this Agreement, without liability, or, in its discretion, to deduct from the Agreement price or consideration, or otherwise recover, the full amount of such fee, commission, percentage, brokerage fee, gift or contingent fee.

13. Successors in Interest. This Agreement shall be binding upon the heirs, successors, executors, administrators and assigns of the respective parties hereto.

14. Copyright, Ownership and Use of Materials. All material created by CONSULTANT pursuant to Exhibit A to accommodate CITY's use of CONSULTANT's software as a service and all intellectual property rights in such material shall remain the property

of CONSULTANT. CITY shall have a royalty-free, nontransferable license to use such material during the term of this Agreement to the extent that such use is necessary for the CITY's use of CONSULTANT's software as a service. CONSULTANT shall acquire no right, title, or interest in or to data collected by CONSULTANT pursuant to this Agreement.

15. Use of Accounts. CONSULTANT will issue accounts, or permit CITY to issue accounts, to individuals selected by CITY as account-holders for using the software/hardware platform through which CONSULTANT's hosted software solution is provided (the "Platform"). Only account-holders may access or use the Platform and each account-holder's access to the Platform requires valid login credentials, including at least user identification and secure passwords (each an "Account"). The rights of an account-holder may not be used by more than one individual, unless the Account of the account-holder is reassigned in its entirety to another account-holder, in which case the prior holder of the Account shall no longer have any right to access or use the Platform. CITY acknowledges and agrees that CITY:

(a) is fully responsible for Accounts assigned by or at the request of CITY and the acts and omissions of each account-holder, including the creation of Account credentials by any person, the maintenance, confidentiality and security of all passwords related to Accounts, and any and all activities that occur under Accounts assigned by or at request of CITY.

(b) will notify CONSULTANT as soon as practicable after obtaining or receiving any knowledge of

(i) any unauthorized use of an Account or any password related to an Account, or

(ii) any other breach of security with respect to an Account, provided that such notification will not negate Customer's liability for any unauthorized use of an Account or

password until such time as CONSULTANT can be reasonably expected to take corrective measures; and

(c) will provide true, current, accurate and complete information as prompted by the Account-creation process or as otherwise requested by CONSULTANT from time to time and to promptly update such information when any changes occur.

CITY shall not:

(a) make the Platform available to anyone, or permit anyone to access the Platform, other than account-holders;

(b) license, sublicense, sell, resell, transfer, assign, distribute, rent, lease or time-share the rights granted to CITY under this Agreement to use the hosted software solution, or copy or otherwise commercially exploit the Platform or its components in any way except in accordance with the rights granted hereunder;

(c) use the Platform in any manner or for any purpose (i) that contravenes, facilitates the violation of, or violates any applicable laws; (ii) that extracts, gathers, collects, or stores personal information about individuals except in compliance with all applicable personal information privacy laws or that involves data mining, robots or similar data gathering or extraction methods on individual's personal information without their express consent, or (iii) that interferes with or disrupts the integrity or performance of the Platform;

(d) attempt to gain unauthorized access to the Platform or its related systems or networks;

(e) post, upload, reproduce, distribute or otherwise transmit on the Platform (i) defamatory, infringing, indecent or unlawful software, materials or information, or (ii)

inappropriate, profane, or obscene software, materials or information without suitable or lawfully-required access controls;

(f) disable or circumvent any access control or related process or procedure established with respect to the Platform; or

(j) remove any copyright or other proprietary or intellectual property rights notices or labels on or in the Platform or any part, copy or report generated therefrom or thereof.

16. Storage Limits. CITY acknowledges and agrees that CONSULTANT may from time to time establish general practices and limits concerning the use of the Platform, including: the maximum size of CITY data and content that may be stored on Platform (the “Storage Limit”); the maximum number or of emails and amount, speed and type of the City data and content, that may be sent from or received using the Platform (the “Usage Limit”). Such general practices and limits may be posted on CONSULTANT website or otherwise made available through the Platform. The City agrees that City’s usage may not exceed such limits, and that it is City’s responsibility to monitor its usage of the Platform. PerfectMIND covenants that the Storage Limit and the Usage Limit set for CITY will not be less than the following:

Minimum Storage Limit

- Storage: 80GB (\$160 per month for every additional 80GB blocks of storage)

Usage Limit

- Accountholders: Unlimited
- Email: 25,000 emails per month (\$200 per month for additional 50,000 emails)

17. Warranties. EXCEPT AS EXPRESSLY OTHERWISE PROVIDED IN THIS AGREEMENT, THE PLATFORM AND THE WORK ARE PROVIDED ON AN “AS-IS” AND “AS-AVAILABLE” BASIS AND CONSULTANT DOES NOT GUARANTEE THAT THE

PLATFORM WILL FUNCTION ERROR-FREE OR UNINTERRUPTED. THE CITY ACKNOWLEDGES THAT CONSULTANT DOES NOT CONTROL THE TRANSFER OF DATA OVER COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES, INCLUDING THE INTERNET, AND THAT THE SERVICE PROVIDED UNDER THIS AGREEMENT MAY BE SUBJECT TO LIMITATIONS, DELAYS, AND OTHER PROBLEMS INHERENT IN THE USE OF SUCH COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES. CONSULTANT IS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY DELAYS, DELIVERY FAILURES, OR OTHER DAMAGE RESULTING FROM SUCH PROBLEMS. THERE ARE NO REPRESENTATIONS, CONDITIONS OR WARRANTIES OTHER THAN THOSE EXPRESSLY PROVIDED IN THIS AGREEMENT. THE CONDITIONS, REPRESENTATIONS AND WARRANTIES EXPRESSLY SET OUT HEREIN ARE IN LIEU OF, AND CONSULTANT EXPRESSLY DISCLAIMS, ALL CONDITIONS, WARRANTIES AND REPRESENTATIONS, EXPRESS, IMPLIED OR STATUTORY, INCLUDING IMPLIED CONDITIONS, WARRANTIES OR REPRESENTATIONS IN RESPECT OF QUALITY, CONDUCT, PERFORMANCE, RELIABILITY, AVAILABILITY, MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE, WHETHER ARISING BY USAGE OF TRADE, BY COURSE OF DEALING, BY COURSE OF PERFORMANCE, AT LAW, IN EQUITY, BY STATUTE OR OTHERWISE HOWSOEVER, TO THE MAXIMUM EXTENT PERMITTED BY APPLICABLE LAW.

18. Limitation of Liability. NEITHER PARTY WILL BE LIABLE TO THE OTHER FOR ANY INDIRECT, INCIDENTAL, SPECIAL OR CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES OF ANY KIND WHATSOEVER AND HOWEVER CAUSED, WHETHER ARISING UNDER CONTRACT, TORT (INCLUDING NEGLIGENCE) OR OTHERWISE, INCLUDING (WITHOUT LIMITATION) LOSS OF PRODUCTION, LOSS OF OR CORRUPTION TO

DATA, LOSS OF PROFITS OR OF CONTRACTS, LOSS OF BUSINESS, LOSS OF MANAGEMENT OR OPERATION TIME AND LOSS OF GOODWILL OR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS, EVEN IF THE PARTY HAS BEEN NOTIFIED OF THE POSSIBILITY THEREOF OR COULD HAVE FORESEEN SUCH CLAIMS. THE ENTIRE LIABILITY OF EACH PARTY TO THE OTHER PARTY FOR DIRECT DAMAGES FROM ANY CAUSE WHATSOEVER, AND REGARDLESS OF THE FORM OF ACTION OR THE CAUSE OF ACTION, WHETHER IN CONTRACT OR IN TORT (INCLUDING NEGLIGENCE), STRICT LIABILITY, BREACH OF A FUNDAMENTAL TERM, FUNDAMENTAL BREACH, INDEMNITY OR OTHERWISE IN CONNECTION WITH THIS AGREEMENT WILL BE LIMITED TO THREE HUNDRED NINETY THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$390,000.00).

19. Force Majeure. Neither party shall be liable to the other party for damages for any delay or failure of delivery arising out of an event of Force Majeure, "Force Majeure" means circumstances beyond a party's reasonable control, including without limitation, acts of God, acts of government, flood, fire, earthquakes, civil unrest, acts of terror, strikes or other labour problems, or Internet service provider failures or delays, or hosting service provider failures or delays.

20. Termination of Agreement. During the initial five (5) year term of this Agreement, neither party may terminate the Agreement except for material breach. Upon expiration of the initial five (5) year term, CITY may terminate this Agreement without cause by giving CONSULTANT thirty (30) days advance written notice from the City Manager. CONSULTANT may terminate this Agreement without cause by giving CITY thirty (30) days advance written notice. Notwithstanding any of the foregoing, CITY may terminate this Agreement on no less than thirty (30) days written notice, upon expiration of its fiscal year on June 30th each year if in

the event the City Council does not authorize continued funding of this Agreement for the subsequent fiscal year. In the event of termination through no fault of CONSULTANT, CITY shall compensate CONSULTANT for services performed as of the date of termination, upon the release to CITY of all Material hereunder, in any and all media or formats in which such materials have been created or are maintained. CITY retains the right to receive and use any MATERIAL, notwithstanding any termination or any dispute regarding the amount to be paid.

21. Attorney's Fees; Venue; Governing Law. If either party commences any legal action against the other party arising out of this Agreement or the performance hereof, the prevailing party in such action shall be entitled to recover its reasonable litigation expenses, including but not limited to, court costs, expert witness fees, discovery expenses, and attorney's fees. Any action arising out of this Agreement shall be brought in Placer County, California, regardless of where else venue may lie. This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of California.

22. Modification. This Agreement and each provision contained herein may be waived, amended, supplemented or eliminated only by mutual written agreement of the parties.

23. Severability. If any of the provisions contained in this Agreement are for any reason held invalid or unenforceable, such holding shall not affect the remaining provisions or the validity and enforceability of the Agreement as a whole.

24. Notices. Any notices to parties required by this Agreement shall be delivered personally or mailed, U.S. first class postage prepaid, addressed as follows:

CITY OF ROSEVILLE

CONSULTANT

Dion Louthan
Parks, Recreation & Libraries Director
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

PerfectMIND, Inc.
110-980 West First Street
North Vancouver, British Columbia V7P 3N4

Either party may amend its address for notice by giving notice to the other party in writing.

25. Integrated Agreement. This is an integrated agreement and contains all of the terms, considerations, understanding and promises of the parties. It shall be read as a whole.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the City of Roseville, a municipal corporation, has authorized the execution of this Agreement in duplicate by its City Manager and attested to by its City Clerk under the authority of Resolution No. _____, adopted by the Council of the City of Roseville on the ____ day of _____, 20____, and CONSULTANT has caused this Agreement to be executed.

CITY OF ROSEVILLE, a
municipal corporation

PERFECTMIND, INC., a
British Columbia corporation

BY: _____
ROB JENSEN
City Manager

BY: _____
its: _____

and

ATTEST:

BY: _____
its: _____

BY: _____
SONIA OROZCO
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

BY: _____
ROBERT R. SCHMITT
City Attorney

APPROVED AS TO SUBSTANCE:

BY: _____
DION LOUTHAN
Parks, Recreation & Libraries Director

EXHIBIT “A”

EXHIBIT “B”

EXHIBIT “C”

EXHIBIT “D”

EXHIBIT “E”

EXHIBIT “F”



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8214
File #: 1006-01

Title: Cirby School Portable Facility Lease Agreement
Contact: Rob Nakamura 916-774-5135 rnakamura@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017
Item #: 6.22.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Recommend Council adopt a Resolution to approve a three year lease agreement with the Placer County Action Council to house and operate *Headstart* and *Early Headstart* programs in the City owned Cirby Adventure Club portable facility, and authorize the City Manager to sign said lease agreement.

BACKGROUND

In 2006, The Parks, Recreation & Libraries Department re-located the Cirby Adventure Club program to a newer portable unit that is more accessible and convenient for participating families. Vacating the older facility created the opportunity to lease the City owned facility to the Placer County Action Council (PCAC) to operate *Headstart* and *Early Headstart* pre-school services. These services provide a great benefit to qualifying Roseville families.

FISCAL IMPACT

The Parks, Recreation & Libraries Department's School Age Child Care Fund will receive \$2,500.00 per year beginning January 2017 and ending December 2020. The life of this agreement totals \$7,500.00 in lease revenues. All maintenance expense is the responsibility of the lessee.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

The Placer County Action Council's *Headstart* Preschool programs provide services for qualifying families and employ's instructors and aides to operate the program.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

This Lease Agreement is not considered a project as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (CEQA Guidelines 15378. Consequently no CEQA action is required.

Respectfully Submitted,

Rob Nakamura, Recreation Superintendent

Dion Louthan, Director, Parks, Recreation & Libraries



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution No. 17-25

PCAC Lease Agreement

RESOLUTION NO. 17-25

APPROVING A LEASE AGREEMENT BETWEEN
THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND PLACER COMMUNITY ACTION COUNCIL, INC. AND
AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE
IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

WHEREAS, a Lease Agreement for Portable Facility at Cirby Elementary School, regarding the property located at 814 Darling Way, between the City of Roseville and Placer Community Action Council, Inc., has been reviewed by the Council; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that said agreement is approved and that the City Manager is authorized to execute it on behalf of the City of Roseville.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

LEASE AGREEMENT
PORTABLE FACILITY AT CIRBY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

THIS LEASE AGREEMENT is made and entered into this _____ day of _____, 20__, by and between City of Roseville, a municipal corporation ("CITY"), and Placer Community Action Council, Inc., a California nonprofit corporation ("LESSEE"),

W I T N E S S E T H:

WHEREAS, CITY owns two 24' x 40' portable buildings located on the Cirby Elementary School campus at 814 Darling Way in Roseville which are depicted more specifically in Exhibit "A", attached ("the Property"); and

WHEREAS, CITY is willing to lease the Property to LESSEE for purposes of operating "Headstart" and "Early Headstart" state preschool programs subject to the terms of this Lease; and

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties agree as follows:

1. Lease. CITY hereby grants to LESSEE a lease of the Property for educational and recreational purposes, subject to the terms of this Agreement.
2. Term. The term of the Lease granted by this Agreement shall begin January 1, 2017 and terminate on December 31, 2020.

3. Rent. LESSEE shall pay the sum of two thousand five hundred dollars (\$2,500.00) per year payable in advance on January 1st of each year.

4. Maintenance and Repairs. CITY shall have no obligation to maintain or repair any portion of the Property, including structural parts of the Property, leased to LESSEE, and all such maintenance and repair shall be the obligation of LESSEE. Maintenance of unexposed HVAC, electrical, plumbing, and sewage systems which requires entry into bearing or exterior walls, or remodeling of the Property which requires entry into or moving of bearing walls, shall be at LESSEE's sole expense and only after receipt of CITY's written consent, which consent shall not be unreasonably withheld.

5. Utilities. LESSEE shall pay for all utilities in connection with its use of the Property.

6. Indemnification. CONSULTANT shall defend, indemnify, and save and hold harmless CITY, its officers, agents, employees and volunteers from any claims, suits or actions of every name, kind and description brought forth, or on account of, injuries to or death of any person (including but not limited to workers and the public), or damage to property, resulting from or arising out of CONSULTANT's willful misconduct or negligent act or omission while engaged in the performance of obligations or exercise of rights created by this Agreement, except those matters arising from CITY's sole or active negligence. The parties intend that this provision shall be broadly construed.

4. Insurance. CONSULTANT agrees to continuously maintain, in full force and effect, the following minimum policies of insurance during the term of this Agreement.

COVERAGELIMITS OF LIABILITY

Workers' Compensation	Statutory
Commercial General Liability	\$1,000,000 each occurrence \$2,000,000 aggregate Personal Injury: \$1,000,000 each occurrence \$2,000,000 aggregate
Automobile Liability	Bodily Injury: \$500,000 per person \$1,000,000 per accident Property Damage: \$100,000 per occurrence
Professional Liability (errors and omissions)	\$1,000,000 per claim

CONSULTANT shall submit a certificate evidencing such coverage in a form satisfactory to the City Attorney of CITY, prior to undertaking any work hereunder. CONSULTANT shall also provide a separate endorsement form or section of the policy showing CITY, its officers, agents and employees as additional named insureds for each type of coverage, except for Workers' Compensation and Professional Liability. Such insurance shall specifically cover the contractual liability of CONSULTANT. The coverage shall be primary as to such additional insureds and no coverage of the CITY shall be called upon to contribute to a loss. In addition, the insurance policy may not contain language which prohibits additional insureds or other insurers from satisfying the self-insured retention or deductible. CONSULTANT shall provide thirty (30) days written notice to CITY prior to cancellation or modification of any insurance required by this Agreement. CONSULTANT shall furnish a certificate for the period covered by this Agreement. Any insurance written on a claims made basis is subject to the prior approval of the City Attorney. Insurance coverage in the minimum amounts set forth herein shall not be

construed to relieve CONSULTANT of liability in excess of such coverage, nor shall it preclude CITY from taking such other actions as are available to it under any other provisions of this Agreement or law. Any deductibles or self-insured retentions must be declared on the certificate of insurance and approved by CITY in writing.

Insurance coverage in the minimum amounts set forth herein shall not be construed to relieve LESSEE of liability in excess of such coverage, nor shall it preclude CITY from taking such other actions as are available to it under any other provision of this Agreement or law.

8. Modifications. LESSEE shall not alter or modify the interior or exterior of the Property without CITY's prior written consent, which consent shall not be unreasonably withheld. Requests from LESSEE to make alterations or modifications shall be in writing.

9. Inspections. CITY shall have the right to inspect the premises at any reasonable time.

10. Access to Other Areas. Access to any additional Cirby Elementary School campus facilities, including but not limited to, restrooms, classrooms, multi-purpose rooms, parking lots, fields, blacktops, play grounds, and play structures, must be granted by the CITY or the Roseville City School District as appropriate.

11. Waiver of Relocation Benefits and Assistance. LESSEE hereby agrees and acknowledges that LESSEE has not been displaced by CITY and thus is not entitled to any relocation benefits or assistance under the California Relocation Assistance Law or any other law, regulation or policy. LESSEE agrees and covenants to waive any claim or potential claim for relocation assistance and benefits associated with this Lease.

12. Possessory Interest. LESSEE hereby agrees and acknowledges that its interest created by this Lease may be subject to a possessory interest tax. LESSEE shall be fully

responsible for payment of any such tax. CITY shall have no obligation to pay any portion of such tax.

13. Default. If LESSEE has not complied in good faith with the terms and conditions of this Lease, CITY may declare a default of this Lease. CITY shall give LESSEE a written notice of the default, after which LESSEE shall cure the default within thirty (30) days. If LESSEE fails to cure the default to the satisfaction of the CITY within that period, CITY may terminate the Lease.

14. Termination. Either party may terminate this Agreement at any time upon giving thirty (30) days advance written notice to the other party. Upon termination of this Lease, LESSEE shall remove all of its property and materials from the Property and return it to the condition it was in prior to LESSEE's use of the Property within thirty (30) days of termination.

15. Notice. Any notices required or permitted by this Agreement shall be delivered personally or mailed with U.S. first class postage prepaid, addressed as follows:

CITY OF ROSEVILLE

LESSEE

Rob Nakamura
Recreation Superintendent
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

Placer Community Action Council
Denyse Cardoza, Executive Director
1166 High Street
Auburn, CA 95603

16. Attorney's Fees. In any legal action arising out of this Agreement, the prevailing party shall be entitled to its reasonable attorney's fees.

17. Venue. Any legal action arising out of this Agreement shall be brought in Placer County, California, regardless of where else venue may lie.

18. Integration. This is an integrated Agreement, and contains all of the terms, considerations, understanding and promises of the parties. It shall be read as a whole.

19. No Assignment. LESSEE shall not assign this Agreement or LESSEE's rights and obligations hereunder, in whole or in part.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the City of Roseville, a municipal corporation, has executed this Agreement in duplicate by its City Manager and LESSEE has caused this Agreement to be duly executed.

CITY OF ROSEVILLE, a
municipal corporation

BY: _____
ROB JENSEN
City Manager

ATTEST:

BY: _____
SONIA OROZCO
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

BY: _____
ROBERT R. SCHMITT
City Attorney

APPROVED AS TO SUBSTANCE:

BY:  _____
DION LOUTHAN
Parks, Recreation and Libraries Director

PLACER COMMUNITY ACTION,
COUNCIL, a California nonprofit
corporation

BY:  _____
DENYSE CARDOZA
Executive Director
11-30-2016

and

BY:  _____
NANCY MYERS
Fiscal and Administrative Director

and

BY:  _____
JO-CAROL ARISMAN
Board of Directors Chairperson



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8219

File #: 0704 & 0704-01

Title: Park Naming Policy Revisions and Name Recommendation

Contact: Tara Gee 916-774-5253 tgee@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 6.23.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Recommend Council approve the proposed park naming policy revisions and approve the following name for the W-50A school/park. The Subcommittee recommends this park be named "Sierra Crossing Park", a geographically based name. According to the policy, the Subcommittee reserves the right to name a park geographically. In this case, the selected name reflects one of the subdivisions surrounding the park and highlights the views of the Sierras from this location. Also under consideration for approval are revisions to the park naming policy. Park identification signs for the new park will be included in the construction budget.

BACKGROUND

Name Recommendation

Advertisement for names for the W-50A school/park site occurred in August 2016. W-50A is a 6.5 acre school/park site off of Westbrook Boulevard in West Roseville. The advertisement period extended for the full month of August. The Subcommittee met on October 11, 2016 to review the name submissions along with names on the "active" list from last year.

The Subcommittee recommends this park be named "Sierra Crossing Park", a geographically based name. According to the policy, the Subcommittee reserves the right to name a park geographically. In this case, the selected name reflects one of the subdivisions surrounding the park and emphasizes the views to the Sierras from this location.

The policy allows for a short list of names to be forwarded for recommendation to the City Council. This year, the Subcommittee elected to forward only one name recommendation for the new park.

Consistent with policy, names not selected for recommendation will remain on the "active" list for one year. Names submitted during this latest advertisement period are attached.

Recommended Policy Revisions

Also under consideration for approval are revisions to the park naming policy. Revisions include:

1. General clean up items

2. Add "Volunteer" as part of the criteria for naming a park after an individual (Paragraph B under criteria)
3. Outlining use of "Roseville" in the name for regional or city-wide parks and recreation facilities
4. Avoidance of duplication of names (surnames or family members) to ease confusion for the public
5. Add a percentage of parks of the overall inventory to be geographically named
6. Add number of years a nominee has lived in Roseville on the submission form

Parks & Recreation Commission

The Parks & Recreation Commission reviewed the name selection and proposed policy revisions at the November 7, 2016 meeting. The Commission approved the name proposal and policy revisions and are forwarding this recommendation to Council for approval.

FISCAL IMPACT

Park identification signs for the new park will be included in the construction budget.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Not applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not apply to activities that will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines §15061(b)(3)). The naming of parks and/or park facilities does not include the potential for a significant environmental effect, and therefore is not subject to CEQA.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tara Gee, Park Planning & Development Superintendent

Dion Louthan, Parks, Recreation & Libraries Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution No. 17-26

Name submissions

Resolution No. 17-27

Proposed Policy Revisions

RESOLUTION NO. 17-26

APPROVING NAME RECOMMENDATION OF SIERRA CROSSING PARK

WHEREAS, names were solicited in August 2016 for the naming of W-50A school/park site off of Westbrook Boulevard in West Roseville; and

WHEREAS, the Parks Naming Subcommittee met on October 11, 2016 to review the name submissions along with names on the “active” list from last year; and

WHEREAS, the Parks Naming Subcommittee recommended “Sierra Crossing Park” to the Parks and Recreation Commission, which reviewed it at its November 7, 2016 meeting and approved forwarding its recommendation to City Council:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that the name of the W-50A school/park to Sierra Crossing Park is hereby approved.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:


NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk



W-50A School/Park Site

ROSEVILLE

RECEIVED

2016 AUG 29 AM 11:43

Suggested Name For a Park or Facility Within a Park

CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
ROSEVILLE, CA

Suggested Name ROCCUCCI PARK or R. & P. ROCCUCCI PARK

(Print or type the suggested name exactly how you would like it to read)

Park Preference: ☒ Any park site ☐ _____ (Specify park)

Reason for Suggestion (Must be completed for further consideration):

MY NAME IS PAUL ROCCUCCI AND I AM A RESIDENT OF ROSEVILLE. RICHARD AND PAULINE ROCCUCCI ARE MY PARENTS, THEY ARE ALSO LOVING GRANDPARENTS TO MY TWO CHILDREN AS WELL AS MY MANY NIECES AND NEPHEWS. FOR OVER 40 YEARS, RICHARD AND PAULINE HAVE BEEN SERVING THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AS WELL AS THE COUNTY OF PLACER. THEY DO THIS OUT OF GENUINE LOVE FOR THE COMMUNITY. RICHARD AND PAULINE DON'T SEEK OUT NOTORIETY OR WEALTH, THEY SERVE THIS CITY BECAUSE THEY BOTH WANT TO SEE ROSEVILLE THRIVE. THEY WANT TO SEE THE CITY THEY HAVE SPENT THEIR LIVES IN CONTINUE TO POSITIVELY GROW AND GET STRONGER. RICHARD AND PAULINE HAVE NEVER ASKED FOR ANYTHING FOR THEIR SERVICE, BUT TODAY I AM REQUESTING THEIR NAMES BE CONSIDERED FOR THE NEXT PARK.

PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENTS

Attach a second sheet if necessary.

☒ Attachment included

Name PAUL ROCCUCCI
(of individual submitting request)

Address 921 HERBERT ST. ROSEVILLE, CA 95678

Phone Number (916) 899-7987

Please submit this form to the City Clerk's office for name consideration. All names must be in accordance with the established City criteria. Submit one name per form.

FOR CITY USE ONLY:

For FY _____ Has this name been submitted before? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, when? _____

Subcommittee Review Comments:

RICHARD ROCCUCCI BIOGRAPHY

August 1, 2016

Richard is a lifelong resident of Roseville, attended local schools, graduated from Roseville High School, Sierra College and University of California, Berkeley, (B.S. and MS in Electrical Engineering). He is a Registered Electrical Engineer in the State of California.

Richard has worked as an Electrical Engineer for over 50 years and currently is Vice President of CES Engineering Inc. He previously worked for Pacific Bell for over 25 years.

Richard's political activities include the City of Roseville Planning Commissioner for 5 years, City Councilmember for 17 years, 2 years as Mayor, 3 years on the Roseville Utility Commission and 8 years as a Trustee of the Roseville Elementary School District. During this time he served on many advisory boards and commissions including the Northern California Power Agency and Central Roseville Revitalization Committee. Richard has been involved with many of the Roseville Specific Planning Documents.

Richard was last on the Roseville Council in 2008 and was appointed to the Placer County Planning Commission by Placer County Supervisor Jack Duran in 2011 where he is the current chairman. He was also chairman of the Route 102 Committee which is now called Placer Parkway.

Richard has served on the Board of the Saint Vincent de Paul Society for over 15 years and is past president of the Roseville Little League. Richard has been married to Pauline for 47 years, have 4 grown children and 6 grandchildren. His hobbies include camping, reading and hiking and of course spending time with the grandchildren.

RICHARD ROCCUCCI, PE

Biography (2016)

General:

- Born July 30, 1942 73 years old
- Lifelong resident of Roseville
- Married 47 years to Pauline Roccucci, RN
- Four children and six grandchildren (Firefighter/Captain, Probation Officer, Paralegal, Elementary School Teacher Certification, Elementary School Employee)

Education:

- Attended local schools
- Graduate of Roseville High School
- Graduate of Sierra College, Rocklin
- University of California, Berkeley BS and MS in Electrical Engineering
- Registered Electrical Engineer, State of California E7239
- Numerous specialized courses in city government, public schools, utility planning, computer courses and building construction

Employment:

- Electronics Engineer for the United States Air Force – 5 years
- Senior Engineer, Project Manager, Engineering Manager for Pacific Bell – 25 years
- Electrical Consulting Engineer – AC Systems Engineering – 2 years
- Consulting Power Engineer – Nextel Communications – 1 year
- Consulting Power Engineer -Telecom Plus – 1 year
- Consulting Power Engineer SBC – 2 years
- Consulting Engineer – CES Engineering Inc. – 12 years (**present partial time employment**)

Hobbies:

- Hiking
- Gardening
- Walking

RICHARD ROCCUCCI

Biography (2016 continued)

Roseville Service:

- **Placer County Planning Commission, 2011 to Present, Currently Chairman**
- Roseville City Council Member – 2000 to 2008
- Roseville Planning Commission – 1972-1977
- Roseville Project Review Commission – 1974-1977
- Roseville City Council Member – 1977-1985
- Roseville Mayor – 1982-1984
- Roseville Utility Commission Member – 1986-1989
- Roseville City School District Trustee – 1990-1998
- Board Member, Saint Vincent DePaul Society (**current**)
- Cooking Crew, Tommy Apostolos Benefit Dinner
- Past President, Roseville Little League

Regional Committees while on last council position (member or commissioner):

- Member of Northern California Power Agency (NCPA)
- Economic Development Committee (EDAC)
- Placer Flood Control and Conservation District
- South Placer Waste Water Authority (SPWWA)
- Central Roseville Revitalization Committee (CRRC)
- Historic District Revitalization Committee
- Various committees associated with the elected positions

Prior to 2000 Regional Committees (member or commissioner):

- Highway 65 Bypass Committee
- Route 102 Committee – Chairman (now Placer Parkway)
- Member of Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG)
- Member of Placer County Local Area Formation Commission (LAFCO)
- Member of Northern California Power Agency (NCPA)
- Various committees associated with the elected positions

PAULINE ROCCUCCI BIOGRAPHY

August 01, 2016

Pauline is a lifelong resident of Roseville, attended local schools, graduated from Roseville High School, Sacramento City College and California State University, Sacramento (B.S. in Nursing). She received the "Distinguished Service award" from CSUS Alumni association in 1995.

Pauline has been a Registered Nurse for 45 years and current nurse at Mercy San Juan Medical Center. Previously she was employed at Roseville Community Hospital, now Sutter Roseville.

Pauline's political activities include the City of Roseville Planning Commissioner for 3 years, City Councilwoman for 17 years, 4 years as Mayor and 8 years as a Director of the Placer County Water Agency. During this time she served on many advisory boards and commissions including the Northern California Power Agency, the Regional water Authority, and Board Member of the American Public Power Association. Locally she was involved with the development of the Roseville Auto Mall, the Galleria and numerous other projects beneficial to the Roseville Economy.

Pauline was re-elected to the Roseville City Council in November 2008 with the highest votes and was sworn in as mayor on December 2, 2010. She was again re-elected to the council in 2012.

She is a member of the Flying Samaritan Medical Health Team, Roseville Soroptimist and member of the South Placer Woman's Leadership Coalition.

Pauline is the current chairperson of EXCEL Roseville which provides services to underserved children. Pauline has been married to Richard for 47 years, have 4 grown children and 7 grandchildren. Her hobbies include camping, reading and hiking and of course spending time with the grandchildren.

BIOGRAPHY (Pauline Roccucci 08-01-16)

EDUCATION

California State University Sacramento – 1974 BS in Nursing with a Certificate in Public Health Nursing
Sacramento City College – Graduated 1968
Registered Nurse – 1968

March 28, 1995 - Received “Distinguished Service Award” from CSUS Alumni Association
2006 – Received “Water Statesperson of the Year Award” from the Regional Water Authority

WORK HISTORY/COMMUNITY SERVICE

2008 to present – Roseville City Council

2010 to 2012 - **Mayor** of City of Roseville

Dec 1998 to 2006 -Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) Director District 1 (**Chairperson**)

1989 to 1998 - Served two terms on Roseville City Council

1989 to 1991- **Mayor** of City of Roseville

1986 to 1989 - Roseville Planning Commissioner, City of Roseville, Chairperson 1989

1974 to Present - Registered Nurse at Mercy Health Care West, Mercy San Juan Medical Center and
Mercy Folsom Hospital

1968 to 1973 - Registered Nurse at Roseville Community Hospital

CURRENT COMMITTEES

Primary

Placer County Flood Control & Water Conservation
Board of Directors
Regional Water Authority Board of Directors
Risk Oversight Committee
Union Pacific/City of Roseville Committee
Downtown Business Attraction Team Steering Committee
PCWA/Roseville joint water meeting
South Placer Waste Water Authority JPA

Alternate

“Bizz Johnson” Highway Interchange Joint Powers Authority (JPA)
Placer County Economic Development Board
Northern California Power Agency (NCPA)
Economic Development Advisory Committee (EDAC)
Roseville Revitalization Committee
Naming of Fire Department Facilities Committee

Other

City-County Committee For Regional Development Issues
Regional Cooperative Fire Protection
School District-City of Roseville Issues Committee
Parks & Recreation Ad Hoc Committee for Naming of Facilities within City Parks
City Selection Committee
Mayor/Supervisors Quarterly Meeting
Business Advisory Council
Sacto Pacific Rim Committee
Annexation Negotiations with Placer County
Placer County Local Community Benefit Committee (LCBC)
City/County Master Tax Share & Annexation Ad Hoc Committee
Association of Bay Area Governments Finance for Non-profit Corporation

PAST COMMITTEES

1998 to 2006 - Northern California Power Agency (NCPA) Commissioner representing
PCWA / Legislation and Regulation Committee

2000 to 2006 - PCWA and Placer County Water and Energy Committee Chairperson

2004 to 2006 – Placer Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) Representative to Special Districts

2000 to 2006 - Regional Water Authority Representative, Executive Committee Member,
Elected Chairperson of Authority in 2005

2007 to 2008 - Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) Member representing the Public
(alternate)

2004 - **American Public Power Association**, Policy Maker Committee Member

2000 to 2002 - Nevada Irrigation District/PCWA Ad Hoc Committee Chairperson

1999 to 2000 - Regional Council of Rural Counties, Water/Hydro Committee

1998 to 2000 - PCWA Budget Committee

1995 - Roseville Regional Mall Committee

1993 - Legislation & Regulatory Committee for NCPA and APPA

1991 to Dec 1998 - American Public Power Association (APPA) Board of Directors for
South West United States. Re-elected to the Board of Directors, June 1995

1990 to Dec 1998 - Northern California Power Agency (NCPA) Commissioner representing the
City of Roseville

- **Elected Chairperson of NCPA in September 1995**
- Northern California Power Agency (NCPA) –
- Commissioner and NCPA Vice-Chair (1992 – 1995)
- Placer County Economic Development Board – past chairperson
- **BECOME** (Business, Educators, and Community Organized to Maximize Education) Promote a closer relationship of city Government with local schools. Presentations on Council/City Manager from of government to high School senior government classes

1995 to May 1996 - Member of the Healthy City Coalition

1992 - Placer County Community Service Commissioner

- Placer County Calif. Army National Guard Commissioner, Unit 115
- One of two City Council representatives to obtain status of Corp of Engineers' progress on Dry Creek Flood Control Planning and interview consultant for flood control project
- Member of Roseville Growth Task Force
- Roseville High School Site Council-Parent input on school policy

1991 to 1994 - Placer County Transportation Commission

1991- Business meetings in Washington, D.C. with Congressional and Senate staff

- regarding federal legislation on water wheeling through Folsom Lake (also in 1995)
- Interviewed representatives for local manufacturing companies for input on business retention and expansion for Placer County Economic Development Department
- Regional Issues Committee, Chairperson
- South Placer/North Sacramento—Support of light rail committee

1990 to 1991 - Fourth of July Celebration Committee Member

- Co-Chairperson and active participant for Celebrity Chefs fund raiser for the Chaplaincy program at Roseville Community Hospital and Roseville Police Department
- Current committee member and active participant of Start-A-Heart Community CPR Program sponsored by Roseville Community Hospital

1990 - Representative on Roseville High School District's 5 year strategic plan

1988 to 1989 - Roseville Civic Center and Redevelopment Committees

VOLUNTEER WORK

1988 to present - Flying Samaritan Medical Health Team providing health care to farm workers in Mexico

1990 to present - Roseville Soroptimist Member

1988 to 1995 - Mercy Medical Clinic – Loaves and Fishes

2013 to present – EXCEL Roseville, current president, providing services to under served children

PERSONAL

Member 2007 to present – South Placer Women's Leadership Coalition

Lifelong Resident of Roseville

Married 47 years with 4 Children and six grandchildren.

Husband Richard was former Mayor of Roseville and present Placer County Planning Commissioner.



RECEIVED

2016 SEP 21 AM 9:38

Suggested Name For a Park or Facility Within a Park CLERK DEPARTMENT
ROSEVILLE, CA

Suggested Name SHARON TELLES PARK

(Print or type the suggested name exactly how you would like it to read)

Park Preference: ☐ Any park site ☒ FIDDYMENT FARM OR WESTPARK
(Specify park)

Reason for Suggestion *(Must be completed for further consideration):*

In addition to the attached pages reciting some of Sharon Telles' admirable contributions to the City of Roseville and the Roseville Coalition of neighborhood Associations (RCOA), Sharon was also a key member in helping to start the WestPark-Fiddymment Farm Neighborhood Association (WFFNA), which has now grown to represent over 5,000 homes. Both the WestPark and Fiddymment Farm Neighborhood Associations would be proud to have one of our parks named in Sharon Telles' honor.

Attach a second sheet if necessary.

☒ Attachment included

Name WESTPARK NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION & FIDDYMENT FARM
NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION by FFNA secretary Sue Hallahan-Cook

(of individual submitting request)

Address FFNA Secretary: 2697 Pipestone Loop, Roseville, CA 95747

Phone Number (916) 781-8305

Please submit this form to the City Clerk's office for name consideration. All names must be in accordance with the established City criteria. Submit one name per form.

FOR CITY USE ONLY:

For FY _____ Has this name been submitted before? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, when? _____

Subcommittee Review Comments:



NOMINATION FOR CONSIDERATION

SHARON TELLES

The Fiddymment Farm Neighborhood Association (FFNA), and the WestPark Neighborhood Association (WPNA), members of the Roseville Coalition of Neighborhood Associations (RCONA), are honored to nominate Sharon Telles as a significant Roseville Community leader, and place her name for consideration in the *Name for a Park* program. Sharon was a significant factor in the activation of WFFNA in 2008, and it would be very fitting if one of our great parks could be named in her honor. Sharon has enthusiastically devoted her professional career and good will toward the betterment of her fellow man and the Roseville and Placer County community.

Sharon originally settled in Rocklin, in the Placer County region, in 1974, moving to Roseville in 1999. She earned her realty license in 1986 and has established a distinguished professional career earning many local, state and national awards, including Realtor of the Year several times. She has held membership on many realty related boards, including Director of the National Association of Realtors in 2008 and 2009, and Vice President of the Placer County Area, Northern California Chapter, CRS.

Sharon has had a lengthy term of community involvement in the City of Roseville:

- Highland Reserve Neighborhood Association, a member of RCONA, since 2003 to the present, holding positions as Secretary, Vice President, President, and RCONA Representative (6 years).
- Roseville Coalition of Neighborhood Associations since 2004—Secretary, Treasurer, and President. During her term as RCONA President in 2008, she helped establish the activation of the newly developed WestPark-Fiddymment Farm Neighborhood Association, representing an area that is now destined to grow to over 10,000 homes.
- City of Roseville Board of Appeals—2012 to the present, including Chair of the Board.
- Roseville Chamber of Commerce—Government Affairs Committee, Membership Values/Marketing Committee, Leadership Roseville Graduate 2013/2014.
- Key Contact for Assemblyman Roger Niello—PCAR.
- Toastmasters—Competent Toastmaster, and President in 2000.
- City of Rocklin Proclamation declaring Sharon Telles Day in Rocklin—2006.
- City of Roseville volunteer Recognition for 5 years and 10 years.



The Fiddymment Farm Neighborhood Association and WestPark Neighborhood Association, active members of RCONA, recognize Sharon Telles as a person having contributed substantially to the Roseville community through her work and volunteer activities in the community and has helped numerous families in settling into Roseville through her realty profession. Her personal philosophy is, "No one cares how much you know, until they know how much you care." It seems entirely fitting that a park within the Fiddymment Farm or WestPark Neighborhood Association boundaries she helped establish should be honored with her name.

This nomination was supported and approved by board members of both the Fiddymment Farm Neighborhood Association and WestPark Neighborhood Association of 2016.

Fiddymment Farm Neighborhood Association:

Loren Cook, President

Joe Van Zant, Vice President

Sue Hallahan-Cook, Secretary

Chris Erickson, Treasurer

Robert Gorman, Member-at-Large

Sue Van Zant, Member-at-Large

Pete Constant, Member-at-Large

WestPark Neighborhood Association:

Scott Alvord, President

Dan Gergis, Vice President

Curtis Hunter, Secretary

Pratap Tarvadi, Treasurer

Connie Logg, Member-at-Large



RECEIVED

2016 SEP 21 PM 4:49

CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
ROSEVILLE, CA

Suggested Name For a Park or Facility Within a Park

Suggested Name Stu Herreid Park

(*Print or type the suggested name **exactly** how you would like it to read*)

Park Preference: ☐ Any park site ☒ neighborhood park (parcel W-50A) near elementary school (Specify park)

Reason for Suggestion (*Must be completed for further consideration*):

Stu Herreid passed away this September. He was co-owner of The Strum Shop, a thriving local business which promotes and supports the arts in our community. He is known for creating the Ukes for Schools program during the recession which brought and still continues to bring music into our schools in Roseville and neighboring communities. He was also a community music teacher for many students, old and young in Roseville, hosting clinics, workshops and concerts. He brought weekly open-mic to Ginger's Restaurant so that new musicians of all ages could show up, sign a sheet on site, and play for a crowd of patrons to obtain experience. Stu was a family man with two daughters, a beautiful wife, all devoted to music and carrying on their dad's legacy of a love for giving back. Twice a month Sing-a-longs, classes and workshops at the Strum Shop that were packed with upwards of 50 people, all toting their ukulele's and singing songs from the 1950-60's. It was and still is quite the following of devotees, over 700 community members. He also coordinated the River City Ukes which play at area nursing homes and community gatherings. As a patron of their store, and distant friend of Stu's I felt the need to suggest his name because of his commitment and contribution to the arts and culture of Roseville. What he did for children makes his nomination for the site near a school even more spectacular. He really cared about children and felt that their development and progress in musical ability could lead to not only love of music but lifelong skills for success in other areas of their lives. Had Stu not fallen ill, he would have had at least 20 more years of contributing to music in our community as The Strum Shop just moved to its spectacular location on Vernon Street. We have his family and co-owner/partner to continue his legacy of giving to our City. Attachments included from websites and a magazine on his recent life to give the subcommittee more information.

Attach a second sheet if necessary.

☒ Attachment included

Name Holly Cuthbertson

(*of individual submitting request*)

Address 1714 Quail Circle, Roseville, CA 95661

Phone Number 916-412-7340

Please submit this form to the City Clerk's office for name consideration. All names must be in accordance with the established City criteria. Submit one name per form.

FOR CITY USE ONLY:

For FY _____ Has this name been submitted before? ☐ Yes ☒ No
If yes, when? _____

Subcommittee Review Comments:



The Strum Shop in Roseville, California Stakes its Claim as California's Ukulele Motherlode

SEPTEMBER 12, 2016

From the Winter 2014 issue of *Ukulele* | BY GREG OLWELL | PHOTOS BY BILL MAHON

[Editor's note: Stu Herreid, co-founder of The Strum Shop, died September 9, 2016.]

A strip mall about 20 miles northeast of Sacramento, California, may seem like the unlikely epicenter of the Golden State's ukulele scene, but thanks to owners Stu Herreid and Dan Elliot, the Strum Shop in Roseville has become just that.

[Editor's note: The Strum Shop moved to a new location in Roseville in July 2016, see the visit link.]

The animated and amiable Herreid barely takes a moment to inhale as he recounts how he and Elliott built up their shop. Sitting inside the store's compact office—which is lined with more cigar-box, vintage, and banjo-ukuleles than anyone could call reasonable—he tells how they amassed a huge selection of ukuleles and started a burgeoning uke club, as well as a nonprofit wing that works to get kids playing

the instrument in schools. The Strum Shop has also become an essential performance stop for touring ukulele players like **Herb Ohta Jr, Kimo Hussey, Sarah Maisel, and Craig Chee**.


“The premise of the store is community involvement first,” says Herreid, who, when not plucking away on his favorite banjo-uke, can be found teaching, running a workshop or club meeting, or booking acts for the store’s stage. The man’s life revolves around strumming four strings and serving a dedicated and expansive population hungry for music-making merriment. That wholesale uke identification all started thanks to the popularity of a local ukulele club.

While working as a banjo and mandolin teacher at another store—where Elliott worked on the retail side—Herreid noticed that the shop was selling several ukuleles a day, but had no one teaching the increasingly popular instrument. He quickly assigned himself the role and dove into learning the uke, a decision that would soon change the course of his life. His own interest in the ukulele was growing, as was the number of students signing up for lessons, and Herreid soon realized it was time to seek out other ways to meet the demand. “We started a once-a-month ukulele club,” he says.

“It began with six people, then it went to 13, 20, 40, and 60—pretty soon I had 80 people meeting once a month.”

Despite the community’s growing interest and sales, however, the store’s owner wasn’t turning his attention to the ukulele’s allure, so Herreid and Elliott hatched a plan to open their own uke-focused venture. Within months, they had a business plan and were looking for a space to house a diverse assortment of ukuleles and uke-centric products, which could serve as a meeting space for the Uke University and River City Uke clubs, and provide rooms for lessons, as well as a small performance stage.

While there’s some space at the Strum Shop for other stringed instruments—including guitars, mandolins and banjos—the ukulele reigns supreme. From the front of the 1,900-square-foot store to the back, the walls are lined with ukuleles of all shapes and sizes, from fanciful sub-\$100 Kala Makala Ukadelics to dozens of midrange ukes to custom hand-built ukuleles from California luthiers, like Mike Pereira and Dave Iriguchi. Plus there’s several Tahitian ukuleles, the fun and loud cousin of the ukulele that’s heard on the theme song of the cult television show *Arrested Development*. Many of the items on display on the shop’s floor are on wheels so that they can be rolled out of the way for the store’s frequent club meetings and concerts.



Central to the store's business philosophy is what Herreid calls the ukulele's "aloha spirit," which promotes unity and sharing among the uke community. The inclusive vibe really comes to light at the club meetings, where players help each other as often as the leader does.

"We're going to do one thing at the club—play ukulele and unite our spirits," Herreid says. "If you're having trouble at the ukulele club, the people on both sides of you will be like, 'Here, let me show you how to do it.' I love the spirit of it."

The engagement and involvement that runs deep in the store's bones also extends into the local community, thanks to an initiative that grew out of one of the store's affiliated clubs, the River City Ukulele Orchestra. One of the group's activities is to raise money for the nonprofit Ukes for Schools, a program that works with teachers, parents, and students to get ukuleles into the schools and to help sustain music programs that have withered in the face of recession-era budget cuts.

Ukes for Schools is more than just an effort to nurture new musicians, it's become a way for some teachers—using the club as bait—to motivate their students to improve academically. "A teacher told the kids that if they wanted to be in the ukulele club the next year, each of them would have to raise their reading level by one full grade over the summer," says a visibly proud Herreid. Of the kids in the club, "out of 32, 31 of them raised their reading level one grade. She told them 'Playing ukulele is a privilege, you've got to work for this.'"

Demanding a commitment to the program is central to the success of Ukes for Schools. For each school, it either helps to raise money to purchase ukuleles, or it loans them out if the school has a supportive principal and a teacher with a passion for the instrument. "We don't give them ukuleles, we loan them ukuleles," says Herreid. "As long as they have an active program, we never want to see those ukuleles again. If the program stops, we want those ukuleles back so that we can loan them to somebody else."

Herreid is also quick to point out that their program got a big leg up thanks to the generosity of Kala Brand Music, the company's founder, Mike Upton, and its director of sales and marketing, Rick Carlson, who have donated hundreds of ukuleles to the program: "They gave us 50 ukes to get started. Then Rick called one day and said, 'Could you use a pallet of ukes?' I didn't know what a pallet was, but I said sure."

When the shipment arrived, it turned out to contain almost 250 ukes—some "maybe weren't pristine for retail purposes, but were still perfectly fine for institutional purposes, like schools. That really got the program off the ground," says Herreid.

Elliott, a 40-something, music-industry veteran, who keeps his eyes on the retail side of the shop, doesn't see the "third wave" of ukulele popularity slowing down, especially given the number of people who have gotten hooked on playing in recent years.

"People keep thinking that the ukulele thing is just a passing fad, but it keeps getting bigger every year," Elliot says, standing in front of a wall display containing every imaginable brand of ukulele strings. "It's a very collectible instrument, and very few of our ukulele club members have just one instrument—most have two, three, four, or more. You have to get one with a low-G, a high-G, a soprano, a banjo-uke.

"I'm scrambling to keep instruments on the wall."

Visit

thestrumshop.com

Ukes for Schools program

Source: <http://thestrumshop.com/non-profits>



Ukes for Schools is The Strum Shop's non-profit organization dedicated to bringing the joy of music to elementary and middle school aged children, in our local area, at NO COST to the kids involved. Read more about UFS below...

Other Non-Profits We're Involved With:

- We support the Survivor Girl Ukulele Band Project: Bringing restoration and hope to survivors of human trafficking through the healing power of music and love.
- We also serve as a donation drop off and repair center for Guitars for Vets, Sacramento: a program offering free guitar lessons and supplies to veterans all over our country.

About Ukes for Schools

Ukes for Schools Inc. is dedicated to bringing the joy of music to elementary and middle school-aged children at NO COST to the kids or schools involved. We do this by introducing students to the happiest instrument in the world – The Ukulele!

Through a partnership with The Strum Shop, Ukes for Schools is able to provide quality, entry-level ukuleles and teacher training to schools & organizations throughout Placer and Sacramento counties as well as other areas within Northern California. Ukes for Schools has received donations which have allowed us to loan hundreds of ukuleles to students.

Many of our fundraising contributions are made by The River City Ukulele Orchestra, Kala Music, and donors who believe that music can and does help a child grow up to be a much happier and more productive person in life. Exposure to music can be a life-long journey. Ukes for Schools wants to create a happy ukulele world with happy ukulele people.

What We Do...

- Supply Ukuleles to The Schools
- Support a Teacher or a Member of The School's Community through Training and Workshops
- Create Opportunities for Performances and Rehearsals

We have already provided hundreds of ukuleles throughout the area! This is all made possible through the fundraising efforts of the River City Ukulele Orchestra and all the wonderful donors who believe that music can and does help a child grow up to be a much happier and more productive person in life. We want to help the kids of today to better themselves through music for tomorrow.

The benefits of music are enormous!

Kids who learn to play an instrument enjoy advantages for the rest of their lives, both academic and personal.

Music provides an outlet for self-expression and focuses on “doing” rather than observing. Young musicians learn to conquer fear and take risks. Early music training helps develop brain areas that involve language and reasoning. These are all essential “human skills” that shape lives forever and help to produce productive and positive youth and adults.

Why Ukulele?

The ukulele is a not a complicated instrument to play. It is very portable and easy to learn. You can play your own music or accompany other musicians with just a little patience and practice.

For kids, music provides an outlet for self-expression and focuses on “doing” rather than observing. Young musicians learn to conquer fear and take risks. Early music training helps develop brain areas that involve language and reasoning. These are all essential “human skills” that shape lives forever and help to produce productive and positive youth and adults.

The ukulele is the happiest instrument in the world! By playing the uke, you are creating joy. The act of making music can heal physical, emotional and psychological wounds. It builds connections in the brain and helps prevent memory loss. It is our personal opinion that the ukulele can melt all kinds of barriers.

Where there is a ukulele, there is always hope.

Why Donate?

Ukes for Schools, Inc. is a local “grass-roots” organization. The money we raise is for the promotion and purchase of musical instruments and education in our community. Our operating costs are low and only supported by donations and contributions from our local music community, local business, organizations, corporations and you! Your tax-deductible donation helps to create a positive educational experience and promote dynamic growth of our young people and their future contributions to society



Suggested Name For a Park or Facility Within a Park

Suggested Name

Judge Alan V. Pineschi
(Print or type the suggested name exactly how you would like it to read)

Park Preference:

☐

Any park site

☒

N50A

(Specify park)

Reason for Suggestion (Must be completed for further consideration):

See Attachment

RECEIVED
2016 SEP 22 PM 4:34
CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
ROSEVILLE, CA

Attach a second sheet if necessary.



Attachment included

Name

Susan Goto
(of individual submitting request)

Address

230 Diamond Oaks Road Roseville

Phone Number

916 783-4053

95678

Please submit this form to the City Clerk's office for name consideration. All names must be in accordance with the established City criteria. Submit one name per form.

FOR CITY USE ONLY:

For FY _____

Has this name been submitted before? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, when? _____

Subcommittee Review Comments:

Suggested Name: JUDGE ALAN V. PINESCHI PARK

Site: W50A

Reason for Suggestion: It is with great deal of honor and pride to submit the name JUDGE ALAN V. PINESCHI for the City of Roseville Park site W50A. He is a native of Roseville and attended local elementary schools and graduated from Roseville High School and Sierra College. Alan attended U.C. Davis with a B.A. in Political Science; and graduated from Pepperdine University, School of Law, with a Juris Doctorate degree, Malibu, California; California Judges College, Berkeley, California; and Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) taking numerous courses from 1986 to present.

Alan is married to Susan (June 1975) and they are blessed with three children: Matthew, Michael, and Alina.

His professional experiences are as follows:

1998 to Present: Superior Court Judge, County of Placer, State of California

2002 to 2004: Presiding Judge of the Superior Court

2009 to present: Presiding Judge of the Superior Court

1993 to 1994: Member of the Civil/Small Claims Advisory Committee to the California
Judicial Council

1990 to 1998: Municipal Court Judge

1986 to 1990: Justice Court Judge, Tahoe Judicial District, County of Placer

1983 to 1986: Law Offices of Alan V. Pineschi, Roseville, California

1985 to 1986: Mayor of City of Roseville

1977 to 1983: Private Law Practice, Law Offices of Garbolino & Pineschi, Roseville, California

1983 to 1985: Contact Public Defender for the Roseville Municipal Court

Alan's Professional Organizations are:

California Judges Association

California Judges, Marshals and Constables Association

Former Member of the State Bar of California

Former President and Member of the Placer County Bar Association

Community Organizations are:

Member for 39 years and Past President of the Order of the Sons of Italy in America, Roseville
Lodge 1413

Former Member of the Board of Directors of "ARC" Advocacy, Resources and Choices (Non Profit
Organization serving Developmentally Disabled Adults of Placer County

Former Member of the Tahoe Historical Society

Volunteer for the Tommy Apostolos Fund Charity for over 20 years (Non profit organization that
provides clothing for needy children in south Placer County.)

Your consideration to select the name JUDGE ALAN V. PINESCHI PARK would truly be honorable as his
vitae is most impressive. He is truly deserving of this honor as he is not only highly respectable but
also an outstanding native citizen of Roseville.

P. S. Our city is to be commended for the unique process of selecting names from the pool of
suggested nominations. Our community leaders enhance the lives of our people.

We are motivated to "take a walk in the park" with the abundance of beautiful parks
throughout our city. Thank you.

Active List

(July-August 2015)

Mary Joseph

Rotary Field at Cresthaven

Pioneer Park

Antonio Bermudez Jr

Curtis Banner

Lisa Eck

Hollywood

Steve Markas

Nela Luken

James Denio

Joseph Sorensen

Kenneth Lonnergan

(Note that Jim Gray was submitted in 8/4/14 and was inadvertently included in the email noted as "active")



Suggested Name for a Park or Facility within a Park

Suggested Name

Mary Joseph Park
(Print or type the suggested name exactly how you would like it to read)

Park Preference:

☒ Any park site

☐

Reason for Suggestion (Must be completed for further consideration):

Mary was a very prominent member of the community in the 1960's and 1970's when few local parks were named for prominent women.

Mary passed away in 2006. The attached obituary only lists a few of the many community projects she was a part of as a lifetime Roseville resident.

By honoring someone who is no longer with us, we can pay tribute to their entire life's body of work and high ethical standards.

Attach a second sheet if necessary.

☐ Attachment included

Name

Susan Dutowsky
(Of individual submitting request)

Address

2016 Petruccio Way, Roseville, CA 95661

Phone Number

916.792.8866

Please submit this form to the City Clerk's office for name consideration. All names must be in accordance with the established City criteria. Submit one name per form.

FOR CITY USE ONLY:

For FY _____

Has this name been submitted before?

☐ Yes

☒ No

If yes, when? _____

Subcommittee Review Comments:

RECEIVED
2015 AUG -3 PM 2:42
CITY CLERK'S DEPARTMENT
ROSEVILLE, CA

Auburn Journal

Obituaries Funeral Homes Photos & Memorials Send Flowers Grief & Support Start your Family Tree Search

Mary Joseph

Login with Facebook



Mary Joseph
February 7, 2006

1 entry

Mary Joseph passed away February 7, 2006 in Roseville.

She was lifetime member of the Soroptomist Federation of the America's since 1958 and Soroptomist Int'l. of Roseville. Melba Erven, long time friend

The Guest Book is expired.

Restore the Guest Book

and fellow Soroptomist remembers Mary being Vice President from 1959-1960 and President 1960-1961.

Mary was a member of the California Federation of Women's Clubs. She served on the committee as the district and national delegate and served as the committee member of District and Federation. She was their delegate for many years, attending international conventions throughout Europe including France, England, Italy, Greece, Canada, Australia and Nationally in New Jersey, Hawaii, Alaska, Tennessee and Colorado.

Mary was also an honorary member of the Elks Club under her late husband Monty Joseph and was a charter member of the Sierra View Country Club. She was past president of the Women's Improvement Club, president of the American Cancer Society, was on the board of directors for "PRIDE" - Placer Rehabilitation Industries Dept. of Education.

Mary was very supportive of local youth programs, Boy Scouts, Camp Fire Girls, Pop Warner Football, Little League Baseball Team and PTA president. She was a founding member of several children's programs, ie domestic violence, child abuse, etc.

She was a lifetime member of Eastern Star and was Ester in 1972 and was elected to be Worthy Matron in 1976-77.

Mary is survived by her loving family: daughter Mary (Curtis) Joseph Debord of Sparks, NV; sons Daniel N. (Elena) Joseph of Reno, NV, Michael C. (Ruth) Joseph of Roseville and Robert R. (Jeanann) Kolak of Dutch Flat, CA. She also leaves behind a brother Joseph Rukovania; and grandchildren Billy J. Wellesley and Robert W. Wellesley, both of Sparks, NV, Amy Marie Joseph Kirby of Tucson, AZ, Daniel I. Joseph, Isaac M. Joseph and Evelyn A. Joseph all of Roseville, CA, and Cindy Kolak of Ontario, Canada; and great-grandchildren Alexander Z. Wellesley, Ethan M. Joseph, Abigail S. Joseph, Hailey A. Joseph, Alyssa R. Wellesley and Robert Z. Wellesley.

In lieu of flowers the family suggests donations be made in Mary's name to the charity of your choice.

Funeral services were held Tuesday, February 14, 2006 at Reichert's Funeral Chapel and interment was at Calvary Cemetery

Published in Gold Country Media Newspapers on Feb. 18, 2006

Are you a member of the Joseph family?

Find Your Unique Ethnic Origins

Discover your Ethnicity

Connect with new relatives

Buy Now

Gild Hall

New York City

\$181

View Offers

Z New York

New York City

\$136

tripadvisor

What's the #1 hotel in New York City?

FIND OUT



Print | View Guest Book | [View 370 Records for M. Joseph at Ancestry.com](#)



Suggested Name for a Park or Facility within a Park

Suggested Name Rotary Field at Cresthaven Park

(Print or type the suggested name **exactly** how you would like it to read)

Park Preference: ☐ Any park site ☒ Cresthaven Park Softball Field (Specify Park)

Reason for Suggestion (Must be completed for further consideration):

Since 1938 the Rotary Club of Roseville has served the citizens of Roseville with projects and programs that enhance the lives of youth and seniors. In May of 2015 The Rotary Club of Roseville partnered with the City of Roseville and Roseville Girls Softball to improve the dugouts at Cresthaven Park. As seen in the attachments, this field previously had only low, time worn benches for the players and no viewing options for spectators. At the Rotary Club's expense, fully fenced and shaded dugouts were constructed as well as bleachers for viewing by spectators. This field is used by thousands of youth players annually for recreational softball and is the varsity field for the City's partner, Valley Christian Academy. This project dramatically improved the utility and safety of one of the city's oldest fields and brought it up to current standards.

Attach a second sheet if necessary.

☒ Attachment included

Name Scott B Otsuka

(Of individual submitting request)

Address 800 Mitchell Court, Roseville CA 95747

Phone Number (916) 838-1464

Please submit this form to the City Clerk's office for name consideration. All names must be in accordance with the established City criteria. Submit one name per form.


FOR CITY USE ONLY:

For FY _____ Has this name been submitted before? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, when? _____

Subcommittee Review Comments:


RECEIVED
2015 JUL 27 AM 10:25
CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
ROSEVILLE, CA

Before Photos



Notice the splintered wood at the corner of the bench and the low six foot fence protecting the players and spectators from the action on the playing field


After Photos



Roseville Historical Society

557 Lincoln Street, Roseville, Ca 95678

Phone and Fax (916) 773-3003



July 16, 2012

City of Roseville
Parks and Recreation
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, Calif. 95678

Dear Tara:

Enclosed is an application for the naming of a new park in Roseville. I know we have submitted this name in the past, but would like to try again.

We feel this would be the perfect name for the park that is going in on the old Fiddymont Ranch. What a great way to honor our past by placing this name on a park on a pioneer family's land.

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Phoebe Astill".

Phoebe Astill, Curator/Historian
Roseville Historical Society
Carnegie Museum



Suggested Name For a Park or Facility Within a Park

Suggested Name Pioneer Park

(Print or type the suggested name exactly how you would like it to read)

Park Preference: ☒ Any park site ☐

(Specify park)

Reason for Suggestion (Must be completed for further consideration):

Roseville Historical Society would like to see the City of
Roseville honor the pioneer families of Roseville

Letting the descendants of these families could each
donate a tree for a pioneer home with a plaque keeping
the family name, thus having a living legacy for the families

Attach a second sheet if necessary.

☐ Attachment included

Name Roseville Historical Society

(of individual submitting request)

Address 557 Lincoln St Roseville Ca 95678

Phone Number (916) 773-3003

Please submit this form to the City Clerk's office for name consideration. All names must be in accordance with the established City criteria. Submit one name per form.

FOR CITY USE ONLY:

For FY _____

Has this name been submitted before? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, when? _____

Subcommittee Review Comments:

To: Sonia Orozco, City Clerk

From Rene Aguilera
916 846-5326Page 1
of 2 pgs**Suggested Name for a Park or Facility within a Park****Suggested Name** Antonio Bermudez Jr. Park
(Print or type the suggested name exactly how you would like it to read)Park Preference: ☒ Any park site ☒ OR A Softball Field etc. (Specify Park)**Reason for Suggestion** (Must be completed for further consideration):Mr. Antonio Bermudez Jr. attended 1st to the 5th grade at Vernon School. He attended 6th to 8th at Atlantic Street School graduating in 1945. Antonio's parents came to Roseville CA in 1937. Antonio's Dad also named Antonio worked at the Southern Pacific Railroad.Antonio Bermudez Jr. also worked at the Southern Pacific Railroad from 1949 to 1986 for 38 years. Antonio Bermudez Jr. graduated from Roseville High School in 1944. All of Antonio's brothers and sisters (10 in all) graduated from Roseville High School. Four brothers like Antonio served in the Armed Forces. Antonio Jr served in the Navy from October 25, 1950 to being honorably discharged in the Korean War Conflict on August 13, 1954.

Attach a second sheet if necessary.

☒ Attachment included**Name** RENE Aguilera
(Of individual submitting request)**Address** 136 DONNER AVE**Phone Number** 916 846-5326

Please submit this form to the City Clerk's office for name consideration. All names must be in accordance with the established City criteria. Submit one name per form.

FOR CITY USE ONLY:For FY _____ Has this name been submitted before? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, when? _____

Subcommittee Review Comments:



Page 2 of 2
with more
information
on Antonio Jr
Bernandez

Suggested Name for a Park or Facility within a Park

Suggested Name Antonio Bernandez Jr.

(Print or type the suggested name exactly how you would like it to read)

Park Preference: ☒ Any park site

☐

(Specify Park)

Reason for Suggestion (Must be completed for further consideration):

Mr. Antonio Bernandez Jr. was one of the founders of the Roseville Girls "Pony Tail" softball league (1963-1970) which later changed its name to Roseville Girls Bobby Sox League. Mr. Bernandez managed the "pony tail" league for several years and then later managed the Real Bobby Sox League for 3 yrs 1970-1973 for a total of ten years. Mr. Bernandez played softball for two years (1945-1947) on the Mexican-American Athletic Club. Mr. Bernandez at Roseville High School played Baseball, Basketball, Football, Track & Boxing. Mr. Bernandez played in the Roseville City League Fast Pitch Softball (1945-1976). Mr. Bernandez played in the Roseville City League Basketball (1965-1975). Mr. Bernandez played in the Roseville Pacific Fair & Exposition (PFE) Bowling League. As a member of St. Rose Catholic Parish Mr. Bernandez managed the Catholic Girls Softball team in 1968 and the Guadalupe Catholic Society from 1950-1955.

Any park site or even a Softball facility etc would be worthy of a man who gave so much as a player, volunteer coach & exceptional athlete. Attach a second sheet if necessary.

Attachment included

Name

(Of individual submitting request)

Address

Phone Number

Respectfully
Submitted
Ren
Aguila

Please submit this form to the City Clerk's office for name consideration. All names must be in accordance with the established City criteria. Submit one name per form.

FOR CITY USE ONLY:

For FY

Has this name been submitted before?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If yes, when?

Subcommittee Review Comments:

real!graphic

RECEIVED

2015 JUL 30 PM 1:42

10042 Wolf Road Ste B
Grass Valley CA 95949

CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
ROSEVILLE, CA

Phone 530.268.8866

Fax 530.268.3299

Fax Cover Sheet

Date 7-30-15 Time 1:30pm Pages 3 (Including Cover)
No charge for cover sheet

TO:

Name City of Roseville

Company ~~Park~~ AHN Park Naming

Fax 916-786-9175

FROM:

Name D. Nicole Coenen

Company _____

Phone 530-268-3610

**Suggested Name for a Park or Facility within a Park***Informal**Formal*

Suggested Name Curtis R. Banner Memorial Park or Curtis Banner Park
 (Print or type the suggested name exactly how you would like it to read)

Park Preference: ☒ Any park site ☐ _____ (Specify Park)

Reason for Suggestion (Must be completed for further consideration):

See other sheet.

Attach a second sheet if necessary.

☒ Attachment included

Name D. Nicole Coenen
 (Of individual submitting request)

Address 21001 Cone and Hills Dr. Grass Valley, CA 95949

Phone Number 530-268-3610

Please submit this form to the City Clerk's office for name consideration. All names must be in accordance with the established City criteria. Submit one name per form.

FOR CITY USE ONLY:

For FY _____ Has this name been submitted before? ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If yes, when? _____

Subcommittee Review Comments:

Dear City of Roseville, Parks and Recreation,

I would like to submit Curtis Banner's name for consideration for one of your park's name.

Curtis Banner came to Roseville in 1955. He became a young teacher with the Roseville City School District and worked there for 37 years as a teacher and then as a principal. After retirement he went onto supervise student teachers. Curtis also volunteered for the Roseville Parks and Recreation Dept. He called, kept score and refereed the Rec's baseball and basketball games. He organized, coordinated and supervised various youth and adult activities during the summer, nights and on weekends. Curtis was always very involved in the City of Roseville on many levels. He was on numerous committees. One committee was for the homeless. He helped serve breakfast to local students before their school started. He was a member of the Roseville Sunrise Lions Club. Curtis also helped to build the Boy Scout lodge. Curtis even taught his students how to play golf with his wife's golf clubs, which she never saw again!

Curtis Banner loved Roseville. He loved its people. Most everyone knew him from school, church or one of his many boards or committees that he gave of his time so freely. It didn't matter who you were he always had something funny to say to make you smile. He was a man of integrity and was passionate about fairness for everyone. Curtis passed away last year. He is missed terribly by his family and friends. At the end of each day he would look back to see if he had helped someone, made someone smile or did some good in his community. He was one of the bravest and strongest men I have ever known. This would be a wonderful tribute to a man that worked so hard for children and adults alike his whole life to make things better for them and for the community of Roseville, California.

I thank you for your time and consideration of Curtis R. Banner for one of your new parks.

Sincerely,

D.Nicole Coenen

21001 Cone and Hills Dr.

Grass Valley, CA 95949

530-268-3610



RECEIVED
2015 JUL 30 AM 9:33
CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
ROSEVILLE, CA

Suggested Name for a Park or Facility within a Park

Suggested Name Lisa Eck
(Print or type the suggested name exactly how you would like it to read)

Park Preference: ☒ Any park site ☐ _____ (Specify Park)

Reason for Suggestion (Must be completed for further consideration):

See attachment

Attach a second sheet if necessary.

☐ Attachment included

Name Jim Delaney
(Of individual submitting request)

Address 540 Striped Moss Street. Roswell, GA 30678

Phone Number (415) 407-4715 cell

Please submit this form to the City Clerk's office for name consideration. All names must be in accordance with the established City criteria. Submit one name per form.

FOR CITY USE ONLY:

For FY _____ Has this name been submitted before? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, when? _____

Subcommittee Review Comments:

July 2015

I think a City of Roseville park should be named for Lisa Eck.

She is a librarian at the Martha Riley branch.

For over 5 years she has been hosting 'Mother Goose on the Loose' regularly to 'sold out' crowds of families and children, with three sessions in one day.

Thousands of little ones have had their first exposure to singing, counting and reading through Lisa's enthusiastic and imaginative assemblies. Roseville residence with backgrounds from all over the world and experiences come together to learn, bond and feel a sense of community under Librarian Lisa's playful and engaging half hour gatherings.

Not only is she creative in her presentation, she takes it further by dressing in original costumes and artistic daywear that only serves to peek curiosity in her wee audience members. During Halloween she can be seen in her homemade costumes, during Spring Break she hauls over to the Mike Shellito Pool, reads and sings in her handmade mermaid attire and then goes above and beyond by jumping in the pool and swims with the attendees. Look for her there at Halloween too swimming amongst the floating pumpkins.

I know she donated the much used train table in Martha Riley as the old one was dilapidated. She asked her family for the table for her birthday instead of anything for herself.

Years ago as a first time mother and a new resident to Roseville Lisa was warm and welcoming and was the familiar face that was so comforting as we settled in to the community.

I know she does many other duties with her job as a Roseville Librarian that I am not even aware of but to me and thousands of children she'll always be famous for her rousing Mother Goose on the Loose sessions.

See below for just a few of her costuming theatrics, going above and beyond along with that million dollar smile.

I love that Roseville honors living community leaders by naming schools, library, etc. after them. (Martha Riley, Vencil Brown.) Certainly Lisa Eck is a vital part of Roseville and should be honored because she has contributed substantially and improved the quality of life in Roseville.

We had 421 attend our Big Truck Event today! Debuted my new Truck Dress ..
 Today it was the Line Trucks (and linemen) and me doing Storytime - next week I'll be with the Vactor Truck! If you want to come



You can see Lisa next at the Vactor Truck Storytime in her Truck Dress!



RECEIVED

2015 JUL 27 PM 4:15

CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
ROSEVILLE, CA

Suggested Name for a Park or Facility within a Park

Suggested Name HOLLYWOOD PARK

(Print or type the suggested name **exactly** how you would like it to read)

Park Preference: ☐ Any park site ☒ West Roseville (W-50B)

Reason for Suggestion (Must be completed for further consideration):

My request for a name consideration is based on the Geographical Location of the park.

This Park is located in the middle of a neighborhood whose street names pay tribute to famous Hollywood Actors/Actresses/Performers. Not just any Hollywood stars, but those who starred in the movies that bring us joy, the movies that make us sing along and the movies we love to watch over and over again.

Astaire Way: Pays tribute to Fred Astaire who performed in over 31 Musicals and who is the voice of the narrator in the holiday classic Santa Claus is Coming to Town. This classic film takes us all back to our childhood, and still continues to be a part of our adult lives.

Bogart Court: Pays tribute to Humphrey Bogart, who made over 70 films in his career, but his performance in Casablanca and The African Queen are among my personal favorites.

Barrymore Court: Well, what can I say besides, who can forget how Drew Barrymore had us all laughing and crying at the same time with her performance in movies such as The Wedding Singer and 50 First Dates.

Garland Way: Pays tribute to Judy Garland and her performance in movies such as The Wizard of Oz. Her talent earned her recognition by the American Film Institute, who placed her among the ten greatest female stars in the history of American Cinema.

Coincidentally, Garland Way is the street next to this park and also the sight of a future school. With famous lines such as: "There is no place like home" our future generations will know that no matter what paths their lives may take, "There is no place like Roseville". For this reason, I would love to see Hollywood Park become a part of our community.

Name Evangelina Delgado

Address 6225 Garland Way Roseville, CA 95747

Phone Number 916-765-7753

Please submit this form to the City Clerk's office for name consideration. All names must be in accordance with the established City criteria. Submit one name per form.

FOR CITY USE ONLY:

For FY _____ Has this name been submitted before? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, when? _____

Subcommittee Review Comments:

ROSEVILLE

Suggested Name for a Park or Facility within a Park

Suggested Name Steve Markas Park

(Print or type the suggested name exactly how you would like it to read)

Park Preference: ☒ Any park site ☐ _____ (Specify Park)

Reason for Suggestion (Must be completed for further consideration):

See attached

RECEIVED
2015 JUL 22 PM 4:43
CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
ROSEVILLE, CA

Attach a second sheet if necessary.

☒ Attachment included

Name Stephanie Cervantes
(Of individual submitting request)

Address 908 Fawn Ct, Roseville, CA 95661

Phone Number 916-201-7778 (cell) or 916-783-7778 (home)

Please submit this form to the City Clerk's office for name consideration. All names must be in accordance with the established City criteria. Submit one name per form.

FOR CITY USE ONLY:

For FY _____ Has this name been submitted before? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, when? _____

Subcommittee Review Comments:

Steve Markas was a long time (24 yrs.) Parks' Superintendent in the City of Roseville and an active community leader. When he began his tenure in 1967, there were only a handful of parks in Roseville and one zoo. Upon his retirement in 1991, there were more than a couple dozen parks. He was very involved in the planning and design of those parks, and along with Ed Mahany, Steve was instrumental in the design and realization of Maidu Park. Steve established and trained the "Tree Crew" early in his tenure, and began the first vestiges of the urban forestry program. Roseville parks and their facilities under Steve's watch became known for their quantity, quality and beautiful maintenance. He was critical in helping Roseville obtain status as a Tree City USA. Steve's life-long love of nature and beautiful landscaping carried over into his community activities. He was a frequent guest lecturer and demonstrator for Sierra College and Sacramento State horticulture and landscape courses, the Roseville Garden Club and others. After his retirement, he continued to donate his time and expertise to area gardeners, former colleagues, service clubs, neighbors and anyone who had questions about a tree's health or pruning or landscape design. He was a well-known member of the Roseville community and actively involved in Roseville service clubs (Elk's, Lion's and Mason's). Naming a park in his honor would be a way to memorialize a man who gave so much of himself to the City of Roseville and its beautiful park system.

July 18, 2015

Roseville & Granite Bay

PRESS TRIBUNE



Search...

-Change Page-

Thursday Dec 18 2008 | 0 comments

0

Steve Markas left mark on city's park system

By: Nathan Donato-Weinstein | nathand@goldcountrymedia.com



gwynnie bee.

Plus size clothing
rental in a monthly
subscription box.



FREE SHIPPING, FREE EXCHANGES,
UNLIMITED FASHION

Steve Markas, a longtime Roseville parks superintendent whose tenure coincided with some of the biggest additions to the city's parks department, has died. He was 84. Markas died Dec. 13 of old age, his family said. Markas was a lifelong nature-lover who found the perfect fit working in parks, said his daughter, Stephanie Cervantes. He came to Roseville as the department's chief maintenance official in 1967, when just a handful of parks served the young city. Over the next 24 years, the city added numerous parks facilities, and Markas was heavily involved in their planning and design. "One thing Roseville's known for is not only the number of parks but also how well they were maintained. That was Steve's job," said former City Manager Al Johnson. His impact was felt in several parks department accomplishments, including helping Roseville obtain status as Tree City USA. "He was real instrumental in starting the whole tree crew and in kind of the first vestiges of the urban forestry program," said Mike Shellito, the city's current Parks and Recreation chief who worked with Markas. Steve Markas was born in Kinney, Minnesota, on December 29, 1923 to Croatian immigrants, Annie Carich and John Markas. He

served in the Navy during World War II, working as a mechanic at the Alameda Naval Base. After graduating from UC Berkeley, he joined the San Mateo parks department. He moved to Roseville after taking the superintendent's job there, and raised his only child with his first wife, Millie, who died in 1981. After retirement in 1991, Steve Markas remained in Roseville and continued to be active, donating his time and expertise to area gardeners. "You would find him usually outside up in a tree up until a few years ago pruning things," his daughter said. Markas was a well-known member of the Roseville community. He was a proud Elk, Lion and Mason, Cervantes said. "He loved being outside and he loved people," she said. A celebration of life was scheduled for 2 p.m. Sunday at the Elk's Lodge on Brady Lane. Interment will be private.

CONTRIBUTE
TO THIS STORY

SEND LETTER
TO THE EDITOR

SEND
STORY IDEAS

SEND
CORRECTIONS

SIGN UP FOR
OUR EMAIL
NEWSLETTER

SACRAMENTO STATE
Closer than you think.
SACRAMENTO STATE
in PLACER COUNTY
Take Sac State courses at Sierra College, Rocklin.
Learn more at csus.edu/placer

Latest Section 1



The Address July 2015

View All Sections

FOLSOM
Equestrian
Saturday, August 8
Rodeo Park, Folsom



Suggested Name for a Park or Facility within a Park

Suggested Name NELA LUKEN

(Print or type the suggested name exactly how you would like it to read)

Park Preference: ☐ Any park site ☒ WEST ROSEVILLE (Specify Park)

Reason for Suggestion (Must be completed for further consideration):

(PLEASE SEE ATTACHED)

RECEIVED
2015 JUL 24 PM 4:38
CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
ROSEVILLE, CA

Attach a second sheet if necessary.

☒ Attachment included

Name KEVIN PAYNE
(Of individual submitting request)

Address 311 VERNON STREET

Phone Number (916) 774-5256

Please submit this form to the City Clerk's office for name consideration. All names must be in accordance with the established City criteria. Submit one name per form.

FOR CITY USE ONLY:

For FY _____ Has this name been submitted before? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, when? _____

Subcommittee Review Comments:

Nela Luken

Park Naming Request

July 24, 2015

Members of the Park Naming Committee, I am requesting that you consider "Nela Luken" as the name of a future park in the West Roseville area.

I was one of the fortunate people who was able to work with Nela over the 18 years that she committed her life to the City of Roseville. Nela and I both started our professional and family lives here within the City. In 1995, Nela started working in the Planning Department as an Associate Planner. Her professionalism, negotiation skills and more importantly, her intuitive ability to read people and problem solve propelled her to the positions of Senior Planner and then Principal Planner. She was about to assume the role of the City's first Planning Manager, but on July 19, 2013, she was involved in a tragic car accident that took both her life and that of her daughter, 9 year old Sydney.

During her time here with the City, she was instrumental in guiding future development and making the City what it is today. She worked on 8 specific plans, and staffed the Design Committee, Growth Management Visioning Committee and the Grants Commission. Her responsibilities over the years included design review and the processing of numerous current and long range entitlements. She worked on many Specific Plan projects, including the North Central, North, Northeast, Northwest, West Roseville, Amoruso, Sierra Vista, and Creekview Specific Plans. More specifically, she was the lead City representative and instrumental in the completion of the North Plan, West Plan, Sierra Vista and Creekview Specific Plans. These Specific Plans have brought in 12,921 additional acres to the City, as well as providing housing opportunities for an additional 58,342 new residents. Attached to this submittal is a map that is intended to provide you with a picture of the impact that her efforts, in partnership with the efforts of other; City staff, Commissions, City Council and the development community have created.


Nela not only invested her professional time into the community, but she was also committed to the City on a personal level. When she and her husband decided to start a family they bought a home in Northwest Roseville by the Woodcreek Oaks Golf Course and the Aquatics center. She made this investment, because she wanted to live and work within the community that she helped to build. She spent numerous hours volunteering at the Aquatics center as both her daughter and son were, and are Seawolves. As a mother of two Seawolves, Nela strengthened her bond with the community. She integrated and formed close relationships with other Roseville families as part of this activity as well as others (e.g. den mother for cub scouts). Nela's unfortunate accident occurred while driving back from Redding after spending the weekend with other Roseville families at one of the numerous off-site Seawolves swim meets.

I count myself fortunate to have been Nela's colleague, but more importantly her friend. Although I am submitting this nomination with a heavy heart, I know that it is the right thing to do. Nela's efforts have provided a road map for the development of approximately 20,000 new homes within the west Roseville area. This road map insures that future residents will enjoy easy access to schools, commercial centers and public facilities. They

will enjoy the high quality of life that our existing residents have, because fire and police services have been planned and financed. Recreational park amenities that are not found in other communities will be available to them, because Nela worked with; Community Members, Parks and Recreation staff, the Parks Commission, the City Council and multiple developers to ensure that the Roseville that she cared so much about would be available to others in the future.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this request.


Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kevin Payne", written over the printed name.

Kevin Payne,
Development Services Director
City of Roseville

Attachment:

1. Roseville's Specific Plans Map



Gee, Tara

From: Gee, Tara
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2015 3:59 PM
To: Boyd.Clements@kniferiver.com
Cc: Granada, Sandra
Subject: RE: naming new parks in Roseville

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Clements:

Thank you for your email. Your suggestions will be added to the list of submissions received. Thank you for your time to submit.

Thanks for your time and consideration.

Tara L. Gee, CALA #3868

Park Planning & Development Superintendent

Parks, Recreation & Libraries

City of Roseville

311 Vernon Street

Roseville, CA 95678

(916) 774.5253

(916) 774.5251 fax

www.roseville.ca.us



From: Clements, Boyd [<mailto:Boyd.Clements@kniferiver.com>]

Sent: Friday, July 31, 2015 2:15 PM

To: Parks and Rec

Subject: naming new parks in Roseville

To those tasked with naming three new parks in Roseville:

I heard on last night's news that Roseville is asking for citizens to recommend potential names of three new parks which are coming on line. I was intrigued by this story and it brought me back to my youth and the hours (every day of the summer) that I spent at Garibaldi Park near my home and I watched many softball games, played flag football for my junior high team, and went down the long slide when I was little at Royer Park. I was fortunate enough to live in Roseville in the 50's and 60's receiving a first rate education at the Vernon St. School, Cirby School, Atlantic St. School, and Roseville High. What a great place to grow up.

My parents continued to live there until 2001 and even today at the age of 102 my mother fondly thinks back at her days living in Roseville. And I haven't even brought into the conversation that my wife is from Roseville and her parents and sisters are still part of the community. I still think of Roseville as home and so I thought I would throw in a couple of names for consideration as you make the decision to name the new parks.

You know there is one other thing that comes to mind as I think back at those fun growing-up years. I was one of 20 young people selected for a work/recreation experience in the summer of 1964. The idea was that we worked in the morning and had recreation in the afternoon. I can remember weeding along Dry Creek off Douglas Road and painting the locker room at the community pool. In the afternoon we swam at the pool and even golfed once or twice along with recreational activities. This was one of the interesting and innovative programs that was used to show what a great city Roseville was and help in its efforts to be named an All-American City (which of course it was).

One name I was going to nominate was Harry Crabb. He was the first baseball coach that I can remember having and of course mayor and long-time councilman. I was super excited to see that he already has been honored with a park dedicated in his name. I also thought of Fred Besana and noticed there is already one named for his wife Sylvia.

Here are my suggested names for consideration of this great honor:

James Denio – The owner of the Roseville Auction and Farmers Market which brought people from miles away to Roseville each weekend. This was a unique place and it was fun to bring friends or relatives who might be visiting to see it. Jim Denio was also a kind, generous man who helped others.

Joseph Sorenson – The co-owner of the Roseville Livestock Auction. Just across the street of Denio's establishment the livestock auction also was well known in Northern California. This was a regional livestock auction with people coming from 50+ miles away to sell and buy cattle and other farm animals. Mr. Sorenson was also active in the community serving as a bishop among other things for the local congregation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. He and his wife Lois also are the parents of a significant philanthropist, Jim Sorenson, who has donated significantly for cancer and genetic research at the University of Utah among other things.

Kenneth Lonnergan – The principal of Cirby School for many years and later moving to the City/County Office of Education. His many contributions to education affected many students over many years in Roseville.

Good luck with your task. I am sure it will be a lot of fun and also very difficult making this choice. I appreciate the opportunity to be a part of the process.

Very truly yours,

Boyd Clements
209-948-0302
Stockton, CA

RESOLUTION NO. 17-27

APPROVING REVISIONS TO THE PARK NAMING POLICY PROGRAM FOR
THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

WHEREAS, during the past year, the Park Naming Subcommittee reviewed suggested revisions to the Park Naming Policy; and

WHEREAS, those revisions were submitted to the Parks and Recreation Commission for review and recommendation on November 7, 2016; and

WHEREAS, the Parks and Recreation Commission supports the proposed revisions to the Park Naming Policy.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that said revisions to the Park Naming Policy are hereby adopted by the City of Roseville.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

Park Naming Process DRAFT REVISION (October 2016)

Parks, Recreation & Libraries

On ~~July 20~~, 2016, City Council approved changes to the park naming process. These changes apply to parks and facilities within parks only. The naming process for City buildings and other City facilities remains unchanged.

Annual Advertisement Period

On the first working day in July, a press release would be sent out notifying the public and interested individuals that name suggestions are being sought for new parks and new facilities within parks under construction during that fiscal year period (July 1 to June 30). This suggestion period is open for three weeks. Names should be submitted to the City Clerk and forwarded to appropriate staff.

Annual List

The names received during this open advertisement period would be compiled into a list with the following provisions:

1. The list will be maintained as “active” for a one (1) year period and will be reviewed for name considerations for park projects and facilities within parks scheduled for construction during the same time period of the advertisement;
2. The Park Naming Subcommittee maintains the right to select a name appropriate for the park based on geographical location, such as street names, subdivision name, or adjacent school name;
3. A name suggestion cannot be submitted more than three consecutive years;
4. The Park Naming Subcommittee maintains the right to select a name not on the “active” list due to special circumstances, such as historical significance, ~~substantial financial contributions~~; the passing of an active contributor(s) to the community; or other.

Criteria for Naming a Park Facility

Names must:

1. reflect geographical location;
2. reflect significant natural features;
3. honor a significant individual (See below)

Individuals must have made a significant contribution to the ~~facility~~Roseville community, including, but not limited to:

- A - Donation of land or large financial contribution to ~~the~~a specific facility;
- B - Contributed substantially and improved the quality of life in Roseville. This could relate to involvement with Parks and Recreation or other volunteer community involvement activities towards the betterment of life in Roseville.
- C - Died or disabled in the line of duty as part of City service.

~~C -~~

Naming of new parks or recreation facilities should also consider:

- Including “Roseville” for regional or city-wide parks and recreation facilities;
- Avoidance of duplication of surnames in order to ease confusion of sites and locations for the general public;

The Subcommittee reserves the right to consider exceptions due to extraordinary circumstances which inspire vision and civic engagement. Exceptions can be made when the actions or contributions of an individual not normally meeting the established criteria are so significant and profound that this person deserves consideration.

Each park or facility within a park, such as ball-playing fields, groves of trees, walkways, trails and buildings, or special rooms in a building could be named after selected individuals in their honor as desired and as appropriate.

It is noted that the City of Roseville is grateful for the sacrifices of our fallen soldiers and veterans who served our country. With limited parks and ~~park~~recreation facilities available, it is difficult to place a higher value or honor of

one life over another. Therefore, honoring our fallen soldiers and veterans shall be directed to existing veteran-related programs ~~at Veterans Memorial Park~~ within the City.

Additionally, re-naming of an existing park due to costs, potential loss of neighborhood identity and other considerations shall be discouraged. The City Council reserves the right to consider park sites, not associated with a specific individual(s), to add onto an existing established park name due to special circumstances. In such cases, the original park name shall not be replaced. Under these special circumstances, community contributions towards the offset of costs incurred to change signage shall be a component of the approval process. To ensure geographically named parks remain a part of the process, an effort shall be made to balance the naming of parks in the range of a minimum of eight (8) 20% of the parks within the park system inventory shall ~~remain be~~ geographically based at any given time.

Selection Process

~~Staff, along with an~~ The established Park Naming subcommittee ~~is (i.e. made up of the three officers of the~~ Parks and Recreation Commissioners; ~~and the Mayor and one~~ City Council member~~s~~).:

1. ~~Shall review~~ The Subcommittee shall review all names and recommend a short list of up to three names~~s~~ for each new park or ~~park-recreation~~ facility ~~project~~-scheduled for construction during the same fiscal year;
2. ~~The short list of selected names shall be reviewed by the- Parks and Recreation Commission for~~ consideration at a formal meeting;
2. ~~Thereafter, the Parks and Recreation Commission shall forward the short list of recommendations to the City Council for formal approval. The Commission may elect to recommend a name per park or facility for Council consideration along with the short list; who could select one name for each park or facility as recommendations to the City Council;~~
3. ~~All The Parks & Recreation Commission recommendations and the Subcommittee short list plus all~~ names submitted during the submission period shall ~~will~~ be forwarded to the City Council ~~for approval~~ with the recommendations. ~~Council would receive all names submitted along with~~ This shall include the “active list” of names from the previous year;
4. Potential namesakes will be contacted by Staff prior to the Parks & Recreation Commission meeting

Subcommittee Review Comments:



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8212

File #: 0709

Title: HOUSING AUTHORITY- Roseville Housing Authority Administrative Plan Amendment
Contact: Danielle Foster 916-774-5446 dfoster@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 6.24.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff recommends that the Housing Authority Board adopt the attached resolution, approving the proposed additions to the Housing Authority Administrative Plan and the associated amendment to the Annual Plan, to provide a process to allow for the award of project-based Housing Choice Vouchers. Provision of project-based Housing Choice Vouchers does not present an additional cost to the City and would be provided through the City's existing allotment of Housing Choice Vouchers (Rental Assistance), as vouchers turnover and become available through attrition.

BACKGROUND

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires each housing authority to adopt a written administrative plan that establishes local policies for administering the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Rental Assistance Program. The Roseville Housing Authority (RHA) is required to revise its administrative plan, as necessary, to comply with HUD regulations as well as to include revisions to the Housing Authority's discretionary policies. Revisions to the plan must be formally adopted.

The proposed revisions to the Roseville Housing Authority's Administrative Plan are listed below and provided in the Attachment. The attached draft updates are to implement a project-based voucher program in the City of Roseville. Such a program would allow for up to twenty percent of the Housing Authority's vouchers to be attached to housing units rather than being provided to individual households. Attaching vouchers to units further subsidizes the rent of the unit, increasing its affordability, and overcomes a major hurdle of using a Housing Choice Voucher: finding a vacant housing unit that accepts the voucher and qualifies within the program. This is especially challenging with VASH, or Veterans Assistance Supportive Housing vouchers that focus on housing veterans. Attaching vouchers to housing ensures the availability of housing to go with the rental assistance and the timely use of the funding available in the voucher program. Unit contracts also allow for increased relationship between the Housing Authority and local landlords, which is key with special needs populations, like veterans, and in a tight housing market with low vacancies, like Roseville. Further, the use of project-based housing vouchers provides the City and the Housing Authority more tools to assist new affordable housing projects in the wake of the dissolution of Redevelopment Agencies at the state level in 2012 and the overall reductions in

state and federal funding opportunities.

Once the updated Plan is approved, program participants (tenants and landlords) will be notified of the Plan changes and staff plans to release a Request for Proposals for project-based vouchers in the weeks ahead. Staff's intent would be to slowly begin using this option in new and existing housing units.

Once finalized, additional program updates to the Administrative Plan will be returning to the Housing Authority Board this year due to changes at the federal level.

Proposed Administrative Plan changes:

- Addition of Chapter 17 - Project-Based Vouchers

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no additional fiscal impact with the proposed changes to the Housing Authority's Administrative Plan. There is no impact on the General Fund.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

While the changes proposed will not expand or reduce what the Housing Authority is already doing in the community, the Housing Authority's existing annual budget for rental assistance (over \$4,000,000) will result in approximately 43 jobs based on the Federal guidelines of one job for every \$92,000 in direct government spending. The Housing Authority also provides an important social service to ensure safe and affordable housing for our residents. Safe and affordable housing is an essential component to the foundation of our community's economic stability. This change will help deploy vouchers more quickly into the community, particularly with veterans VASH vouchers and vouchers upon turnover.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not apply to activities that will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3)). The Housing Choice Voucher program does not include the potential for a significant environmental effect, and therefore is not subject to CEQA.

Respectfully Submitted,

Danielle Foster, Housing Manager and Housing Authority Assistant Director

Chris Robles, Economic Development Director and Housing Authority Director



ATTACHMENTS:

~~Description~~
Rob Jensen, City Manager

Resolution No. 1-17

Draft Chapter 17 Project Based Vouchers of the Roseville Housing Authority Administrative Plan

HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE
RESOLUTION NO. 1-17

APPROVING THE UPDATED ROSEVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY
ADMINISTRATIVE PLAN

WHEREAS, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires each housing authority to adopt a written administrative plan that establishes local policies for administering the Housing Choice Voucher Rental Assistance Program; and

WHEREAS, staff has proposed changes to the Administrative Plan, as well as the associated Annual Plan, to allow for the award of project-based Housing Choice Vouchers; and

WHEREAS, the Housing Authority has reviewed the proposed changes to the Roseville Housing Authority Administrative Plan;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Housing Authority of the City of Roseville that it hereby approves the updated Roseville Housing Authority Administrative Plan as well as the associated Annual Plan.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Housing Authority of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES AUTHORITY MEMBERS:

NOES AUTHORITY MEMBERS:

ABSENT AUTHORITY MEMBERS:

Chair

ATTEST:

Secretary

CHAPTER 17 Project-Based Vouchers

INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes HUD regulations and PHA policies related to the project-based voucher (PBV) program in nine parts:

Part I: General Requirements. This part describes general provisions of the PBV program including maximum budget authority requirements, relocation requirements, and equal opportunity requirements.

Part II: PBV Owner Proposals. This part includes policies related to the submission and selection of owner proposals for PBV assistance. It describes the factors the PHA will consider when selecting proposals, the type of housing that is eligible to receive PBV assistance, the cap on assistance at projects receiving PBV assistance, subsidy layering requirements, site selection standards, and environmental review requirements.

Part III: Dwelling Units. This part describes requirements related to housing quality standards, the type and frequency of inspections, and housing accessibility for persons with disabilities.

Part IV: Newly rehabilitated and Newly Constructed Units. This part describes requirements and policies related to the development and completion of newly rehabilitated and newly constructed housing units that will be receiving PBV assistance.

Part V: Housing Assistance Payments Contract. This part discusses HAP Contract requirements and policies including the execution, term, and termination of the HAP Contract. In addition, it describes how the HAP Contract may be amended and identifies provisions that may be added to the HAP Contract at the PHA's discretion.

Part VI: Selection of PBV Program Participants. This part describes the requirements and policies governing how the PHA and the owner will select a family to receive PBV assistance.

Part VII: Occupancy. This part discusses occupancy requirements related to the lease, and describes under what conditions families are allowed or required to move. In addition, exceptions to the occupancy cap (which limits PBV assistance to twenty-five percent (25%) of the units in any project) are also discussed.

Part VIII: Determining Rent to Owner. This part describes how the initial rent to owner is determined, and how rent will be re-determined throughout the life of the HAP Contract. Rent reasonableness requirements are also discussed.

Part IX: Payments to Owner. This part describes the types of payments owners may receive under this program.

PART I: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

17-I.A.OVERVIEW

[24 CFR983.5]

The project-based voucher (PBV) program allows RHA, which already administers a tenant-based voucher program under an annual contributions contract (ACC) with HUD, to operate a PBV program using up to twenty percent (20%) of its voucher program budget authority and attach the funding to specific units rather than using it for tenant-based assistance [24 CFR983.6].

RHA Policy

RHA will only operate a PBV program consistent with its Annual Plan, and the goal of deconcentrating poverty and expanding housing and economic opportunities [42U.S.C. 1437 f(o)(13)].

PBV assistance may be attached to existing housing or newly constructed or newly rehabilitated housing [24 CFR 983.52]. If PBV units are already selected for project-based assistance either under an “Agreement to Enter into HAP Contract” (AHAP) or a HAP Contract, RHA is not required to reduce the number of these units under HAP Contract if the amount of budget authority is subsequently reduced. It is noted that while the number of units does not need to be reduced, HAP Contracts cannot be renewed if more than twenty percent (20%) of the base allocation is utilized for PBV. RHA, however, is responsible for determining the amount of budget authority that is available for project-based vouchers and ensuring that the amount of assistance that is attached to units is within the amounts available under the ACC [24 CFR983.6].

17-I.B. TENANT-BASED VS. PROJECT-BASED VOUCHER ASSISTANCE

[24 CFR983.2]

Except as otherwise noted in this chapter, or unless specifically prohibited by PBV program regulations, RHA policies for the tenant-based voucher program contained in this Administrative Plan also apply to the PBV program and its participants.

17-I.C. RELOCATION REQUIREMENTS

[24 CFR983.7]

Any persons displaced as a result of implementation of the PBV program will be provided relocation assistance in accordance with the requirements of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (URA)[42 U.S.C. 4201-4655] and implementing regulations at 49 CFR part 24.

The cost of required relocation assistance may be paid with funds provided by the owner, local public funds, or funds available from other sources.

The acquisition of real property for a PBV project is subject to the URA and 49 CFR part 24, subpart B. It is the responsibility of RHA to ensure the owner and any representatives of the owner, such as a property manager, comply with these requirements.

17-I.D. EQUAL OPPORTUNITY REQUIREMENTS
[24 CFR983.8]

RHA, owners and property managers must comply with all equal opportunity requirements under federal law and regulations in its implementation of the PBV program. This includes the requirements and authorities cited at 24 CFR 5.105(a). In addition, RHA will comply with the RHA Plan certification on civil rights and affirmatively furthering fair housing, submitted in accordance with 24 CFR903.7(o).

PART II: PBV OWNER PROPOSALS

17-II.A. OVERVIEW

In this document, RHA will;

- Describe the procedures for owner or owner's designee for submission of PBV proposals:
- Describe RHA selection of PBV proposals:
- Explain how RHA will determine that PBV proposals comply with HUD program regulations and requirements;
- Describe how proposals comply with the cap on the number of PBV units per project:
- Describe how units meet site selection standards.

17-II.B. OWNER PROPOSAL SELECTION PROCEDURES

[24 CFR983.51]

RHA will select PBV proposals in accordance with the selection procedures in this RHA Administrative Plan. RHA will select PBV proposals by either of the following two methods.

- RHA request for PBV Proposals. RHA may solicit proposals by using a Request For Proposals (RFP) process to select proposals on a competitive basis in response to RHA's request. RHA may not limit proposals to a single site or impose restrictions that explicitly or practically preclude owner submission of proposals for PBV housing on different sites.
- RHA selection of Proposal previously selected based on a competition. This may include selection of a proposal for housing assisted under a federal, state, or local government housing assistance program that was subject to a competition in accordance with the requirements of the applicable program, community development program, or supportive services program that requires competitive selection of proposals (e.g., HOME, and units for which competitively awarded LIHTCs have been provided), where the proposal has been selected in accordance with such program's competitive selection requirements within three years of the PBV proposals election date, and the earlier competitive selection proposal did not involve any consideration that the project would receive PBV assistance.

Solicitation and Selection of PBV Proposals [24 CFR 983.51(b) and(c)]

RHA procedures for selecting PBV proposals are designed and operated to provide broad public notice of the opportunity to offer PBV proposals for consideration by RHA.

RHA Request for Proposals for Newly Rehabilitated and Newly Constructed Units

RHA will advertise its request for proposals (RFP) for PBV proposals in newly rehabilitated and newly constructed housing in the following newspaper:

- Press Tribune

In addition, RHA will post the RFP and proposal submission and selection procedures on its website (www.roseville.ca.us/housing).

RHA will publish its notice at least once in the newspaper mentioned above. The notice will specify the number of units RHA estimates that it will be able to assist under the funding RHA is making available. Proposals will be due in RHA office by close of business no less than three weeks from the date of publication.

In order for the proposal to be considered, the owner or owner's designee (herein after referred to as "owner") must submit the proposal to RHA by the published deadline date and time, and the proposal must respond to all requirements as outlined in the RFP. Incomplete proposals will not be reviewed.

RHA will rate and rank proposals for **newly rehabilitated** and **newly constructed** housing using the following criteria:

- Owner experience and capacity to build or rehabilitate housing as identified in the RFP;
- Extent to which the project furthers RHA goal of deconcentrating poverty and expanding housing and economic opportunities;
- If applicable, the extent to which services for special populations are provided on site or in the immediate area for occupants of the property; and
- Projects with less than twenty-five percent (25%) of the units assisted will be rated higher than projects with twenty-five percent (25%) of the units assisted. Projects with the lowest percent of requested assisted units will be seen more favorably.

RHA Requests for Proposals for Existing Housing Units

RHA will advertise its request for proposals (RFP) for existing housing that is to be rehabilitated in the following newspaper:

- Press Tribune

In addition, RHA will post the notice inviting such proposal submission and the rating and ranking procedures on its electronic website (www.roseville.ca.us/housing). The notice will specify the number of units RHA estimates that it will be able to assist under the funding RHA is making available. Owner proposals will be accepted on an ongoing basis with an evaluation taking place when RHA has received a minimum of five proposals or eight weeks have past, whichever comes first.

The proposals will be evaluated using the following criteria:

- Experience as an owner in the tenant-based voucher program and owner compliance with the owner's obligations under the tenant-based program;
- Extent to which the project furthers RHA goal of deconcentrating poverty and expanding housing and economic opportunities;
- If applicable, extent to which services for special populations are provided onsite or in the immediate area for occupants of the property; and
- Extent to which units are occupied by families/households that are eligible to participate in the PBV program.

RHA Selection of Proposals Subject to a Previous Competition under a Federal, State, or Local Housing Assistance Program

RHA will accept proposals for PBV assistance from owners that were competitively selected under another federal, state or local housing assistance program, including projects that were competitively awarded Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) on an ongoing basis. RHA will ensure that the Previous Competitive Selection which is the basis for selection for PBV assistance is made without regard of the possibility of PBV assistance.

RHA may periodically advertise that it is accepting proposals, specifying the number of vouchers available for this purpose in the following newspaper:

- Press Tribune

Proposals will be reviewed on a first-come first-served basis. RHA will evaluate each proposal on its merits using the following factors:

- Extent to which the project furthers RHA goal of deconcentrating poverty and expanding housing and economic opportunities; and
- Extent to which the proposal complements other local activities such as the redevelopment of a public housing site under the HOPE VI program, the HOME program, CDBG activities, other development activities in a HUD-designated Enterprise Zone, Economic Community, or Renewal Community.

RHA Notice of Owner Selection [24 CFR983.51(d)]

RHA Policy

Within fifteen (15) days of RHA making a selection, RHA will notify the selected owner, in writing, of the owner's selection for the PBV program. RHA will also notify, in writing, all owners that submitted proposals that were not selected and advise such entities of the name of the selected owner.

In addition, RHA will publish its notice for selection of PBV proposals in the same newspaper RHA used to solicit the proposals. The announcement will include the name of the owner and address of units selected for the PBV program. RHA will also post the notice of owner selection on its website.

RHA will make available to any interested party its rating and ranking sheets and the documents that identify RHA's basis for selecting the proposal. These documents will be available for review by the public and other interested parties for one month after publication of the notice of owner selection. RHA will not make available sensitive owner information that is privileged, such as financial statements and similar information about the owner. RHA will make these documents available for review at RHA offices during normal business hours. The cost for reproduction of allowable documents will be ten cents (10¢) per page.

17-II.C. HOUSING TYPE

[24 CFR983.52]

RHA will attach PBV assistance for units in existing housing or for newly constructed or newly rehabilitated housing developed under and in accordance with an agreement to enter into a housing assistance payments contract that was executed prior to the start of construction. A housing unit is considered an existing unit for purposes of the PBV program if, at the time of notice of RHA's election, the units exist and substantially comply with HQS. "Substantially" is defined as any unit that has an accumulation of items that would cost less than \$1,000 and take less than one month's time to comply fully with HQS requirements. Units for which new construction or rehabilitation was started in accordance with PBV program requirements do not qualify as existing housing.

RHA choice of housing type will be reflected when it solicits proposals.

17-II.D. PROHIBITION OF ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN UNITS

Ineligible Housing Types [24 CFR983.53]

RHA will not attach or pay PBV assistance to shared housing units; units on the grounds of a penal reformatory, medical, mental, or similar public or private institution; nursing homes or facilities providing continuous psychiatric, medical, nursing services, board and care, or intermediate care (except that assistance may be provided in assisted living facilities); units that are owned or controlled by an educational institution or its affiliate and are designated for occupancy by students; manufactured homes or pads; cooperative housing; and transitional housing. In addition, RHA will not attach or

pay PBV assistance for a unit occupied by an owner and RHA will not select or enter into an AHAP or enter into a HAP Contract for a unit occupied by a family ineligible for participation in the PBV program.

Subsidized Housing [24 CFR983.54]

RHA will not attach or pay PBV assistance to units in any of the following types of subsidized housing:

- A public housing unit;
- A unit subsidized with any other form of Section 8 assistance;
- A unit subsidized with any governmental rent subsidy;
- A unit subsidized with any governmental subsidy that covers all or any part of the operating costs of the housing;
- A unit subsidized with Section 236 rental assistance payments (except that RHA could attach assistance to a unit subsidized with Section 236 interest reduction payments);
- A Section 202 project for non-elderly with disabilities;
- Section 811 project-based supportive housing for persons with disabilities;
- Section 202 supportive housing for the elderly;
- A Section 101 rent supplement project;
- A unit subsidized with any form of tenant-based rental assistance;
- A unit with any other duplicative federal, state, or local housing subsidy determined by HUD or RHA, in accordance with HUD requirements.

17-II.E. SUBSIDY LAYERING REQUIREMENTS [24 CFR983.55]

RHA will provide PBV assistance only in accordance with HUD subsidy layering regulations [24 CFR 4.13] and other requirements.

The subsidy layering review is intended to prevent excessive public assistance by combining (layering) housing assistance payment subsidy under the PBV program with other governmental housing assistance from federal, state, or local agencies, including assistance such as tax concessions or tax credits.

RHA will submit the necessary documentation to HUD for a subsidy layering review. RHA will not enter into an AHAP Contract or a HAP Contract until HUD (or an independent entity approved by HUD) has conducted any required subsidy layering review and determined that the PBV assistance is in accordance with HUD subsidy layering requirements. Subsidy layering reviews are not required for projects that have undergone a review conducted by the applicable state or local agency for funding on the project.

The HAP Contract will contain the owner's certification that the project has not received and will not receive (before or during the term of the HAP Contract) any public

assistance for acquisition, development, or operation of the housing other than assistance disclosed in the subsidy layering review in accordance with HUD requirements.

17-II.F. CAP ON NUMBER OF PBV UNITS IN EACH PROJECT

Twenty-Five Percent (25%) per Project Cap [24 CFR983.56(a)]

In general, RHA may not select a proposal to provide PBV assistance for units in a project or enter into an AHAP or a HAP Contract to provide PBV assistance for units in a project, if the total number of dwelling units in the project that will receive PBV assistance during the term of the PBV HAP Contract, is more than twenty-five percent (25%) of the number of dwelling units (assisted or unassisted) in the project.

Section 2835(a)(1) of HERA defines a “Project” to mean a single building, multiple contiguous buildings or multiple buildings on contiguous parcels of land.

Exceptions to Twenty-Five Percent (25%) per Project Cap [24 CFR983.56(b)]

Exceptions are allowed and PBV units are not counted against the twenty-five percent (25%) per project capif:

- The units are in a single-family project, defined by HUD as any project with one to four units;
- The units are *excepted units* in a multifamily project because they are specifically made available for elderly or disabled families or families receiving supportive services (also known as *qualifying families*).

Supportive Services

The types of supportive services offered to families for a project to qualify for the exception are those intended to promote self-sufficiency, including:

- Outreach;
- Case management, counseling;
- Health care, psychiatric and mental health care, substance abuse treatment;
- Life skills, parenting skills;
- Child care, transportation, housing search assistance, budgeting;
- Employment assistance, job training/placement;
- Education, vocational opportunities.

Supportive services do not have to be provided at the project site. When supportive services are provided, whether or site or not, the following conditions apply:

The statement of family responsibility in the lease must contain the family’s obligation to participate in the designated service program. Failure of the family to comply is good cause to terminate the family from the program.

Participation in medical or disability-related services other than drug and alcohol

treatment in the case of current abusers is not required as a condition of living in an excepted unit.

RHA will ensure that only families receiving supportive services and complying with the service requirements are assisted. To qualify, a family must have at least one member receiving at least one qualifying supportive service. RHA will not require participation in medical or disability-related services other than drug and alcohol treatment in the case of current abusers as a condition of living in an excepted unit, although such services maybe offered. If a family at the time of initial tenancy is receiving, and while the resident of an excepted unit, has received, FSS supportive services or any other supportive services as defined above, and successfully completes the FSS contract of participation or the supportive services requirement, the unit continues to count as an excepted unit for as long as the family resides in the unit.

RHA will monitor the excepted family's continued receipt of supportive services and take appropriate action regarding those families that fail without good cause to complete their supportive services requirement. Monitoring will be accomplished by requiring the owner to provide quarterly reports on the family's participation and confirming this information by interviewing the tenant at the annual re-examination.

RHA will provide PBV assistance for the following types of excepted units – units limited to use by “qualifying families”:

Units in a multifamily project specifically made available for elderly or disabled families;
Units for families receiving supportive services.

Elderly, disabled, and families receiving supportive services are all “qualifying families.”

Promoting Partially-Assisted Projects [24 CFR983.56(c)]

RHA is not setting a cap on the number of PBV units assisted per project beyond the twenty-five percent (25%) cap for non-excepted units.

17-II.G. SITE SELECTION STANDARDS

Compliance with PBV Goals, Civil Rights Requirements, and HQS Site Standards [24 CFR983.57(b)]

RHA will not select a proposal for existing, newly constructed, or newly rehabilitated PBV housing on a site or enter into an AHAP Contract or HAP Contract for units on the site, unless RHA has determined that PBV assistance for housing at the selected site is consistent with the goal of deconcentrating poverty and expanding housing and economic opportunities. The standard for deconcentrating poverty and expanding housing and economic opportunities will be consistent with the Agency Plan under 24 CFR 903 and this Administrative Plan.

In addition, prior to selecting a proposal, RHA will determine that the site is suitable from the stand point of facilitating and furthering full compliance with the applicable Civil Rights Laws, regulations, and Executive Orders, and that the site meets the HQS site

and neighborhood standards at 24 CFR982.401(I).

RHA Policy

It is RHA's goal to select sites for PBV housing that provide for deconcentrating poverty and expanding housing and economic opportunities. In complying with this goal RHA will limit approval of sites for PBV housing in census tracts that have family poverty concentrations of twenty percent (20%) or less.

RHA will grant exceptions to the twenty percent (20%) standard where RHA determines that the PBV assistance will complement other local redevelopment activities designed to deconcentrate poverty and expand housing and economic opportunities in census tracts with poverty concentrations greater than twenty percent (20%), such as sites census tracts where:

The proposed PBV development will be located in a HUD-designated Enterprise Zone, Economic Community, or Renewal Community;

The concentration of assisted units will be or has decreased as a result of public housing demolition and HOPE VI redevelopment;

The proposed PBV development will be located is undergoing significant revitalization as a result of state, local, or federal dollars invested in the area;

New market rate units are being developed where such market rate units will positively impact the poverty rate in the area;

There has been an overall decline in the poverty rate within the past five years; or

There are meaningful opportunities for educational and economic advancement.

Existing and Newly Rehabilitated Housing Site and Neighborhood Standards [24 CFR983.57(d)]

RHA will not enter into an AHAP for units that will be newly rehabilitated, or execute a HAP Contract for existing units until it has determined that the site complies with the HUD required site and neighborhood standards. The site must:

- Be adequate in size, exposure, and contour to accommodate the number and type of units proposed;
- Have adequate utilities and streets available to service the site;
- Promote a greater choice of housing opportunities and avoid undue concentration of assisted persons in areas containing a high proportion of low-income persons;
- Be accessible to social, recreational, educational, commercial, and health facilities and services and other municipal facilities and services equivalent to those found in neighborhoods consisting largely of unassisted similar units; and
- Be located so that travel time and cost via public transportation or private automobile from the neighborhood to places of employment is not excessive.

New Construction Site and Neighborhood Standards [24 CFR983.57(e)]

In order to be selected for PBV assistance, as it for newly constructed housing must meet the following HUD-required site and neighborhood standards:

- The site must be adequate in size, exposure, and contour to accommodate the number and type of units proposed;
- The site must have adequate utilities and streets available to service the site;
- The site must not be located in an area of minority concentration unless RHA determines that sufficient, comparable opportunities exist for housing for minority families in the income range to be served by the proposed project outside areas of minority concentration or that the project is necessary to meet overriding housing needs that cannot be met in that housing market area;
- The site must not be located in a racially mixed area if the project will cause a significant increase in the proportion of minority to non-minority residents in the area.
- The site must promote a greater choice of housing opportunities and avoid undue concentration of assisted persons in areas containing a high proportion of low income persons;
- The neighborhood must not be one that is seriously detrimental to family life or in which substandard dwellings or other undesirable conditions predominate;
- The housing must be accessible to social, recreational, educational, commercial, and health facilities and services and other municipal facilities and services equivalent to those found in neighborhoods consisting largely of unassisted similar units;and
- Except for housing designed for elderly persons, the housing must be located so that travel time and cost via public transportation or private automobile from the neighborhood to places of employment is not excessive.

17-II.H. ENVIRONMENTALREVIEW [24 CFR983.58]

RHA's activities under the PBV program are subject to HUD environmental regulations in 24CFR parts 50 and 58. The *responsible entity* (i.e., City of Roseville) is responsible for performing the federal environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42U.S.C.4321etseq.). RHA will not enter in to an AHAP Contract nor enter into a HAP Contract until it has complied with the environmental review requirements.

In the case of existing housing, the City of Roseville is responsible for the environmental review under 24 CFR part 58, must determine whether or not PBV assistance is categorically excluded from review under the National Environmental Policy Act and whether or not the assistance is subject to review under the laws and authorities listed in 24 CFR 58.5. RHA will not enter into an agreement to enter into a HAP Contract or a HAP contract with an owner until the environmental review is completed. RHA will supply all available, relevant information necessary for the responsible entity to perform any required environmental review for any site. RHA requires the owner to carry out mitigating measures required by the City of Roseville (or HUD, if applicable) as a result of the environmental review.

PART III: DWELLING UNITS

17-III.A. OVERVIEW

This part identifies the special housing quality standards that apply to the PBV program, housing accessibility for persons with disabilities, and special procedures for conducting housing quality standards inspections.

17-III.B. HOUSING QUALITY STANDARDS

[24 CFR983.101]

The housing quality standards (HQS) for the tenant-based program, including those for special housing types, generally apply to the PBV program. HQS requirements for shared housing, cooperative housing, manufactured home space rental, and the homeownership option do not apply because these housing types are not assisted under the PBV program.

The physical condition standards at 24 CFR 5.703 do not apply to the PBV program.

Lead-based Paint [24 CFR983.101(c)]

The lead-based paint requirements for the tenant-based voucher program do not apply to the PBV program. Instead, the Lead-based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. 4821-4846), the Residential Lead-based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 4851-4856), and implementing regulations at 24 CFR part 35, subparts A, B, H, and R, apply to the PBV program.

17-III.C. HOUSING ACCESSIBILITY FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Housing will comply with program accessibility requirements of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794) and implementing regulations at 24 CFR part 8. RHA will ensure that the percentage of accessible dwelling units complies with the requirements of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794), as implemented by HUD's regulations at 24 CFR 8, subpart C.

Housing first occupied after March 13, 1991, will comply with design and construction requirements of the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988 and implementing regulations at 24 CFR 100.205, as applicable. (24 CFR983.102)

17-III.D. INSPECTING UNITS

Pre-selection Inspection [24 CFR983.103(a)]

RHA will examine the proposed site before the proposal selection date. If the units to be assisted already exist, RHA will inspect all the units before the proposal selection date, and will determine whether the units substantially comply with HQS. To qualify as existing housing, units must substantially comply with HQS on the proposal selection

date. RHA, however, will not execute the HAP Contract until the units fully comply with HQS.

Pre-HAP Contract Inspections [24 CFR983.103(b)]

RHA will inspect each contract unit before execution of the HAP Contract. RHA will not enter into a HAP Contract covering a unit until the unit fully complies with HQS.

Turnover Inspections [24 CFR983.103(c)]

Before providing assistance to a new family in a contract unit, RHA will inspect the unit. RHA will not provide assistance on behalf of the family until the unit fully complies with HQS.

Bi-annual Inspections [24 CFR983.103(d)]

At least every other year during the term of the HAP Contract, RHA will inspect a random sample, consisting of at least twenty-percent (20%) of the contract units in each project to determine if the contract units and the premises are maintained in accordance with HQS. The sample will be selected at random. Turnover inspections are not counted toward meeting this bi-annual inspection requirement.

If more than twenty-percent (20%) of the bi-annual sample of inspected contract units in a project fails the initial inspection, RHA will reinspect one-hundred percent (100%) of the contract units in the project.

Other Inspections [24 CFR983.103(e)]

RHA will inspect contract units whenever needed to determine that the contract units comply with HQS and that the owner is providing maintenance, utilities, and other services in accordance with the HAP Contract. RHA will take into account complaints and any other information coming to its attention in scheduling inspections.

RHA will conduct follow-up inspections needed to determine if the owner (or, if applicable, the family) has corrected an HQS violation, and will conduct inspections to determine the basis for exercise of contractual and other remedies for owner or family violations of HQS.

In conducting RHA supervisory quality control HQS inspections, RHA will include a representative sample of both tenant-based and project-based units.

PART IV: NEWLY REHABILITATED AND NEWLY CONSTRUCTED UNITS

17-IV.A.OVERVIEW

[24 CFR983.151]

There are specific requirements that apply to PBV assistance for newly constructed or newly rehabilitated housing that do not apply to PBV assistance in existing housing. This part describes the requirements unique to this type of assistance. Housing selected for this type of assistance may not at a later date be selected for PBV assistance as existing housing.

17-IV.B. AGREEMENT TO ENTER INTO HAP CONTRACT

In order to offer PBV assistance in newly rehabilitated or newly constructed units, RHA will enter into an agreement to enter into an AHAP Contract with the owner of the property. The Agreement will be in the form required by HUD [24 CFR983.152(a)].

In the AHAP, the owner agrees to develop the PBV contract units to comply with HQS, and RHA agrees that, upon timely completion of such development in accordance with the terms of the Agreement, RHA will enter into a HAP Contract with the owner for the contract units [24 CFR983.152(b)].

Content of the Agreement [24 CFR983.152(c)]

At a minimum, the AHAP will describe the following features of the housing to be developed and assisted under the PBV program:

- Site and the location of the contract units;
- Number of contract units by area (size) and number of bedrooms and bathrooms;
- Services, maintenance, or equipment to be supplied by the owner without charges in addition to the rent;
- Utilities available to the contract units, including a specification of utility services to be paid by the owner and utility services to be paid by the tenant;
- An indication of whether or not the design and construction requirements of the Fair Housing Act and section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 apply to units under the Agreement. If applicable, any required work item resulting from these requirements will be included in the description of work to be performed under the Agreement;
- Estimated initial rents to owner for the contract units;
- Description of the work to be performed under the Agreement. For newly rehabilitated units, the description will include the rehabilitation work, write up and, where determined necessary by RHA, specifications and plans. For new construction units, the description will include the working drawings and specifications.
- Any additional requirements for quality, architecture, or design over and above HQS.

Execution of the AHAP [24 CFR983.153]

The AHAP will be executed “promptly” after RHA notice of proposal selection to the selected owner. RHA, however, will not enter into the AHAP with the owner until the

subsidy layering review is completed. Likewise, RHA will not enter into the AHAP until the environmental review is completed and RHA has received environmental approval. Promptly, in this case, requires the selected owner to have completed the necessary reviews for the project and be ready to enter into an AHAP within one year from the date of notification that the project is awarded PBV assistance.

RHA Policy

RHA has the option to grant up to two six-month extensions to this one year limit provided the owner can demonstrate that progress is being made and that the project will go to AHAP within the extended time frame.

17-IV.C. CONDUCT OF DEVELOPMENT WORK

Labor Standards [24 CFR983.154(b)]

If an AHAP covers the development of nine or more contract units (whether or not completed in stages), the owner and the owner's contractors and subcontractors must pay Davis-Bacon wages to laborers and mechanics employed in the development of housing. The HUD-prescribed form of the Agreement will include the labor standards clauses required by HUD, such as those involving Davis-Bacon wage rates.

The owner, contractors, and subcontractors must also comply with the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act, Department of Labor regulations in 29 CFR part 5, and other applicable federal labor relations laws and regulations. RHA will monitor compliance with labor standards.

Equal Opportunity [24 CFR983.154(c)]

The owner must comply with Section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 and the implementing regulation at 24 CFR part 135. The owner must also comply with federal equal employment opportunity requirements.

Owner Disclosure [24 CFR 983.154(d) and(e)]

The AHAP and HAP Contracts must include a certification by the owner that the owner and other project principals are not on the U.S. General Services Administration list of parties excluded from federal procurement and non-procurement programs.

The owner must also disclose any possible conflict of interest that would be a violation of the AHAP and HAP Contracts or HUD regulations.

17-IV.D. COMPLETION OF HOUSING

The AHAP will specify the deadlines for completion of the housing, and the owner must develop and complete the housing in accordance with these deadlines. The AHAP will also specify the deadline for submission by the owner of the required evidence of completion.

Evidence of Completion [24 CFR983.155(b)]

At a minimum, the owner must submit the following evidence of completion to RHA in the form and manner required by RHA:

- Owner certification that the work has been completed in accordance with HQS and all requirements of the AHAP;
- Owner certification that the owner has complied with labor standards and equal opportunity requirements in development of the housing; and
- Certificate of Occupancy (for new construction) or Final Building Permit cards (for rehabilitation projects) from the City of Roseville.

RHA Acceptance of Completed Units [24 CFR983.156]

Upon notice from the owner that the housing is completed, RHA will inspect the housing to determine if has been completed in accordance with the AHAP, including compliance with HQS and any additional requirements imposed under the AHAP. RHA will also determine if the owner has submitted all required evidence of completion.

If the work has not been completed in accordance with the AHAP, RHA will not enter into the HAP Contract.

If RHA determines the work has been completed in accordance with the AHAP and that the owner has submitted all required evidence of completion, RHA will submit the HAP Contract for execution by the owner and must then execute the HAP Contract.

PART V: HOUSING ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS CONTRACT (HAP)

17-V.A.OVERVIEW

RHA will enter into a HAP Contract with an owner for units that are receiving PBV assistance. The purpose of the HAP Contract is to provide housing assistance payments for eligible families. Housing assistance is paid for contract units leased and occupied by eligible families during the HAP Contract term. The HAP Contract will be in the form required by HUD [24 CFR983.202].

17-V.B. HAP CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS

Contract Information [24 CFR983.203]

The HAP Contract will must specify the following information:

- The total number of contract units by number of bedrooms;
- The project's name, street address, city or county, state and zip code, block and lot number (if known), and any other information necessary to clearly identify the site and the project;
- The number of contract units in each project, the location of each contract unit, the area of each contract unit, and the number of bedrooms and bathrooms in each contract unit;
- Services, maintenance, and equipment to be supplied by the owner and included in the rent to owner;
- Utilities available to the contract units, including a specification of utility services to be paid by the owner(included in rent) and utility services to be paid by the tenant;
- Features provided to comply with program accessibility requirements of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and implementing regulations at 24CFR part 8;
- The HAP Contract term;
- The number of units in any project that will exceed the twenty-five percent(25%) per project cap, which will be set-aside for occupancy by qualifying families; and The initial rent to owner for the first twelve (12) months of the HAP Contract term.

Execution of the HAP Contract [24 CFR983.204]

RHA will not enter into a HAP Contract until each contract unit has been inspected and RHA has determined that the unit complies with Housing Quality Standards (HQS).

For existing housing, the HAP Contract will be executed "promptly" after the RHA selects the owner proposal and inspects the housing units. "Promptly," in this case, means that the owner must be ready and willing to sign the HAP Contract within two (2) months from the date RHA has completed HQS inspections, found the units in compliance, and has notified the owner of its selection decision.

For newly constructed or newly rehabilitated housing, the HAP Contract will be executed after RHA has inspected the completed units, determined that the units have been completed in accordance with the AHAP, and the owner furnishes all required evidence of completion. Also, for newly rehabilitated or newly constructed housing, the HAP Contract will be executed within two months of RHA determining that the units have been completed in accordance with the AHAP, all units meet HQS, and the owner has submitted all required evidence of completion.

Term of HAP Contract [24 CFR983.205]

RHA will enter into a HAP Contract with an owner for an initial term of no less than one year and no more than fifteen (15) years.

RHA Policy

The term of all PBV HAP Contracts will be negotiated with the owner on a case-by-case basis within HUD parameters.

At the time of the initial HAP contract or any time before expiration of the HAP Contract, RHA may extend the term of the contract for an additional term of up to fifteen (15) years if RHA determines an extension is appropriate to continue providing affordable housing for low-income families. Subsequent extensions are subject to the same limitations. All extensions must be on the form and subject to the conditions prescribed by HUD at the time of the extension.

Contracts or contract extensions may not exceed fifteen years cumulatively. APHA must determine that the extension of the contract is appropriate to achieve long-term affordability of the housing or to expand housing opportunities.

RHA Policy

When determining whether or not to extend an expiring PBV contract, RHA will consider several factors including, but not limited to:

- The cost of extending the contract and the amount of available budget authority;
- The condition of the contract units;
- The owner's record of compliance with obligations under the HAP Contract and lease(s);
- Whether the location of the units continues to support the goals of deconcentrating poverty and expanding housing opportunities; and
- Whether the funding could be used more appropriately for tenant-based assistance.

Termination by RHA [24 CFR983.205(c)]

The HAP Contract will provide that the term of RHA's contractual commitment is subject to the availability of sufficient appropriated funding as determined by HUD or by RHA in accordance with HUD instructions. For these purposes, sufficient funding means the availability of appropriations, and of funding under the ACC from such appropriations, to

make full payment of housing assistance payments payable to the owner for any contract year in accordance with the terms of the HAP Contract. If it is determined that there may not be sufficient funding to continue housing assistance payments for all contract units and for the full term of the HAP Contract, the RHA may terminate the HAP Contract by notice to the owner. The termination will be implemented in accordance with HUD instructions.

Termination by Owner [24 CFR983.205(d)]

If in accordance with program requirements the amount of rent to an owner for any contract unit is reduced below the amount of the rent to owner at the beginning of the HAP Contract term, the owner may terminate the HAP Contract by giving notice to the RHA. In this case, families living in the contract units must be offered tenant-based assistance.

Remedies for HQS Violations [24 CFR983.207(b)]

RHA will not make any HAP payment to the owner for a contract unit during any period in which the unit does not comply with HQS.

RHA Policy

If RHA determines that a contract does not comply with HQS, RHA will abate and terminate PBV HAP contracts for non-compliance with HQS in accordance with the policies used in the tenant-based voucher program. These policies are contained in Section 8-II.G., Enforcing Owner Compliance.

17-V.C. AMENDMENTS TO THE HAPCONTRACT

Substitution of Contract Units [24 CFR983.206(a)]

RHA will amend the HAP Contract to substitute a different unit, if the unit has the same number of bedrooms in the same project, is HQS compliant, and meets all PBV requirements for a previously covered contract unit. Before any such substitution can take place, RHA will inspect the proposed unit and determine the reasonable rent for the unit.

Addition of Contract Units [24 CFR983.206(b)]

At RHA's discretion and subject to the restrictions on the number of dwelling units that can receive PBV assistance per project and on the overall size of RHA's PBV program, a HAP Contract may be amended during the three-year period following the execution date of the HAP Contract to add additional PBV units in the same project. This type of amendment is subject to all PBV program requirements except that a new PBV proposal is not required.

RHA Policy

RHA will consider adding contract units to the HAP Contract when RHA determines that additional housing is needed to serve eligible low-income families.

Circumstances may include, but are not limited to:

- The local housing inventory is reduced due to a disaster (either due to loss of housing units, or an influx of displaced families); and
- Voucher holders are having difficulty finding units that meet program requirements.

17-V.D. HAP CONTRACT YEAR, ANNIVERSARY AND EXPIRATION DATES

[24 CFR 983.206(c) and 983.302(e)]

The HAP Contract year is the period of twelve (12) calendar months preceding each annual anniversary of the HAP Contract during the HAP Contract term. The initial contract year is calculated from the first day of the first calendar month of the HAP Contract term.

The annual anniversary of the HAP Contract is the first day of the first calendar month after the end of the preceding contract year.

There is a single annual anniversary and expiration date for all units under a particular HAP Contract, even in cases where contract units are placed under the HAP Contract in stages (on different dates) or units are added by amendment. The anniversary and expiration dates for all units coincide with the dates for the contract units that were originally placed under contract.

17-V.E. OWNER RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER THE HAP

[24 CFR 983.209]

When the owner executes the HAP Contract, the owner certifies that at such execution and at all times during the term of the HAP Contract:

- All contract units are in good condition and the owner is maintaining the premises and contract units in accordance with HQS;
- The owner is providing all services, maintenance, equipment and utilities as agreed to under the HAP Contract and the leases;
- Each contract unit for which the owner is receiving HAP, is leased to an eligible family referred by RHA, and the lease is in accordance with the HAP Contract and HUD requirements;
- To the best of the owner's knowledge the family resides in the contract unit for which the owner is receiving HAP, and the unit is the family's only residence;
- The owner (including a principal or other interested party) is not the spouse, parent, child, grandparent, grandchild, sister, or brother of any member of a family residing in a contract unit;
- The amount of the HAP the owner is receiving is correct under the HAP Contract;
- The rent for contract units does not exceed rents charged by the owner for comparable unassisted units;

- Except for HAP and tenant rent, the owner has not received and will not receive any other payment or consideration for rental of the contract unit; and
- The family does not own or have any interest in the contract unit.

17-V.F. ADDITIONAL HAP REQUIREMENTS

Housing Quality and Design Requirements [24 CFR 983.101(e) and 983.207(a)]

The owner is required to maintain and operate the contract units and premises in accordance with HQS, including performance of ordinary and extraordinary maintenance. The owner must provide all the services, maintenance, equipment, and utilities specified in the HAP Contract with RHA and in the lease with each assisted family. In addition, maintenance, replacement and redecoration must be in accordance with the standard practice for the project as established by the owner.

RHA may elect to establish additional requirements for quality, architecture, or design of PBV housing. Any such additional requirements must be specified in the RFP, AHAP Contract and the HAP Contract. These requirements must be in addition to, not in place of, compliance with HQS.

RHA Policy

RHA will identify the need for any special features on a case-by-case basis depending on the intended occupancy of the PBV project. RHA will specify any special design standards or additional requirements in the invitation for PBV proposals, the AHAP Contract, and the HAP Contract.

Vacancy Payments [24 CFR 983.352(b)]

Vacancy Payments will be paid to the owner in accordance with the terms of the HAP Contract.

PART VI: SELECTION OF PBV PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

17-VI.A. OVERVIEW

Many of the provisions of the tenant-based voucher regulations [24 CFR 982] also apply to the PBV program. This includes requirements related to determining eligibility and selecting applicants from the waiting list. Even with these similarities, there are requirements that are unique to the PBV program. This part describes the requirements and policies related to eligibility and admission to the PBV program.

17-VI.B. ELIGIBILITY FOR PBV ASSISTANCE

[24 CFR 983.251(a) and (b)]

RHA will select families for the PBV program from those who have applied for Admission to the voucher program. A separate PBV Waiting List will be maintained. Eligibility for admission will be determined at the commencement of PBV assistance.

Applicants for PBV assistance must meet the same eligibility requirements as applicants for the tenant-based voucher program. Applicants must qualify as a family/household as defined by HUD and RHA, have income at or below HUD-specified income limits, and qualify on the basis of citizenship or the eligible immigration status of family members [24CFR 982.201(a) and 24CFR983.2(a)]. In addition, an applicant family must provide Social Security information for family members [24CFR5.216and5.218] and consent to RHA's collection and use of family information regarding income, expenses, and family composition [24 CFR 5.230]. An applicant family also must meet HUD requirements related to current or past criminal activity. In addition families who will reside in "Excepted" units must meet the appropriate criteria as a "qualified" family.

RHA Policy

RHA will determine an applicant family's eligibility for the PBV program in accordance with the policies in Chapter 3.

In-Place Families [24 CFR983.251(b)]

An eligible family residing in a proposed PBV contract unit on the date the proposal is selected by RHA is considered an "in-place family." These families are afforded protection from displacement under the PBV rule. If a unit to be placed under contract (either an existing unit or a unit requiring rehabilitation) is occupied by an eligible family on the date the proposal is selected, the in-place family will be placed on RHA's waiting list. Once the family's continued eligibility is determined (RHA may deny assistance to an in-place family for the grounds specified in 24 CFR 982.552 and 982.553), the family will be given an absolute selection preference and RHA must refer these families to the project owner for an appropriately-sized PBV unit in the project. Admission of eligible in-place families is not subject to income targeting requirements.

This regulatory protection from displacement does not apply to families that are not eligible to participate in the program on the proposal selection date.

17-VI.C. ORGANIZATION OF THE WAITING LIST

[24 CFR983.251(c)]

RHA will use separate waiting lists for the tenant-based Housing Choice Voucher Program and the PBV Program.

17-VI.D. SELECTION FROM THE WAITING LIST

[24 CFR983.251(c)]

Applicants who will occupy units with PBV assistance will be selected from RHA's waiting list. RHA will place families referred by the PBV owner on its PBV waiting list when the waiting list is open.

Income Targeting [24 CFR983.251(c)(6)]

At least seventy-five percent (75%) of the families admitted to RHA's tenant-based and project-based voucher programs during RHA fiscal year from the waiting list will be extremely-low income families. The income targeting requirement applies to the total of admissions to both programs.

Units with Accessibility Features [24 CFR983.251(c)(7)]

When selecting families to occupy PBV units that have special accessibility features for persons with disabilities, RHA will must first refer families who require such features to the owner.

Preferences [24 CFR983.251(d)]

RHA will use the same selection preferences that are used for the tenant-based voucher program. RHA provides an absolute selection preference for eligible in-place families as described in Section 7-VI.B. All preferences that apply to the Housing Choice Voucher Program also apply to the PBV program or for particular PBV projects or units. When vacancies in PBV units of a specific size (i.e., number of bedrooms) or excepted units, RHA will select only qualified families of the correct income and family composition size according to RHA's subsidy standards for those units in the correct order from the waiting list.

If RHA has projects with more than twenty-five percent (25%) of the units receiving project-based assistance because those projects include "excepted units"(units specifically made available for elderly or disabled families, or families receiving supportive services), the RHA will give preference to such families when referring families to these units [24 CFR983.261(b)].

17-VI.E. OFFER OF PBV ASSISTANCE

Refusal of Offer [24 CFR983.251(e)(3)]

RHA is prohibited from taking, and will not take, any of the following actions against a family who has applied for, received, or refused an offer of PBV assistance:

- Refuse to list the applicant on the waiting list for tenant-based voucher assistance;
- Deny any admission preference for which the applicant qualifies;
- Change the applicant's place on the waiting list based on preference, date, and time of application, or other factors affecting selection under RHA's selection policy;
- Remove the applicant from the tenant-based voucher waiting list.

Disapproval by Landlord [24 CFR983.251(e)(2)]

If a PBV owner rejects a family for admission to the owner's units, such rejection may not affect the family's position on the tenant-based voucher waiting list.

Acceptance of Offer [24 CFR983.252]

Family Briefing

When a family accepts an offer for PBV assistance, RHA will give the family a normal briefing. The briefing will include information on how the program works and the responsibilities of the family and owner. In addition to the oral briefing, RHA will provide a briefing packet that explains how RHA determines the total tenant payment for a family, the family obligations under the program, and applicable fair housing information.

Persons with Disabilities

If an applicant family's head or spouse is disabled, RHA will assure effective communication, in accordance with 24CFR8.6, in conducting the oral briefing and in providing the written information packet. This may include making alternative formats available (see Chapter 2). In addition, RHA will have a mechanism for referring a family that includes a member with mobility impairment to an appropriate accessible PBV unit.

Persons with Limited English Proficiency

RHA will take reasonable steps to assure meaningful access by persons with limited English proficiency in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Executive Order 13166 (see Chapter 2).

Violence Against Women Act (VAWA)

No applicant for the PBV program who has been a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, or stalking shall be denied admission into the program if they are otherwise qualified.

An incident or incidents of actual or threatened domestic violence, dating violence, or stalking will not be construed as a serious or repeated violation of the lease by the

victim or threatened victim of that violence, and shall not be good cause for terminating the assistance, tenancy, or occupancy rights of the victim of such violence.

RHA may terminate the assistance to remove an unlawful occupant or tenant who engages in criminal acts or threatened acts of violence or stalking to family members or others without terminating the assistance or evicting victimized lawful occupants.

There is no limitation on the ability of RHA to terminate assistance for other good cause unrelated to the incident or incidents of domestic violence, dating violence or stalking, other than the victim may not be subject to a “more demanding standard” than non-victims.

There is no prohibition on RHA terminating assistance if it “can demonstrate an actual and imminent threat to other tenants or those employed at or providing service to the property if that tenant’s (victim’s) assistance is not terminated.”

Any protections provided by law which give greater protection to the victim are not superseded by these provisions.

Definitions

The same definitions of “domestic violence,” “dating violence,” and “stalking,” and of “immediate family member” are provided in Sections 606 and 607. While definitions of domestic and dating violence refer to standard definitions in the Violence Against Women Act, the definition of stalking provided in Title VI is specific to the housing provisions.

These are:

1. *Domestic Violence*—[As defined in Section 40002 of VAWA 1994] which states as follows: SEC 40002(a)(6) – “DOMESTIC VIOLENCE” – The term ‘domestic violence’ includes felony or misdemeanor crimes of violence committed by a current or former spouse of the victim, by a person with whom the victim shares a child in common, by a person who is cohabiting with or has cohabited with the victim as a spouse, by a person similarly situated to a spouse of the victim under the domestic or family violence laws of the jurisdiction receiving grant monies, or by any other person against an adult or youth victim who is protected from that person’s acts under the domestic or family violence laws of the jurisdiction.
2. *Dating Violence* – [As defined in Section 40002 of VAWA 1994] which states as follows: SEC 40002(a)(8) – “DATING VIOLENCE”- The term ‘dating violence’ means violence committed by a person— (A) who is or has been in a social relationship of a romantic or intimate nature with the victim; and (B) where the existence of such a relationship shall be determined based on a consideration of the following factors:

- (i) The length of the relationship.
- (ii) The type of relationship.
- (iii) The frequency of interaction between the persons involved in the relationship.

3. *Stalking* – means - (A) (i) to follow, pursue, or repeatedly commit acts with the intent to kill, injure, harass, or intimidate another person; and (ii) to place under surveillance with the intent to kill, injure, harass or intimidate another person; and (B) in the course of, or as a result of, such following, pursuit, surveillance or repeatedly committed acts, to place a person in reasonable fear of the death of, or serious bodily injury to, or to cause substantial emotional harm to—
- (i) that person;
 - (ii) a member of the immediate family of that person; or
 - (iii) the spouse or intimate partner of that person;...

Immediate Family Member—means, with respect to a person—(A) a spouse, parent, brother, sister, or child of that person, or an individual to whom that person stands in loco parentis; or (B) any other person living in the household of that person and related to that person by blood or marriage.

17-VI.F. OWNER SELECTION OF TENANTS

The owner is responsible for developing written tenants election procedures that are consistent with the purpose of improving housing opportunities for very low-income families and reasonably related to program eligibility and an applicant's ability to fulfill their obligations under the lease. An owner must promptly notify in writing any rejected applicant of the grounds for any rejection [24 CFR983.253(b)].

Leasing [24 CFR983.253(a)]

During the term of the HAP Contract, the owner must lease contract units to eligible families that are selected and referred by RHA from RHA's waiting list. The contract unit leased to the family must be the appropriate size unit for the size of the family, based on RHA's subsidy standards.

Filling Vacancies [24 CFR983.254(a)]

The owner must promptly notify RHA of any vacancy or expected vacancy in a contract unit. After receiving such notice, RHA will make every reasonable effort to refer promptly a sufficient number of families for the owner to fill such vacancies. The RHA and the owner will make reasonable efforts to minimize the likelihood and length of any vacancy.

RHA Policy

The owner must notify RHA in writing (mail, fax, or e-mail) within seven (7) calendar days of learning about any vacancy or expected vacancy.

RHA will make every reasonable effort to refer families to the owner within fifteen (15) days of receiving such notice from the owner.

Reduction in HAP Contract Units Due to Vacancies [24 CFR983.254(b)]

If any contract units have been vacant for 120 or more days since owner notice of the vacancy, RHA will give notice to the owner amending the HAP Contract to reduce the number of contract units by subtracting the number of contract units (according to the bedroom size) that have been vacant for this period.

RHA Policy

RHA will provide the notice to the owner within fifteen (15) days of the 120th day of the vacancy. Unless the owner can give adequate reason for RHA not to reduce the number of contract units within fifteen (15) days of the date of RHA's notice, the amendment to the HAP Contract will be effective the 1st day of the month following the date of RHA's notice.

17-VI.G. TENANT SCREENING [24 CFR983.255]

RHA Responsibility

RHA is not responsible or liable to the owner or any other person for the family's behavior or suitability for tenancy.

RHA Policy

RHA will not conduct screening to determine a PBV applicant family's suitability for tenancy. RHA may deny applicants based on such screening. RHA will provide the owner with an applicant family's current and prior address (as shown in RHA records) and the name and address (if known by RHA) of the family's current landlord and any prior landlords.

RHA will inform owners of their responsibility to screen prospective tenants. Upon request, owners may request and RHA will provide specific information about the family being considered for tenancy. RHA will provide the following information:

- The family's current address as provided by the Applicant; and
- The name and address, if known, of the owner/landlord of the family's current and prior places of residence.

RHA will respond only to specific questions asked by owners and only when RHA has documentation to confirm the accuracy of the information being provided. RHA will provide applicant families a description of its policy on providing information to owners and give the same types of information to allowners.

Owner Responsibility

The owner is responsible for screening and selection of the family to occupy the owner's unit. When screening families, the owner may consider a family's background with respect to the following factors:

- Payment of rent and utility bills;
- Caring for a unit and premises;
- Respecting the rights of other residents to the peaceful enjoyment of their housing;
- Drug-related criminal activity or other criminal activity that is a threat to the health, safety, or property of others; and
- Compliance with other essential conditions of tenancy.

The owner must notify RHA in writing within fifteen (15) days when rejecting an applicant and include the grounds for such rejection.

PART VII: OCCUPANCY

17-VII.A.OVERVIEW

After an applicant has been selected from the waiting list, determined eligible by the RHA, referred to an owner and determined suitable by the owner, the family will sign the lease and occupancy of the unit may begin.

17-VII.B.LEASE

[24 CFR983.256]

The tenant must have legal capacity to enter a lease under state and local law. *Legal capacity* means that the tenant is bound by the terms of the lease and may enforce the terms of the lease against the owner.

Form of Lease [24 CFR983.256(b)]

The tenant and the owner must enter into a written lease agreement that is signed by both parties. If an owner uses a standard lease form for rental units to unassisted tenants in the locality or premises, the same lease must be used for assisted tenants, except that the lease must include a HUD-required tenancy addendum. The tenancy addendum must include, word-for-word, all provisions required by HUD.

If the owner does not use a standard lease form for rental to unassisted tenants, the owner may use another form of lease.

RHA Policy

RHA may review the owner's lease for compliance with state or local law.

Lease Requirements [24 CFR983.256(c)]

The lease for a PBV unit must specify all of the following information:

- The names of the owner and the tenant;
- The unit rented (address, apartment number, if any, and any other information needed to identify the leased contract unit);
- The term of the lease (initial term and any provision for renewal);
- The amount of the tenant rent to owner, which is subject to change during the term of the lease in accordance with HUD requirements;
- A specification of the services, maintenance, equipment, and utilities that will be provide by the owner; and
- The amount of any charges for food, furniture, or supportive services.

Tenancy Addendum [24 CFR983.256(d)]

The tenancy addendum in the lease must state:

- The program tenancy requirements;

- The composition of the household as approved by RHA (the names of family members and any RHA-approved live-in aide);
- All provisions in the HUD-required tenancy addendum must be included in the lease. The terms of the tenancy addendum prevail over other provisions of the lease.

Initial Term and Lease Renewal [24 CFR 983.256(f) and 983.257(b)]

The initial lease term must be for at least one year. Upon expiration of the lease, an owner may renew the lease, refuse to renew the lease for “good cause,” or refuse to renew the lease without good cause. If the owner refuses to renew the lease without good cause, RHA will provide the family with a tenant-based voucher and remove the unit from the PBV HAP Contract.

Changes in the Lease [24 CFR 983.256(e)]

If the tenant and owner agree to any change in the lease, the change must be in writing, and the owner must immediately give RHA a copy of all changes.

The owner must notify RHA in advance of any proposed change in the lease regarding the allocation of tenant and owner responsibilities for utilities. Such changes may only be made if approved by RHA and in accordance with the terms of the lease relating to its amendment. RHA will re-determine reasonable rent, in accordance with program requirements, based on any change in the allocation of the responsibility for utilities between the owner and the tenant. There-determined reasonable rent will be used in calculation of the rent to owner from the effective date of the change.

Owner Termination of Tenancy [24 CFR 983.257]

With two exceptions, the owner of a PBV unit may terminate tenancy for the same reasons an owner may in the tenant-based voucher program (see Section 12-III.B. and 24CFR982.310). In the PBV program, terminating tenancy for “good cause” does not include doing so for a business or economic reason, or a desire to use the unit for personal or family use or other non-residential purpose.

Non-Compliance with Supportive Services Requirement [24 CFR 983.257(c)]

If a family is living in a project-based unit that is excepted from the twenty-five percent (25%) per project cap on project-basing because of participation in a supportive services program (e.g., Family Self-Sufficiency), and the family fails to complete its supportive services requirement without good cause, such failure is grounds for lease termination by the owner.

Tenant Absence from the Unit [24 CFR 983.256(g) and 982.312(a)]

The owner may specify in the lease a maximum period of tenant absence from the unit that is shorter than the maximum period permitted by RHA policy. According to program requirements, the family’s assistance must be terminated if they are absent from the unit for more than one hundred-eighty (180) consecutive days.

Security Deposits [24 CFR983.258]

The owner may collect a security deposit from the tenant. The security deposit must not exceed the following:

- Unfurnished Unit: Two months contract rent (this includes any amount labeled as last month's rent)
- Furnished Unit: Three months contract rent (this includes any amount labeled as last month's rent)

When the tenant moves out of a contract unit, the owner, subject to state and local law, may use the security deposit, including any interest on the deposit, in accordance with the lease, as reimbursement for any unpaid tenant rent, damages to the unit, or other amounts owed by the tenant under the lease.

The owner must give the tenant a written list of all items charged against the security deposit and the amount of each item. After deducting the amount used to reimburse the owner, the owner must promptly refund the full amount of the balance to the tenant.

If the security deposit does not cover the amount owed by the tenant under the lease, the owner may seek to collect the balance from the tenant. RHA has no liability or responsibility for payment of any amount owed by the family to the owner.

17-VII.C.MOVES

Overcrowded, Under-Occupied, and Accessible Units [24 CFR983.259]

RHA Policy

If RHA determines that a family is occupying a unit that is too small or too big, based on RHA's subsidy standards, or a unit with accessibility features that the family does not require, and the unit is needed by a family that does require the features, RHA will notify the family and the owner within fifteen (15) days of RHA's determination of the family's need to move. RHA will offer the family the following types of continued assistance in the following order, based on the availability of assistance:

- PBV assistance in the same project;
- PBV assistance in another project; and
- Tenant-based voucher assistance.

If RHA offers the family a tenant-based voucher, RHA will terminate the housing assistance payments for a wrong-sized or accessible unit at expiration of the term of the family's voucher (including any extension granted by RHA).

RHA Policy

When RHA offers a family another form of assistance that is not a tenant-based voucher, the family will be given thirty (30) calendar days from the date of the offer to

accept the offer and move-out of the PBV unit. If the family does not move-out within this thirty-day timeframe, RHA will terminate the housing assistance payments at the expiration of this thirty-day period.

RHA may make exceptions to this thirty-day period if needed for reasons beyond the family's control such as death, serious illness, or other medical emergency of a family member.

Family Right to Move [24 CFR983.260]

The family may terminate the lease at any time after the first year of occupancy. The family must give advance written notice to the owner in accordance with the lease and provide a copy of such notice to RHA. If the family wishes to move with continued tenant-based assistance, the family must contact RHA to request the rental assistance prior to providing notice to terminate the lease.

If the family terminates the lease in accordance with these requirements, RHA will offer the family the opportunity for continued tenant-based assistance, in the form of a Housing Choice Voucher. If a voucher is not immediately available upon termination of the family's lease in the PBV unit, YCH will give the family priority to receive the next available voucher.

If the family terminates the assisted lease before the end of the first year, the family relinquishes the Housing Choice Voucher assistance.

17-VII.D. EXCEPTIONS TO THE OCCUPANCY CAP [24 CFR983.261]

RHA will not pay housing assistance under a PBV HAP Contract for more than twenty-five percent (25%) of the number of dwelling units in a project unless the units are [24 CFR983.56]:

- In a single-family project;
- Specifically made available for elderly or disabled families; or
- Specifically made available for families receiving supportive services as defined by RHA. At least one member must be receiving at least one qualifying supportive service.

If a family at the time of initial tenancy is receiving and while the resident of an excepted unit has received Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) supportive services or any other service as defined as defined by RHA and successfully completes the FSS contract of participation or the supportive services requirement, the unit continues to count as an excepted unit for as long as the family resides in the unit.

A family (or remaining members of a family) residing in an excepted unit that no longer meets the criteria for a “qualifying family” in connection with the twenty-five percent (25%) per project cap exception (e.g., the family does not successfully complete supportive services requirements, or due to a change in family composition the family is no longer elderly or disabled), must vacate the unit, and RHA will cease paying housing assistance payments on behalf of the non-qualifying family.

If the family is moving to a non-excepted PBV unit, the family will have sixty (60) days in which to complete the move. If the family will move with a Housing Choice Voucher, as is likely to be the case with a non-elderly or non-disabled surviving spouse, then the term of the voucher will apply. RHA may grant extensions if the family can demonstrate good cause as outlined in Chapter 5, Section II-E of this Administrative Plan. If the family fails to vacate the unit within the established time, the unit must be removed from the HAP Contract. It is possible for the HAP Contract to be amended to substitute a different unit in the project in accordance with program requirements; or the owner terminates the lease and evicts the family. RHA will terminate housing assistance payments for a family residing in an excepted unit that is not in compliance with its family obligations to comply with supportive services requirements.

PART VIII: DETERMINING RENT TO OWNER

17-VIII.A.OVERVIEW

The amount of the initial rent to an owner of units receiving PBV assistance is established at the beginning of the HAP Contract term. Although for newly rehabilitated or newly constructed housing, the agreement to enter into HAP Contract (Agreement) states the estimated amount of the initial rent to owner, the actual amount of the initial rent to owner is established at the beginning of the HAP Contract term.

During the term of the HAP Contract, the rent to owner is re-determined at the owner's request in accordance with program requirements, and at such time that there is a five percent or greater decrease in the published FMR.

17-VIII.B. RENTLIMITS

[24 CFR983.301]

Except for certain tax credit units (discussed below), the rent to owner must not exceed the lowest of the following amounts:

- An amount determined by RHA, not to exceed 110 percent of the applicable fair market rent (or any HUD-approved exception payment standard) for the unit bedroom size minus any utility allowance;
- The reasonable rent; or
- The rent requested by the owner.

Certain Tax Credit Units [24 CFR983.301(c)]

For certain tax credit units, the rent limits are determined differently than for other PBV units. In general, the rent to owner must not exceed the lowest of the tax credit rent minus any utility allowance; the reasonable rent; or the rent requested by the owner. Under provisions of the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008, PHAs are permitted to use the higher Section 8 rent for a tax credit unit if the LIHTC rent is less than the amount that would be permitted under Section 8. RHA will follow the rules and regulations promulgated by HUD and in effect at the time the HAP Contract is executed.

Definitions

A **qualified census tract** is any census tract (or equivalent geographic area defined by the Bureau of the Census) in which at least fifty percent (50%) of households have an income of less than sixty percent (60%) of Area Median Gross Income (AMGI), or where the poverty rate is at least twenty-five percent (25%) and where the census tract is designated as a qualified census tract by HUD.

Tax credit rent is the rent charged for comparable units of the same unit size (i.e., number of bedrooms) in the project that also receive the low-income housing tax credit but do not have any additional rental assistance (e.g., tenant-based voucher assistance).

Use of FMRs, Exception Payment Standards, and Utility Allowances

[24 CFR983.301(f)]

When determining the initial rent to owner, RHA will use the most recently published FMR in effect and the utility allowance schedule in effect at execution of the HAP contract. When re-determining the rent to owner, RHA will use the most recently published FMR and the utility allowance schedule in effect at the time of redetermination. RHA will not use an earlier FMR for initial rent determination or for redeterminations.

Any HUD-approved exception payment standard amount under the tenant-based voucher program also applies to the project-based voucher program. The same utility allowance schedule applies to both the tenant-based and project-based voucher programs.

Redetermination of Rent [24 CFR983.302]

RHA will redetermine the rent to owner upon the owner's request or when there is a five percent (5%) or greater decrease in the published FMR.

Rent Increase

If an owner wishes to request an increase in the rent to owner from RHA, it must be requested sixty (60) days prior to the annual anniversary of the HAP Contract and include the requested amount of rent being proposed (see Section 9-I.H.). RHA will only make rent increases in accordance with the rent limits described previously. There are no provisions in the PBV program for special adjustments (e.g., adjustments that reflect increases in the actual and necessary expenses of owning and maintaining the units which have resulted from substantial general increases in real property taxes, utility rates, or similar costs).

RHA Policy

RHA will not approve any increase of rent to owner until and unless the owner has complied with requirements of the HAP Contract, including compliance with HQS. The owner will not receive any retroactive increase of rent for any period of noncompliance.

Rent Decrease

If there is a decrease in the rent to owner, as established in accordance with program requirements such as a change in the FMR or exception payment standard, or reasonable rent amount, the rent to owner will be decreased regardless of whether the owner requested a rent adjustment.

Notice of Rent Change

The rent to owner is re-determined by written notice by RHA to the owner specifying the amount of the re-determined rent. RHA notice of rent adjustment constitutes an amendment of the rent to owner specified in the HAP Contract. The adjusted amount of

Rent to owner applies for the period of twelve (12) calendar months from the annual anniversary of the HAP Contract.

RHA Policy

RHA will provide the owner with at least thirty (30) days written notice of any change in the amount of rent to owner.

17-VIII.C. REASONABLE RENT

[24 CFR 983.303]

At the time the initial rent is established and all times during the term of the HAP contract, the rent to owner for a contract unit will not exceed the reasonable rent for the unit as determined by RHA.

When Rent Reasonable Determinations are Required

RHA will re-determine the reasonable rent for a unit receiving PBV assistance whenever any of the following occur:

- There is a five percent (5%) or greater decrease in the published FMR in effect sixty (60) days before the contract anniversary (for the unit sizes specified in the HAP Contract) as compared with the FMR that was in effect one year before the contract anniversary date;
- RHA approves a change in the allocation of responsibility for utilities between the owner and the tenant;
- The HAP Contract is amended to add or substitute a different contract unit in the same project; or
- There is any other change that may substantially affect the reasonable rent.

How to Determine Reasonable Rent

The reasonable rent of a unit receiving PBV assistance will be determined by comparison to rent for other comparable unassisted units. When making this determination, RHA will consider factors that affect market rent. Such factors include the location, quality, size, type and age of the unit, as well as the amenities, housing services, maintenance, and utilities to be provided by the owner.

Comparability Analysis

For each unit, the comparability analysis must use at least three comparable units in the private unassisted market. This may include units in the premises or project that are receiving project-based assistance. The analysis will show how the reasonable rent was

determined, including major differences between the contract units and comparable unassisted units, and will be retained by RHA. The comparability analysis may be performed by RHA staff or by another qualified person or entity. Those who conduct these analyses or are involved in determining the housing assistance payment based on the analyses will not have any direct or indirect interest in the property.

Owner Certification of Reasonable Rent

By accepting each monthly housing assistance payment, the owner certifies that the rent to owner is not more than rent charged by the owner for other comparable unassisted units in the premises. At any time, RHA may require the owner to submit information on rents charged by the owner for other units in the premises or elsewhere.

17-VIII.D. EFFECT OF OTHER SUBSIDY AND RENT CONTROL

In addition to the rent limits discussed in Section 7-VIII.B above, other restrictions may limit the amount of rent to owner in a PBV unit. In addition, certain types of subsidized housing are not even eligible to receive PBV assistance (see Section 7-II.D).

Other Subsidy [24 CFR983.304]

At its discretion, RHA may reduce the initial rent to owner because of other governmental subsidies, including tax credit or tax exemption, grants, or other subsidized financing.

For units receiving assistance under the HOME program, rents will not exceed rent limits as required by that program.

For units in any of the following types of federally subsidized projects, the rent to owner will not exceed the subsidized rent (basic rent) as determined in accordance with requirements for the applicable federal program:

- An insured or non-insured Section 236 project;
- A formerly insured or non-insured Section 236 project that continues to receive Interest Reduction Payment following a decoupling action;
- A Section 221(d)(3) below market interest rate (BMIR) project;
- A Section 515 project of the Rural Housing Service;
- A project receiving low-income housing tax credits; and
- Any other type of federally subsidized project specified by HUD.

Combining Subsidy

Rent to owner will not exceed any limitation required to comply with HUD subsidy layering requirements.

Rent Control [24 CFR983.305]

In addition to the rent limits set by PBV program regulations, the amount of rent to owner also may be subject to rent control or other limits under local, state, or federal law.

PART IX: PAYMENTS TO OWNER

17-IX.A. HOUSING ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS

[24 CFR 983.351]

During the term of the HAP Contract, RHA will make housing assistance payments to the owner in accordance with the terms of the HAP Contract. During the term of the HAP Contract, payments will be made for each month that a contract unit complies with HQS and is leased to and occupied by an eligible family. The housing assistance payment will be paid to the owner on or about the first day of the month for which payment is due, unless the owner and RHA agree on a later date.

RHA will not make any housing assistance payment to the owner for any month after the month when the family moves out of the unit (even if household goods or property are left in the unit). The amount of the housing assistance payment by RHA is the rent to owner minus the tenant rent (total tenant payment minus the utility allowance).

In order to receive housing assistance payments, the owner must comply with all provisions of the HAP Contract. Unless the owner complies with all provisions of the HAP Contract, the owner does not have a right to receive housing assistance payments.

17-IX.B. VACANCY PAYMENTS

[24 CFR 983.352]

RHA Policy

If an assisted family moves out of the unit, the owner may keep the housing assistance payment for the calendar month when the family moves out. RHA will not make vacancy payments.

17-IX.C. TENANT RENT TO OWNER

[24 CFR 983.353]

The tenant rent is the portion of the rent to owner paid by the family. The amount of tenant rent is determined by RHA in accordance with HUD requirements. Any changes in the amount of tenant rent will be effective on the date stated in RHA notice to the family and owner.

The family is responsible for paying the tenant rent (total tenant payment minus the utility allowance). The amount of the tenant rent determined by RHA is the maximum amount the owner may charge the family for rental of a contract unit. The tenant rent covers all housing services, maintenance, equipment, and utilities to be provided by the owner. The owner may not demand or accept any rent payment from the tenant in excess of the tenant rent as determined by RHA. The owner must immediately return any excess payment to the tenant.

Tenant and RHA Responsibilities

The family is not responsible for the portion of rent to owner that is covered by the housing assistance payment and the owner may not terminate the tenancy of an assisted family for nonpayment by RHA. Likewise, RHA is responsible only for making the housing assistance payment to the owner in accordance with the HAP Contract. RHA is not responsible for paying tenant rent, or any other claim by the owner, including damage to the unit. RHA will not use housing assistance payments or other program funds (including administrative fee reserves) to pay any part of the tenant rent or other claim by the owner.

Utility Reimbursements

RHA Policy

If the amount of the utility allowance exceeds the total tenant payment, RHA will pay the amount of such excess to the tenant as a reimbursement for tenant-paid utilities, and the tenant rent to the owner must be zero.

17-IX.D. OTHER FEES AND CHARGES

[24 CFR983.354]

Meals and Supportive Services

With the exception of PBV assistance in assisted living developments, the owner may not require the tenant to pay charges for meals or supportive services. Non-payment of such charges is not grounds for termination of tenancy.

In assisted living developments receiving PBV assistance, the owner may charge for meals or supportive services. These charges will not be included in the rent to owner, nor will the value of meals and supportive services be included in the calculation of the reasonable rent. Non-payment of such charges, however, is grounds for termination of the lease by the owner in an assisted living development.

Other Charges by Owner

The owner may not charge extra amounts for items customarily included in rent in the locality or provided at no additional cost to unsubsidized tenants in the premises.



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8220
File #: 0709-01

Title: HOUSING SUCCESSOR - FY2015-16 Annual Report - Housing Successor Low and Moderate Income Housing Asset Fund
Contact: Melissa Hagan 916-774-5476 mhagan@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017
Item #: 6.25.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff requests the City Council, acting as Housing Successor, to adopt the attached resolution approving the Low and Moderate Income Housing Asset Fund annual report for Fiscal Year 2015-16.

BACKGROUND

Redevelopment agencies were dissolved by legislation in February of 2012; however, obligations to report on housing activities by Housing Successors continue on an annual basis. In 2014, the Governor signed into law SB-341, requiring Housing Successors (those entities that assumed the affordable housing assets and functions of the former redevelopment agency) to produce an annual report of their affordable housing activities.

The new report is due to be completed by December 31st of each year and includes:

1. An independent Financial Audit of the Low and Moderate Income Housing Asset Fund ("Fund"), for the fiscal year most recently ended must be prepared by December 31st of each year. The audit may be included in the host jurisdiction's annual audit;
2. If a jurisdiction is a city or county, the Report of Required Information must be prepared by December 31st of each year and reported to the State of California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) as part of the annual housing element report that is due on April 1st of each year;
3. The Report of Required Information must be posted on the Housing Successor's website by December 31st of each year. The Housing Successor must also post the information on its website with the former Redevelopment Agency's pre-dissolution implementation plan.

DISCUSSION

-
The Report of Required Information per Health and Safety Code 34171.1 (f) is to include the following information:

1. The amount deposited to the Low and Moderate Income Housing Asset Fund;
2. A statement of the balance in the fund as of the close of the fiscal year;
3. A description of expenditures from the fund by category;
4. The statutory value of real property owned by the Housing Successor, the value of loans and grants receivable, and the sum of these two amounts;
5. A description of any transfers made;
6. A description of any project for which the Housing Successor receives or holds property tax revenue pursuant to the Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule and the status of that project;
7. For interests in real property acquired by the former redevelopment agency prior to February 1, 2012, a status update on compliance with Section 33334.16. For interests in real property acquired on or after February 1, 2012, a status update on the project;
8. A description of any outstanding obligations pursuant to Section 33413 that remained to transfer to the Housing Successor on February 1, 2012, of the Housing Successor's progress in meeting those obligations, and of the Housing Successor's plans to meet unmet obligations;
9. Reporting on income targeting requirements (does not need to be included until December 31, 2019 for the period from January 1, 2014 through the end of the fiscal year covered by the report (June 30, 2019 for most Housing Successors);
10. The percentage of units of deed-restricted rental housing restricted to seniors and assisted individually or jointly by the Housing Successor, its former redevelopment agency, and its host jurisdiction within the previous 10 years;
11. The amount of any excess surplus, the amount of time that the Housing Successor has had excess surplus, and the Housing Successor's plan for eliminating the excess surplus.

The completed Report of Required Information for the City of Roseville Housing Successor is included as Attachment A.

Since the FY2015-16 audit of Low and Moderate Income Asset Fund (Fund 296) is included in the City of Roseville's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) as allowed by SB-341, Finance staff will be presenting the CAFR to City Council sometime during the first quarter of 2017. The CAFR will also be available on the City's website by that time.

FISCAL IMPACT

Activities and expenditures of the Low and Moderate Income Housing Asset Fund are separate and are not dependent upon the General Fund.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Approval of the annual report for Low and Moderate Income Housing Asset Fund for FY2015-16 will not create any new jobs, but use of these funds and parcels within the community does create new jobs. With the pending construction start of Mercy Housing's project at 623 Vernon Street, new construction jobs will be available locally and once complete, the project will include commercial space that will create new jobs as well.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not apply to activities that will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines §15061(b)(3)). The annual report for the Housing Successor Low and Moderate Income Asset Fund does not include the potential for a significant environmental effect, and therefore is not subject to CEQA.

Respectfully Submitted,

Melissa Hagan, Administrative Analyst

Chris Robles, Economic Development Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution No. 17-28

FY2015-16 Annual Report - Housing Successor Low and Moderate Income Housing Asset Fund per SB341

RESOLUTION NO. 17-28

APPROVING THE ANNUAL REPORT FOR THE LOW AND MODERATE
INCOME HOUSING ASSET FUND FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015-16

WHEREAS, in 2012 the California State Legislature dissolved redevelopment agencies, and the City of Roseville Housing Successor Agency assumed the housing assets and functions of the former City of Roseville Redevelopment Agency; and

WHEREAS, SB-341 requires Housing Successors to produce an annual report of their housing activities by December 31st of each year; and

WHEREAS, staff has prepared the Annual Report for the Low and Moderate Income Housing Asset Fund for fiscal year 2015-16.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Roseville, acting in its role as Housing Successor, approves the Annual Report for the Low and Moderate Income Housing Asset Fund for fiscal year 2015-16.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

Report of Required Information per Health and Safety Code 34176.1 (f)

City of Roseville Housing Successor

Fiscal Year 2015-16

1. Any amounts deposited into the Fund, with segregation of amounts deposited from payments pursuant to a Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule ("ROPS") from other sources.	<table><tr><th>Amount</th><th>Source</th><th>Purpose</th></tr><tr><td>244,399</td><td>ROPS - SERAF Loan Repayments</td><td>Fund Balance-Reserved</td></tr><tr><td>5,881</td><td>Interest on Investments Earned</td><td>Fund Balance-Reserved</td></tr><tr><td>34,586</td><td>Principal & Int on Notes/Loans</td><td>Fund Balance-Reserved</td></tr><tr><td>11,000</td><td>Other Revenue</td><td>Fund Balance-Reserved</td></tr><tr><td>195,275</td><td>20% Deposit from City Loan Payoff</td><td>Fund Balance-Reserved</td></tr><tr><td>58,000</td><td>Loan Payoffs-Program Income</td><td>Fund Balance-Reserved</td></tr><tr><td>\$549,140</td><td>TOTAL</td><td></td></tr></table>			Amount	Source	Purpose	244,399	ROPS - SERAF Loan Repayments	Fund Balance-Reserved	5,881	Interest on Investments Earned	Fund Balance-Reserved	34,586	Principal & Int on Notes/Loans	Fund Balance-Reserved	11,000	Other Revenue	Fund Balance-Reserved	195,275	20% Deposit from City Loan Payoff	Fund Balance-Reserved	58,000	Loan Payoffs-Program Income	Fund Balance-Reserved	\$549,140	TOTAL	
	Amount	Source	Purpose																								
	244,399	ROPS - SERAF Loan Repayments	Fund Balance-Reserved																								
	5,881	Interest on Investments Earned	Fund Balance-Reserved																								
	34,586	Principal & Int on Notes/Loans	Fund Balance-Reserved																								
	11,000	Other Revenue	Fund Balance-Reserved																								
	195,275	20% Deposit from City Loan Payoff	Fund Balance-Reserved																								
	58,000	Loan Payoffs-Program Income	Fund Balance-Reserved																								
\$549,140	TOTAL																										
2. The balance in the Fund at the fiscal year end, with segregation of amounts held to meet obligations on a ROPS from other amounts.	<table><tr><th>Amount</th><th>Description</th></tr><tr><td>\$881,332</td><td>Cash</td></tr><tr><td>3,137</td><td>Interest Receivable</td></tr><tr><td>\$884,470</td><td>Fund Balance 6/30/16</td></tr></table>			Amount	Description	\$881,332	Cash	3,137	Interest Receivable	\$884,470	Fund Balance 6/30/16																
	Amount	Description																									
	\$881,332	Cash																									
	3,137	Interest Receivable																									
\$884,470	Fund Balance 6/30/16																										
3. A description of expenditures from the Fund by category for: a. Monitoring and preserving the long-term affordability of units subject to affordability restrictions or covenants entered into by the redevelopment agency or the housing successor and administering permitted affordable housing activities. <i>The amount that can be spent on monitoring and administration is capped at 2% of the value of the assets in the Fund or \$200,000 whichever is greater.</i> b. Homeless prevention and rapid rehousing services. <i>This amount is limited to \$250,000 annually.</i> c. Development of housing affordable to households at or below 80% of area median income ("AMI").	<table><tr><th>Amount</th><th>Description</th></tr><tr><td>\$27,195</td><td>a. Staff charges for Monitoring</td></tr><tr><td>3,275</td><td>Misc Office Charges</td></tr><tr><td>0</td><td>b. Homeless Prevention</td></tr><tr><td>0</td><td>c. Development of Affordables</td></tr><tr><td>\$30,470</td><td>Total Expenditures</td></tr></table>			Amount	Description	\$27,195	a. Staff charges for Monitoring	3,275	Misc Office Charges	0	b. Homeless Prevention	0	c. Development of Affordables	\$30,470	Total Expenditures												
	Amount	Description																									
	\$27,195	a. Staff charges for Monitoring																									
	3,275	Misc Office Charges																									
	0	b. Homeless Prevention																									
	0	c. Development of Affordables																									
\$30,470	Total Expenditures																										

Report of Required Information per Health and Safety Code 34176.1 (f)

City of Roseville Housing Successor

Fiscal Year 2015-16

4. The statutory value of real property owned by the housing successor, the value of loans and grants receivable, and the sum of these two amounts. <i>"Statutory value of real property" means the value of properties formerly held by the former redevelopment agency as listed on the housing asset transfer form approved by the Department of Finance ("DOF") and the purchase price of properties purchased by the housing successor.</i>	<table border="1"><thead><tr><th><i>Amount</i></th><th><i>Description</i></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>\$861,246</td><td>304 Washington Blvd</td></tr><tr><td>5,502,804</td><td>Deferred Receivables</td></tr><tr><td>0</td><td>SERAF Receivable from SA</td></tr><tr><td>\$6,364,050</td><td>Total Value of Land & A/R</td></tr></tbody></table>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Description</i>	\$861,246	304 Washington Blvd	5,502,804	Deferred Receivables	0	SERAF Receivable from SA	\$6,364,050	Total Value of Land & A/R
<i>Amount</i>	<i>Description</i>										
\$861,246	304 Washington Blvd										
5,502,804	Deferred Receivables										
0	SERAF Receivable from SA										
\$6,364,050	Total Value of Land & A/R										
5. A description of any inter-jurisdictional transfers of monies from the Fund in the previous fiscal year as well as any transfer from prior fiscal years if the funds are still unencumbered and a description of and status update on any project for which transferred funds have been or will be expended if that project has not yet been placed in service.	<table border="1"><tr><td align="center">none</td></tr></table>	none									
none											
6. A description of any project for which the housing successor receives or holds real property tax revenue pursuant to the ROPS and the status of that project.	<table border="1"><tr><td align="center">none</td></tr></table>	none									
none											
7. For interests in real property acquired by the former redevelopment agency prior to February 1, 2012, a status update on compliance with the development of the property within five (5) years after the DOF approved the property as a housing asset, which would typically be the date of approval of the housing asset transfer list. For interests in real property acquired on or after February 1, 2012, a status update on the project.	Fiscal Year 2017: Mercy Housing has secured a loan from the Housing Successor in the amount of \$5,760,000 for the development of a mixed-use affordable housing development in downtown Roseville. The loan was approved by City Council acting as the Housing Successor on November 16, 2016. The funds - the remainder of the 2006 housing bonds - were wired to the developer's escrow account in November of 2016. The loan expenditure will be reported in the Annual Report for FY2016-17.										
8. A description of any outstanding replacement housing and housing production obligations that transferred to the housing successor on February 1, 2012, the housing successor's progress in meeting those obligations, and the housing successor's plans to meet the unmet obligations.	The Agency will continue to work with 2-3 affordable housing developers. Going forward the Agency is hopeful that loan portfolio payoffs and 20% set-aside deposits from City loan payments will provide additional assistance for affordable housing developments.										

Report of Required Information per Health and Safety Code 34176.1 (f)

City of Roseville Housing Successor

Fiscal Year 2015-16

9. Reporting on income targeting requirements does not need to be included until December 31, 2019 for the period from January 1, 2014 through the end of the fiscal year covered by the report (June 30, 2019 for most housing successors), and every five years thereafter. However, it may be useful for housing successors to track this information on an annual basis to ensure the requirement is met every five years. <i>The required income targeting expenditures are that, over a five year period, the funds remaining after expenditures for monitoring and administration and rapid rehousing services, if any, must be expended for the development of housing affordable to and occupied by households earning 80% or less of the AMI, with at least 30% of the funds expended on the development of housing affordable to and occupied by households earning 30% or less of the AMI and not more than 20% of the funds expended on the development of housing affordable to and occupied by households earning between 60% and 80% of the AMI.</i>	Not Required until 2019										
10. The percentage of units of deed-restricted rental housing restricted to seniors and assisted individually or jointly by the housing successor, its former redevelopment agency, and its host jurisdiction within the previous 10 years in relation to the total number of units of deed-restricted rental housing assisted individually or jointly by the housing successor, its former redevelopment agency, and its host jurisdiction within the same time period. <i>If the percentage of assisted senior rental housing is more than 50 percent of the total of all assisted rental housing, no additional senior rental housing can be assisted until the percentage falls to 50 percent or less.</i>	<table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width:15%;"># of Units</th> <th style="width:85%;">Description</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td align="center">123</td> <td>Senior Restricted Rental Housing Units</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">154</td> <td>Non-Senior Restricted Rental Housing Units</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">277</td> <td>Total Units</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">44%</td> <td>% of Senior Restricted Rental Housing Units</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	# of Units	Description	123	Senior Restricted Rental Housing Units	154	Non-Senior Restricted Rental Housing Units	277	Total Units	44%	% of Senior Restricted Rental Housing Units
# of Units	Description										
123	Senior Restricted Rental Housing Units										
154	Non-Senior Restricted Rental Housing Units										
277	Total Units										
44%	% of Senior Restricted Rental Housing Units										
11. The amount of any excess surplus, the amount of time that the successor agency has had the excess surplus, and the housing successor's plan for eliminating the excess surplus. <i>The definition of excess surplus has been modified so that an "excess surplus" exists to the extent a housing successor holds unencumbered funds in its Fund in an amount that exceeds the greater of \$1,000,000 or the total amount of deposits into the Fund for the preceding four fiscal years. The housing successor is required to spend the excess surplus amount or transfer that amount to another jurisdiction as provided in Health and Safety Code Section 34176.1(c)(2) within three fiscal years. If not, the excess surplus amount must be transferred to HCD to use pursuant to the Multifamily Housing Program or the Joe Serna, Jr. Farmworker Housing Grant Program.</i>	\$0.00										



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8188

File #: 0709 & 0201-01

Title: CalHome and BEGIN Re-Use Fund - Budget Adjustment

Contact: Melissa Hagan 916-774-5476 mhagan@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 6.26.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff is requesting that City Council adopt an ordinance approving a budget adjustment for \$61,000 to fund additional Owner Occupied Rehabilitation Program loans from the CalHome fund, and \$19,900 to fund additional Owner Occupied Rehabilitation Program loans from the BEGIN Re-Use fund.

BACKGROUND

The City of Roseville's Housing Division Owner Occupied Rehabilitation Loan Program assists eligible low income individuals and homeowners with first-time homebuyer and rehabilitation loans that are secured by a Deed of Trust. The loans are deferred, there is no monthly payment on the loans; however, the loans are due and payable upon sale, change of title or change of use, such as a change from owner-occupied housing to renter-occupied housing. The rehab loans are used to correct health and safety deficiencies and make general property improvements. The funding for both the CalHome and BEGIN deferred loan programs were established through State of California legislation and codified in the State's Health and Safety Code. The original funds were awarded to the City through a competitive process from the State of California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Owner-occupied rehab loans to income-qualified homeowners is a permitted reuse of these funds.

The Division began disbursing loans in 2003 from the CalHome fund and in 2007 from the BEGIN fund and has since assisted low income homeowners with nearly \$2.2 million in first-time homebuyer and deferred rehab loans. As these loans are paid off, the money is returned to the original program and can be reused to fund Owner-Occupied Rehabilitation Program loans. In order to disburse additional rehab loans this fiscal year, the budget for each of the funds needs to be increased by \$61,000 and \$19,900 respectively.

FISCAL IMPACT

The sources of funds for the rehabilitation loans are CALHOME and BEGIN Re-Use Funds. This

action has no impact on the General Fund.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

The Council of Economic Advisors (CEA) a three-member council that analyzes and interprets economic developments and advises the White House on national economic policy, purports that total employment not only includes direct and indirect jobs, but also induced jobs. CEA estimates that total employment is increased by one job-year (one job for one year) for every \$92,000 in direct government spending. As a result of expending an additional \$80,900 in loans for the rehabilitation program, staff calculates this will create .88 job-years.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not apply to activities that will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3)). This budget adjustment does not include the potential for a significant environmental effect, and therefore is not subject to CEQA. Rehabilitation projects are reviewed individually for compliance with CEQA.

Respectfully Submitted,

Melissa Hagan, Administrative Analyst

Chris Robles, Economic Development Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Ordinance No. 5779

Budget Adjustment

ORDINANCE NO. 5779

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE
AUTHORIZING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016-17
BUDGET AND DECLARING THIS ORDINANCE TO BE IMMEDIATELY
EFFECTIVE AS AN APPROPRIATION MEASURE

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. The City of Roseville Annual Budget, Fiscal Year 2016-17, is hereby amended by transferring appropriation to and from the activities indicated below:

Appropriate funds for CalHome and BEGIN, deferred loan programs through the State of California, per request of the Economic Development Department, as listed on the attached Request for Budget Adjustment totaling \$80,900.00.

SECTION 2. This ordinance is hereby declared to be an appropriation measure, immediately effective pursuant to the provisions of Section 5.03 of the Charter.

SECTION 3. The City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to post a true copy of the foregoing ordinance in each of three (3) conspicuous locations in the City and she shall immediately after such posting enter in the ordinance book, under the record of the ordinance, a certificate under her hand stating the time and place of such publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville, this
_____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk



REQUEST FOR BUDGET ADJUSTMENT FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Instructions: Complete all necessary fields. Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory and required for processing. Obtain required approvals and process according to the procedure outlined in:

[A.R. 6.01 Budget Adjustment Policy & Procedure.](#)

For more detailed budget adjustment training information, including examples, please click on the following link:



[Miscellaneous Budget Training Information.](#)

REQUESTER*: Melissa Hagan (x 5475)

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION*: Economic Development/Housing

FISCAL YEAR/EFFECTIVE DATE*: FY2017

PROPOSED COUNCIL DATE (if applicable): 01/18/2017

USE OF FUNDS*						
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL			JL		
	ORG KEY*	OBJECT*	FUND*	PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
61,000	08117	5910	262			CalHome funds for Rehab Loans
19,900	08119	5910	263			BEGIN funds for Rehab Loans
\$ 80,900	TOTAL					
SOURCE OF FUNDS*						
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL			JL		
	ORG KEY	OBJECT	FUND*	PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
61,000	00262		262			Fund Balance
19,900	00263		263			Fund Balance
\$ 80,900	TOTAL					
FINANCE USE		Approved:				
		 BUDGET MANAGER/DESIGNEE DATE 1/8/16		 Finance Director Date		

Justification for Budget Adjustment*:

This is to increase the budget for the CalHome and BEGIN programs in order to fund rehab loans. The CalHome and BEGIN programs accumulate available resources from loan payoffs and are available to re-use for new rehab loans to low income homeowners who qualify for the program.

Approved:		Approved:	
			
REQUESTING DEPARTMENT HEAD / DESIGNEE	DATE 12/13/16	CITY MANAGER	DATE



REQUEST FOR BUDGET ADJUSTMENT
FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Instructions: Complete all necessary fields. Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory and required for processing. Obtain required approvals and process according to the procedure outlined in:
[A.R. 6.01 Budget Adjustment Policy & Procedure.](#)

For more detailed budget adjustment training information, including examples, please click on the following link:
[Miscellaneous Budget Training Information.](#)

REQUESTER*: Melissa Hagan (x 5475)

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION*: Economic Development/Housing

FISCAL YEAR/EFFECTIVE DATE*: FY2017

PROPOSED COUNCIL DATE (if applicable): 01/18/2017

USE OF FUNDS*						
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL			JL		
	ORG KEY*	OBJECT*	FUND*	PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
61,000	08117	5910	262			CalHome funds for Rehab Loans
19,900	08119	5910	263			BEGIN funds for Rehab Loans
\$ 80,900	TOTAL					

SOURCE OF FUNDS*						
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL			JL		
	ORG KEY	OBJECT	FUND*	PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
61,000	00262		262			Fund Balance
19,900	00263		263			Fund Balance
\$ 80,900	TOTAL					

FINANCE USE	Approved:		
	 BUDGET MANAGER/DISEGNEE	1/8/16 DATE	 Finance Director,

Justification for Budget Adjustment*:

This is to increase the budget for the CalHome and BEGIN programs in order to fund rehab loans. The CalHome and BEGIN programs accumulate available resources from loan payoffs and are available to re-use for new rehab loans to low income homeowners who qualify for the program.

Approved:		Approved:	
 REQUESTING DEPARTMENT HEAD / DESIGNEE	12/13/16 DATE	 CITY MANAGER	DATE



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8223

File #: 0900-04-01 & 0201-01

Title: 2016 Sidewalk, Curb and Gutter Repair Project - Notice of Completion and Budget Adjustment

Contact: Nick Graves 916-746-1300 ngraves@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 6.27.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff recommends the City Council accept the 2016 Sidewalk, Curb and Gutter Repair Project as complete, adopt a resolution authorizing the Public Works Director to execute the Notice of Completion, adopt an ordinance for a Budget Adjustment to transfer funds to the General Fund, and authorize staff to expend funds from the General Fund and the North Central Roseville Community Facilities District fund.

BACKGROUND

This is a bi-annual maintenance project, which repairs sidewalks, curbs and gutters damaged by "Official City Street Trees". This year's project included 150 repair locations throughout the City. A map showing the areas where repairs were made is attached. A majority of the damage repaired was caused by the roots of Official City Street Trees. However, this year's project included additional work for sidewalk repairs within the North Central Lighting and Landscaping District (LLD) and within Maidu Park. Four ADA curb ramps were also constructed. Incorporating the additional work into our curb, gutter, and sidewalk project gave us an improved economy of scale which resulted in lower unit prices.

FISCAL IMPACT

The project was awarded at the June 15, 2016 council meeting for \$229,349.00 plus a 10% construction contingency. The final construction cost was \$247,628.80. The increase in cost was due to additional needed sidewalk repairs discovered during construction. There were sufficient funds in the project's contingency budget at award to cover the increased cost. The project is funded by several funding sources. These sources and amounts are: \$159,313 of General Liability Insurance Funds for damage caused by Official City Street Trees; \$9,807.40 of North Central LLD sidewalk maintenance funds for work within the North Central LLD; \$4,020.00 of Park Maintenance Funds for the Maidu Park repairs; \$50,488.40 of Street Maintenance Funds available for any work along City streets; and \$24,000 of CIP Rehab Funds (ADA Compliance in

R/W account - 21507) for the ADA curb ramps.

The attached Budget Adjustment transfers \$159,313 from the General Liability Fund and \$24,000 from the General CIP Rehab Fund to the General Fund. With Council approval, these monies transferred to the General Fund will be used to fund a portion of the construction contract. The Budget Adjustment also reallocates monies to the North Central Roseville CFD account used to fund a portion of the project. These fund expenditures were approved by Council in fiscal year 2016. However, they were in annual accounts that expired before the contract approved by Council that June made it through the City's contract approval process. At the end of last fiscal year, those monies were returned to their original funding sources. This request is for approval to spend in fiscal year 2017 those same monies that were not spent in fiscal year 2016.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Based on Federal guidelines, there is one job created for every \$92,000.00 in direct government spending. Based on that figure, this project will create 2.7 jobs.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The Council action of accepting the 2016 Sidewalk, Curb and Gutter Repair Project as complete will not result in a direct physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines §15060(c)(2). Adoption of the 2016 Sidewalk, Curb and Gutter Repair Project Notice of Completion does not include the potential for a significant effect, and therefore is not subject to CEQA.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nick Graves, Assistant Engineer

Rhon Herndon, Public Works Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution No. 17-31

Notice of Completion

Exhibit A - Vicinity Map

Ordinance No. 5788

Budget Adjustment

RESOLUTION NO. 17-31

ACCEPTING THE PUBLIC WORK KNOWN AS THE 2016 SIDEWALK, CURB AND GUTTER REPAIR PROJECT, APPROVING THE “NOTICE OF COMPLETION”, AND AUTHORIZING THE PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE SAID NOTICE ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Roseville as follows:

1. The “Notice of Completion” on file in the City Clerk’s Department relative to that public work known as the 2016 Sidewalk, Curb and Gutter Repair Project has been approved and the public work accepted.
2. The Director Public Works is hereby authorized and directed to execute said Notice on behalf of the City of Roseville.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20____, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

AFTER RECORDING RETURN TO:
CITY CLERK
311 VERNON STREET
ROSEVILLE, CA 95678

NOTICE OF COMPLETION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the public work known as 2016 Sidewalk, Curb and Gutter Repair Project, was completed and accepted by the City of Roseville on 1/18/2017. The location is indicated on the attached map, marked as Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein by this reference.

The general contractor on said project was All-American Construction, Inc.

The surety on said project was The Guarantee Company of North America.

ATTEST:

RHON L. HERNDON
Public Works Director
City of Roseville

SONIA OROZCO, CITY CLERK

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF PLACER)

I, Rhon L. Herndon, being first duly sworn, depose and say: I am the Public Works Director of the City of Roseville, a municipal corporation in the State of California, owner of the property described in the above Notice. I am duly authorized to make this verification for and on behalf of the City of Roseville. I have read the Notice of Completion and know its contents and the facts stated therein are true.

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.


RHON L. HERNDON
Public Works Director
City of Roseville

State of California)
County of Placer)

Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on this ____ day of _____, 2017,
by RHON L. HERNDON proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s)
who appeared before me.

Notary Public in and for said County and State

"EXHIBIT A"
2016 SIDEWALK CURB & GUTTER PROJECT
VICINITY MAP



LEGEND

PROJECT LOCATION ○

ORDINANCE NO. 5788

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE
AUTHORIZING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016-17
BUDGET AND DECLARING THIS ORDINANCE TO BE IMMEDIATELY
EFFECTIVE AS AN APPROPRIATION MEASURE

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. The City of Roseville Annual Budget, Fiscal Year 2016-17, is hereby amended by transferring appropriation to and from the activities indicated below:

Appropriate funds for the 2016 Sidewalk, Curb and Gutter Repair Project per request of the Public Works Department, as listed on the attached Request for Budget Adjustment totaling \$376,434.00

SECTION 2. This ordinance is hereby declared to be an appropriation measure, immediately effective pursuant to the provisions of Section 5.03 of the Charter.

SECTION 3. The City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to post a true copy of the foregoing ordinance in each of three (3) conspicuous locations in the City and she shall immediately after such posting enter in the ordinance book, under the record of the ordinance, a certificate under her hand stating the time and place of such publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville, this
_____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk



REQUEST FOR BUDGET ADJUSTMENT FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Instructions: Complete all necessary fields. Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory and required for processing. Obtain required approvals and process according to the procedure outlined in: [A.R. 6.01 Budget Adjustment Policy & Procedure](#).

For more detailed budget adjustment training information, including examples, please click on the following link: [Miscellaneous Budget Training Information](#).

REQUESTER*: Jason Shykowski/Nick Graves

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION*: Public Works

FISCAL YEAR/EFFECTIVE DATE*: Fy2016-17

PROPOSED COUNCIL DATE (if applicable): 01/18/2017

USE OF FUNDS*

AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL		FUND*	JL		
	ORG KEY*	OBJECT*		PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
159,313	21504	6130	100			2016 Sidewalk, Curb & Gutter / Construction
24,000	21507	6130	100			2016 Sidewalk, Curb & Gutter / Construction
159,313	00100	3902				Transfer in from General Liability
24,000	00100	3902	310			Transfer in from Gen. CIP Rehab
9,808	00336	6130				2016 Sidewalk, Curb & Gutter / Construction
\$ 376,434	TOTAL					

SOURCE OF FUNDS*

AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL		FUND*	JL		
	ORG KEY	OBJECT		PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
159,313	03112	8902				Transfer out to GF
24,000	00310	8902	310			Transfer out to GF
159,313	03112					Gen Liab Fund Balance
24,000	00310					Gen CIP rehab fund balance
9,808	00336					Fund Balance NCRCFD
\$ 376,434	TOTAL					

FINANCE USE

Approved:

Kathy Cullen 12/22/16

BUDGET MANAGER/DESIGNEE

DATE

Windy Haul

Finance Director

Date

Justification for Budget Adjustment*:

Funds needed for construction contract.

Approved:

[Signature] 12-22-2016

REQUESTING DEPARTMENT HEAD/DESIGNEE

DATE

Approved:

CITY MANAGER

DATE



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8225

File #: 0401-02-02-1

Title: 316 Vernon Office Building - Budget Adjustments
Contact: Jeannine Thrash 916-774-5473 jthrash@roseville.ca.us
Monty Hanks 916-774-5313 mhanks@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 6.28.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff recommends the City Council approve the attached budget adjustments relating to 316 Vernon Street project revenues and expenses for FY2016-17.

BACKGROUND

Fund 105 (316 Vernon Street Fund) was created to track transactions belonging to 316 Vernon Street Building separately from the General Fund. A decision was made that using a separate fund to track the transactions separately was not necessary, therefore this budget adjustment transfers all transactions to the General Fund and closes out Fund 105.

FISCAL IMPACT

The budget adjustment is a net zero transaction and has no fiscal impact to the City's General Fund.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Approval of these budget adjustments will not create any new jobs.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The budget adjustments are not considered a "project" as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (CEQA Guidelines §15378). Consequently no CEQA action is required.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jeannine Thrash, Administrative Analyst

Monty Hanks, Finance Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Ordinance No. 5789

Ordinance No. 5790

Ordinance No. 5791

Budget adjustments

ORDINANCE NO. 5789

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE
AUTHORIZING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016-17
BUDGET AND DECLARING THIS ORDINANCE TO BE IMMEDIATELY
EFFECTIVE AS AN APPROPRIATION MEASURE

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. The City of Roseville Annual Budget, Fiscal Year 2016-17, is hereby amended by transferring appropriation to and from the activities indicated below:

Appropriate funds relating to 316 Vernon Street project revenues and expenses per the request of the Finance Department, as listed on the attached Request for Budget Adjustment in the amount of \$1,174,782.00.

SECTION 2. This ordinance is hereby declared to be an appropriation measure, immediately effective pursuant to the provisions of Section 5.03 of the Charter.

SECTION 3. The City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to post a true copy of the foregoing ordinance in each of three (3) conspicuous locations in the City and she shall immediately after such posting enter in the ordinance book, under the record of the ordinance, a certificate under her hand stating the time and place of such publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville, this
_____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

ORDINANCE NO. 5790

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE
AUTHORIZING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016-17
BUDGET AND DECLARING THIS ORDINANCE TO BE IMMEDIATELY
EFFECTIVE AS AN APPROPRIATION MEASURE

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. The City of Roseville Annual Budget, Fiscal Year 2016-17, is hereby amended by transferring appropriation to and from the activities indicated below:

Appropriate funds relating to 316 Vernon Street project revenues and expenses per the request of the Finance Department, as listed on the attached Request for Budget Adjustment in the amount of (\$182,244.00).

SECTION 2. This ordinance is hereby declared to be an appropriation measure, immediately effective pursuant to the provisions of Section 5.03 of the Charter.

SECTION 3. The City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to post a true copy of the foregoing ordinance in each of three (3) conspicuous locations in the City and she shall immediately after such posting enter in the ordinance book, under the record of the ordinance, a certificate under her hand stating the time and place of such publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville, this
_____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

ORDINANCE NO. 5791

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE
AUTHORIZING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016-17
BUDGET AND DECLARING THIS ORDINANCE TO BE IMMEDIATELY
EFFECTIVE AS AN APPROPRIATION MEASURE

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. The City of Roseville Annual Budget, Fiscal Year 2016-17, is hereby amended by transferring appropriation to and from the activities indicated below:

Appropriate funds relating to 316 Vernon Street project revenues and expenses per the request of the Finance Department, as listed on the attached Request for Budget Adjustment in the amount of \$125,000.00.

SECTION 2. This ordinance is hereby declared to be an appropriation measure, immediately effective pursuant to the provisions of Section 5.03 of the Charter.

SECTION 3. The City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to post a true copy of the foregoing ordinance in each of three (3) conspicuous locations in the City and she shall immediately after such posting enter in the ordinance book, under the record of the ordinance, a certificate under her hand stating the time and place of such publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville, this
_____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk



REQUEST FOR BUDGET ADJUSTMENT FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Instructions: Complete all necessary fields. Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory and required for processing. Obtain required approvals and process according to the procedure outlined in: A.R. 6.01 Budget Adjustment Policy & Procedure.

REQUESTER*: Jeannine Thrash

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION*: Finance admin

FISCAL YEAR/EFFECTIVE DATE*: FY2017

PROPOSED COUNCIL DATE (if applicable): 01/18/2017

For more detailed budget adjustment training information, including examples, please click on the following link:
Miscellaneous Budget Training Information.

USE OF FUNDS*						
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL			JL		
	ORG KEY*	OBJECT*	FUND*	PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
297,915	09806	3110	100			Move from Fund 105 into Fund 100
9,329	09806	3102	100			Move from Fund 105 into Fund 100
215,000	09806	8110	100			Move from Fund 105 into Fund 100
648,038	09806	8111	100			Move from Fund 105 into Fund 100
2,500	09806	8140	100			Move from Fund 105 into Fund 100
2,000	09806	8145	100			Move from Fund 105 into Fund 100
\$ 1,174,782	TOTAL					

SOURCE OF FUNDS*						
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL			JL		
	ORG KEY	OBJECT	FUND*	PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
307,244	09807	3110	105			Move out of fund 105 into General fund
215,000	09807	8110	105			Move out of fund 105 into General fund
648,038	09807	8111	105			Move out of fund 105 into General fund
2,500	09807	8140	105			Move out of fund 105 into General fund
2,000	09807	8145	105			Move out of fund 105 into General fund
\$ 1,174,782	TOTAL					

FINANCE USE	Approved:	<i>Kathy Cullen</i> 12/16/16	<i>Walter Hane</i>
	BUDGET MANAGER/DESIGNEE	DATE	Finance Director
			Date

Justification for Budget Adjustment*:

Moving out of individual fund (Fund 105) into the General Fund (Fund 100).
Taking tenant improvement loan pymt portion of \$1,554.70/month and moving from 09807/3110 (Fund 105) to 09806/3102 (Fund 100).

Approved:	<i>Walter Hane</i>	Approved:	
REQUESTING DEPARTMENT HEAD / DESIGNEE	DATE	CITY MANAGER	DATE



REQUEST FOR BUDGET ADJUSTMENT FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Instructions: Complete all necessary fields. Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory and required for processing. Obtain required approvals and process according to the procedure outlined in: [A.R. 6.01 Budget Adjustment Policy & Procedure.](#)

REQUESTER*: Jeannine Thrash

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION*: Finance

FISCAL YEAR/EFFECTIVE DATE*: 2017

PROPOSED COUNCIL DATE (if applicable): 01/18/2017

For more detailed budget adjustment training information, including examples, please click on the following link:

[Miscellaneous Budget Training Information.](#)

USE OF FUNDS*							
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*	
	GL			JL			
	ORG KEY*	OBJECT*	FUND*	PROJECT	ACTIVITY		
867,538	00222	8902	222	700100		Increase Transfer In to Fund 100	
(867,538)	00222	8902	222	700105		Decrease Transfer out to Fund 105	
(182,244)	00105	8900	105	700100		Decrease Transfer out to Fund 100	
\$ (182,244)	TOTAL						

SOURCE OF FUNDS*							
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*	
	GL			JL			
	ORG KEY	OBJECT	FUND*	PROJECT	ACTIVITY		
867,538	00100	3902	100	700222		Increase Transfer In from Fund 222	
(867,538)	00105	3902	105	700222		Decrease Transfer In from Fund 222	
(182,244)	00100	3900	100	700105		Decrease Transfer In from Fund 105	
\$ (182,244)	TOTAL						

FINANCE USE	Approved:	Comments:
	<i>Kathy Cullen</i> 12/20/16	<i>Maity Haul</i>
	BUDGET MANAGER/DESIGNEE	DATE

Justification for Budget Adjustment*:

This budget adjustment is to increase the transfers from the Public Facilities Fund (222) to the General Fund (100) and decrease the transfers from the Public Facilities Fund (222) to the 316 Vernon Fund (105) as a result of moving all activity in the 316 Vernon Fund to the General Fund. In addition, an unnecessary transfer was eliminated from the 316 Vernon Fund (105) to the General Fund (100).

Approved:	Approved:
<i>Maity Haul</i>	
REQUESTING DEPARTMENT HEAD / DESIGNEE	CITY MANAGER
DATE	DATE

REQUEST FOR BUDGET ADJUSTMENT
FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Instructions: Complete all necessary fields. Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory and required for processing. Obtain required approvals and process according to the procedure outlined in:
A.R. 6.01 Budget Adjustment Policy & Procedure.

REQUESTER*: Jeannine Thrash

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION*: Finance admin

FISCAL YEAR/EFFECTIVE DATE*: FY2017

PROPOSED COUNCIL DATE (if applicable): 01/18/2017

For more detailed budget adjustment training information, including examples, please click on the following link:

Miscellaneous Budget Training Information.

USE OF FUNDS*						
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL			JL		
	ORG KEY*	OBJECT*	FUND*	PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
10,000	03331	5100	100			Move from Fund 105 into Fund 100
70,000	03331	5400	100			Move from Fund 105 into Fund 100
45,000	03332	5100	100			Move from Fund 105 into Fund 100
\$ 125,000	TOTAL					

SOURCE OF FUNDS*						
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL			JL		
	ORG KEY	OBJECT	FUND*	PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
10,000	05005	5100	105			Move out of fund 105 into General fund
70,000	05005	5400	105			Move out of fund 105 into General fund
45,000	05005	5100	105			Move out of fund 105 into General fund
\$ 125,000	TOTAL					

FINANCE USE	Approved: <i>Kathy Cullen</i> 12/16/16	<i>Marty Haul</i>
	BUDGET MANAGER/DISEGNEE	Finance Director
	DATE	Date

Justification for Budget Adjustment*:

Moving out of individual fund (Fund 105) into the General Fund (Fund 100).

Approved: <i>Marty Haul</i>	Approved:
REQUESTING DEPARTMENT HEAD / DESIGNEE	CITY MANAGER
DATE	DATE



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8181

File #: 0800-02 & 0201-01

Title: Environmental Utilities Department Historical Data Repository System Upgrade - Professional Design Services Agreement and Budget Adjustment

Contact: Charles Aycock 916-746-1887 caycock@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 6.29.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff recommends City Council approve the following items:

- Adopt an ordinance approving the attached budget adjustment. The budget adjustment will transfer \$3,800,000.00 from the Water and Wastewater Rehabilitation Funds to the HDR System Upgrade project (173506);
- Provided the HDR System Upgrade budget adjustment is approved, staff recommends Council adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to execute the Professional Design Services Agreement with CH2M Hill Engineers, Inc. for the HDR System Upgrade Project for the amount of \$324,216.00, which will be funded by the Historical Data Repository Upgrade Project CIP.

BACKGROUND

The HDR System is a centralized Oracle data repository which collects data from the water and both wastewater treatment plant Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) systems that are operated and maintained by the Environmental Utilities Department (EUD). In addition to the thousands of data points sent to the HDR System by each of the SCADA systems daily, the HDR system also receives data from EUD's Laboratory and Water Information Management Systems and is designated as the 'system of record' for all EUD regulatory compliance monitoring data. Using the existing Oracle Forms and Reports and Discoverer software applications, authorized individuals are able to create reports for internal use, as well as publish required compliance reports for Regional, State and Federal regulating agencies.

An HDR assessment was completed by CH2M Hill Engineers, Inc. (CH2M) in 2011, and a subsequent assessment was completed by the WT Roseville Joint Venture in 2014 as part of the Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) System Replacement Project, with each consultant determining that the HDR system was currently meeting Environmental Utilities Department (EUD) business needs, but a future project should be implemented to replace or upgrade the HDR for a number of reasons including:

- Oracle discontinued support for its Forms and Reports 10g Utility in 2010;
- The Discoverer Business Intelligence Suite currently utilized by the HDR was discontinued in

2014;

- Microsoft will discontinue Windows Server 2003 in summer of 2015;
- The discontinued versions of the various HDR software components prevent upgrading to current software drivers and tools, like Java, which impairs the HDR system's performance and potentially introduces security vulnerabilities into the HDR system;
- The City's service contract with Dell for HDR hardware support ended in the fall of 2015;
- The existing HDR system is not configured utilizing modern data warehousing practices, thus limiting the ability to use current data mining, reporting and analytic tools.

Because the items listed above comprise the core elements that make up the HDR from a cost perspective, EUD determined that an evaluation should be conducted to assess whether EUD should upgrade the existing hardware and Oracle software platforms or whether EUD should change to another database platform that could be more cost effective to operate and maintain. Aspect Software, Inc. was contracted to assist the City in a discovery process assisting City staff with completion of the following list of tasks and findings (in parenthesis).

- Assess the Business Intelligence functional requirements and provide a solution recommendation;
 - o (Logi_Analytics Business Intelligence software solution was determined to be the best value solution for EUD's needs.)
- Conduct an analysis to identify the best value database platform between Oracle and Microsoft SQL;
 - o (Determined upgrade to the existing Oracle database software and related Forms and Reports software was the best value solution for the City.)
- Determine whether a cloud solution should be leveraged
 - o (Determined that a cloud solution was not appropriate for this project.)
- Provide recommendation for virtualizing the HDR, which would reduce the quantity of hardware servers required for the HDR;
 - o (Determined that virtualization of the HDR platform was appropriate for our application.)
- Develop life-cycle budgetary estimates for all options considered in the assessment process, to allow EUD staff to select the appropriate hardware and software platform and associated configuration changes;
 - o (Life-cycle estimates were provided and utilized for the establishment of this project's budget.)

CH2M has been functioning as the Project Engineer for the SCADA systems replacement project, and employs technical experts who effectively assessed the existing HDR system. Due to their successful assessment, EUD design and project engineering experience with CH2M, EUD determined that CH2M was best qualified to perform the design and engineering services for the HDR System Upgrade project.

Under this agreement, CH2M will be tasked with leveraging the studies completed by their staff, WT Roseville JV, and Aspect Software Inc., to develop technical specifications required for the City to release a Request for Proposal to receive proposals from perspective integration firms to:

- Upgrade the HDR's Oracle database and Oracle Forms and Reports software;
- Coordinate with the EUD staff to implement the Logi Analytics business intelligence software solution, allowing easier access to the data stored in the HDR;
- Replace HDR production system hardware;
- Provide HDR test environment, which will also serve as a disaster recovery environment
- Provide complete documentation of all software and conduct EUD staff training

After an integration firm is selected via the RFP process, CH2M will provide engineering services on behalf of the EUD to review project submittals, test plans and the proposed system configuration. CH2M will also lead the effort to thoroughly test the new HDR system in the factory test environment, as well as in the field, prior to accepting the system of record for EUD's compliance data.

FISCAL IMPACT

The cost for the Historical Data Repository System Upgrade professional design services agreement is \$324,216.00 and the total cost for the complete system replacement is estimated to be \$3,800,000. The project funding is split between the Water and Wastewater Utility Rehabilitation funds. The Water Rehabilitation fund is contributing 1/3 of the funding and the Wastewater Rehabilitation fund is contributing 2/3 of the funding. The wastewater rehabilitation portion of the cost is further split between the South Placer Wastewater Authority (SPWA) partners with Roseville assuming responsibility for 63.47% (\$1,607,906.67), Placer County contributing 11.68%, and the South Placer Municipal Utility District contributing 24.85%. The Water Rehabilitation Fund's liability for the requested change is \$1,266,666.67. Roseville's total current contribution to this project is estimated to be \$2,874,573.34.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Approximately 7 temporary jobs will be created by this project.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not apply to activities that will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines §15061(b)(3)). The Historical Data Repository System Upgrade project does not include the potential for a significant environmental effect, and therefore is not subject to CEQA.

Respectfully Submitted,

Charles Aycock, EIM Systems Coordinator

Richard Plecker, Environmental Utilities Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution No. 17-29

Professional Design Services Agreement_CH2M

PDSA_Exhibit A

Ordinance No. 5786

Budget Adjustment Form

RESOLUTION NO. 17-29

APPROVING A PROFESSIONAL DESIGN SERVICES AGREEMENT BY AND BETWEEN
THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND CH2M HILL ENGINEERS, INC., AND AUTHORIZING
THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF
THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

WHEREAS, a professional design services agreement regarding the Environmental
Utilities Department Historical Data Upgrade project, by and between the City of Roseville and
CH2M Hill Engineers, Inc., has been reviewed by the City Council; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that
said agreement is hereby approved and that the City Manager is authorized to execute it on
behalf of the City of Roseville.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of
_____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

PROFESSIONAL DESIGN SERVICES AGREEMENT

Environmental Utilities Department HDR System Upgrade Project

THIS AGREEMENT is made and entered into this ____ day of _____, 20____, by and between the City of Roseville, a municipal corporation ("CITY"), and CH2M Hill Engineers, Inc., a Delaware corporation ("CONSULTANT "); and

W I T N E S S E T H:

WHEREAS, CITY desires professional design services consisting of technical services to assist CITY with the preparation of a Request for Proposal for the Historical Data Repository (HDR) System Upgrade Project, database system design and support services; and

WHEREAS, CONSULTANT has prepared a proposal dated October 17, 2016, which describes the scope of work to be performed by CONSULTANT, the budget for the work, and the schedule for performance of the work; and

WHEREAS, CONSULTANT is qualified and experienced to provide such professional design services.

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties agree as follows:

1. Services. CONSULTANT shall perform, at the direction of CITY, the scope of services as described in EXHIBIT "A," attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.
2. Compensation. For its services provided hereunder, CONSULTANT shall be

compensated on a time and expense basis in accordance with the budget estimate as described in EXHIBIT "A." Total compensation shall not exceed three hundred twenty-four thousand, two hundred sixteen dollars (\$324,216).

CONSULTANT shall submit monthly invoices for its services. Such invoices shall be delineated by task, the person performing the services, and the hourly rate, which shall be stated in time increments of not greater than one-tenth (1/10) hours. CITY shall pay invoices within thirty (30) days after receipt, if the services specified in the invoice have been satisfactorily completed.

3. Indemnification. To the fullest extent allowed by law, CONSULTANT agrees to indemnify, including the cost to defend CITY, and its officers, agents, employees and volunteers from any and all claims, demands, costs or liability that arise out of, or pertain to, or relate to the negligence, recklessness, or willful misconduct of CONSULTANT and its agents in the performance of services under this contract, but this indemnity does not apply to liability for damages for death or bodily injury to persons, injury to property, or other loss, arising from the negligence, willful misconduct or defects in design by CITY or the agents, servants, or independent contractors who are directly responsible to CITY, or arising from the active negligence of CITY.

CONSULTANT's responsibility for such defense and indemnity obligations shall survive the termination or completion of this Agreement for the full period of time allowed by law. The defense and indemnity obligations of this Agreement are undertaken in addition to, and shall not in any way be limited by, the insurance obligations contained in this Agreement.

4. Insurance. CONSULTANT agrees to continuously maintain, in full force and effect, the following minimum policies of insurance during the term of this Agreement.

COVERAGE

LIMITS OF LIABILITY

Workers' Compensation

Statutory

Commercial General Liability

\$2,000,000 each occurrence
\$4,000,000 aggregate
Personal Injury:
\$2,000,000 each occurrence
\$4,000,000 aggregate

Automobile Liability

\$1,000,000 combined single limit

Professional Liability (errors and omissions)

\$2,000,000 per claim
\$4,000,000 aggregate

a. Form. CONSULTANT shall submit a certificate evidencing such coverage for the period covered by this Agreement in a form satisfactory to Risk Management and the City Attorney, prior to undertaking any work hereunder. Any insurance written on a claims made basis is subject to the approval of Risk Management and the City Attorney.

b. Additional Insureds. CONSULTANT shall also provide a separate endorsement form or section of the policy showing CITY, its officers, agents, employees and volunteers as additional insureds for each type of coverage, except for Workers' Compensation and Professional Liability. Such insurance shall specifically cover the contractual liability of CONSULTANT. The additional insured coverage under the CONSULTANT's policy shall be primary and noncontributory, as evidenced by a separate endorsement or section of the policy, and shall not seek contribution from CITY's insurance or self-insurance. In addition, the additional insured coverage shall be at least as broad as the Insurance Services Office ("ISO") CG 20 01 Endorsement. Furthermore, the requirements for coverage and limits shall be the minimum coverage and limits specified in this Agreement.

c. Cancellation/Modification. CONSULTANT shall provide ten (10) days written notice to CITY prior to cancellation or modification of any insurance required by this Agreement.

d. Umbrella/Excess Insurance. The limits of insurance required in this Agreement may be satisfied by a combination of primary and excess insurance. Any excess insurance shall contain or be endorsed to contain a provision that such coverage shall also apply on a primary and noncontributory basis for the benefit of CITY (if agreed to in a written contract) before CITY's own insurance shall be called upon to protect it as a named insured.

e. Subcontractors. CONSULTANT agrees to include in its contracts with all subcontractors the same requirements and provisions of this Agreement, including the indemnity and insurance requirements, to the extent they apply to the scope of the subcontractor's work. Furthermore, CONSULTANT shall require its subcontractors to agree to be bound to CONSULTANT and CITY in the same manner and to the same extent as CONSULTANT is bound to CITY under this Agreement. Additionally, CONSULTANT shall obligate its subcontractors to comply with these same provisions with respect to any tertiary subcontractor, regardless of tier. A copy of CITY's indemnity and insurance provisions will be furnished to the subcontractor or tertiary subcontractor upon request.

f. Self-Insured Retentions. All self-insured retentions ("SIR") must be disclosed to Risk Management for approval and shall not reduce the limits of liability. Policies containing any SIR provision shall provide or be endorsed to provide that the SIR may be satisfied by either the named insured or CITY. CITY reserves the right to obtain a full copy of any insurance policy and endorsements; not including other client, proprietary, or confidential information. The failure to exercise this right shall not constitute a waiver of such right.

g. Waiver of Subrogation. CONSULTANT hereby agrees to waive subrogation which any insurer of CONSULTANT may acquire from CONSULTANT by virtue of the payment of any loss under a Workers Compensation, Commercial General Liability or Automobile Liability policy. All Workers Compensation, Commercial General Liability and Automobile Liability policies shall be endorsed with a waiver of subrogation in favor of CITY, its officers, agents, employees and volunteers for all work performed by CONSULTANT, its employees, agents and subcontractors.

h. Liability/Remedies. Insurance coverage in the minimum amounts set forth herein shall not be construed to relieve CONSULTANT of liability in excess of such coverage, nor shall it preclude CITY from taking such other actions as are available to it under any other provisions of this Agreement or law.

5. Records. CONSULTANT and its subcontractors shall maintain all files and records relating to the services performed hereunder during the term of this Agreement and for a period of not less than one (1) year after the date of termination or expiration. Provided, however, that in the event of litigation or settlement of claims arising from the performance of this Agreement, CONSULTANT and its subcontractors shall maintain all files and records until such litigation, appeals or claims are resolved. Duly authorized representatives of CITY shall have right of access during normal business hours and after reasonable notice to CONSULTANT's and subcontractors' files and records relating to the services performed hereunder, and may review and copy the files and records at appropriate stages during performance of the services and during the one (1) year period following termination or expiration of this Agreement. CONSULTANT shall include this provisions in its contracts with all subcontractors.

6. Time is of the Essence. Time is of the essence of this Agreement.
7. Compliance with Laws. CONSULTANT shall comply with all federal, state and local laws, ordinances and policies as may be applicable to the performance of services under this Agreement.
8. Ability to Perform. CONSULTANT agrees and represents that it has the time, ability and professional expertise to perform the services required under this Agreement.
9. Governing Agreement. In the event of any conflict between this Agreement and its EXHIBITS, the provisions of this Agreement shall govern. In the event of any conflict between any of the EXHIBITS, the provisions of the first in order of attachment shall govern.
10. Assignment. CONSULTANT is employed to perform unique personal services. CONSULTANT shall not assign this Agreement without the prior written consent of CITY. CONSULTANT shall not employ or otherwise incur any obligation to pay other specialists or experts for services in connection with this Agreement, without prior written consent of CITY.
11. Independent Contractor. CONSULTANT shall act as an independent contractor, and covenants and agrees that it will conduct itself consistent with such status, that it will neither hold itself out as, nor claim to be, an officer or employee of CITY by reason of this Agreement.
12. Representation and Warranties. CONSULTANT warrants that it has not employed or retained any company or person, other than a bona fide employee working for CONSULTANT, to solicit or secure this Agreement, and that it has not paid or agreed to pay any company or person, other than a bona fide employee, any fee, commission, percentage, brokerage fee, gift or any other consideration, contingent upon or resulting from the award or making of this Agreement. For breach or violation of this warranty, CITY shall have the right to terminate as void this Agreement, without liability, or, in its discretion, to deduct from the

Agreement price or consideration, or otherwise recover, the full amount of such fee, commission, percentage, brokerage fee, gift or contingent fee.

13. Successors in Interest. This Agreement shall be binding upon the heirs, successors, executors, administrators and assigns of the respective parties hereto.

14. Copyright, Ownership and Use of Materials. All tangible materials ("Material") created or delivered pursuant to this Agreement is considered a work made for hire under the Copyright Act. To the extent such Material does not qualify as a work made for hire, CONSULTANT hereby assigns to CITY all right, title, and interest, including but not limited to all copyrights, in all Material created by CONSULTANT in its performance under this Agreement. Material constitutes the scope of work outlined in Exhibit A and attached hereto, and all written and other tangible expressions, including but not limited to, drawings, papers, documents, reports, surveys, renderings, exhibits, sketches, maps, models, prints, paintings or photographs, in any and all media or formats in which such materials have been created or are maintained. All Material furnished by CONSULTANT is, and shall remain, the property of CITY.

CONSULTANT shall execute any documents necessary to effectuate such assignment. In the event that CONSULTANT uses, employs, designates, or retains any person or entity who is not an employee of CONSULTANT, to perform any work required of it pursuant to this Agreement, CONSULTANT shall require said person or entity to execute an agreement containing the preceding paragraph.

15. Termination of Agreement. The City may terminate this Agreement without cause by giving CONSULTANT ten (10) days advance written notice from the City Manager. CONSULTANT may terminate this Agreement without cause by giving CITY thirty (30) days

advance written notice. In the event of termination through no fault of CONSULTANT, CITY shall compensate CONSULTANT for services performed as of the date of termination, upon the release to CITY of all Material hereunder, in any and all media or formats in which such materials have been created or are maintained. CITY retains the right to receive and use any Material, notwithstanding any termination or any dispute regarding the amount to be paid.

16. Attorney's Fees; Venue; Governing Law. If either party commences any legal action against the other party arising out of this Agreement or the performance thereof, the prevailing party in such action shall be entitled to recover its reasonable litigation expenses, including but not limited to, court costs, expert witness fees, discovery expenses, and attorneys' fees. Any action arising out of this Agreement shall be brought in Placer County, California, regardless of where else venue may lie. This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of California.

17. Modification. This Agreement and each provision contained herein may be waived, amended, supplemented or eliminated only by mutual written agreement of the parties.

18. Severability. If any of the provisions contained in this Agreement is for any reason held invalid or unenforceable, such holding shall not affect the remaining provisions or the validity and enforceability of the Agreement as a whole.

19. Notices. Any notices to parties required by this Agreement shall be delivered personally or mailed, U.S. first class postage prepaid, addressed as follows:

CITY OF ROSEVILLE

Richard D. Plecker
Environmental Utilities Director
2005 Hilltop Circle
Roseville, CA 95747

CONSULTANT

Bill Misslin
CH2M Hill Engineers, Inc.
2525 Airpark Drive
Redding, CA 96001

Either party may amend its address for notice by giving notice to the other party in writing.

20. Integrated Agreement. This is an integrated agreement and contains all of the terms, considerations, understanding and promises of the parties. It shall be read as a whole.

21. Standard of Care. The standard of care applicable to CONSULTANT's services will be the degree of skill and diligence normally employed by professional engineers or consultants performing the same or similar services at the time said services are performed. CONSULTANT will re-perform any services not meeting this standard without additional compensation.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the City of Roseville, a municipal corporation, has authorized the execution of this Agreement in duplicate by its City Manager and attested to by its City Clerk under the authority of Resolution No. _____, adopted by the Council of the City of Roseville on the ____ day of _____, 20__, and CONSULTANT has caused this Agreement to be executed.

CITY OF ROSEVILLE, a
municipal corporation

BY: _____
ROB JENSEN
City Manager

CH2M HILL ENGINEERS, INC., a
Delaware corporation

BY: Thomas J. Pica
its: SR. VICE PRESIDENT
BUSINESS

and

BY: G. J. Rivas
its: ASST Secretary

[SIGNATURES CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE]



ATTEST:

BY: _____
SONIA OROZCO
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

BY: _____
ROBERT R. SCHMITT
City Attorney

APPROVED AS TO SUBSTANCE:

BY:  FOR _____
RICHARD D. PLECKER
Environmental Utilities Director

EXHIBIT “A”

October 17, 2016

Exhibit A – Scope of Work

City of Roseville – HDR System Upgrade Project Database System Design and Support Services

The work covered under this AGREEMENT between City of Roseville (hereinafter referred to as CITY) and CH2M HILL Engineers, Inc. (hereinafter referred to as CONSULTANT) includes project management, Request for Proposal (RFP) preparation, project planning and execution technical assistance, system testing assistance, and project close-out. Specifically, this project involves design and support services using new versions of hardware and software for the Historical Data Repository (HDR) system for the CITY Environmental Utilities Department (EU). The official name for this project will be the Environmental Utilities HDR System Upgrade Project (hereinafter referred to as the “Project”).

Introduction

EU has developed their current HDR system organically since the early 2000’s. The system uses Oracle as the database engine and Oracle tools, such as Oracle Forms, Oracle Reports, and Oracle Discoverer for user-interaction and report generation.

In 2010, CH2M HILL was selected to perform SCADA System Replacement Master Planning services for EU. The two main deliverables of the project were the assessments and upgrade recommendations for the SCADA system and the HDR system in use at the time. The SCADA Master Plan is currently being used by EU to upgrade their SCADA systems. The HDR system was found to meet or exceed the data management and reporting requirements of EU and, with improvements, was flexible enough to interface with the current and recommended SCADA systems. CH2M HILL found no commercial historian data system that met or exceeded the current and anticipated data management and reporting expectations.

In March 2014, Oracle announced that it will no longer update its Oracle Discoverer tool after version 11g1 and will end extended support for it in June 2017. Oracle has decided to build its Business Intelligence Foundation Suite and hopes that their users will adopt this toolset in the place of the Discoverer tool. The current version of the Oracle Database used by HDR (11.1) is two versions removed from the one currently supported by Oracle (12.1) and is no longer available for extended support. The current version of Oracle Forms and Reports used to access HDR (11.1.1.x) is three versions removed from the one currently supported by Oracle (12.2.x). Fortunately, Oracle will continue to develop and provide support for their Database; they will also continue to develop and provide support for their Forms and Reports tools as part of their Fusion Middleware suite.

In 2015, EU hired Aspect Software to perform a discovery on the current HDR system and alternatives to the Oracle Discoverer tool that are compatible with the reporting and tracking needs of EU and the HDR system. Business intelligence tools from seven different companies (Birst, Logi Analytics, Microsoft, Micro Strategy, Oracle, Pyramid Analytics, and Tableau) were reviewed and evaluated. Of the vendors who were asked to provide a

demonstration of their tool, only Logi Analytics and Oracle responded. Based on the demonstrations, the Logi Analytics tool provided the most flexibility and options to EU users.

General

The HDR System Upgrade Project will include preparing technical content for an RFP so the CITY can hire a CONTRACTOR to implement software and hardware upgrades to the current HDR system, and the CH2M technical support for the Project will continue through the upgrade implementation. Updating the Oracle database and related software to current versions will provide up to five years of Premier support with an additional three years of extended support available for an additional fee from Oracle. Updating the hardware will provide a stable system platform using current hardware technology on which to run the software. This HDR upgrade is expected to provide fast and reliable data storage and reporting services to the EU staff for at least five years.

The major elements of the Project include:

- Assist EU with the creation of the RFP and review of proposals.
- Technical oversight of the Project on behalf of the City, including reviewing the selected vendor plans and submittals for completeness and feasibility, and reviewing implemented documents for adherence to plan.
- Assist with factory and on-site testing.
- Assist with cut-over and demonstration testing.

The tasks and activities proposed below represent the best practices for leading a technical effort such as the Project. Once the vendor for performing the upgrade (herein referred to as CONTRACTOR) is selected, adjustments might be needed in order to meet schedule or other constraints.

Assumptions

The following major assumptions were made in developing this scope of work for the Project:

- Existing communication links between sites will not be upgraded or changed.
- Existing Oracle database will be used and all existing related software will be upgraded to latest version available from Oracle (except for Discoverer, which will be replaced by Logi Info by Logi Analytics).
- The CONTRACTOR will provide plans for activities they will perform and then documents describing the steps they took to accomplish the planned activity. The documents must be written in sufficient detail as to be able to repeat the activity with an identical outcome.
- The CONTRACTOR is responsible for providing a complete upgraded HDR System that complies with the RFP requirements, and CONSULTANT provides technical oversight to check for compliance with the requirements of the RFP.

- CONSULTANT's scope of work defined below is to help prepare an RFP and to provide technical assistance and technical reviews. CONSULTANT is not responsible for managing the CONTRACTOR's performance.

Consultant's Scope of Work

The design and support services to be provided for this Project include the work required to deliver the described tasks of the Project from RFP definition through close-out. For this Project, the CONSULTANT will perform the necessary technical reviews of submitted plans and outcomes required by the RFP, which will define the upgraded system and documentation deliverables expected by EU. The CONTRACTOR will perform the actual work, provide the necessary plans and documents, and purchase the hardware and software for the Project. Software and hardware licenses must be transferrable to the CITY at close-out.

The tasks and activities performed by the CONSULTANT in support of this project are listed below.

Task 1 –Project Management

The purpose of this task is to provide for management of Project activities.

Subtask 1.1—Project Management

- Status Reporting – Monitor budget, progress, and schedule. Monitor work efforts and evaluate actual versus planned progress. Provide monthly written progress reports to CITY's project manager.
- Administration – Maintain Project records, manage and process Project communications, coordinate Project administrative matters, and prepare monthly invoice.
- Health and Safety - Manage the health, safety, and environmental activities of its staff and the staff of its subconsultants to achieve compliance with applicable health and safety laws and regulations.

Subtask 1.1 Deliverables

- Monthly Progress Reports: Submit electronically to the CITY.

Subtask 1.2—Quality Control Review, Coordination, and Response

Implement and carry out an effective quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) program. Coordinate the participation of senior reviewers at appropriate points in the Project.

Task 2 – RFP Preparation and Proposal Processing

In this task, the CONSULTANT will provide assistance to the CITY with the preparation of the RFP, in general, and the technical sections, in particular. Once the RFP has been published, the CONSULTANT will be available to answer questions during the pre-

proposal meeting with potential contractors. The CONSULTANT will also assist the CITY with the technical review of the proposals.

Site Visits

- CONSULTANT will participate in the pre-proposal meeting with CITY staff and potential contractors. This meeting will likely be conducted via a virtual meeting and over the phone.
- CONSULTANT will also participate in proposal review meetings and a ranking meeting to select the best value CONTRACTOR proposal. This will be a three-day visit.
- CONSULTANT will also participate in interviews with the CONTRACTORS as required. This will be a four-day visit.
-

Deliverables

- Technical section of the RFP as a MS Word document.

Task 3 – Project Planning

Once the CONTRACTOR has been selected, the CONSULTANT will schedule a Project Kickoff meeting with the CITY and the CONTRACTOR. The Project Kickoff meeting will define roles and responsibilities of the Project team in addition to the expectations of the CITY and the CONSULTANT.

As will be required by the RFP, the CONTRACTOR will prepare and the CONSULTANT and CITY will review the Project Plan, which will include the following content as sections or sub-sections:

- IT Security plan (including network architecture, VLAN, and firewall configuration)
- Hardware purchase and implementation plan
- Software purchase and implementation plan
- Set-up and configuration plan for the production and dev/test servers
- Configuration for remote connection to the production and dev/test servers by CONSULTANT during development.
- Oracle VM Server installation and configuration plan
- Oracle 12c installation and configuration plan for the production and dev/test servers
- Installation and configuration plan for WebLogic virtual servers on the production and dev/test servers
- Installation and configuration plan for Oracle Enterprise Manager on the production and dev/test servers
- Installation and configuration plan for Oracle Forms and Reports on the production and dev/test servers
- Conversion plan for the current Oracle procedures and batch jobs on the production and dev/test servers
- Conversion plan for HDR on the production and dev/test servers

- Conversion plan for the current Oracle Forms and Reports on the production and dev/test servers
- Conversion plan for the current Oracle procedures and batch jobs on the production and dev/test servers
- Installation and configuration plan for Logi Info on the production and dev/test servers
- Integration plan for Logi Info with Oracle Forms and Reports on the production and dev/test servers
- Integration Plan for end-user Logi dashboard development
- Training plan
- System maintenance, backup, and recovery plan – database and system software
- Factory testing plan
- On-site testing plan
- Cut-over plan
- Operational Availability Demonstration Testing (OAD) Plan
 - Emergency response plan
- Warranty response plan

The CONSULTANT will provide the CONTRACTOR with technical review comments for each plan. Comments that need resolution by the CONTRACTOR will be provided in a formatted spreadsheet that will be identified as the Exceptions List. The Exceptions List will be maintained by the CONTRACTOR and monitored by the CITY and CONSULTANT.

Project execution (Task 4) should not begin until the project plan has been reviewed and approved by the CITY.

Site Visits

- CONSULTANT will participate in the Project Kickoff meeting with CITY and CONTRACTOR. This will be a two day visit.

Deliverables

- Project Instructions, Adobe pdf file.
- Project Kick-off meeting minutes, Adobe pdf file.
- Initial Exceptions List, MS Excel workbook.

Task 4 – Project Execution

In this task, the CONSULTANT will provide technical review services of the CONTRACTOR's deliverables. Activities performed by the CONSULTANT include:

- Technical review of the hardware purchase and implementation document.
- Technical review of the software purchase and implementation document.
- Technical review of the set-up and configuration document of the production and dev/test servers.
- Technical review of the Oracle VM Server installation and configuration document.
- Technical review of the network architecture and firewall permissions document.
- Technical review of the installation and configuration document for Oracle 12c on the production and dev/test servers.

- Technical review of the installation and configuration document for WebLogic virtual servers on the production and dev/test servers.
- Technical review of the installation and configuration document for Oracle Enterprise Manager on the production and dev/test servers.
- Technical review of the installation and configuration document for Oracle Forms and Reports on the production and dev/test servers.
- Technical review of the HDR conversion document for HDR on the production and dev/test servers.
- Technical review of the conversion document for the current Oracle Forms and Reports on the production and dev/test servers.
- Technical review of the conversion document for the current Oracle procedures and batch jobs on the production and dev/test servers.
- Technical review of the installation and configuration of Logi Info document.
- Technical review of the integration of the Oracle Forms and Reports with Logi Info document.
- Technical review of training materials.
- Technical review of system maintenance, backup, and restore procedures.

The documents created by the aforementioned activities are meant to provide the CITY staff with sufficient information to enable them to repeat the activity and obtain identical results. The documents will be reviewed by the CONSULTANT and review comments will be provided to the CONTRACTOR for inclusion in the Exceptions List. The CITY and CONSULTANT will monitor the Exceptions List.

Site Visits

- No site visits are planned for this task.

Deliverables

- Technical review comment document and additions to the Exceptions List for each submittal received from CONTRACTOR.

Task 5 – Factory Testing

In this task, the CONSULTANT will provide assistance to the CITY with the testing of the production and dev/test environments at the CONTRACTOR site. Because of security issues, the test should be performed in a closed network at the CONSULTANT site. Once the testing is deemed successful, the system may be deployed at the Dry Creek WWTP plant (see Task 6).

Activities performed as part of this task includes:

- User training, provided by the CONTRACTOR.
- Administrative training, provided by the CONTRACTOR.
- Technical review comment document of the factory testing procedure by the CONSULTANT.
- Participation at the factory test at the CONTRACTOR site.
- Documentation of issues raised during the factory test, providing them to the CONTRACTOR, and monitoring their resolution.

Site Visits

- CONSULTANT will participate in the testing with CITY staff. This will be a five-day visit.

Deliverables

- Technical review comment document of the factory testing procedure.
- List of technical issues raised during the factory test to be added to the Exceptions List.

Task 6 – On-site Testing

In this task, the CONSULTANT will provide assistance to the CITY with the testing of the production and dev/test environments at the Dry Creek WWTP site. The hardware and software will be installed at Dry Creek and will be hooked up to the plant network, but the production database will not be cut-over during this task.

The three goals of this test are:

- Setup and configuration of communications between the new systems and the CITY network
- Setup and configuration of CITY staff workstations so they can access the new systems
- Verification of data storage and reporting consistency between the old system and the new systems.

Once the testing is deemed successful, the old HDR system will be cut-over to the new system (see Task 7).

Activities performed as part of this task includes:

- User training, provided by the CONTRACTOR.
- Administrative training, provided by the CONTRACTOR.
- Technical review of the on-site testing procedure.
- Presence at the on-site test at the Dry Creek WWTP site.
- Documentation of issues raised during the on-site test, providing them to the CONTRACTOR, and monitoring their resolution.

Site Visits

- CONSULTANT will observe the testing with CITY staff and will offer technical assistance as requested by the CITY. This will be two five-day visits.

Deliverables

- Technical review comment document of the on-site testing procedure.
- List of technical issues raised during the on-site test to be added to the Exceptions List.

Task 7 – Cut-over

In this task, the CONSULTANT will provide technical assistance to the CITY with the quality assurance testing of the production and dev/test environments at the Dry Creek WWTP site after the new HDR system has been activated and the old system has been deactivated. The current content of the old HDR system will be loaded into the new HDR system as part of the cut-over process. Communications with the SCADA systems will also be changed so that it recognizes the new HDR system instead of the old one. Once cut-over is deemed successful, OAD testing may commence (see Task 8).

Activities performed as part of this task includes:

- Technical review of the cut-over procedure.
- Presence at the cut-over at the Dry Creek WWTP site.
- Documentation of issues raised during the cut-over, providing them to the CONTRACTOR, and monitoring their resolution.

Site Visits

- CONSULTANT will participate in the cut-over with CITY staff. This will be a five-day visit.

Deliverables

- Technical review comment document of the cut-over procedure.
- List of technical issues raised during the cut-over to be added to the Exceptions List.

Task 8 – OAD Testing

In this task, the CONSULTANT will provide assistance to the CITY with the Operational Availability Demonstration (OAD) test. The OAD test will last for 90 days and will be used to operate the new HDR system in a real-life and real-time scenario. If problems occur, they will be documented by the CITY and provided to the CONSULTANT and CONTRACTOR. CONSULTANT will provide technical guidance to the CITY on the recommended action required by the CONTRACTOR; whether it is an emergency, or minor problem. The CONTRACTOR will be asked to provide immediate service if the problem interrupts production. Otherwise, the CONTRACTOR will be asked to resolve the issue within two weeks. Communications between the CONTRACTOR and the production and dev/test environments at the Dry Creek WWTP will be severed unless the CONTRACTOR is providing updates to the software. Once OAD testing is deemed successful, Project Close-out may commence (see Task 9).

Activities performed as part of this task includes:

- Perform operational tests.
- Document issues and communicate them with the CONTRACTOR.

Site Visits

- CONSULTANT will participate in the testing with CITY staff. This will be a three-day visit.

Deliverables

- List of technical issues to be added to the Exceptions List.

Task 9 – Project Close-out

In this task, the CONSULTANT will provide the CITY with a summary of applicable Project-related documentation. Once the CITY has determined that the CONSULTANT has fulfilled its obligations to them, the CONSULTANT will issue the CITY a final invoice.

Activities performed as part of this task includes:

- Deliver copies of all Project-related documents.
- Deliver final invoice.

Site Visits

- No site visits are scheduled for this task.

Deliverables

- Project-related documents, as Adobe pdf files and/or native file formats.

Task 10 – Technical Services Allowance

As requested by the CITY, the CONSULTANT will provide other technical services to the CITY. CONSULTANT will conduct technical analyses, designs, startup and testing support, training assistance, and other related support beyond the limits of the budget established for other tasks included in this AGREEMENT, and as not otherwise identified in this Scope of Work.

Since the scope of the services to be conducted in accordance with this task cannot be firmly defined at this time, this task has been established as an allowance task to be used only at the direction of the CITY. CONSULTANT will develop a scope of work and budget for each Technical Services request made by the CITY and obtain mutual agreement with the CITY prior to authorization. CONSULTANT will make efforts to complete requested services within the overall allowance budget established for this task. However, due to the lack of definition of the scope of work and level of effort required for these services, CONSULTANT will conduct work only to the extent that the work can be completed in accordance with the limits of the allowance budget. If the Work cannot be completed by CONSULTANT within the allowance budget established for the work, said budget will require an adjustment to complete the work.

CITY Responsibilities

The services described below are assumed to be provided by CITY in a timely manner:

- Provide timely input and assistance to CONSULTANT and CONTRACTOR as necessary to complete work tasks effectively
- Provide a consolidated set of review comments on all draft Project deliverables.

- Prepare/file applications and pay fees for permits and licenses required by local, state, and federal authorities.

Schedule

The scope of engineering services and activities associated with this AGREEMENT will be completed in accordance with the approximate Project Schedule outlined below:

- CONSULTANT Notice to Proceed - December 2016
- CITY Issue RFP Documents - December 2016
- CITY Award Contract - May 2017
- Project Planning Completion - May 2017
- Project Execution Completion - November 2017
- Cut-Over/SAT Complete - December 2017
- OAD Complete - Final Completion - March 2018

Budget

This Work is hereby proposed on a Time & Materials basis with a not-to-exceed value of \$324,216.00. Total value includes cost of living increase for work performed in 2017. Detailed level of effort and task subtotals are attached.

Renegotiation of Compensation

CONSULTANT's budget estimate is based both on the assumptions listed herein and timely completion of this project by CONTRACTOR. If the Project progresses under different conditions than the assumptions listed or if project timing deviates from the assumed schedule for causes beyond CONSULTANT's control, CONSULTANT reserves the right to request renegotiation of those portions of the fee affected by the time change.

October 17, 2016

City of Roseville
Historical Data Repository System Upgrade Project
Fee Estimate - Labor and Expense Breakdown

Scope Task	WBS	Description	Program Manager	Senior Project Manager	Senior Technologist	Project Engineer	Office / Client / Accounting	Total Hours	Subcontractor Labor Price	Subcontractors	ODCs & Travel	Communications / Computer Charge \$/hour	Subtotal Expenses (Subs, ODCs, Travel, Comm, & Computer)	Total Price
Task 1														
HQR System Upgrade Project														
Task 1.1														
Project Management														
01.01		Project Management	Steve	30	1	24	40	94	\$ 18,040			\$ 564		\$ 18,604
01.02		Quality Control Review, Coordination, and Response						8	\$ 2,456			\$ 48		\$ 2,504
Task 2														
RFP Preparation and Proposal Processing														
02.01		RFP preparation						120	\$ 31,440			\$ 720		\$ 32,160
02.02		RFP publication						0	\$ -			\$ -		\$ -
02.03		Mandatory pre-proposal meeting						6	\$ 1,572			\$ 36		\$ 1,608
02.04		Proposal question comments and publication						16	\$ 4,192			\$ 96		\$ 4,288
02.05		Review proposals						20	\$ 5,240			\$ 120		\$ 5,360
02.06		Bidding meeting (2 travel days, 1 onsite day)						24	\$ 6,288		\$ 1,655	\$ 144		\$ 8,087
02.07		Follow-up meeting (2 travel days, 2 onsite days)						32	\$ 8,384		\$ 1,913	\$ 192		\$ 10,489
02.08		Final selection/negotiation						12	\$ 3,168			\$ 192		\$ 3,360
Task 3														
Project Planning														
03.01		Project Kickoff preparation						12	\$ 3,168			\$ 192		\$ 3,360
03.02		Project Kickoff meeting (2 travel days, 1 onsite day)						24	\$ 6,288		\$ 1,655	\$ 144		\$ 8,087
03.03		Project plan review						8	\$ 2,136			\$ 48		\$ 2,184
03.04		Document technical issues and communicate them with the CONTRACTOR. Monitor issue resolution.						144	\$ 38,400		\$ 1,655	\$ 864	\$ 2,535	\$ 42,994
Task 4														
Project Execution														
04.01		Technical review of the various submittal documents from the Contractor during project execution.						168	\$ 44,856			\$ 1,008		\$ 45,864
Task 5														
Factory Testing														
05.01		User training, provided by the CONTRACTOR.						8	\$ 2,136			\$ 48		\$ 2,184
05.02		Administrative training, provided by the CONTRACTOR.						8	\$ 2,136			\$ 48		\$ 2,184
05.03		Technical review of the factory testing procedure.						16	\$ 4,272			\$ 96		\$ 4,368
05.04		Presence at the factory test at the CONTRACTOR site (2 travel days, 3-5 onsite days)						40	\$ 10,680		\$ 2,687	\$ 240		\$ 13,607
05.05		Document technical issues and communicate them with the CONTRACTOR. Monitor issue resolution.						8	\$ 2,136			\$ 48		\$ 2,184
Task 6														
On-site Testing														
06.01		User training, provided by the CONTRACTOR.						8	\$ 2,136			\$ 48		\$ 2,184
06.02		Administrative training, provided by the CONTRACTOR.						8	\$ 2,136			\$ 48		\$ 2,184
06.03		Technical review of the on-site testing procedure.						8	\$ 2,136			\$ 48		\$ 2,184
06.04		Presence at the on-site test at the consultant site (2 travel days, 3-5 onsite days)						40	\$ 10,680		\$ 2,687	\$ 240		\$ 13,607
06.05		Document technical issues and communicate them with the CONTRACTOR. Monitor issue resolution.						8	\$ 2,136			\$ 48		\$ 2,184
Task 7														
Cut-over														
07.01		Technical review of the cut-over procedure.						16	\$ 4,272			\$ 96		\$ 4,368
07.02		Presence at the cut-over at the Dry Creek WWTP site - Oracle (2 travel days, 3-5 onsite days)						40	\$ 10,680		\$ 2,687	\$ 240		\$ 13,607
07.03		Presence at the cut-over at the Dry Creek WWTP site - LogAnalytical (2 travel days, 3-5 onsite days)						40	\$ 10,680		\$ 2,687	\$ 240		\$ 13,607
07.04		Document technical issues and communicate them with the CONTRACTOR. Monitor issue resolution.						8	\$ 2,136			\$ 48		\$ 2,184
Task 8														
QA/QC Testing														
08.01		Assist with Operational tests (2 travel days, 3-5 onsite days)						40	\$ 10,680		\$ 2,687	\$ 240		\$ 13,607
08.02		Document technical issues and communicate them with the CONTRACTOR. Monitor issue resolution.						8	\$ 2,136			\$ 48		\$ 2,184
Task 9														
Project Close-out														
09.01		Obtain copies of all Project-related documents.						32	\$ 8,384			\$ 192		\$ 8,576
09.02		Obtain final invoice.						2	\$ 512			\$ 12		\$ 524
Task 10														
Technical Services Allowance														
10.01		Task or ratio as determined by the CITY. Effort estimated.						140	\$ 36,680		\$ 2,687	\$ 840		\$ 40,007
TOTAL														
									1140	\$ 286,224	\$ -	\$ 21,138	\$ 6,852	\$ 314,214

\$ 307.00 \$ 262.00 \$ 262.00 \$ 214.00 \$ 102.00

ORDINANCE NO. 5786

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE
AUTHORIZING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016-17
BUDGET AND DECLARING THIS ORDINANCE TO BE IMMEDIATELY
EFFECTIVE AS AN APPROPRIATION MEASURE

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. The City of Roseville Annual Budget, Fiscal Year 2016-17, is hereby amended by transferring appropriation to and from the activities indicated below:

Appropriate funds for the Historical Data Repository system upgrade project, per request of the Environmental Utilities Department, as listed on the attached Request for Budget Adjustment in the amount of \$4,320,800.00.

SECTION 2. This ordinance is hereby declared to be an appropriation measure, immediately effective pursuant to the provisions of Section 5.03 of the Charter.

SECTION 3. The City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to post a true copy of the foregoing ordinance in each of three (3) conspicuous locations in the City and she shall immediately after such posting enter in the ordinance book, under the record of the ordinance, a certificate under her hand stating the time and place of such publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville, this
_____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk



REQUEST FOR BUDGET ADJUSTMENT

FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Instructions: Complete all necessary fields. Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory and required for processing. Obtain required approvals and process according to the procedure outlined in:

A.R. 6.01 Budget Adjustment Policy & Procedure

For more detailed budget adjustment training information, including examples, please click on the following link:

Miscellaneous Budget Training Information

REQUESTER*: Charles K. Aycocock

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION*: Environmental Utilities

FISCAL YEAR/EFFECTIVE DATE*: 01/18/2017

PROPOSED COUNCIL DATE (if applicable): 01/18/2017

USE OF FUNDS*						
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL		FUND*	JL		
	ORG KEY*	OBJECT*		PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
3,240,600	30503	6130	00474	103501	45	SCADA Systems Replacement Project
1,080,200	00474	3902	474			Transfer from Water Rehab Fund
\$ 4,320,800	TOTAL					

SOURCE OF FUNDS*						
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL		FUND*	JL		
	ORG KEY	OBJECT		PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
1,371,206			474			SPWA Partner - Roseville (63.47%)
252,335	00474	3790	474			SPWA Partner - Placer County (11.68%)
536,859	00474	3790	474			SPWA Partner - SPMUD (24.85%)
1,080,200			482			Water Rehabilitation Fund
1,080,200	00482	8902	482			Transfer Water Rehab to Wastewater Rehab Fund
\$ 4,320,800	TOTAL					

FINANCE USE	Approved:	<i>Kathy Cullen</i> 11/23/16	<i>Wally Han</i>
	BUDGET MANAGER/DESIGNEE	DATE	Finance Director

Justification for Budget Adjustment*:

Budget Adjustment for Contract Amendment 1, and to cover additional project extended overhead and expenses.

Approved:	<i>[Signature]</i> 10/15/16	Approved:	
REQUESTING DEPARTMENT HEAD / DESIGNEE	DATE	CITY MANAGER	DATE



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8193

File #: 0800-03 & 0201-01

Title: Electric Software Application Capital Improvement Project - Budget Adjustment

Contact: Lisa Gist 916-774-5677 lgist@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 6.30.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff recommends City Council adopt an ordinance to approve a budget adjustment in the amount of \$151,736 for the Electric Software Application Capital Improvement Project.

BACKGROUND

The City of Roseville implemented an accounting change during the FY2016-17 budget process to account for capital projects (CIPs) in the Electric Construction Fund instead of the Electric Operations Fund. This change allows for segregation of the finances of each fund. The operations fund accounts for operating activities and the construction fund accounts for capital activities. This change required existing CIPs to be re-established in the new fund during the budget process with estimated project balances for the end of the fiscal year, June 30th. The balance estimate from March for this CIP was \$2,000,000. Actual balance as of June 30th was \$2,151,736. This budget adjustment re-establishes the budget to the previously authorized level.

FISCAL IMPACT

Approval of the attached budget adjustment authorizes \$151,736 in spending from the Electric Construction Fund for FY2016-17.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Not applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The budget adjustment is not considered a "project" as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (CEQA Guidelines §15378). Consequently no CEQA action is required.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lisa Gist, Electric Business Analyst

Michelle Bertolino, Electric Utility Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Ordinance No. 5780

Budget Adjustment

ORDINANCE NO. 5780

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE
AUTHORIZING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016-17
BUDGET AND DECLARING THIS ORDINANCE TO BE IMMEDIATELY
EFFECTIVE AS AN APPROPRIATION MEASURE

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. The City of Roseville Annual Budget, Fiscal Year 2016-17, is hereby amended by transferring appropriation to and from the activities indicated below:

Appropriate funds for the Electric Software Application Capital Improvement Project, per request of the Electric Department, as listed on the attached Request for Budget Adjustment totaling \$151,736.00.

SECTION 2. This ordinance is hereby declared to be an appropriation measure, immediately effective pursuant to the provisions of Section 5.03 of the Charter.

SECTION 3. The City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to post a true copy of the foregoing ordinance in each of three (3) conspicuous locations in the City and she shall immediately after such posting enter in the ordinance book, under the record of the ordinance, a certificate under her hand stating the time and place of such publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville, this
_____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk



REQUEST FOR BUDGET ADJUSTMENT FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Instructions: Complete all necessary fields. Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory and required for processing. Obtain required approvals and process according to the procedure outlined in:
A.R. 6.01 Budget Adjustment Policy & Procedure.

For more detailed budget adjustment training information, including examples, please click on the following link:
Miscellaneous Budget Training Information.

REQUESTER*: Lisa Gist

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION*: Electric/Finance & Admin

FISCAL YEAR/EFFECTIVE DATE*: FY2016-17

PROPOSED COUNCIL DATE (if applicable): 01/18/2017

USE OF FUNDS*

AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL		FUND*	JL		
	ORG KEY*	OBJECT*		PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
151,736	40002	6130	491	174103	36	ELEC SOFTWARE APPLICATION (CIP)
\$ 151,736	TOTAL					

SOURCE OF FUNDS*

AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL			JL		
	ORG KEY	OBJECT	FUND*	PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
151,736			491			Electric Construction Fund Available Resources
\$ 151,736	TOTAL					

FINANCE USE

Approved:

Kathy Cullen 11/29/16

BUDGET MANAGER/SIGNEE

DATE

Wally Hurl

Finance Director

Date

Justification for Budget Adjustment*:

Roseville Electric Utility requests a budget adjustment of \$151,736 to re-establish the Electric Software Application Capital Improvement Project at its previously authorized level. During the budget process for the 2016-2017 fiscal year, Electric implemented an accounting change to track all CIPs in the Electric Construction Fund. This change required existing CIPs to be re-established within the new fund with estimated account balances for the new fiscal year. The estimate for this CIP was \$2,000,000. Actual balance after fiscal year close was \$2,151,736. This budget adjustment re-establishes the budget to the previously authorized level.

Approved: *[Signature]*
REQUESTING DEPARTMENT HEAD / DESIGNEE DATE

Approved: _____
CITY MANAGER DATE



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8207
File #: 0201-01

Title: Vehicle Replacement - Budget Adjustments
Contact: Lisa Gist 916-774-5677 lgist@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017
Item #: 6.31.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff recommends City Council adopt an ordinance to approve two budget adjustments which are required due to accounting changes implemented as part of the FY2016-17 adopted budget. The budget adjustments of \$734,511 and \$321,184 are for previously authorized vehicle replacements.

BACKGROUND

The City of Roseville implemented an accounting change during the FY2016-17 budget process to account for vehicles in the Electric Construction Fund and Traffic Signals Capital Fund instead of the Automotive Replacement Fund. This change provides a more accurate recording of assets. At the end of the FY2015-16 fiscal year, eight Electric vehicles and two Traffic Signals vehicles were in the process of being replaced within the Automotive Replacement Fund. Since this fund no longer has the funding to replace the vehicles, existing budget authority for the vehicle purchases must be re-established in the new funds. These budget adjustments re-establish the budget to the previously authorized levels in the new funds.

FISCAL IMPACT

Approval of the attached budget adjustments authorize \$1,055,695 in spending for the FY2016-17 budget.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Not applicable

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The budget adjustment is not considered a "project" as defined by the California Environmental

Quality Act (CEQA) (CEQA Guidelines §15378). Consequently no CEQA action is required.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lisa Gist, Electric Business Analyst

Michelle Bertolino, Electric Utility Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Ordinance No. 5782

Traf Sigs

Ordinance No. 5783

Elec vehicles

ORDINANCE NO. 5782

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE
AUTHORIZING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016-17
BUDGET AND DECLARING THIS ORDINANCE TO BE IMMEDIATELY
EFFECTIVE AS AN APPROPRIATION MEASURE

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. The City of Roseville Annual Budget, Fiscal Year 2016-17, is hereby amended by transferring appropriation to and from the activities indicated below:

Appropriate funds for two traffic signal vehicles, per request of the Electric/Public Works Department, as listed on the attached Request for Budget Adjustment totaling \$321,184.00.

SECTION 2. This ordinance is hereby declared to be an appropriation measure, immediately effective pursuant to the provisions of Section 5.03 of the Charter.

SECTION 3. The City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to post a true copy of the foregoing ordinance in each of three (3) conspicuous locations in the City and she shall immediately after such posting enter in the ordinance book, under the record of the ordinance, a certificate under her hand stating the time and place of such publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville, this
_____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk



REQUEST FOR BUDGET ADJUSTMENT FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Instructions: Complete all necessary fields. Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory and required for processing. Obtain required approvals and process according to the procedure outlined in:

[A.R. 6.01 Budget Adjustment Policy & Procedure.](#)

For more detailed budget adjustment training information, including examples, please click on the following link:

[Miscellaneous Budget Training Information.](#)

REQUESTER*: Lisa Gist/Jason Shykowski

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION*: Electric/PW Traffic Signals

FISCAL YEAR/EFFECTIVE DATE*: FY2016/17

PROPOSED COUNCIL DATE (if applicable): 01/18/2017

USE OF FUNDS*						
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL		FUND*	JL		
	ORG KEY*	OBJECT*		PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
160,592	08336	6000	213			Traffic Signal Vehicle Replace/Vehicle 07-360
160,592	08336	6000	213			Traffic Signal Vehicle Replace/Vehicle 07-373
\$ 321,184	TOTAL					
SOURCE OF FUNDS*						
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL		FUND*	JL		
	ORG KEY	OBJECT		PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
321,184			213			TS Capital Fund Avail Resources(Replacement Funds
\$ 321,184	TOTAL					
FINANCE USE Approved: <u>Kathy Cullen</u> 12/6/16 BUDGET MANAGER/DESIGNEE <u>Marty Hunk</u> Finance Director						

Justification for Budget Adjustment*:

Traffic Signals requests a budget adjustment of \$321,184 to re-establish vehicles approved for purchase in prior fiscal years to previously authorized level. During the budget process for the 2016-2017 fiscal year, Traffic Signals implemented an accounting change to account for all vehicles in the Traffic Signals Capital Fund. This change requires vehicles in the process of replacement to be re-established within the new fund. Vehicles 07-360 and 07-373 are to be re-appropriated in the Traffic Signals Capital Fund. There is sufficient funding available in the fund.

Approved: <u>[Signature]</u> 12-6-2016 REGULATING DEPARTMENT HEAD/DESIGNEE	Approved: _____ CITY MANAGER
DATE	DATE

ORDINANCE NO. 5783

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE
AUTHORIZING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016-17
BUDGET AND DECLARING THIS ORDINANCE TO BE IMMEDIATELY
EFFECTIVE AS AN APPROPRIATION MEASURE

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. The City of Roseville Annual Budget, Fiscal Year 2016-17, is hereby amended by transferring appropriation to and from the activities indicated below:

Appropriate funds for eight electric vehicles, per request of the Electric Department, as listed on the attached Request for Budget Adjustment totaling \$734,511.00.

SECTION 2. This ordinance is hereby declared to be an appropriation measure, immediately effective pursuant to the provisions of Section 5.03 of the Charter.

SECTION 3. The City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to post a true copy of the foregoing ordinance in each of three (3) conspicuous locations in the City and she shall immediately after such posting enter in the ordinance book, under the record of the ordinance, a certificate under her hand stating the time and place of such publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville, this
_____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk



REQUEST FOR BUDGET ADJUSTMENT FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Instructions: Complete all necessary fields. Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory and required for processing. Obtain required approvals and process according to the procedure outlined in:
[A.R. 6.01 Budget Adjustment Policy & Procedure.](#)

For more detailed budget adjustment training information, including examples, please click on the following link:
[Miscellaneous Budget Training Information.](#)

REQUESTER*: Lisa Gist

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION*: Electric / Admin

FISCAL YEAR/EFFECTIVE DATE*: FY2016/17

PROPOSED COUNCIL DATE (if applicable): 01/18/2017

USE OF FUNDS*						
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL			JL		
	ORG KEY*	OBJECT*	FUND*	PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
32,000	03322	6000	502			Vehicle Replacement/Vehicle 05-H02
19,450	08630	6000	491			Electric Vehicles/Vehicle 90-606
19,450	08630	6000	491			Electric Vehicles/Vehicle 90-607
19,450	08630	6000	491			Electric Vehicles/Vehicle 90-617
19,450	08630	6000	491			Electric Vehicles/Vehicle 90-618
421,945	08630	6000	491			Electric Vehicles/Vehicle 03-326
68,994	08630	6000	491			Electric Vehicles/Vehicle 06-393
133,772	08630	6000	491			Electric Vehicles/Vehicle 06-555
\$ 734,511	TOTAL					

SOURCE OF FUNDS*						
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL			JL		
	ORG KEY	OBJECT	FUND*	PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
32,000			502			Auto Repl Fund Avail Resources(Replacement Funds)
702,511			491			Elec Const Fund Avail Resource(Replacement Funds)
\$ 734,511	TOTAL					

FINANCE USE	Approved:		
	<i>Kathy Cullen</i> 01/21/16	<i>Wally Hall</i>	
	BUDGET MANAGER/DESIGNEE	Finance Director	Date

Justification for Budget Adjustment*:

Roseville Electric Utility requests a budget adjustment of \$734,511 to re-establish vehicles approved for purchase in prior fiscal years to previously authorized level. During the budget process for the 2016-2017 fiscal year, Electric implemented an accounting change to account for all vehicles in the Electric Construction Fund. This change requires vehicles in the process of replacement to be re-established within the new fund. Vehicles 90-606, 90-607, 90-617, 90-618, 03-326, 06-393 and 06-555 are to be re-appropriated in the Electric Construction Fund. There is sufficient funding available in the fund. Vehicle 05-H02 is to be re-appropriated in the Automotive Replacement Fund as it was delivered before the accounting change was implemented.

Approved:	Approved:
<i>John Brown</i>	
REQUESTING DEPARTMENT HEAD / DESIGNEE	CITY MANAGER
DATE	DATE



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8208

File #: 0800-03 & 0201-01

Title: Vehicle Replacement Fund Transfers - Budget Adjustment
Contact: Jacquelyn Flickinger 916-774-5516 jflickinger@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 6.32.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Adopt an ordinance approving a Budget Adjustment to increase the transfer amount from the Vehicle Replacement Fund to the Electric Construction and Traffic Signal Funds.

BACKGROUND

In fiscal year 2017, the Electric Department requested to transfer their funding and vehicles in the Vehicle Replacement Fund to the Electric Construction and the Traffic Signal Funds in order to account for these assets within the Electric Funds and on the separately issued Electric Annual Report. An estimate was prepared for the transfer of the vehicles and funding, however, the amount owed to the Electric Department at the time of the transfer was more than the original budgeted amount. This budget adjustment is to increase the transfer amount from Vehicle Replacement Fund to the Electric Construction and Traffic Signal Funds to actual amount owed.

FISCAL IMPACT

There will be no fiscal impact to the City's General Fund as a result of this action.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

This item a budget adjustment, therefore no jobs will be created.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

A budget adjustment is not considered a project defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not apply to activities that will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines 15061(b) (3)).

Respectfully Submitted,

Jacquelyn Flickinger, Controller

Monty Hanks, Finance Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Ordinance No. 5784

Budget Adjustment

ORDINANCE NO. 5784

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE
AUTHORIZING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016-17
BUDGET AND DECLARING THIS ORDINANCE TO BE IMMEDIATELY
EFFECTIVE AS AN APPROPRIATION MEASURE

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. The City of Roseville Annual Budget, Fiscal Year 2016-17, is hereby amended by transferring appropriation to and from the activities indicated below:

Appropriate funds to increase the transfer amount for Electric Department vehicle purchases per the request of the Finance Department, as listed on the attached Request for Budget Adjustment in the amount of \$1,435,876.00.

SECTION 2. This ordinance is hereby declared to be an appropriation measure, immediately effective pursuant to the provisions of Section 5.03 of the Charter.

SECTION 3. The City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to post a true copy of the foregoing ordinance in each of three (3) conspicuous locations in the City and she shall immediately after such posting enter in the ordinance book, under the record of the ordinance, a certificate under her hand stating the time and place of such publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville, this
_____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk



REQUEST FOR BUDGET ADJUSTMENT
FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Instructions: Complete all necessary fields. Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory and required for processing. Obtain required approvals and process according to the procedure outlined in:
[A.R. 6.01 Budget Adjustment Policy & Procedure.](#)

For more detailed budget adjustment training information, including examples, please click on the following link:
[Miscellaneous Budget Training Information.](#)

REQUESTER*: Jacquelyn Flickinger

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION*: Finance/Accounting

FISCAL YEAR/EFFECTIVE DATE*: 2017

PROPOSED COUNCIL DATE (if applicable): 01/18/2017

USE OF FUNDS*						
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL		FUND*	JL		
	ORG KEY*	OBJECT*		PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
1,225,886	00491	3900	491	700502	95	Transfer In from Vehicle Replacement
209,990	00213	3900	502	700502	95	Transfer Out to Electric Rehab
\$ 1,435,876	TOTAL					

SOURCE OF FUNDS*						
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL		FUND*	JL		
	ORG KEY	OBJECT		PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
1,225,886	00502	8900	502	700491	94	Transfer Out to Electric Rehab
209,990	00502	8900	502	700213	94	Transfer Out to Traffic Signals
\$ 1,435,876	TOTAL					

FINANCE USE	Approved:		
	<i>Kathy Cullen</i>	01/18/16	<i>Wally Paul</i>
	BUDGET MANAGER/DESIGNEE	DATE	Finance Director
			Date

Justification for Budget Adjustment*:

In fiscal year 2017, the Electric Department requested to transfer their funding and vehicles in the Vehicle Replacement Fund to the Electric Construction and the Traffic Signal Funds in order to account for these assets within the Electric Funds and on the separately issued Electric Annual Report. An estimate was prepared for the transfer of the vehicles and funding, however, the amount owed to the Electric Department at the time of the transfer was more than the original budgeted amount. This budget adjustment is to increase the transfer amount from Vehicle Replacement Fund to the Electric Construction and Traffic Signal Funds to actual amount owed.

Approved:	Approved:
<i>Wally Paul</i>	
REQUESTING DEPARTMENT HEAD/DESIGNEE	CITY MANAGER
DATE	DATE



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8229

File #: 0201-01 & 0800-03

Title: Enterprise Resource Planning and 800 MHz Projects - Budget Adjustment

Contact: Jacquelyn Flickinger 916-774-5516 jflickinger@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 6.33.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Adopt an ordinance approving a Budget Adjustment to transfer funds from the General Fund to the General CIP Rehab Fund.

BACKGROUND

At the December 14, 2016 City Council Meeting, Item 8.1 discussed the year-end performance report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016. During this discussion it was explained that there was an increase in Unrestricted General Fund Balance and staff provided options and requested input on the best use of the additional funds. As a result of the discussion at the meeting, a budget adjustment was prepared to transfer \$5,500,000 from the General Fund to the General CIP Rehab Fund to fund the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) (replacement of IFAS; \$1,500,000) and the 800MHz (\$4,000,000) projects.

FISCAL IMPACT

The budget adjustment approves transferring \$5,500,000 from the General Fund to the General CIP Rehab Fund to fund the ERP and 800 MHz projects.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

This item is a budget adjustment, therefore no jobs will be created.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

A budget adjustment is not considered a project defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not apply to activities that will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable

indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines 15061(b) (3).

Respectfully Submitted,

Jacquelyn Flickinger, Controller

Monty Hanks, Finance Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Ordinance No. 5792

Budget Adjustment

ORDINANCE NO. 5792

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE
AUTHORIZING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016-17
BUDGET AND DECLARING THIS ORDINANCE TO BE IMMEDIATELY
EFFECTIVE AS AN APPROPRIATION MEASURE

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. The City of Roseville Annual Budget, Fiscal Year 2016-17, is hereby amended by transferring appropriation to and from the activities indicated below:

Appropriate funds for funding of the Enterprise Resource Planning and 800 MHz projects per the request of the Finance Department, as listed on the attached Request for Budget Adjustment in the amount of \$11,000,000.00.

SECTION 2. This ordinance is hereby declared to be an appropriation measure, immediately effective pursuant to the provisions of Section 5.03 of the Charter.

SECTION 3. The City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to post a true copy of the foregoing ordinance in each of three (3) conspicuous locations in the City and she shall immediately after such posting enter in the ordinance book, under the record of the ordinance, a certificate under her hand stating the time and place of such publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville, this
_____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk



REQUEST FOR BUDGET ADJUSTMENT FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Instructions: Complete all necessary fields. Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory and required for processing. Obtain required approvals and process according to the procedure outlined in:
[A.R. 6.01 Budget Adjustment Policy & Procedure.](#)

REQUESTER*: Kathy Cullen

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION*: Finance/Budget

FISCAL YEAR/EFFECTIVE DATE*: 2017

PROPOSED COUNCIL DATE (if applicable): 01/18/2017

For more detailed budget adjustment training information, including examples, please click on the following link:

[Miscellaneous Budget Training Information.](#)

USE OF FUNDS*						
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL			JL		
	ORG KEY*	OBJECT*	FUND*	PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
1,500,000	90017	6130	310	159002	45	ERP project
4,000,000	90017	6130	310	169006	45	800MHz project
1,500,000	00100	8900	100			Transfer out to CIP Rehab for ERP
4,000,000	00100	8900	100			Transfer out to CIP Rehab for 800 MHz
\$ 11,000,000	TOTAL					

SOURCE OF FUNDS*						
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL			JL		
	ORG KEY	OBJECT	FUND*	PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
1,500,000	00310	3900	310			Transfer in from GF for ERP
4,000,000	00310	3900	310			Transfer in from GF for 800 MHz
1,500,000			310			Use of General CIP rehab fund balance for ERP
4,000,000			310			Use of General CIP rehab fund balance for 800 MHz
\$ 11,000,000	TOTAL					

FINANCE USE	Approved:		
	<i>Kathy Cullen</i>	12/15/16	<i>Walter Haul</i>
	BUDGET MANAGER/DESIGNEE	DATE	Finance Director
			DATE

Justification for Budget Adjustment*:

Per City Council discussion at the December 14th meeting, this budget adjustment transfers \$5.5 million from the General Fund unrestricted fund balance at the end of FY2016 to the CIP Rehab. \$1.5 million for the ERP project and \$4 million for the 800 MHz project.

Approved:	Approved:
REQUESTING DEPARTMENT HEAD / DESIGNEE	CITY MANAGER
DATE	DATE



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8233
File #: 0600-01

Title: Staffing and Salary Schedule Changes
Contact: Linda Hampton 916-774-5215 lhampton@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017
Item #: 6.34.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff recommends the City Council approve Management A & B salary schedules to reflect the deletion of Meter Services Supervisor and Electric Retail Services Supervisor, a salary increase for Risk Manager and adding a new classification Electric Customer Programs Supervisor.

In addition, staff is requesting Council approve adding the class Electric Utility Inspection Technician to IBEW A & B salary schedules to meet the Electric Department's business needs. Staff is also recommending Council approve an allocation schedule reflecting the deletion of seven vacant allocations, adding one Human Resources Technician, reclassifying two vacant Electric Line Technician allocations to two Electric Utility Inspection Technician allocations and reclassifying an Electric Retail Services Supervisor allocation to an Electric Customer Programs Supervisor. It is recommended that City Council take the following actions:

1. Adopt an ordinance to approve the attached Management A & B salary schedules (Appendix G) reflecting the deletion of Meter Services Supervisor (4546, B786) and Electric Retail Service Supervisor (6280, B748), the addition of Electric Customer Programs Supervisor (6285, B941) and a salary increase for Risk Manager (6540/B819) effective January 21, 2017; and,
2. Adopt an ordinance to approve the attached IBEW A & B salary schedules (Appendix D) reflecting the addition of Electric Utility Inspection Technician (9250, B256) effective January 21, 2017; and
3. Motion to approve the attached city-wide allocation schedule effective January 21, 2017

BACKGROUND

As part of the Municipal Code, the Human Resources Department is charged with maintaining the City's classification plan.

Throughout the year, Council has approved new allocations as promotional opportunities with the provision that positions would be identified for elimination after the promotional recruitment process was complete. Periodically, staff will be coming to Council to make these adjustments to the allocation schedule to reflect these eliminated allocations. Staff is requesting the following allocations be deleted from the allocation schedule:

Class Title	Division
Management Assistant II	01500

Management Assistant II	08100
Senior Parks Maintenance Worker	08555
Finance Technician	05042
Financial Analyst	08110
Electric Business Analyst	08600
Meter Services Supervisor	05041

Staff is also recommending that the following classification be deleted from the Management salary schedules as it will no longer be utilized:

Class Title	Group
Meter Services Supervisor (4546/B786)	Management

Additionally, staff is requesting the following allocation, classification and salary changes:

Human Resource Technician:

The City recently concluded a Citywide safety assessment of its operations. As a result of the study, staff is recommending the addition of a Human Resources Technician position which will be assigned to the risk management division to support the enhancement of a centralized safety and training program.

Risk Manager:

The Human Resources Department is reorganizing the risk management function to bring efficiencies and cost savings to the City. The subrogation contract is being brought inhouse to better serve departments and to save the City approximately \$60,000 per year. As a result of this increased workload and the additional expanded duties of the centralization of the City's safety function, the Risk Manager position is recommended for a salary increase of 13.4%

Electric Customer Program Supervisor

Staff is requesting to change the title of Electric Retail Services Supervisor to Electric Customer Program Supervisor as it is more appropriate for the work assigned. There would be no change in salary.

Electric Utility Inspection Technician

Staff is requesting to add the new classification of Electric Utility Inspection Technician to establish a class for the Electric Department to utilize to inspect electrical assets and equipment in order to ensure the safety of the public and City employees and to support compliance with the California Public Utilities Commission and maintain the reliability of the sub-transmission and distribution system. The class will primarily be responsible for carrying out State mandated General Order inspections in order to provide safe and reliable power to the electric customers of the City of Roseville. In addition, staff is requesting to reclassify two vacant Electric Line Technician allocations to two Electric Utility Inspection Technician allocations.

FISCAL IMPACT

Human Resources

From	To	Current Salary & Benefits	Proposed Salary & Benefits	Annual Impact	Fiscal Impact
Risk Manager		\$184,950	\$209,832	\$ 24,882	\$ 11,484
	Human Resources Technician	\$ -	\$104,285	\$ 104,285	\$ 48,132
Subrogation Contractor	Risk Manager			\$(60,000)	\$(30,000)

The proposed changes will result in an annual cost to the Human Resources Department budget of

\$69,167 and the fiscal impact for the remainder of this year will be \$29,616.

Electric

From	To	Current Salary & Benefits	Proposed Salary & Benefits	Annual Impact	Fiscal Impact
Line Technician (2)	Electric Utility Inspection Tech (2)	\$392,478	\$356,798	\$ (35,680)	\$ (16,468)

The proposed change will result in an annual savings to the Electric Department budget of \$35,680 and a fiscal savings of \$16,468.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

One new job will be created by this action.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Salary schedule and staffing changes are not considered a “project” as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (CEQA Guidelines 15378). Consequently no CEQA action is required.

Respectfully Submitted,

Linda Hampton, Human Resources Manager

Gayle Satchwell, Human Resources Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Ordinance No. 5795

01/21/2017 Management Salary Schedule A Appendix G

01/21/2017 Management Salary Schedule B Appendix G

Ordinance No. 5796

01/21/2017 IBEW Salary Schedule A

01/21/2017 IBEW Salary Schedule B

ORDINANCE NO. 5795

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AMENDING
ORDINANCE NO. 5769, THE SALARY ORDINANCE FOR MANAGEMENT EMPLOYEES,
SALARY SCHEDULES A AND B, AS AMENDED BY APPENDIX "G" TO BE EFFECTIVE
JANUARY 21, 2017, AS AN URGENCY MEASURE

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. Title and Purpose.

Ordinance No. 5769, the Salary Ordinance for Management Employees, Salary Schedules A and B, is hereby amended as shown on Appendix "G" attached hereto.

DELETION OF CLASSIFICATION:

<u>Classification No.</u>	<u>Position Title</u>	<u>Salary Range</u>
4546/B786	Meter Services Supervisor	4303
6280/B748	Electric Retail Service Supervisor	7339

ADDITION OF CLASSIFICATION:

<u>Classification No.</u>	<u>Position Title</u>	<u>Salary Range</u>
6285/B941	Electric Customer Programs Supervisor	7339

SECTION 2. Salary Plan Effective Date.

This Ordinance shall be effective January 21, 2017 as an urgency measure.

SECTION 3. Urgency Ordinance.

This ordinance is hereby declared to be an urgency measure, immediately necessary for the public peace, health and safety and shall take effect January 21, 2017. A statement of urgency is as follows:

It is necessary to amend the Salary Ordinance to comply with recently approved changes for the orderly and necessary continuance of operations of the City.

SECTION 4. Posting.

The City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to post a true copy of the foregoing ordinance in each of three (3) conspicuous locations in the City and she shall immediately after such posting enter in the Ordinance Book under the record of the ordinance a certificate under her hand stating the time and place of said publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20____, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
43	ACCOUNTING SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	41.0047	3280.37	7107.48	85289.75
		STEP B	43.0549	3444.39	7462.85	89554.23
		STEP C	45.2077	3616.61	7836.00	94031.94
		STEP D	47.4680	3797.44	8227.80	98733.54
		STEP E	49.8415	3987.32	8639.18	103670.22
		STEP F	52.3335	4186.68	9071.14	108853.73
		STEP G	54.9502	4396.02	9524.70	114296.42

45 ADMIN ANALYST I

STEP A	33.2609	2660.87	5765.22	69182.67
STEP B	34.9239	2793.91	6053.47	72641.71
STEP C	36.6700	2933.60	6356.13	76273.60
STEP D	38.5037	3080.29	6673.97	80087.69
STEP E	40.4288	3234.30	7007.65	84091.90
STEP F	42.4503	3396.02	7358.05	88296.62
STEP G	44.5728	3565.82	7725.95	92711.42

50 ADMIN ANALYST II

STEP A	36.5872	2926.97	6341.78	76101.37
STEP B	38.4165	3073.32	6658.86	79906.32
STEP C	40.3372	3226.97	6991.78	83901.37
STEP D	42.3541	3388.32	7341.37	88096.52
STEP E	44.4717	3557.73	7708.42	92501.13
STEP F	46.6954	3735.63	8093.86	97126.43
STEP G	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60

86 ALTERNATIVE TRANSP ANALYST I

STEP A	33.7583	2700.66	5851.43	70217.26
STEP B	35.4464	2835.71	6144.04	73728.51
STEP C	37.2187	2977.49	6451.24	77414.89
STEP D	39.0796	3126.36	6773.79	81285.56
STEP E	41.0335	3282.68	7112.47	85349.68
STEP F	43.0852	3446.81	7468.10	89617.21
STEP G	45.2396	3619.16	7841.53	94098.36

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code Title Step Hourly Bi-weekly Monthly Annual

88 ALTERNATIVE TRANSP ANALYST II

STEP A	36.5872	2926.97	6341.78	76101.37
STEP B	38.4165	3073.32	6658.86	79906.32
STEP C	40.3372	3226.97	6991.78	83901.37
STEP D	42.3541	3388.32	7341.37	88096.52
STEP E	44.4717	3557.73	7708.42	92501.13
STEP F	46.6954	3735.63	8093.86	97126.43
STEP G	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60

90 ALTERNATIVE TRANSP MGR

STEP A	48.1545	3852.36	8346.79	100161.46
STEP B	50.5623	4044.98	8764.13	105169.53
STEP C	53.0904	4247.23	9202.33	110428.01
STEP D	55.7449	4459.59	9662.45	115949.41
STEP E	58.5322	4682.57	10145.57	121746.88
STEP F	61.4588	4916.70	10652.85	127834.22
STEP G	64.5317	5162.54	11185.49	134225.94

245 ASST CITY ATTORNEY

STEP A	71.0229	5681.83	12310.64	147727.67
STEP B	74.5741	5965.92	12926.17	155114.05
STEP C	78.3028	6264.22	13572.48	162869.75
STEP D	82.2179	6577.43	14251.10	171013.24
STEP E	86.3288	6906.30	14963.66	179563.90
STEP F	90.6452	7251.62	15711.84	188542.10
STEP G	95.1775	7614.20	16497.43	197969.20

250 ASST CITY CLERK

STEP A	35.6195	2849.56	6174.05	74088.66
STEP B	37.4005	2992.04	6482.76	77793.09
STEP C	39.2706	3141.64	6806.90	81682.75
STEP D	41.2341	3298.73	7147.24	85766.88
STEP E	43.2958	3463.66	7504.60	90055.23
STEP F	45.4606	3636.85	7879.83	94557.99
STEP G	47.7336	3818.69	8273.82	99285.89

325 ASST CITY MANAGER

STEP A	74.0814	5926.51	12840.77	154089.31
STEP B	77.7854	6222.83	13482.80	161793.63
STEP C	81.6747	6533.97	14156.94	169883.37
STEP D	85.7585	6860.68	14864.80	178377.68
STEP E	90.0464	7203.71	15608.04	187296.51
STEP F	94.5487	7563.89	16388.44	196661.29
STEP G	99.2762	7942.09	17207.87	206494.49

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
8553 ASST ELEC UTIL DIR-RESOURCES						
		STEP A	77.7298	6218.38	13473.16	161677.98
		STEP B	81.6164	6529.31	14146.84	169762.11
		STEP C	85.6972	6855.77	14854.18	178250.17
		STEP D	89.9819	7198.55	15596.86	187162.35
		STEP E	94.4811	7558.48	16376.72	196520.68
		STEP F	99.2051	7936.40	17195.55	206346.60
		STEP G	104.1655	8333.24	18055.35	216664.24
395 ASST ELEC UTIL DIRECTOR						
		STEP A	70.9719	5677.75	12301.79	147621.55
		STEP B	74.5206	5961.64	12916.90	155002.84
		STEP C	78.2466	6259.72	13562.74	162752.92
		STEP D	82.1588	6572.70	14240.85	170890.30
		STEP E	86.2668	6901.34	14952.91	179434.94
		STEP F	90.5802	7246.41	15700.56	188406.81
		STEP G	95.1093	7608.74	16485.61	197827.34
411 ASST EU DIRECTOR						
		STEP A	62.1514	4972.11	10772.90	129274.91
		STEP B	65.2588	5220.70	11311.52	135738.30
		STEP C	68.5218	5481.74	11877.11	142525.34
		STEP D	71.9478	5755.82	12470.95	149651.42
		STEP E	75.5453	6043.62	13094.51	157134.22
		STEP F	79.3225	6345.80	13749.23	164990.80
		STEP G	83.2886	6663.08	14436.69	173240.28
480 ASST FIRE CHIEF						
		STEP A	61.2592	4900.73	10618.26	127419.13
		STEP B	64.3221	5145.76	11149.16	133789.96
		STEP C	67.5383	5403.06	11706.63	140479.66
		STEP D	70.9152	5673.21	12291.96	147503.61
		STEP E	74.4609	5956.87	12906.55	154878.67
		STEP F	78.1839	6254.71	13551.87	162622.51
		STEP G	82.0932	6567.45	14229.48	170753.85
484 ASST HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR						
		STEP A	53.1051	4248.40	9204.88	110458.60
		STEP B	55.7603	4460.82	9665.11	115981.42
		STEP C	58.5483	4683.86	10148.37	121780.46
		STEP D	61.4758	4918.06	10655.80	127869.66
		STEP E	64.5495	5163.96	11188.58	134262.96
		STEP F	67.7770	5422.16	11748.01	140976.16
		STEP G	71.1659	5693.27	12335.42	148025.07

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
510 ASST POLICE CHIEF						
		STEP A	67.3324	5386.59	11670.94	140051.31
		STEP B	70.6990	5655.92	12254.49	147053.87
		STEP C	74.2339	5938.71	12867.21	154406.56
		STEP D	77.9456	6235.65	13510.57	162126.89
		STEP E	81.8429	6547.43	14186.10	170233.24
		STEP F	85.9350	6874.80	14895.41	178744.90
		STEP G	90.2318	7218.54	15640.18	187682.14
920 BILLING SERVICES MANAGER						
		STEP A	44.7525	3580.20	7757.10	93085.15
		STEP B	46.9901	3759.21	8144.95	97739.41
		STEP C	49.3396	3947.17	8552.20	102626.38
		STEP D	51.8066	4144.53	8979.81	107757.70
		STEP E	54.3969	4351.75	9428.80	113145.59
		STEP F	57.1168	4569.34	9900.24	118802.86
		STEP G	59.9726	4797.81	10395.25	124743.01
1017 BLDG INSPECTION SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	40.3307	3226.45	6990.65	83887.85
		STEP B	42.3473	3387.78	7340.19	88082.38
		STEP C	44.4646	3557.16	7707.19	92486.36
		STEP D	46.6877	3735.01	8092.53	97110.41
		STEP E	49.0223	3921.78	8497.19	101966.38
		STEP F	51.4734	4117.87	8922.05	107064.67
		STEP G	54.0470	4323.76	9368.14	112417.76
1043 BLDG OFFICIAL						
		STEP A	50.1505	4012.04	8692.76	104313.09
		STEP B	52.6581	4212.64	9127.40	109528.75
		STEP C	55.2910	4423.28	9583.77	115005.18
		STEP D	58.0555	4644.44	10062.95	120755.44
		STEP E	60.9583	4876.66	10566.10	126793.22
		STEP F	64.0062	5120.50	11094.41	133132.88
		STEP G	67.2065	5376.52	11649.13	139789.52
910 BUDGET ANALYST I						
		STEP A	34.4334	2754.67	5968.45	71621.47
		STEP B	36.1549	2892.39	6266.84	75202.19
		STEP C	37.9628	3037.02	6580.21	78962.62
		STEP D	39.8610	3188.88	6909.24	82910.88
		STEP E	41.8541	3348.32	7254.71	87056.52
		STEP F	43.9466	3515.72	7617.41	91408.92
		STEP G	46.1440	3691.52	7998.29	95979.52

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
915 BUDGET ANALYST II						
		STEP A	37.3182	2985.45	6468.48	77621.85
		STEP B	39.1840	3134.72	6791.89	81502.72
		STEP C	41.1434	3291.47	7131.52	85578.27
		STEP D	43.2005	3456.04	7488.08	89857.04
		STEP E	45.3605	3628.84	7862.48	94349.84
		STEP F	47.6286	3810.28	8255.62	99067.48
		STEP G	50.0100	4000.80	8668.40	104020.80
930 BUDGET MANAGER						
		STEP A	44.7525	3580.20	7757.10	93085.15
		STEP B	46.9901	3759.21	8144.95	97739.41
		STEP C	49.3396	3947.17	8552.20	102626.38
		STEP D	51.8066	4144.53	8979.81	107757.70
		STEP E	54.3969	4351.75	9428.80	113145.59
		STEP F	57.1168	4569.34	9900.24	118802.86
		STEP G	59.9726	4797.81	10395.25	124743.01
1050 BUSINESS SVCS ADMINISTRATOR						
		STEP A	42.3780	3390.24	7345.52	88146.24
		STEP B	44.4970	3559.76	7712.81	92553.76
		STEP C	46.7217	3737.73	8098.42	97181.13
		STEP D	49.0581	3924.64	8503.40	102040.84
		STEP E	51.5108	4120.86	8928.53	107142.46
		STEP F	54.0864	4326.91	9374.97	112499.71
		STEP G	56.7907	4543.25	9843.72	118124.65
1125 CENTRAL SERVICES DIRECTOR						
		STEP A	60.9892	4879.13	10571.46	126857.53
		STEP B	64.0388	5123.10	11100.05	133200.70
		STEP C	67.2407	5379.25	11655.05	139860.65
		STEP D	70.6027	5648.21	12237.80	146853.61
		STEP E	74.1329	5930.63	12849.70	154196.43
		STEP F	77.8396	6227.16	13492.19	161906.36
		STEP G	81.7316	6538.52	14166.81	170001.72
1245 CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER						
		STEP A	86.5875	6927.00	15008.50	180102.00
		STEP B	90.9169	7273.35	15758.92	189107.15
		STEP C	95.4628	7637.02	16546.88	198562.62
		STEP D	100.2359	8018.87	17374.22	208490.67
		STEP E	105.2477	8419.81	18242.93	218915.21
		STEP F	110.5101	8840.80	19155.08	229861.00
		STEP G	116.0356	9282.84	20112.83	241354.04

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
1180 CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER						
		STEP A	60.9892	4879.13	10571.46	126857.53
		STEP B	64.0388	5123.10	11100.05	133200.70
		STEP C	67.2407	5379.25	11655.05	139860.65
		STEP D	70.6027	5648.21	12237.80	146853.61
		STEP E	74.1329	5930.63	12849.70	154196.43
		STEP F	77.8396	6227.16	13492.19	161906.36
		STEP G	81.7316	6538.52	14166.81	170001.72
1220 CITY CLERK						
		STEP A	55.5188	4441.50	9623.25	115479.10
		STEP B	58.2948	4663.58	10104.43	121253.18
		STEP C	61.2096	4896.76	10609.66	127315.96
		STEP D	64.2701	5141.60	11140.15	133681.80
		STEP E	67.4836	5398.68	11697.15	140365.88
		STEP F	70.8579	5668.63	12282.03	147384.43
		STEP G	74.4006	5952.04	12896.10	154753.24
1224 CITY LIBRARIAN						
		STEP A	50.0106	4000.84	8668.50	104022.04
		STEP B	52.5111	4200.88	9101.92	109223.08
		STEP C	55.1365	4410.92	9556.99	114683.92
		STEP D	57.8936	4631.48	10034.89	120418.68
		STEP E	60.7880	4863.04	10536.58	126439.04
		STEP F	63.8276	5106.20	11063.45	132761.40
		STEP G	67.0190	5361.52	11616.62	139399.52
1370 CONTROLLER						
		STEP A	46.1683	3693.46	8002.50	96030.06
		STEP B	48.4767	3878.13	8402.62	100831.53
		STEP C	50.9006	4072.04	8822.77	105873.24
		STEP D	53.4456	4275.64	9263.90	111166.84
		STEP E	56.1179	4489.43	9727.10	116725.23
		STEP F	58.9238	4713.90	10213.45	122561.50
		STEP G	61.8699	4949.59	10724.11	128689.39
1645 DEPT PUBLIC INFO OFFICER						
		STEP A	38.3214	3065.71	6642.37	79708.51
		STEP B	40.2376	3219.00	6974.51	83694.20
		STEP C	42.2491	3379.92	7323.17	87878.12
		STEP D	44.3617	3548.93	7689.36	92272.33
		STEP E	46.5799	3726.39	8073.84	96886.19
		STEP F	48.9088	3912.70	8477.52	101730.30
		STEP G	51.3546	4108.36	8901.46	106817.56

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
1655 DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY I						
		STEP A	51.0406	4083.25	8847.04	106164.47
		STEP B	53.5926	4287.41	9289.39	111472.69
		STEP C	56.2723	4501.78	9753.86	117046.33
		STEP D	59.0859	4726.87	10241.55	122898.65
		STEP E	62.0402	4963.21	10753.63	129043.58
		STEP F	65.1422	5211.38	11291.31	135495.76
		STEP G	68.3993	5471.94	11855.88	142270.54
1658 DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY II						
		STEP A	56.1446	4491.57	9731.74	116780.87
		STEP B	58.9519	4716.15	10218.33	122619.91
		STEP C	61.8995	4951.96	10729.24	128750.91
		STEP D	64.9944	5199.56	11265.70	135188.46
		STEP E	68.2442	5459.53	11828.99	141947.88
		STEP F	71.6564	5732.51	12420.44	149045.27
		STEP G	75.2392	6019.14	13041.46	156497.54
1659 DEPUTY CITY MANAGER						
		STEP A	55.5189	4441.51	9623.27	115479.31
		STEP B	58.2948	4663.58	10104.43	121253.18
		STEP C	61.2096	4896.76	10609.66	127315.96
		STEP D	64.2701	5141.60	11140.15	133681.80
		STEP E	67.4837	5398.69	11697.17	140366.09
		STEP F	70.8579	5668.63	12282.03	147384.43
		STEP G	74.4007	5952.05	12896.12	154753.45
1674 DEVELOPMENT ANALYST I						
		STEP A	33.2609	2660.87	5765.22	69182.67
		STEP B	34.9239	2793.91	6053.47	72641.71
		STEP C	36.6700	2933.60	6356.13	76273.60
		STEP D	38.5037	3080.29	6673.97	80087.69
		STEP E	40.4288	3234.30	7007.65	84091.90
		STEP F	42.4503	3396.02	7358.05	88296.62
		STEP G	44.5728	3565.82	7725.95	92711.42
1675 DEVELOPMENT ANALYST II						
		STEP A	36.5872	2926.97	6341.78	76101.37
		STEP B	38.4165	3073.32	6658.86	79906.32
		STEP C	40.3372	3226.97	6991.78	83901.37
		STEP D	42.3541	3388.32	7341.37	88096.52
		STEP E	44.4717	3557.73	7708.42	92501.13
		STEP F	46.6954	3735.63	8093.86	97126.43
		STEP G	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - A**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
----------	-------	------	--------	-----------	---------	--------

1676 DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR

STEP A	67.1903	5375.22	11646.31	139755.82
STEP B	70.5498	5643.98	12228.63	146743.58
STEP C	74.0772	5926.17	12840.04	154080.57
STEP D	77.7812	6222.49	13482.07	161784.89
STEP E	81.6702	6533.61	14156.16	169874.01
STEP F	85.7538	6860.30	14863.99	178367.90
STEP G	90.0416	7203.32	15607.21	187286.52

1695 DEVELOPMENT SERVICES MANAGER

STEP A	55.5189	4441.51	9623.27	115479.31
STEP B	58.2948	4663.58	10104.43	121253.18
STEP C	61.2096	4896.76	10609.66	127315.96
STEP D	64.2701	5141.60	11140.15	133681.80
STEP E	67.4837	5398.69	11697.17	140366.09
STEP F	70.8579	5668.63	12282.03	147384.43
STEP G	74.4007	5952.05	12896.12	154753.45

1710 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

STEP A	64.6607	5172.85	11207.85	134494.25
STEP B	67.8939	5431.51	11768.27	141219.31
STEP C	71.2886	5703.08	12356.69	148280.28
STEP D	74.8529	5988.23	12974.50	155694.03
STEP E	78.5957	6287.65	13623.25	163479.05
STEP F	82.5255	6602.04	14304.42	171653.04
STEP G	86.6518	6932.14	15019.64	180235.74

1712 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

STEP A	50.1075	4008.60	8685.30	104223.60
STEP B	52.6130	4209.04	9119.58	109435.04
STEP C	55.2436	4419.48	9575.55	114906.68
STEP D	58.0058	4640.46	10054.33	120652.06
STEP E	60.9060	4872.48	10557.04	126684.48
STEP F	63.9516	5116.12	11084.94	133019.32
STEP G	67.1490	5371.92	11639.16	139669.92

1310 ELECTRIC BUSINESS ANALYST I

STEP A	39.3071	3144.56	6813.23	81758.76
STEP B	41.2726	3301.80	7153.91	85847.00
STEP C	43.3361	3466.88	7511.59	90139.08
STEP D	45.5029	3640.23	7887.16	94646.03
STEP E	47.7780	3822.24	8281.52	99378.24
STEP F	50.1669	4013.35	8695.59	104347.15
STEP G	52.6752	4214.01	9130.36	109564.41

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
1312 ELECTRIC BUSINESS ANALYST II						
		STEP A	43.2416	3459.32	7495.21	89942.52
		STEP B	45.4038	3632.30	7869.99	94439.90
		STEP C	47.6740	3813.92	8263.49	99161.92
		STEP D	50.0576	4004.60	8676.65	104119.80
		STEP E	52.5605	4204.84	9110.48	109325.84
		STEP F	55.1886	4415.08	9566.02	114792.28
		STEP G	57.9480	4635.84	10044.32	120531.84
2335 ELECTRIC COMPLIANCE ANALYST						
		STEP A	45.0209	3601.67	7803.62	93643.47
		STEP B	47.2719	3781.75	8193.79	98325.55
		STEP C	49.6356	3970.84	8603.50	103242.04
		STEP D	52.1174	4169.39	9033.68	108404.19
		STEP E	54.7232	4377.85	9485.35	113824.25
		STEP F	57.4593	4596.74	9959.61	119515.34
		STEP G	60.3323	4826.58	10457.59	125491.18
6285 ELECTRIC CUSTOMER PROGRAMS SUPV						
		STEP A	54.7676	4381.40	9493.05	113916.60
		STEP B	57.5059	4600.47	9967.68	119612.27
		STEP C	60.3812	4830.49	10466.07	125592.89
		STEP D	63.4002	5072.01	10989.36	131872.41
		STEP E	66.5703	5325.62	11538.85	138466.22
		STEP F	69.8987	5591.89	12115.77	145389.29
		STEP G	73.3937	5871.49	12721.57	152658.89
2284 ELECTRIC ENGINEERING TECH SUPV						
		STEP A	47.8512	3828.09	8294.20	99530.49
		STEP B	50.2436	4019.48	8708.89	104506.68
		STEP C	52.7559	4220.47	9144.35	109732.27
		STEP D	55.3937	4431.49	9601.57	115218.89
		STEP E	58.1633	4653.06	10081.63	120979.66
		STEP F	61.0715	4885.72	10585.72	127028.72
		STEP G	64.1251	5130.00	11115.01	133380.20
2280 ELECTRIC LINE CONST SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	61.4415	4915.32	10649.86	127798.32
		STEP B	64.5137	5161.09	11182.37	134188.49
		STEP C	67.7392	5419.13	11741.46	140897.53
		STEP D	71.1263	5690.10	12328.55	147942.70
		STEP E	74.6826	5974.60	12944.98	155339.80
		STEP F	78.4168	6273.34	13592.24	163106.94
		STEP G	82.3374	6586.99	14271.81	171261.79

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
2338 ELECTRIC OPERATIONS MANAGER						
		STEP A	67.5845	5406.76	11714.64	140575.76
		STEP B	70.9637	5677.09	12300.37	147604.49
		STEP C	74.5119	5960.95	12915.39	154984.75
		STEP D	78.2374	6258.99	13561.14	162733.79
		STEP E	82.1493	6571.94	14239.21	170870.54
		STEP F	86.2569	6900.55	14951.19	179414.35
		STEP G	90.5697	7245.57	15698.74	188384.97
2346 ELECTRIC RATES & FINANCL ADMIN						
		STEP A	58.3337	4666.69	10111.17	121334.09
		STEP B	61.2503	4900.02	10616.71	127400.62
		STEP C	64.3128	5145.02	11147.55	133770.62
		STEP D	67.5284	5402.27	11704.92	140459.07
		STEP E	70.9049	5672.39	12290.18	147482.19
		STEP F	74.4500	5956.00	12904.66	154856.00
		STEP G	78.1726	6253.80	13549.91	162599.00
2348 ELECTRIC REGU COMPLNCE ADMNSTR						
		STEP A	67.5845	5406.76	11714.64	140575.76
		STEP B	70.9637	5677.09	12300.37	147604.49
		STEP C	74.5119	5960.95	12915.39	154984.75
		STEP D	78.2374	6258.99	13561.14	162733.79
		STEP E	82.1493	6571.94	14239.21	170870.54
		STEP F	86.2569	6900.55	14951.19	179414.35
		STEP G	90.5697	7245.57	15698.74	188384.97
2314 ELECTRIC RESOURCES ANALYST I						
		STEP A	47.9688	3837.50	8314.59	99775.10
		STEP B	50.3673	4029.38	8730.33	104763.98
		STEP C	52.8855	4230.84	9166.82	110001.84
		STEP D	55.5300	4442.40	9625.20	115502.40
		STEP E	58.3064	4664.51	10106.44	121277.31
		STEP F	61.2217	4897.73	10611.76	127341.13
		STEP G	64.2828	5142.62	11142.35	133708.22
2316 ELECTRIC RESOURCES ANALYST II						
		STEP A	52.7703	4221.62	9146.85	109762.22
		STEP B	55.4088	4432.70	9604.19	115250.30
		STEP C	58.1792	4654.33	10084.39	121012.73
		STEP D	61.0883	4887.06	10588.63	127063.66
		STEP E	64.1427	5131.41	11118.06	133416.81
		STEP F	67.3498	5387.98	11673.96	140087.58
		STEP G	70.7172	5657.37	12257.64	147091.77

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
2354 ELECTRIC RISK MGMT ADMNSTR						
		STEP A	64.1688	5133.50	11122.59	133471.10
		STEP B	67.3774	5390.19	11678.74	140144.99
		STEP C	70.7462	5659.69	12262.67	147152.09
		STEP D	74.2836	5942.68	12875.82	154509.88
		STEP E	77.9977	6239.81	13519.60	162235.21
		STEP F	81.8976	6551.80	14195.58	170347.00
		STEP G	85.9924	6879.39	14905.34	178864.19
2352 ELECTRIC SAFETY COORDINATOR						
		STEP A	36.5871	2926.96	6341.76	76101.16
		STEP B	38.4164	3073.31	6658.84	79906.11
		STEP C	40.3371	3226.96	6991.76	83901.16
		STEP D	42.3539	3388.31	7341.34	88096.11
		STEP E	44.4716	3557.72	7708.41	92500.92
		STEP F	46.6952	3735.61	8093.83	97126.01
		STEP G	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60
2319 ELECTRIC SUBSTATION SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	61.4415	4915.32	10649.86	127798.32
		STEP B	64.5137	5161.09	11182.37	134188.49
		STEP C	67.7392	5419.13	11741.46	140897.53
		STEP D	71.1263	5690.10	12328.55	147942.70
		STEP E	74.6826	5974.60	12944.98	155339.80
		STEP F	78.4168	6273.34	13592.24	163106.94
		STEP G	82.3374	6586.99	14271.81	171261.79
2358 ELECTRIC TECHNOLOGY SYST SUPV						
		STEP A	50.0104	4000.83	8668.46	104021.63
		STEP B	52.5110	4200.88	9101.90	109222.88
		STEP C	55.1365	4410.92	9556.99	114683.92
		STEP D	57.8934	4631.47	10034.85	120418.27
		STEP E	60.7880	4863.04	10536.58	126439.04
		STEP F	63.8273	5106.18	11063.39	132760.78
		STEP G	67.0187	5361.49	11616.57	139398.89
2320 ELECTRIC UTILITY DIRECTOR						
		STEP A	92.9432	7435.45	16110.15	193321.85
		STEP B	97.5900	7807.20	16915.60	202987.20
		STEP C	102.4696	8197.56	17761.39	213136.76
		STEP D	107.5931	8607.44	18649.47	223793.64
		STEP E	112.9728	9037.82	19581.95	234983.42
		STEP F	118.6215	9489.72	20561.06	246732.72
		STEP G	124.5526	9964.20	21589.11	259069.40

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code Title Step Hourly Bi-weekly Monthly Annual

2378 ELECTRONIC MAINT COORDINATOR

STEP A	39.2746	3141.96	6807.59	81691.16
STEP B	41.2384	3299.07	7147.98	85775.87
STEP C	43.3003	3464.02	7505.38	90064.62
STEP D	45.4653	3637.22	7880.65	94567.82
STEP E	47.7384	3819.07	8274.65	99295.87
STEP F	50.1254	4010.03	8688.40	104260.83
STEP G	52.6317	4210.53	9122.82	109473.93

2415 EMS QUAL ASSURANCE COORDINATOR

STEP A	45.1917	3615.33	7833.22	93998.73
STEP B	47.4512	3796.09	8224.87	98698.49
STEP C	49.8239	3985.91	8636.14	103633.71
STEP D	52.3152	4185.21	9067.96	108815.61
STEP E	54.9309	4394.47	9521.35	114256.27
STEP F	57.6775	4614.20	9997.43	119969.20
STEP G	60.5613	4844.90	10497.29	125967.50

2500 ENERGY SERVICES ACCOUNT REP I

STEP A	39.3599	3148.79	6822.38	81868.59
STEP B	41.3279	3306.23	7163.50	85962.03
STEP C	43.3942	3471.53	7521.66	90259.93
STEP D	45.5640	3645.12	7897.76	94773.12
STEP E	47.8421	3827.36	8292.63	99511.56
STEP F	50.2342	4018.73	8707.26	104487.13
STEP G	52.7459	4219.67	9142.62	109711.47

2501 ENERGY SERVICES ACCOUNT REP II

STEP A	43.2959	3463.67	7504.62	90055.47
STEP B	45.4605	3636.84	7879.82	94557.84
STEP C	47.7337	3818.69	8273.84	99286.09
STEP D	50.1204	4009.63	8687.53	104250.43
STEP E	52.6264	4210.11	9121.90	109462.91
STEP F	55.2577	4420.61	9578.00	114936.01
STEP G	58.0206	4641.64	10056.90	120682.84

1277 ENGINEERING MANAGER

STEP A	56.5013	4520.10	9793.55	117522.70
STEP B	59.3265	4746.12	10283.26	123399.12
STEP C	62.2925	4983.40	10797.36	129568.40
STEP D	65.4073	5232.58	11337.26	136047.18
STEP E	68.6775	5494.20	11904.10	142849.20
STEP F	72.1113	5768.90	12499.29	149991.50
STEP G	75.7169	6057.35	13124.26	157491.15

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
2540 ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR						
		STEP A	42.0752	3366.01	7293.03	87516.41
		STEP B	44.1791	3534.32	7657.71	91892.52
		STEP C	46.3881	3711.04	8040.60	96487.24
		STEP D	48.7074	3896.59	8442.61	101311.39
		STEP E	51.1428	4091.42	8864.75	106377.02
		STEP F	53.6998	4295.98	9307.96	111695.58
		STEP G	56.3849	4510.79	9773.38	117280.59
2541 ENVIRONMENTAL UTIL COMPL ADMIN						
		STEP A	42.0733	3365.86	7292.70	87512.46
		STEP B	44.1769	3534.15	7657.32	91887.95
		STEP C	46.3857	3710.85	8040.18	96482.25
		STEP D	48.7050	3896.40	8442.20	101306.40
		STEP E	51.1401	4091.20	8864.28	106371.40
		STEP F	53.6972	4295.77	9307.51	111690.17
		STEP G	56.3820	4510.56	9772.88	117274.56
1684 ENVIRONMENTAL UTIL DIRECTOR						
		STEP A	74.5054	5960.43	12914.26	154971.23
		STEP B	78.2306	6258.44	13559.97	162719.64
		STEP C	82.1421	6571.36	14237.96	170855.56
		STEP D	86.2493	6899.94	14949.87	179398.54
		STEP E	90.5617	7244.93	15697.36	188368.33
		STEP F	95.0898	7607.18	16482.23	197786.78
		STEP G	99.8443	7987.54	17306.34	207676.14
2565 EQUIPMENT MAINT SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	31.4681	2517.44	5454.47	65453.64
		STEP B	33.0415	2643.32	5727.19	68726.32
		STEP C	34.6936	2775.48	6013.55	72162.68
		STEP D	36.4283	2914.26	6314.23	75770.86
		STEP E	38.2497	3059.97	6629.94	79559.37
		STEP F	40.1622	3212.97	6961.44	83537.37
		STEP G	42.1703	3373.62	7309.51	87714.22
6520 ERP MANAGER						
		STEP A	48.3018	3864.14	8372.31	100467.74
		STEP B	50.7170	4057.36	8790.94	105491.36
		STEP C	53.2529	4260.23	9230.50	110766.03
		STEP D	55.9154	4473.23	9692.00	116304.03
		STEP E	58.7112	4696.89	10176.60	122119.29
		STEP F	61.6468	4931.74	10685.44	128225.34
		STEP G	64.7291	5178.32	11219.71	134636.52

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
2548 EU BUSINESS SVCS ADMINISTRATOR						
		STEP A	42.9160	3433.28	7438.77	89265.28
		STEP B	45.0618	3604.94	7810.71	93728.54
		STEP C	47.3149	3785.19	8201.24	98414.99
		STEP D	49.6806	3974.44	8611.30	103335.64
		STEP E	52.1646	4173.16	9041.86	108502.36
		STEP F	54.7729	4381.83	9493.96	113927.63
		STEP G	57.5115	4600.92	9968.66	119623.92
2546 EU RATE ANALYST I						
		STEP A	34.4334	2754.67	5968.45	71621.47
		STEP B	36.1550	2892.40	6266.86	75202.40
		STEP C	37.9628	3037.02	6580.21	78962.62
		STEP D	39.8609	3188.87	6909.22	82910.67
		STEP E	41.8540	3348.32	7254.69	87056.32
		STEP F	43.9467	3515.73	7617.42	91409.13
		STEP G	46.1440	3691.52	7998.29	95979.52
2547 EU RATE ANALYST II						
		STEP A	37.3182	2985.45	6468.48	77621.85
		STEP B	39.1841	3134.72	6791.91	81502.92
		STEP C	41.1434	3291.47	7131.52	85578.27
		STEP D	43.2005	3456.04	7488.08	89857.04
		STEP E	45.3605	3628.84	7862.48	94349.84
		STEP F	47.6286	3810.28	8255.62	99067.48
		STEP G	50.0100	4000.80	8668.40	104020.80
3395 FACILITIES MANAGER						
		STEP A	40.8297	3266.38	7077.15	84925.77
		STEP B	42.8712	3429.69	7431.00	89172.06
		STEP C	45.0147	3601.18	7802.56	93630.66
		STEP D	47.2655	3781.24	8192.68	98312.20
		STEP E	49.6288	3970.30	8602.32	103227.81
		STEP F	52.1102	4168.82	9032.43	108389.20
		STEP G	54.7157	4377.26	9484.05	113808.66
3301 FINANCE DIRECTOR						
		STEP A	67.0881	5367.04	11628.60	139543.24
		STEP B	70.4426	5635.40	12210.05	146520.60
		STEP C	73.9648	5917.18	12820.56	153846.78
		STEP D	77.6629	6213.03	13461.56	161538.83
		STEP E	81.5462	6523.69	14134.67	169616.09
		STEP F	85.6235	6849.88	14841.40	178096.88
		STEP G	89.9047	7192.37	15583.48	187001.77

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
2900 FINANCE MANAGER						
		STEP A	44.7525	3580.20	7757.10	93085.15
		STEP B	46.9901	3759.21	8144.95	97739.41
		STEP C	49.3396	3947.17	8552.20	102626.38
		STEP D	51.8066	4144.53	8979.81	107757.70
		STEP E	54.3969	4351.75	9428.80	113145.59
		STEP F	57.1168	4569.34	9900.24	118802.86
		STEP G	59.9726	4797.81	10395.25	124743.01
3310 FINANCE SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	36.3377	2907.01	6298.53	75582.41
		STEP B	38.1543	3052.34	6613.41	79360.94
		STEP C	40.0622	3204.97	6944.11	83329.37
		STEP D	42.0654	3365.23	7291.33	87496.03
		STEP E	44.1686	3533.48	7655.89	91870.68
		STEP F	46.3770	3710.16	8038.68	96464.16
		STEP G	48.6957	3895.65	8440.58	101287.05
3391 FIRE BATTALLION CHIEF (8HR)						
		STEP A	51.1945	4095.56	8873.71	106484.56
		STEP B	53.1586	4252.68	9214.15	110569.88
		STEP C	55.8162	4465.29	9674.80	116097.69
		STEP D	58.6075	4688.60	10158.63	121903.60
		STEP E	61.5376	4923.00	10666.51	127998.20
		STEP F	64.6146	5169.16	11199.86	134398.36
		STEP G	67.8453	5427.62	11759.85	141118.22
905 FIRE BATTALION CHIEF (24HR)						
		STEP A	36.1622	4050.16	8775.36	105304.32
		STEP B	37.9704	4252.68	9214.15	110569.80
		STEP C	39.8687	4465.29	9674.80	116097.65
		STEP D	41.8625	4688.60	10158.63	121903.60
		STEP E	43.9555	4923.01	10666.53	127998.41
		STEP F	46.1533	5169.16	11199.86	134398.40
		STEP G	48.4609	5427.62	11759.84	141118.14
3330 FIRE CHIEF						
		STEP A	72.7667	5821.33	12612.89	151354.73
		STEP B	76.4051	6112.40	13243.55	158922.60
		STEP C	80.2252	6418.01	13905.70	166868.41
		STEP D	84.2366	6738.92	14601.01	175212.12
		STEP E	88.4484	7075.87	15331.05	183972.67
		STEP F	92.8706	7429.64	16097.57	193170.84
		STEP G	97.5142	7801.13	16902.46	202829.53

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - A**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
3332 FIRE DIVISION CHIEF						
		STEP A	55.6902	4455.21	9652.96	115835.61
		STEP B	58.4747	4677.97	10135.61	121627.37
		STEP C	61.3984	4911.87	10642.38	127708.67
		STEP D	64.4683	5157.46	11174.50	134094.06
		STEP E	67.6918	5415.34	11733.24	140798.94
		STEP F	71.0764	5686.11	12319.90	147838.91
		STEP G	74.6301	5970.40	12935.88	155230.60
3392 FLEET MANAGER						
		STEP A	40.8297	3266.38	7077.15	84925.77
		STEP B	42.8712	3429.69	7431.00	89172.06
		STEP C	45.0147	3601.18	7802.56	93630.66
		STEP D	47.2655	3781.24	8192.68	98312.20
		STEP E	49.6288	3970.30	8602.32	103227.81
		STEP F	52.1102	4168.82	9032.43	108389.20
		STEP G	54.7157	4377.26	9484.05	113808.66
3451 GOVERNMENT RELATIONS ADMINISTR						
		STEP A	43.9043	3512.34	7610.07	91320.94
		STEP B	46.0995	3687.96	7990.58	95886.96
		STEP C	48.4044	3872.35	8390.09	100681.15
		STEP D	50.8248	4065.98	8809.63	105715.58
		STEP E	53.3660	4269.28	9250.10	111001.28
		STEP F	56.0343	4482.74	9712.61	116551.34
		STEP G	58.8358	4706.86	10198.20	122378.46
3589 HOUSING MANAGER						
		STEP A	43.4430	3475.44	7530.12	90361.44
		STEP B	45.6170	3649.36	7906.94	94883.36
		STEP C	47.8979	3831.83	8302.30	99627.63
		STEP D	50.2928	4023.42	8717.41	104609.02
		STEP E	52.8074	4224.59	9153.28	109839.39
		STEP F	55.4478	4435.82	9610.95	115331.42
		STEP G	58.2202	4657.61	10091.50	121098.01
3590 HOUSING SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	36.5872	2926.97	6341.78	76101.37
		STEP B	38.4165	3073.32	6658.86	79906.32
		STEP C	40.3372	3226.97	6991.78	83901.37
		STEP D	42.3541	3388.32	7341.37	88096.52
		STEP E	44.4717	3557.73	7708.42	92501.13
		STEP F	46.6954	3735.63	8093.86	97126.43
		STEP G	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
3594 HUMAN RESOURCES ANALYST I						
		STEP A	32.3413	2587.31	5605.83	67270.00
		STEP B	33.9584	2716.67	5886.13	70633.50
		STEP C	35.6563	2852.51	6180.43	74165.18
		STEP D	37.4392	2995.13	6489.45	77873.44
		STEP E	39.3111	3144.89	6813.93	81767.11
		STEP F	41.2767	3302.13	7154.62	85855.47
		STEP G	43.3405	3467.24	7512.35	90148.24
3596 HUMAN RESOURCES ANALYST II						
		STEP A	35.5826	2846.61	6167.65	74011.83
		STEP B	37.3617	2988.94	6476.03	77712.42
		STEP C	39.2298	3138.39	6799.84	81598.04
		STEP D	41.1913	3295.31	7139.83	85677.94
		STEP E	43.2509	3460.07	7496.82	89961.84
		STEP F	45.4134	3633.07	7871.66	94459.93
		STEP G	47.6841	3814.73	8265.24	99182.93
3598 HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR						
		STEP A	61.0708	4885.66	10585.60	127027.26
		STEP B	64.1243	5129.94	11114.87	133378.54
		STEP C	67.3305	5386.44	11670.62	140047.44
		STEP D	70.6971	5655.76	12254.16	147049.96
		STEP E	74.2321	5938.56	12866.89	154402.76
		STEP F	77.9437	6235.49	13510.24	162122.89
		STEP G	81.8408	6547.26	14185.73	170228.86
3599 HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGER						
		STEP A	41.6683	3333.46	7222.50	86670.06
		STEP B	43.7518	3500.14	7583.64	91003.74
		STEP C	45.9395	3675.16	7962.84	95554.16
		STEP D	48.2364	3858.91	8360.97	100331.71
		STEP E	50.6482	4051.85	8779.02	105348.25
		STEP F	53.1808	4254.46	9218.00	110616.06
		STEP G	55.8398	4467.18	9678.89	116146.78
3625 INFO SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR						
		STEP A	42.8581	3428.64	7428.73	89144.84
		STEP B	45.0010	3600.08	7800.17	93602.08
		STEP C	47.2510	3780.08	8190.17	98282.08
		STEP D	49.6135	3969.08	8599.67	103196.08
		STEP E	52.0942	4167.53	9029.66	108355.93
		STEP F	54.6989	4375.91	9481.14	113773.71
		STEP G	57.4339	4594.71	9955.20	119462.51

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
3740 INTERPRETIVE SRVCS SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	34.8445	2787.56	6039.71	72476.56
		STEP B	36.5866	2926.92	6341.67	76100.12
		STEP C	38.4161	3073.28	6658.79	79905.48
		STEP D	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
		STEP E	42.3537	3388.29	7341.30	88095.69
		STEP F	44.4713	3557.70	7708.35	92500.30
		STEP G	46.6949	3735.59	8093.78	97125.39
3601 IT DIVISION MANAGER						
		STEP A	48.3018	3864.14	8372.31	100467.74
		STEP B	50.7170	4057.36	8790.94	105491.36
		STEP C	53.2529	4260.23	9230.50	110766.03
		STEP D	55.9154	4473.23	9692.00	116304.03
		STEP E	58.7112	4696.89	10176.60	122119.29
		STEP F	61.6468	4931.74	10685.44	128225.34
		STEP G	64.7291	5178.32	11219.71	134636.52
3602 IT PROGRAM MANAGER						
		STEP A	43.9092	3512.73	7610.92	91331.13
		STEP B	46.1046	3688.36	7991.46	95897.56
		STEP C	48.4098	3872.78	8391.03	100692.38
		STEP D	50.8304	4066.43	8810.60	105727.23
		STEP E	53.3719	4269.75	9251.12	111013.55
		STEP F	56.0403	4483.22	9713.65	116563.82
		STEP G	58.8424	4707.39	10199.34	122392.19
3810 KEY ACCOUNTS REPRESENTATIVE						
		STEP A	47.6233	3809.86	8254.70	99056.46
		STEP B	50.0044	4000.35	8667.42	104009.15
		STEP C	52.5047	4200.37	9100.81	109209.77
		STEP D	55.1299	4410.39	9555.84	114670.19
		STEP E	57.8863	4630.90	10033.62	120403.50
		STEP F	60.7806	4862.44	10535.30	126423.64
		STEP G	63.8196	5105.56	11062.06	132744.76
4246 LIBRARY SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	32.1157	2569.25	5566.72	66800.65
		STEP B	33.7218	2697.74	5845.11	70141.34
		STEP C	35.4077	2832.61	6137.33	73648.01
		STEP D	37.1782	2974.25	6444.22	77330.65
		STEP E	39.0370	3122.96	6766.41	81196.96
		STEP F	40.9889	3279.11	7104.74	85256.91
		STEP G	43.0383	3443.06	7459.97	89519.66

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - A**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
4449 MANAGEMENT ANALYST						
		STEP A	38.4165	3073.32	6658.86	79906.32
		STEP B	40.3372	3226.97	6991.78	83901.37
		STEP C	42.3541	3388.32	7341.37	88096.52
		STEP D	44.4717	3557.73	7708.42	92501.13
		STEP E	46.6954	3735.63	8093.86	97126.43
		STEP F	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60
		STEP G	51.4815	4118.52	8923.46	107081.52
4509 MAPPING SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	36.5871	2926.96	6341.76	76101.16
		STEP B	38.4164	3073.31	6658.84	79906.11
		STEP C	40.3371	3226.96	6991.76	83901.16
		STEP D	42.3539	3388.31	7341.34	88096.11
		STEP E	44.4716	3557.72	7708.41	92500.92
		STEP F	46.6952	3735.61	8093.83	97126.01
		STEP G	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60
4960 OPEN SPACE SUPERINTENDENT						
		STEP A	40.3361	3226.88	6991.59	83899.08
		STEP B	42.3530	3388.24	7341.18	88094.24
		STEP C	44.4707	3557.65	7708.25	92499.05
		STEP D	46.6942	3735.53	8093.66	97123.93
		STEP E	49.0292	3922.33	8498.39	101980.73
		STEP F	51.4803	4118.42	8923.25	107079.02
		STEP G	54.0543	4324.34	9369.41	112432.94
5020 PARK DEVELOPMENT ANALYST I						
		STEP A	33.2609	2660.87	5765.22	69182.67
		STEP B	34.9239	2793.91	6053.47	72641.71
		STEP C	36.6700	2933.60	6356.13	76273.60
		STEP D	38.5037	3080.29	6673.97	80087.69
		STEP E	40.4288	3234.30	7007.65	84091.90
		STEP F	42.4503	3396.02	7358.05	88296.62
		STEP G	44.5728	3565.82	7725.95	92711.42
5022 PARK DEVELOPMENT ANALYST II						
		STEP A	36.5872	2926.97	6341.78	76101.37
		STEP B	38.4165	3073.32	6658.86	79906.32
		STEP C	40.3372	3226.97	6991.78	83901.37
		STEP D	42.3541	3388.32	7341.37	88096.52
		STEP E	44.4717	3557.73	7708.42	92501.13
		STEP F	46.6954	3735.63	8093.86	97126.43
		STEP G	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
5024 PARK PLANNING & DEVELOPMT SUPT						
		STEP A	40.3363	3226.90	6991.62	83899.50
		STEP B	42.3531	3388.24	7341.20	88094.44
		STEP C	44.4708	3557.66	7708.27	92499.26
		STEP D	46.6942	3735.53	8093.66	97123.93
		STEP E	49.0293	3922.34	8498.41	101980.94
		STEP F	51.4805	4118.44	8923.28	107079.44
		STEP G	54.0543	4324.34	9369.41	112432.94
5090 PARKS SUPERINTENDENT						
		STEP A	40.3363	3226.90	6991.62	83899.50
		STEP B	42.3531	3388.24	7341.20	88094.44
		STEP C	44.4708	3557.66	7708.27	92499.26
		STEP D	46.6942	3735.53	8093.66	97123.93
		STEP E	49.0293	3922.34	8498.41	101980.94
		STEP F	51.4805	4118.44	8923.28	107079.44
		STEP G	54.0543	4324.34	9369.41	112432.94
5069 PARKS SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	34.8445	2787.56	6039.71	72476.56
		STEP B	36.5867	2926.93	6341.69	76100.33
		STEP C	38.4162	3073.29	6658.80	79905.69
		STEP D	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
		STEP E	42.3537	3388.29	7341.30	88095.69
		STEP F	44.4713	3557.70	7708.35	92500.30
		STEP G	46.6949	3735.59	8093.78	97125.39
5082 PARKS,REC & LIBRARIES DIRECTOR						
		STEP A	66.0802	5286.41	11453.90	137446.81
		STEP B	69.3842	5550.73	12026.59	144319.13
		STEP C	72.8533	5828.26	12627.90	151534.86
		STEP D	76.4960	6119.68	13259.30	159111.68
		STEP E	80.3208	6425.66	13922.27	167067.26
		STEP F	84.3370	6746.96	14618.41	175420.96
		STEP G	88.5538	7084.30	15349.32	184191.90
5010 PARKS,REC & LIBRARY BUS ADMSTR						
		STEP A	40.2452	3219.61	6975.83	83710.01
		STEP B	42.2576	3380.60	7324.65	87895.80
		STEP C	44.3703	3549.62	7690.85	92290.22
		STEP D	46.5888	3727.10	8075.39	96904.70
		STEP E	48.9184	3913.47	8479.18	101750.27
		STEP F	51.3641	4109.12	8903.11	106837.32
		STEP G	53.9324	4314.59	9348.28	112179.39

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
5309 PLANNING MANAGER						
		STEP A	55.5189	4441.51	9623.27	115479.31
		STEP B	58.2948	4663.58	10104.43	121253.18
		STEP C	61.2096	4896.76	10609.66	127315.96
		STEP D	64.2701	5141.60	11140.15	133681.80
		STEP E	67.4837	5398.69	11697.17	140366.09
		STEP F	70.8579	5668.63	12282.03	147384.43
		STEP G	74.4007	5952.05	12896.12	154753.45
5400 POLICE CAPTAIN						
		STEP A	58.5500	4684.00	10148.67	121784.00
		STEP B	61.4775	4918.20	10656.10	127873.20
		STEP C	64.5514	5164.11	11188.91	134266.86
		STEP D	67.7789	5422.32	11748.35	140980.20
		STEP E	71.1679	5693.43	12335.77	148029.21
		STEP F	74.7263	5978.10	12952.56	155430.67
		STEP G	78.4626	6277.01	13600.18	163202.21
5410 POLICE CHIEF						
		STEP A	77.9578	6236.62	13512.68	162152.22
		STEP B	81.8558	6548.46	14188.33	170260.06
		STEP C	85.9485	6875.88	14897.74	178772.88
		STEP D	90.2460	7219.68	15642.64	187711.68
		STEP E	94.7583	7580.66	16424.77	197097.26
		STEP F	99.4962	7959.69	17246.00	206952.09
		STEP G	104.4707	8357.65	18108.25	217299.05
5420 POLICE LIEUTENANT						
		STEP A	53.1477	4251.82	9212.27	110547.21
		STEP B	55.8051	4464.41	9672.88	116074.58
		STEP C	58.5953	4687.63	10156.53	121878.30
		STEP D	61.5251	4922.01	10664.35	127972.22
		STEP E	64.6014	5168.11	11197.57	134370.83
		STEP F	67.8314	5426.51	11757.45	141089.37
		STEP G	71.2230	5697.84	12345.32	148143.84
5489 POLICE SERVICES ADMINISTRATOR						
		STEP A	41.4691	3317.52	7187.97	86255.72
		STEP B	43.5427	3483.41	7547.40	90568.81
		STEP C	45.7198	3657.58	7924.76	95097.18
		STEP D	48.0058	3840.46	8321.00	99852.06
		STEP E	50.4061	4032.48	8737.05	104844.68
		STEP F	52.9264	4234.11	9173.90	110086.91
		STEP G	55.5728	4445.82	9632.61	115591.42

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
5485 POLICE SOCIAL SVCS ADMINSTR						
		STEP A	43.9043	3512.34	7610.07	91320.94
		STEP B	46.0995	3687.96	7990.58	95886.96
		STEP C	48.4044	3872.35	8390.09	100681.15
		STEP D	50.8248	4065.98	8809.63	105715.58
		STEP E	53.3660	4269.28	9250.10	111001.28
		STEP F	56.0343	4482.74	9712.61	116551.34
		STEP G	58.8358	4706.86	10198.20	122378.46
5505 POWER ENGINEERING MANAGER						
		STEP A	67.5845	5406.76	11714.64	140575.76
		STEP B	70.9637	5677.09	12300.37	147604.49
		STEP C	74.5119	5960.95	12915.39	154984.75
		STEP D	78.2374	6258.99	13561.14	162733.79
		STEP E	82.1493	6571.94	14239.21	170870.54
		STEP F	86.2569	6900.55	14951.19	179414.35
		STEP G	90.5697	7245.57	15698.74	188384.97
5600 POWER GENERATION SUPERTINDENT						
		STEP A	62.0272	4962.17	10751.38	129016.57
		STEP B	65.1286	5210.28	11288.95	135467.48
		STEP C	68.3849	5470.79	11853.38	142240.59
		STEP D	71.8041	5744.32	12446.04	149352.52
		STEP E	75.3944	6031.55	13068.36	156820.35
		STEP F	79.1642	6333.13	13721.79	164661.53
		STEP G	83.1225	6649.80	14407.90	172894.80
5530 POWER PLANT OPS & MAINT SUPV						
		STEP A	59.0692	4725.53	10238.66	122863.93
		STEP B	62.0227	4961.81	10750.60	129007.21
		STEP C	65.1239	5209.91	11288.14	135457.71
		STEP D	68.3800	5470.40	11852.53	142230.40
		STEP E	71.7990	5743.92	12445.16	149341.92
		STEP F	75.3889	6031.11	13067.40	156808.91
		STEP G	79.1584	6332.67	13720.78	164649.47
5535 POWER SUPPLY & PORTFOLIO ADMST						
		STEP A	64.1688	5133.50	11122.59	133471.10
		STEP B	67.3774	5390.19	11678.74	140144.99
		STEP C	70.7462	5659.69	12262.67	147152.09
		STEP D	74.2836	5942.68	12875.82	154509.88
		STEP E	77.9977	6239.81	13519.60	162235.21
		STEP F	81.8976	6551.80	14195.58	170347.00
		STEP G	85.9924	6879.39	14905.34	178864.19

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
5519 PREVENTATIVE MAINT SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	42.7162	3417.29	7404.14	88849.69
		STEP B	44.8518	3588.14	7774.31	93291.74
		STEP C	47.0943	3767.54	8163.01	97956.14
		STEP D	49.4492	3955.93	8571.19	102854.33
		STEP E	51.9218	4153.74	8999.77	107997.34
		STEP F	54.5179	4361.43	9449.76	113397.23
		STEP G	57.2435	4579.48	9922.20	119066.48
5514 PRINCIPAL ENGINEER						
		STEP A	50.2219	4017.75	8705.12	104461.55
		STEP B	52.7328	4218.62	9140.35	109684.22
		STEP C	55.3696	4429.56	9597.39	115168.76
		STEP D	58.1381	4651.04	10077.27	120927.24
		STEP E	61.0451	4883.60	10581.15	126973.80
		STEP F	64.0975	5127.80	11110.23	133322.80
		STEP G	67.3020	5384.16	11665.68	139988.16
5513 PRINCIPAL PLANNER						
		STEP A	46.3792	3710.33	8039.06	96468.73
		STEP B	48.6982	3895.85	8441.02	101292.25
		STEP C	51.1330	4090.64	8863.05	106356.64
		STEP D	53.6897	4295.17	9306.21	111674.57
		STEP E	56.3742	4509.93	9771.52	117258.33
		STEP F	59.1928	4735.42	10260.08	123121.02
		STEP G	62.1526	4972.20	10773.11	129277.40
5615 PUB AFFAIRS&COMMUNICAT ADMNSTR						
		STEP A	43.9043	3512.34	7610.07	91320.94
		STEP B	46.0995	3687.96	7990.58	95886.96
		STEP C	48.4044	3872.35	8390.09	100681.15
		STEP D	50.8248	4065.98	8809.63	105715.58
		STEP E	53.3660	4269.28	9250.10	111001.28
		STEP F	56.0343	4482.74	9712.61	116551.34
		STEP G	58.8358	4706.86	10198.20	122378.46
5610 PUBLIC AFFAIRS&COMMNCT DIRCTOR						
		STEP A	55.5188	4441.50	9623.25	115479.10
		STEP B	58.2948	4663.58	10104.43	121253.18
		STEP C	61.2096	4896.76	10609.66	127315.96
		STEP D	64.2701	5141.60	11140.15	133681.80
		STEP E	67.4836	5398.68	11697.15	140365.88
		STEP F	70.8579	5668.63	12282.03	147384.43
		STEP G	74.4006	5952.04	12896.10	154753.24

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
5565 PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER						
		STEP A	40.2377	3219.01	6974.53	83694.31
		STEP B	42.2495	3379.96	7323.25	87879.03
		STEP C	44.3620	3548.96	7689.42	92272.98
		STEP D	46.5801	3726.41	8073.89	96886.63
		STEP E	48.9091	3912.73	8477.58	101730.96
		STEP F	51.3546	4108.37	8901.46	106817.51
		STEP G	53.9223	4313.78	9346.53	112158.38
5635 PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR						
		STEP A	60.9892	4879.13	10571.46	126857.53
		STEP B	64.0388	5123.10	11100.05	133200.70
		STEP C	67.2407	5379.25	11655.05	139860.65
		STEP D	70.6027	5648.21	12237.80	146853.61
		STEP E	74.1329	5930.63	12849.70	154196.43
		STEP F	77.8396	6227.16	13492.19	161906.36
		STEP G	81.7316	6538.52	14166.81	170001.72
5652 PURCHASING & WAREHOUSE MANAGER						
		STEP A	41.1306	3290.45	7129.30	85551.59
		STEP B	43.1871	3454.97	7485.76	89829.17
		STEP C	45.3465	3627.72	7860.05	94320.63
		STEP D	47.6138	3809.10	8253.05	99036.66
		STEP E	49.9945	3999.56	8665.71	103988.49
		STEP F	52.4942	4199.54	9098.99	109187.92
		STEP G	55.1189	4409.51	9553.94	114647.31
6125 RECREATION MANAGER						
		STEP A	46.0837	3686.69	7987.84	95854.09
		STEP B	48.3880	3871.04	8387.25	100647.04
		STEP C	50.8072	4064.57	8806.58	105678.97
		STEP D	53.3476	4267.80	9246.91	110963.00
		STEP E	56.0151	4481.20	9709.28	116511.40
		STEP F	58.8160	4705.28	10194.77	122337.28
		STEP G	61.7566	4940.52	10704.47	128453.72
6145 RECREATION SUPERINTENDENT						
		STEP A	40.3363	3226.90	6991.62	83899.50
		STEP B	42.3531	3388.24	7341.20	88094.44
		STEP C	44.4708	3557.66	7708.27	92499.26
		STEP D	46.6942	3735.53	8093.66	97123.93
		STEP E	49.0293	3922.34	8498.41	101980.94
		STEP F	51.4805	4118.44	8923.28	107079.44
		STEP G	54.0543	4324.34	9369.41	112432.94

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
6147 RECREATION SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	34.8445	2787.56	6039.71	72476.56
		STEP B	36.5867	2926.93	6341.69	76100.33
		STEP C	38.4162	3073.29	6658.80	79905.69
		STEP D	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
		STEP E	42.3537	3388.29	7341.30	88095.69
		STEP F	44.4713	3557.70	7708.35	92500.30
		STEP G	46.6949	3735.59	8093.78	97125.39
6244 REFUSE & STORMWATER MANAGER						
		STEP A	56.5013	4520.10	9793.55	117522.70
		STEP B	59.3265	4746.12	10283.26	123399.12
		STEP C	62.2925	4983.40	10797.36	129568.40
		STEP D	65.4073	5232.58	11337.26	136047.18
		STEP E	68.6775	5494.20	11904.10	142849.20
		STEP F	72.1113	5768.90	12499.29	149991.50
		STEP G	75.7169	6057.35	13124.26	157491.15
6231 REFUSE SUPERINTENDENT						
		STEP A	40.0712	3205.69	6945.67	83348.09
		STEP B	42.0747	3365.97	7292.94	87515.37
		STEP C	44.1783	3534.26	7657.57	91890.86
		STEP D	46.3875	3711.00	8040.50	96486.00
		STEP E	48.7067	3896.53	8442.49	101309.93
		STEP F	51.1420	4091.36	8864.61	106375.36
		STEP G	53.6991	4295.92	9307.84	111694.12
6235 REFUSE SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	33.7592	2700.73	5851.59	70219.13
		STEP B	35.4472	2835.77	6144.18	73730.17
		STEP C	37.2197	2977.57	6451.41	77416.97
		STEP D	39.0799	3126.39	6773.84	81286.19
		STEP E	41.0339	3282.71	7112.54	85350.51
		STEP F	43.0854	3446.83	7468.13	89617.63
		STEP G	45.2399	3619.19	7841.58	94098.99
6242 REFUSE UTILITY MANAGER						
		STEP A	50.8512	4068.09	8814.20	105770.49
		STEP B	53.3936	4271.48	9254.89	111058.68
		STEP C	56.0634	4485.07	9717.65	116611.87
		STEP D	58.8664	4709.31	10203.50	122442.11
		STEP E	61.8098	4944.78	10713.69	128564.38
		STEP F	64.9004	5192.03	11249.40	134992.83
		STEP G	68.1453	5451.62	11811.85	141742.22

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
6450 RISK MANAGER						
		STEP A	50.2260	4018.08	8705.85	104470.16
		STEP B	52.7373	4218.99	9141.14	109693.66
		STEP C	55.3742	4429.94	9598.20	115178.35
		STEP D	58.1429	4651.43	10078.11	120937.26
		STEP E	61.0501	4884.00	10582.01	126984.13
		STEP F	64.1026	5128.21	11111.11	133333.33
		STEP G	67.3077	5384.62	11666.67	140000.00
6500 SAFETY COORDINATOR						
		STEP A	36.5871	2926.96	6341.76	76101.16
		STEP B	38.4164	3073.31	6658.84	79906.11
		STEP C	40.3371	3226.96	6991.76	83901.16
		STEP D	42.3539	3388.31	7341.34	88096.11
		STEP E	44.4716	3557.72	7708.41	92500.92
		STEP F	46.6952	3735.61	8093.83	97126.01
		STEP G	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60
7130 SR BUSINESS SYSTEMS ANALYST						
		STEP A	34.7663	2781.30	6026.15	72313.90
		STEP B	36.5046	2920.36	6327.46	75929.56
		STEP C	38.3298	3066.38	6643.83	79725.98
		STEP D	40.2463	3219.70	6976.02	83712.30
		STEP E	42.2586	3380.68	7324.82	87897.88
		STEP F	44.3716	3549.72	7691.07	92292.92
		STEP G	46.5900	3727.20	8075.60	96907.20
7145 SR DATABASE ANALYST						
		STEP A	38.1818	3054.54	6618.17	79418.14
		STEP B	40.0910	3207.28	6949.10	83389.28
		STEP C	42.0955	3367.64	7296.55	87558.64
		STEP D	44.2002	3536.01	7661.36	91936.41
		STEP E	46.4103	3712.82	8044.45	96533.42
		STEP F	48.7307	3898.45	8446.65	101359.85
		STEP G	51.1673	4093.38	8869.00	106427.98
7123 SR DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY						
		STEP A	61.7590	4940.72	10704.90	128458.77
		STEP B	64.8470	5187.76	11240.14	134881.71
		STEP C	68.0893	5447.15	11802.15	141625.80
		STEP D	71.4938	5719.50	12392.26	148707.09
		STEP E	75.0685	6005.48	13011.87	156142.44
		STEP F	78.8219	6305.75	13662.46	163949.56
		STEP G	82.7630	6621.04	14345.59	172147.04

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
7128 SR ELECTRIC BUSINESS ANALYST						
		STEP A	47.5668	3805.34	8244.91	98938.94
		STEP B	49.9452	3995.61	8657.16	103886.01
		STEP C	52.4425	4195.40	9090.03	109080.40
		STEP D	55.0646	4405.16	9544.53	114534.36
		STEP E	57.8179	4625.43	10021.76	120261.23
		STEP F	60.7088	4856.70	10522.85	126274.30
		STEP G	63.7442	5099.53	11048.99	132587.93
7163 SR ENERGY SERVICES ACCOUNT REP						
		STEP A	47.6233	3809.86	8254.70	99056.46
		STEP B	50.0044	4000.35	8667.42	104009.15
		STEP C	52.5047	4200.37	9100.81	109209.77
		STEP D	55.1299	4410.39	9555.84	114670.19
		STEP E	57.8863	4630.90	10033.62	120403.50
		STEP F	60.7806	4862.44	10535.30	126423.64
		STEP G	63.8196	5105.56	11062.06	132744.76
7142 SR ENGINEER						
		STEP A	42.7247	3417.97	7405.61	88867.37
		STEP B	44.8610	3588.88	7775.90	93310.88
		STEP C	47.1040	3768.32	8164.69	97976.32
		STEP D	49.4593	3956.74	8572.94	102875.34
		STEP E	51.9321	4154.56	9001.56	108018.76
		STEP F	54.5288	4362.30	9451.65	113419.90
		STEP G	57.2552	4580.41	9924.23	119090.81
7150 SR HUMAN RESOURCES ANALYST						
		STEP A	38.4165	3073.32	6658.86	79906.32
		STEP B	40.3372	3226.97	6991.78	83901.37
		STEP C	42.3541	3388.32	7341.37	88096.52
		STEP D	44.4717	3557.73	7708.42	92501.13
		STEP E	46.6954	3735.63	8093.86	97126.43
		STEP F	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60
		STEP G	51.4815	4118.52	8923.46	107081.52
7194 SR IT ANALYST						
		STEP A	34.8115	2784.92	6033.99	72407.92
		STEP B	36.5520	2924.16	6335.68	76028.16
		STEP C	38.3796	3070.36	6652.46	79829.56
		STEP D	40.2987	3223.89	6985.10	83821.29
		STEP E	42.3135	3385.08	7334.34	88012.08
		STEP F	44.4293	3554.34	7701.07	92412.94
		STEP G	46.6506	3732.04	8086.10	97033.24

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
7180 SR PLANNER						
		STEP A	40.3307	3226.45	6990.65	83887.85
		STEP B	42.3473	3387.78	7340.19	88082.38
		STEP C	44.4646	3557.16	7707.19	92486.36
		STEP D	46.6877	3735.01	8092.53	97110.41
		STEP E	49.0223	3921.78	8497.19	101966.38
		STEP F	51.4734	4117.87	8922.05	107064.67
		STEP G	54.0470	4323.76	9368.14	112417.76
7151 SR POWER ENGINEER						
		STEP A	59.8134	4785.07	10367.65	124411.87
		STEP B	62.8043	5024.34	10886.07	130632.94
		STEP C	65.9443	5275.54	11430.34	137164.14
		STEP D	69.2416	5539.32	12001.87	144022.52
		STEP E	72.7036	5816.28	12601.95	151223.48
		STEP F	76.3389	6107.11	13232.07	158784.91
		STEP G	80.1558	6412.46	13893.67	166724.06
5555 SR POWER PLANT ENGINEER						
		STEP A	59.8134	4785.07	10367.65	124411.87
		STEP B	62.8043	5024.34	10886.07	130632.94
		STEP C	65.9443	5275.54	11430.34	137164.14
		STEP D	69.2416	5539.32	12001.87	144022.52
		STEP E	72.7036	5816.28	12601.95	151223.48
		STEP F	76.3389	6107.11	13232.07	158784.91
		STEP G	80.1558	6412.46	13893.67	166724.06
7520 STREET MAINT SUPERINTENDENT						
		STEP A	42.7162	3417.29	7404.14	88849.69
		STEP B	44.8518	3588.14	7774.31	93291.74
		STEP C	47.0943	3767.54	8163.01	97956.14
		STEP D	49.4492	3955.93	8571.19	102854.33
		STEP E	51.9218	4153.74	8999.77	107997.34
		STEP F	54.5179	4361.43	9449.76	113397.23
		STEP G	57.2435	4579.48	9922.20	119066.48
7522 STREET MAINT SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	32.5766	2606.12	5646.60	67759.24
		STEP B	34.2054	2736.43	5928.93	71147.20
		STEP C	35.9157	2873.25	6225.38	74704.56
		STEP D	37.7114	3016.91	6536.65	78439.78
		STEP E	39.5970	3167.76	6863.48	82361.77
		STEP F	41.5769	3326.15	7206.66	86479.86
		STEP G	43.6557	3492.46	7566.99	90803.86

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
8762	URBAN FORESTER					
		STEP A	34.8445	2787.56	6039.71	72476.56
		STEP B	36.5866	2926.92	6341.67	76100.12
		STEP C	38.4161	3073.28	6658.79	79905.48
		STEP D	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
		STEP E	42.3537	3388.29	7341.30	88095.69
		STEP F	44.4713	3557.70	7708.35	92500.30
		STEP G	46.6949	3735.59	8093.78	97125.39
9047	WATER CONSERVATION ADMINSTR					
		STEP A	38.4381	3075.04	6662.60	79951.24
		STEP B	40.3601	3228.80	6995.75	83949.00
		STEP C	42.3780	3390.24	7345.52	88146.24
		STEP D	44.4970	3559.76	7712.81	92553.76
		STEP E	46.7218	3737.74	8098.44	97181.34
		STEP F	49.0582	3924.65	8503.42	102041.05
		STEP G	51.5109	4120.87	8928.55	107142.67
9084	WATER DISTRIBUTION SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	34.8445	2787.56	6039.71	72476.56
		STEP B	36.5867	2926.93	6341.69	76100.33
		STEP C	38.4162	3073.29	6658.80	79905.69
		STEP D	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
		STEP E	42.3537	3388.29	7341.30	88095.69
		STEP F	44.4713	3557.70	7708.35	92500.30
		STEP G	46.6949	3735.59	8093.78	97125.39
9085	WATER DISTRIBUTION SUPT					
		STEP A	42.0794	3366.35	7293.76	87525.15
		STEP B	44.8448	3587.58	7773.09	93277.18
		STEP C	47.0871	3766.96	8161.76	97941.16
		STEP D	49.4415	3955.32	8569.86	102838.32
		STEP E	51.9135	4153.08	8998.34	107980.08
		STEP F	54.5093	4360.74	9448.27	113379.34
		STEP G	57.2346	4578.76	9920.66	119047.96
9101	WATER QUALITY LAB SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	36.5854	2926.83	6341.46	76097.63
		STEP B	38.4146	3073.16	6658.53	79902.36
		STEP C	40.3354	3226.83	6991.46	83897.63
		STEP D	42.3521	3388.16	7341.03	88092.36
		STEP E	44.4698	3557.58	7708.09	92497.18
		STEP F	46.6932	3735.45	8093.48	97121.85
		STEP G	49.0277	3922.21	8498.13	101977.61

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
9175 WATER TRMT PLT CHIEF OPERATOR						
		STEP A	41.8116	3344.92	7247.34	86968.12
		STEP B	43.9023	3512.18	7609.73	91316.78
		STEP C	46.0973	3687.78	7990.19	95882.38
		STEP D	48.4023	3872.18	8389.73	100676.78
		STEP E	50.8222	4065.77	8809.18	105710.17
		STEP F	53.3634	4269.07	9249.65	110995.87
		STEP G	56.0315	4482.52	9712.12	116545.52
9244 WATER UTILITY MANAGER						
		STEP A	56.5013	4520.10	9793.55	117522.70
		STEP B	59.3265	4746.12	10283.26	123399.12
		STEP C	62.2925	4983.40	10797.36	129568.40
		STEP D	65.4073	5232.58	11337.26	136047.18
		STEP E	68.6775	5494.20	11904.10	142849.20
		STEP F	72.1113	5768.90	12499.29	149991.50
		STEP G	75.7169	6057.35	13124.26	157491.15
8980 WSTWTR COLLECTION SUPT						
		STEP A	42.7094	3416.75	7402.96	88835.55
		STEP B	44.8448	3587.58	7773.09	93277.18
		STEP C	47.0871	3766.96	8161.76	97941.16
		STEP D	49.4415	3955.32	8569.86	102838.32
		STEP E	51.9135	4153.08	8998.34	107980.08
		STEP F	54.5093	4360.74	9448.27	113379.34
		STEP G	57.2346	4578.76	9920.66	119047.96
8978 WSTWTR COLLECTION SUPV						
		STEP A	34.8446	2787.56	6039.73	72476.76
		STEP B	36.5867	2926.93	6341.69	76100.33
		STEP C	38.4162	3073.29	6658.80	79905.69
		STEP D	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
		STEP E	42.3538	3388.30	7341.32	88095.90
		STEP F	44.4713	3557.70	7708.35	92500.30
		STEP G	46.6949	3735.59	8093.78	97125.39
9040 WSTWTR TRMT PLT CHIEF OPERATOR						
		STEP A	45.9928	3679.42	7972.08	95665.02
		STEP B	48.2926	3863.40	8370.71	100448.60
		STEP C	50.7070	4056.56	8789.21	105470.56
		STEP D	53.2425	4259.40	9228.70	110744.40
		STEP E	55.9044	4472.35	9690.09	116281.15
		STEP F	58.6998	4695.98	10174.63	122095.58
		STEP G	61.6346	4930.76	10683.33	128199.96

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
9045	WSTWTR UTILITY MANAGER					
		STEP A	56.5013	4520.10	9793.55	117522.70
		STEP B	59.3265	4746.12	10283.26	123399.12
		STEP C	62.2925	4983.40	10797.36	129568.40
		STEP D	65.4073	5232.58	11337.26	136047.18
		STEP E	68.6775	5494.20	11904.10	142849.20
		STEP F	72.1113	5768.90	12499.29	149991.50
		STEP G	75.7169	6057.35	13124.26	157491.15

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B701	ACCOUNTING SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	41.0047	3280.37	7107.48	85289.75
		STEP B	42.0169	3361.35	7282.93	87395.12
		STEP C	43.0545	3444.36	7462.79	89553.43
		STEP D	44.1178	3529.42	7647.09	91765.04
		STEP E	45.2073	3616.59	7835.94	94031.27
		STEP F	46.3238	3705.90	8029.46	96353.46
		STEP G	47.4678	3797.42	8227.75	98733.01
		STEP H	48.6401	3891.20	8430.94	101171.32
		STEP I	49.8413	3987.30	8639.15	103669.84
		STEP J	51.0722	4085.77	8852.51	106230.08
		STEP K	52.3334	4186.67	9071.13	108853.53
		STEP L	53.6259	4290.07	9295.15	111541.78
		STEP M	54.9502	4396.02	9524.70	114296.42

B702 ADMIN ANALYST I

	STEP A	33.2609	2660.87	5765.22	69182.67
	STEP B	34.0820	2726.56	5907.54	70890.56
	STEP C	34.9236	2793.88	6053.42	72641.08
	STEP D	35.7861	2862.88	6202.92	74435.08
	STEP E	36.6699	2933.59	6356.11	76273.39
	STEP F	37.5755	3006.04	6513.08	78157.04
	STEP G	38.5035	3080.28	6673.94	80087.28
	STEP H	39.4543	3156.34	6838.74	82064.94
	STEP I	40.4287	3234.29	7007.64	84091.69
	STEP J	41.4271	3314.16	7180.69	86168.36
	STEP K	42.4502	3396.01	7358.03	88296.41
	STEP L	43.4986	3479.88	7539.75	90477.08
	STEP M	44.5728	3565.82	7725.95	92711.42

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B703	ADMIN ANALYST II					
		STEP A	36.5872	2926.97	6341.78	76101.37
		STEP B	37.4902	2999.21	6498.30	77979.61
		STEP C	38.4160	3073.28	6658.77	79905.28
		STEP D	39.3647	3149.17	6823.21	81878.57
		STEP E	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
		STEP F	41.3331	3306.64	7164.40	85972.84
		STEP G	42.3538	3388.30	7341.32	88095.90
		STEP H	43.3998	3471.98	7522.63	90271.58
		STEP I	44.4716	3557.72	7708.41	92500.92
		STEP J	45.5699	3645.59	7898.78	94785.39
		STEP K	46.6952	3735.61	8093.83	97126.01
		STEP L	47.8484	3827.87	8293.72	99524.67
		STEP M	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60

B704 ALTERNATIVE TRANSP ANALYST I

	STEP A	33.7583	2700.66	5851.43	70217.26
	STEP B	34.5918	2767.34	5995.91	71950.94
	STEP C	35.4461	2835.68	6143.99	73727.88
	STEP D	36.3215	2905.72	6295.72	75548.72
	STEP E	37.2185	2977.48	6451.20	77414.48
	STEP F	38.1376	3051.00	6610.51	79326.20
	STEP G	39.0795	3126.36	6773.78	81285.36
	STEP H	40.0446	3203.56	6941.06	83292.76
	STEP I	41.0335	3282.68	7112.47	85349.68
	STEP J	42.0469	3363.75	7288.12	87457.55
	STEP K	43.0853	3446.82	7468.11	89617.42
	STEP L	44.1493	3531.94	7652.54	91830.54
	STEP M	45.2396	3619.16	7841.53	94098.36

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B705	ALTERNATIVE TRANSP ANALYST II					
		STEP A	36.5872	2926.97	6341.78	76101.37
		STEP B	37.4902	2999.21	6498.30	77979.61
		STEP C	38.4160	3073.28	6658.77	79905.28
		STEP D	39.3647	3149.17	6823.21	81878.57
		STEP E	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
		STEP F	41.3331	3306.64	7164.40	85972.84
		STEP G	42.3538	3388.30	7341.32	88095.90
		STEP H	43.3998	3471.98	7522.63	90271.58
		STEP I	44.4716	3557.72	7708.41	92500.92
		STEP J	45.5699	3645.59	7898.78	94785.39
		STEP K	46.6952	3735.61	8093.83	97126.01
		STEP L	47.8484	3827.87	8293.72	99524.67
		STEP M	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60

B706 ALTERNATIVE TRANSP MGR

	STEP A	48.1545	3852.36	8346.79	100161.46
	STEP B	49.3432	3947.46	8552.83	102633.94
	STEP C	50.5618	4044.95	8764.05	105168.59
	STEP D	51.8105	4144.84	8980.49	107765.83
	STEP E	53.0900	4247.20	9202.27	110427.21
	STEP F	54.4011	4352.09	9429.53	113154.32
	STEP G	55.7446	4459.57	9662.40	115948.78
	STEP H	57.1213	4569.70	9901.02	118812.25
	STEP I	58.5319	4682.56	10145.54	121746.44
	STEP J	59.9774	4798.20	10396.09	124753.09
	STEP K	61.4587	4916.69	10652.83	127833.99
	STEP L	62.9764	5038.11	10915.92	130990.98
	STEP M	64.5317	5162.54	11185.49	134225.94

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B711	ASST CITY ATTORNEY					
		STEP A	71.0229	5681.83	12310.64	147727.67
		STEP B	72.7761	5822.09	12614.53	151374.31
		STEP C	74.5734	5965.87	12926.05	155112.65
		STEP D	76.4151	6113.20	13245.28	158943.31
		STEP E	78.3022	6264.18	13572.38	162868.58
		STEP F	80.2360	6418.88	13907.56	166890.78
		STEP G	82.2175	6577.40	14251.03	171012.31
		STEP H	84.2479	6739.83	14602.97	175235.63
		STEP I	86.3285	6906.28	14963.60	179563.25
		STEP J	88.4605	7076.84	15333.15	183997.75
		STEP K	90.6451	7251.61	15711.81	188541.76
		STEP L	92.8836	7430.69	16099.83	193197.98
		STEP M	95.1775	7614.20	16497.43	197969.20

B712 ASST CITY CLERK

STEP A	35.6195	2849.56	6174.05	74088.66
STEP B	36.4988	2919.91	6326.46	75917.53
STEP C	37.4002	2992.02	6482.70	77792.39
STEP D	38.3238	3065.91	6642.80	79713.55
STEP E	39.2703	3141.62	6806.85	81682.16
STEP F	40.2401	3219.21	6974.95	83699.38
STEP G	41.2339	3298.71	7147.20	85766.42
STEP H	42.2522	3380.17	7323.71	87884.51
STEP I	43.2956	3463.65	7504.58	90054.90
STEP J	44.3649	3549.19	7689.91	92278.90
STEP K	45.4605	3636.84	7879.82	94557.82
STEP L	46.5832	3726.65	8074.42	96893.02
STEP M	47.7336	3818.69	8273.82	99285.89

CITY OF ROSEVILLE

SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGBB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B707	ASST CITY MANAGER					
		STEP A	74.0814	5926.51	12840.77	154089.31
		STEP B	75.9101	6072.80	13157.75	157893.00
		STEP C	77.7848	6222.78	13482.69	161792.38
		STEP D	79.7058	6376.46	13815.67	165788.06
		STEP E	81.6742	6533.93	14156.86	169882.33
		STEP F	83.6912	6695.29	14506.47	174077.69
		STEP G	85.7581	6860.64	14864.73	178376.84
		STEP H	87.8759	7030.07	15231.82	182781.87
		STEP I	90.0461	7203.68	15607.99	187295.88
		STEP J	92.2699	7381.59	15993.44	191921.39
		STEP K	94.5486	7563.88	16388.42	196661.08
		STEP L	96.8836	7750.68	16793.15	201517.88
		STEP M	99.2762	7942.09	17207.87	206494.49

B940 ASST ELEC UTIL DIR-RESOURCES

STEP A	77.7298	6218.38	13473.16	161677.98
STEP B	79.6487	6371.89	13805.77	165669.29
STEP C	81.6157	6529.25	14146.72	169760.65
STEP D	83.6312	6690.49	14496.07	173952.89
STEP E	85.6966	6855.72	14854.07	178248.92
STEP F	87.8130	7025.04	15220.92	182651.04
STEP G	89.9816	7198.52	15596.81	187161.72
STEP H	92.2038	7376.30	15981.99	191783.90
STEP I	94.4808	7558.46	16376.67	196520.06
STEP J	96.8141	7745.12	16781.11	201373.32
STEP K	99.2051	7936.40	17195.55	206346.60
STEP L	101.6550	8132.40	17620.20	211442.40
STEP M	104.1655	8333.24	18055.35	216664.24

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B708	ASST ELEC UTIL DIRECTOR					
		STEP A	70.9719	5677.75	12301.79	147621.55
		STEP B	72.7240	5817.92	12605.49	151265.92
		STEP C	74.5200	5961.60	12916.80	155001.60
		STEP D	76.3603	6108.82	13235.78	158829.42
		STEP E	78.2461	6259.68	13562.65	162751.88
		STEP F	80.1785	6414.28	13897.60	166771.28
		STEP G	82.1585	6572.68	14240.80	170889.68
		STEP H	84.1875	6735.00	14592.50	175110.00
		STEP I	86.2666	6901.32	14952.87	179434.52
		STEP J	88.3971	7071.76	15322.16	183865.96
		STEP K	90.5801	7246.40	15700.55	188406.60
		STEP L	92.8171	7425.36	16088.29	193059.56
		STEP M	95.1093	7608.74	16485.61	197827.34

B709 ASST EU DIRECTOR

	STEP A	62.1514	4972.11	10772.90	129274.91
	STEP B	63.6854	5094.83	11038.80	132465.63
	STEP C	65.2582	5220.65	11311.42	135737.05
	STEP D	66.8698	5349.58	11590.76	139089.18
	STEP E	68.5212	5481.69	11877.00	142524.09
	STEP F	70.2134	5617.07	12170.32	146043.87
	STEP G	71.9474	5755.79	12470.88	149650.59
	STEP H	73.7242	5897.93	12778.86	153346.33
	STEP I	75.5449	6043.59	13094.44	157133.39
	STEP J	77.4106	6192.84	13417.83	161014.04
	STEP K	79.3223	6345.78	13749.19	164990.38
	STEP L	81.2813	6502.50	14088.75	169065.10
	STEP M	83.2886	6663.08	14436.69	173240.28

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGBB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B713	ASST FIRE CHIEF					
		STEP A	61.2592	4900.73	10618.26	127419.13
		STEP B	62.7714	5021.71	10880.37	130564.51
		STEP C	64.3216	5145.72	11149.07	133788.92
		STEP D	65.9101	5272.80	11424.41	137093.00
		STEP E	67.5378	5403.02	11706.55	140478.62
		STEP F	69.2057	5536.45	11995.65	143947.85
		STEP G	70.9148	5673.18	12291.89	147502.78
		STEP H	72.6661	5813.28	12595.45	151145.48
		STEP I	74.4607	5956.85	12906.52	154878.25
		STEP J	76.2996	6103.96	13225.26	158703.16
		STEP K	78.1839	6254.71	13551.87	162622.51
		STEP L	80.1147	6409.17	13886.54	166638.57
		STEP M	82.0932	6567.45	14229.48	170753.85

B845 ASST HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR

	STEP A	53.1051	4248.40	9204.88	110458.60
	STEP B	54.4160	4353.28	9432.10	113185.28
	STEP C	55.7598	4460.78	9665.03	115980.38
	STEP D	57.1369	4570.95	9903.72	118844.75
	STEP E	58.5479	4683.83	10148.30	121779.63
	STEP F	59.9938	4799.50	10398.92	124787.10
	STEP G	61.4754	4918.03	10655.73	127868.83
	STEP H	62.9936	5039.48	10918.89	131026.68
	STEP I	64.5493	5163.94	11188.54	134262.54
	STEP J	66.1434	5291.47	11464.85	137578.27
	STEP K	67.7769	5422.15	11748.00	140975.95
	STEP L	69.4507	5556.05	12038.12	144457.45
	STEP M	71.1659	5693.27	12335.42	148025.07

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B710	ASST POLICE CHIEF					
		STEP A	67.3324	5386.59	11670.94	140051.31
		STEP B	68.9945	5519.56	11959.04	143508.46
		STEP C	70.6983	5655.87	12254.38	147052.55
		STEP D	72.4443	5795.54	12557.01	150684.16
		STEP E	74.2334	5938.67	12867.12	154405.45
		STEP F	76.0667	6085.33	13184.89	158218.65
		STEP G	77.9452	6235.62	13510.50	162126.02
		STEP H	79.8701	6389.61	13844.16	166129.88
		STEP I	81.8426	6547.41	14186.05	170232.62
		STEP J	83.8638	6709.10	14536.39	174436.69
		STEP K	85.9349	6874.79	14895.38	178744.58
		STEP L	88.0571	7044.57	15263.24	183158.85
		STEP M	90.2318	7218.54	15640.18	187682.14

B714 BILLING SERVICES MANAGER

	STEP A	44.7525	3580.20	7757.10	93085.15
	STEP B	45.8572	3668.58	7948.58	95382.95
	STEP C	46.9897	3759.17	8144.88	97738.53
	STEP D	48.1501	3852.01	8346.02	100152.28
	STEP E	49.3393	3947.14	8552.14	102625.64
	STEP F	50.5577	4044.62	8763.34	105160.08
	STEP G	51.8063	4144.50	8979.76	107757.12
	STEP H	53.0857	4246.86	9201.52	110418.29
	STEP I	54.3967	4351.74	9428.76	113145.18
	STEP J	55.7401	4459.21	9661.62	115939.41
	STEP K	57.1167	4569.33	9900.22	118802.65
	STEP L	58.5272	4682.18	10144.72	121736.60
	STEP M	59.9726	4797.81	10395.25	124743.01

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGBB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B715	BLDG INSPECTION SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	40.3307	3226.45	6990.65	83887.85
		STEP B	41.3263	3306.10	7163.22	85958.70
		STEP C	42.3469	3387.75	7340.12	88081.55
		STEP D	43.3927	3471.41	7521.40	90256.81
		STEP E	44.4643	3557.14	7707.14	92485.74
		STEP F	45.5624	3644.99	7897.48	94769.79
		STEP G	46.6876	3735.00	8092.51	97110.20
		STEP H	47.8406	3827.24	8292.37	99508.44
		STEP I	49.0220	3921.76	8497.14	101965.76
		STEP J	50.2327	4018.61	8707.00	104484.01
		STEP K	51.4732	4117.85	8922.02	107064.25
		STEP L	52.7444	4219.55	9142.36	109708.35
		STEP M	54.0470	4323.76	9368.14	112417.76

B717 BLDG OFFICIAL

	STEP A	50.1505	4012.04	8692.76	104313.09
	STEP B	51.3885	4111.08	8907.34	106888.05
	STEP C	52.6576	4212.61	9127.31	109527.76
	STEP D	53.9580	4316.64	9352.72	112232.66
	STEP E	55.2906	4423.24	9583.70	115004.35
	STEP F	56.6560	4532.48	9820.38	117844.50
	STEP G	58.0552	4644.42	10062.90	120754.79
	STEP H	59.4889	4759.11	10311.41	123736.95
	STEP I	60.9581	4876.64	10566.06	126792.76
	STEP J	62.4635	4997.08	10827.00	129924.03
	STEP K	64.0061	5120.49	11094.39	133132.64
	STEP L	65.5868	5246.94	11368.37	136420.48
	STEP M	67.2065	5376.52	11649.13	139789.52

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B718	BUDGET ANALYST I					
		STEP A	34.4334	2754.67	5968.45	71621.47
		STEP B	35.2833	2822.66	6115.77	73389.26
		STEP C	36.1547	2892.37	6266.81	75201.77
		STEP D	37.0476	2963.80	6421.58	77059.00
		STEP E	37.9625	3037.00	6580.16	78962.00
		STEP F	38.9000	3112.00	6742.66	80912.00
		STEP G	39.8607	3188.85	6909.18	82910.25
		STEP H	40.8451	3267.60	7079.81	84957.80
		STEP I	41.8538	3348.30	7254.65	87055.90
		STEP J	42.8874	3430.99	7433.81	89205.79
		STEP K	43.9466	3515.72	7617.41	91408.92
		STEP L	45.0319	3602.55	7805.52	93666.35
		STEP M	46.1440	3691.52	7998.29	95979.52

B719 BUDGET ANALYST II

	STEP A	37.3182	2985.45	6468.48	77621.85
	STEP B	38.2394	3059.15	6628.16	79537.95
	STEP C	39.1838	3134.70	6791.85	81502.30
	STEP D	40.1515	3212.12	6959.59	83515.12
	STEP E	41.1431	3291.44	7131.47	85577.64
	STEP F	42.1591	3372.72	7307.57	87690.92
	STEP G	43.2003	3456.02	7488.05	89856.62
	STEP H	44.2672	3541.37	7672.98	92075.77
	STEP I	45.3604	3628.83	7862.46	94349.63
	STEP J	46.4806	3718.44	8056.63	96679.64
	STEP K	47.6285	3810.28	8255.60	99067.28
	STEP L	48.8047	3904.37	8459.48	101513.77
	STEP M	50.0100	4000.80	8668.40	104020.80

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGBM MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B720	BUDGET MANAGER					
		STEP A	44.7525	3580.20	7757.10	93085.15
		STEP B	45.8572	3668.58	7948.58	95382.95
		STEP C	46.9897	3759.17	8144.88	97738.53
		STEP D	48.1501	3852.01	8346.02	100152.28
		STEP E	49.3393	3947.14	8552.14	102625.64
		STEP F	50.5577	4044.62	8763.34	105160.08
		STEP G	51.8063	4144.50	8979.76	107757.12
		STEP H	53.0857	4246.86	9201.52	110418.29
		STEP I	54.3967	4351.74	9428.76	113145.18
		STEP J	55.7401	4459.21	9661.62	115939.41
		STEP K	57.1167	4569.33	9900.22	118802.65
		STEP L	58.5272	4682.18	10144.72	121736.60
		STEP M	59.9726	4797.81	10395.25	124743.01

B721 BUSINESS SVCS ADMINISTRATOR

	STEP A	42.3780	3390.24	7345.52	88146.24
	STEP B	43.4242	3473.93	7526.86	90322.33
	STEP C	44.4966	3559.72	7712.74	92552.92
	STEP D	45.5955	3647.64	7903.22	94838.64
	STEP E	46.7215	3737.72	8098.39	97180.72
	STEP F	47.8753	3830.02	8298.38	99580.62
	STEP G	49.0577	3924.61	8503.33	102040.01
	STEP H	50.2692	4021.53	8713.32	104559.93
	STEP I	51.5107	4120.85	8928.52	107142.25
	STEP J	52.7828	4222.62	9149.01	109788.22
	STEP K	54.0863	4326.90	9374.95	112499.50
	STEP L	55.4220	4433.76	9606.48	115277.76
	STEP M	56.7907	4543.25	9843.72	118124.65

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B722	CENTRAL SERVICES DIRECTOR					
		STEP A	60.9892	4879.13	10571.46	126857.53
		STEP B	62.4949	4999.59	10832.44	129989.39
		STEP C	64.0383	5123.06	11099.97	133199.66
		STEP D	65.6198	5249.58	11374.09	136489.18
		STEP E	67.2403	5379.22	11654.98	139859.82
		STEP F	68.9009	5512.07	11942.82	143313.87
		STEP G	70.6024	5648.19	12237.74	146852.99
		STEP H	72.3460	5787.68	12539.97	150479.68
		STEP I	74.1327	5930.61	12849.66	154196.01
		STEP J	75.9635	6077.08	13167.00	158004.08
		STEP K	77.8395	6227.16	13492.18	161906.16
		STEP L	79.7618	6380.94	13825.37	165904.54
		STEP M	81.7316	6538.52	14166.81	170001.72

B723 CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

	STEP A	86.5875	6927.00	15008.50	180102.00
	STEP B	88.7250	7098.00	15379.00	184548.00
	STEP C	90.9161	7273.28	15758.79	189105.48
	STEP D	93.1614	7452.91	16147.97	193775.71
	STEP E	95.4621	7636.96	16546.76	198561.16
	STEP F	97.8196	7825.56	16955.39	203464.76
	STEP G	100.2354	8018.83	17374.13	208489.63
	STEP H	102.7108	8216.86	17803.20	213638.46
	STEP I	105.2473	8419.78	18242.86	218914.38
	STEP J	107.8465	8627.72	18693.39	224320.72
	STEP K	110.5099	8840.79	19155.04	229860.59
	STEP L	113.2390	9059.12	19628.09	235537.12
	STEP M	116.0356	9282.84	20112.83	241354.04

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B724	CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER					
		STEP A	60.9892	4879.13	10571.46	126857.53
		STEP B	62.4949	4999.59	10832.44	129989.39
		STEP C	64.0383	5123.06	11099.97	133199.66
		STEP D	65.6198	5249.58	11374.09	136489.18
		STEP E	67.2403	5379.22	11654.98	139859.82
		STEP F	68.9009	5512.07	11942.82	143313.87
		STEP G	70.6024	5648.19	12237.74	146852.99
		STEP H	72.3460	5787.68	12539.97	150479.68
		STEP I	74.1327	5930.61	12849.66	154196.01
		STEP J	75.9635	6077.08	13167.00	158004.08
		STEP K	77.8395	6227.16	13492.18	161906.16
		STEP L	79.7618	6380.94	13825.37	165904.54
		STEP M	81.7316	6538.52	14166.81	170001.72

B725 CITY CLERK

STEP A	49.4890	3959.12	8578.09	102937.12
STEP B	50.7112	4056.89	8789.94	105479.29
STEP C	51.9636	4157.08	9007.02	108084.28
STEP D	53.2468	4259.74	9229.44	110753.34
STEP E	54.5618	4364.94	9457.37	113488.54
STEP F	55.9093	4472.74	9690.94	116291.34
STEP G	57.2900	4583.20	9930.26	119163.20
STEP H	58.7049	4696.39	10175.51	122106.19
STEP I	60.1546	4812.36	10426.79	125121.56
STEP J	61.6402	4931.21	10684.30	128211.61
STEP K	63.1625	5053.00	10948.16	131378.00
STEP L	64.7223	5177.78	11218.53	134622.38
STEP M	66.3207	5305.65	11495.58	137947.05

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B726	CITY LIBRARIAN					
		STEP A	43.4443	3475.54	7530.34	90364.14
		STEP B	44.5172	3561.37	7716.31	92595.77
		STEP C	45.6166	3649.32	7906.87	94882.52
		STEP D	46.7432	3739.45	8102.15	97225.85
		STEP E	47.8976	3831.80	8302.25	99627.00
		STEP F	49.0804	3926.43	8507.26	102087.23
		STEP G	50.2925	4023.40	8717.36	104608.40
		STEP H	51.5345	4122.76	8932.64	107191.76
		STEP I	52.8072	4224.57	9153.24	109838.97
		STEP J	54.1114	4328.91	9379.30	112551.71
		STEP K	55.4477	4435.81	9610.93	115331.21
		STEP L	56.8170	4545.36	9848.28	118179.36
		STEP M	58.2202	4657.61	10091.50	121098.01

B852 CONTROLLER

STEP A	46.1683	3693.46	8002.50	96030.06
STEP B	47.3080	3784.64	8200.05	98400.64
STEP C	48.4763	3878.10	8402.55	100830.70
STEP D	49.6734	3973.87	8610.05	103320.67
STEP E	50.9002	4072.01	8822.70	105872.41
STEP F	52.1572	4172.57	9040.58	108486.97
STEP G	53.4453	4275.62	9263.85	111166.22
STEP H	54.7652	4381.21	9492.63	113911.61
STEP I	56.1177	4489.41	9727.06	116724.81
STEP J	57.5035	4600.28	9967.27	119607.28
STEP K	58.9236	4713.88	10213.42	122561.08
STEP L	60.3788	4830.30	10465.65	125587.90
STEP M	61.8699	4949.59	10724.11	128689.39

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B728	DEPT PUBLIC INFO OFFICER					
		STEP A	38.3214	3065.71	6642.37	79708.51
		STEP B	39.2676	3141.40	6806.38	81676.60
		STEP C	40.2373	3218.98	6974.46	83693.58
		STEP D	41.2310	3298.48	7146.70	85760.48
		STEP E	42.2493	3379.94	7323.21	87878.54
		STEP F	43.2926	3463.40	7504.05	90048.60
		STEP G	44.3618	3548.94	7689.37	92272.54
		STEP H	45.4574	3636.59	7879.28	94551.39
		STEP I	46.5800	3726.40	8073.86	96886.40
		STEP J	47.7303	3818.42	8273.25	99279.02
		STEP K	48.9091	3912.72	8477.57	101730.92
		STEP L	50.1169	4009.35	8686.92	104243.15
		STEP M	51.3546	4108.36	8901.46	106817.56

B729 DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY I

	STEP A	51.0406	4083.25	8847.04	106164.47
	STEP B	52.3005	4184.04	9065.43	108785.13
	STEP C	53.5922	4287.37	9289.31	111471.69
	STEP D	54.9157	4393.25	9518.72	114224.59
	STEP E	56.2719	4501.75	9753.79	117045.48
	STEP F	57.6616	4612.92	9994.67	119936.04
	STEP G	59.0856	4726.85	10241.50	122897.98
	STEP H	60.5447	4843.58	10494.42	125933.07
	STEP I	62.0400	4963.20	10753.59	129043.11
	STEP J	63.5721	5085.77	11019.16	132229.96
	STEP K	65.1421	5211.37	11291.29	135495.51
	STEP L	66.7508	5340.07	11570.14	138841.71
	STEP M	68.3993	5471.94	11855.88	142270.54

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B730	DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY II					
		STEP A	56.1446	4491.57	9731.74	116780.87
		STEP B	57.5306	4602.45	9971.97	119663.60
		STEP C	58.9514	4716.11	10218.23	122618.81
		STEP D	60.4072	4832.58	10470.58	125647.00
		STEP E	61.8990	4951.92	10729.17	128749.98
		STEP F	63.4277	5074.22	10994.13	131929.59
		STEP G	64.9941	5199.53	11265.64	135187.72
		STEP H	66.5992	5327.94	11543.86	138526.32
		STEP I	68.2439	5459.51	11828.95	141947.37
		STEP J	69.9293	5594.34	12121.07	145452.90
		STEP K	71.6563	5732.50	12420.42	149045.00
		STEP L	73.4259	5874.07	12727.15	152725.82
		STEP M	75.2392	6019.14	13041.46	156497.54

B731 DEPUTY CITY MANAGER

	STEP A	55.5189	4441.51	9623.27	115479.31
	STEP B	56.8894	4551.15	9860.82	118329.95
	STEP C	58.2944	4663.55	10104.36	121252.35
	STEP D	59.7340	4778.72	10353.89	124246.72
	STEP E	61.2092	4896.73	10609.59	127315.13
	STEP F	62.7208	5017.66	10871.60	130459.26
	STEP G	64.2698	5141.58	11140.09	133681.18
	STEP H	65.8570	5268.56	11415.21	136982.56
	STEP I	67.4834	5398.67	11697.12	140365.47
	STEP J	69.1500	5532.00	11986.00	143832.00
	STEP K	70.8577	5668.61	12282.00	147384.01
	STEP L	72.6076	5808.60	12585.31	151023.80
	STEP M	74.4007	5952.05	12896.12	154753.45

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B732	DEVELOPMENT ANALYST I					
		STEP A	33.2609	2660.87	5765.22	69182.67
		STEP B	34.0820	2726.56	5907.54	70890.56
		STEP C	34.9236	2793.88	6053.42	72641.08
		STEP D	35.7861	2862.88	6202.92	74435.08
		STEP E	36.6699	2933.59	6356.11	76273.39
		STEP F	37.5755	3006.04	6513.08	78157.04
		STEP G	38.5035	3080.28	6673.94	80087.28
		STEP H	39.4543	3156.34	6838.74	82064.94
		STEP I	40.4287	3234.29	7007.64	84091.69
		STEP J	41.4271	3314.16	7180.69	86168.36
		STEP K	42.4502	3396.01	7358.03	88296.41
		STEP L	43.4986	3479.88	7539.75	90477.08
		STEP M	44.5728	3565.82	7725.95	92711.42

B733 DEVELOPMENT ANALYST II

	STEP A	36.5872	2926.97	6341.78	76101.37
	STEP B	37.4902	2999.21	6498.30	77979.61
	STEP C	38.4160	3073.28	6658.77	79905.28
	STEP D	39.3647	3149.17	6823.21	81878.57
	STEP E	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
	STEP F	41.3331	3306.64	7164.40	85972.84
	STEP G	42.3538	3388.30	7341.32	88095.90
	STEP H	43.3998	3471.98	7522.63	90271.58
	STEP I	44.4716	3557.72	7708.41	92500.92
	STEP J	45.5699	3645.59	7898.78	94785.39
	STEP K	46.6952	3735.61	8093.83	97126.01
	STEP L	47.8484	3827.87	8293.72	99524.67
	STEP M	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B734	DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR					
		STEP A	67.1903	5375.22	11646.31	139755.82
		STEP B	68.8490	5507.92	11933.82	143205.92
		STEP C	70.5493	5643.94	12228.54	146742.54
		STEP D	72.2916	5783.32	12530.54	150366.52
		STEP E	74.0769	5926.15	12840.00	154079.95
		STEP F	75.9063	6072.50	13157.09	157885.10
		STEP G	77.7809	6222.47	13482.02	161784.27
		STEP H	79.7018	6376.14	13814.97	165779.74
		STEP I	81.6701	6533.60	14156.15	169873.80
		STEP J	83.6870	6694.96	14505.74	174068.96
		STEP K	85.7538	6860.30	14863.99	178367.90
		STEP L	87.8715	7029.72	15231.06	182772.72
		STEP M	90.0416	7203.32	15607.21	187286.52

B735 DEVELOPMENT SERVICES MANAGER

STEP A	55.5189	4441.51	9623.27	115479.31
STEP B	56.8894	4551.15	9860.82	118329.95
STEP C	58.2944	4663.55	10104.36	121252.35
STEP D	59.7340	4778.72	10353.89	124246.72
STEP E	61.2092	4896.73	10609.59	127315.13
STEP F	62.7208	5017.66	10871.60	130459.26
STEP G	64.2698	5141.58	11140.09	133681.18
STEP H	65.8570	5268.56	11415.21	136982.56
STEP I	67.4834	5398.67	11697.12	140365.47
STEP J	69.1500	5532.00	11986.00	143832.00
STEP K	70.8577	5668.61	12282.00	147384.01
STEP L	72.6076	5808.60	12585.31	151023.80
STEP M	74.4007	5952.05	12896.12	154753.45

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B736	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR					
		STEP A	64.6607	5172.85	11207.85	134494.25
		STEP B	66.2571	5300.56	11484.56	137814.76
		STEP C	67.8933	5431.46	11768.17	141218.06
		STEP D	69.5700	5565.60	12058.80	144705.60
		STEP E	71.2881	5703.04	12356.60	148279.24
		STEP F	73.0487	5843.89	12661.77	151941.29
		STEP G	74.8527	5988.21	12974.46	155693.61
		STEP H	76.7012	6136.09	13294.87	159538.49
		STEP I	78.5955	6287.64	13623.22	163478.64
		STEP J	80.5364	6442.91	13959.64	167515.71
		STEP K	82.5254	6602.03	14304.40	171652.83
		STEP L	84.5634	6765.07	14657.65	175891.87
		STEP M	86.6518	6932.14	15019.64	180235.74

B737 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

STEP A	43.4443	3475.54	7530.34	90364.14
STEP B	44.5172	3561.37	7716.31	92595.77
STEP C	45.6166	3649.32	7906.87	94882.52
STEP D	46.7432	3739.45	8102.15	97225.85
STEP E	47.8976	3831.80	8302.25	99627.00
STEP F	49.0804	3926.43	8507.26	102087.23
STEP G	50.2925	4023.40	8717.36	104608.40
STEP H	51.5345	4122.76	8932.64	107191.76
STEP I	52.8072	4224.57	9153.24	109838.97
STEP J	54.1114	4328.91	9379.30	112551.71
STEP K	55.4477	4435.81	9610.93	115331.21
STEP L	56.8170	4545.36	9848.28	118179.36
STEP M	58.2202	4657.61	10091.50	121098.01

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B738	ELECTRIC BUSINESS ANALYST I					
		STEP A	39.3071	3144.56	6813.23	81758.76
		STEP B	40.2773	3222.18	6981.39	83776.78
		STEP C	41.2720	3301.76	7153.81	85845.76
		STEP D	42.2913	3383.30	7330.49	87965.90
		STEP E	43.3357	3466.85	7511.52	90138.25
		STEP F	44.4059	3552.47	7697.02	92364.27
		STEP G	45.5026	3640.20	7887.11	94645.40
		STEP H	46.6263	3730.10	8081.89	96982.70
		STEP I	47.7778	3822.22	8281.48	99377.82
		STEP J	48.9577	3916.61	8486.00	101832.01
		STEP K	50.1668	4013.34	8695.57	104346.94
		STEP L	51.4057	4112.45	8910.32	106923.85
		STEP M	52.6752	4214.01	9130.36	109564.41

B739 ELECTRIC BUSINESS ANALYST II

	STEP A	43.2416	3459.32	7495.21	89942.52
	STEP B	44.3091	3544.72	7680.24	92162.92
	STEP C	45.4034	3632.27	7869.92	94439.07
	STEP D	46.5246	3721.96	8064.26	96771.16
	STEP E	47.6736	3813.88	8263.42	99161.08
	STEP F	48.8510	3908.08	8467.50	101610.08
	STEP G	50.0574	4004.59	8676.61	104119.39
	STEP H	51.2936	4103.48	8890.89	106690.68
	STEP I	52.5604	4204.83	9110.46	109325.63
	STEP J	53.8584	4308.67	9335.45	112025.47
	STEP K	55.1885	4415.08	9566.00	114792.08
	STEP L	56.5514	4524.11	9802.24	117626.91
	STEP M	57.9480	4635.84	10044.32	120531.84

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B740	ELECTRIC COMPLIANCE ANALYST					
		STEP A	45.0209	3601.67	7803.62	93643.47
		STEP B	46.1322	3690.57	7996.24	95954.97
		STEP C	47.2715	3781.72	8193.72	98324.72
		STEP D	48.4389	3875.11	8396.07	100752.91
		STEP E	49.6352	3970.81	8603.43	103241.21
		STEP F	50.8610	4068.88	8815.90	105790.88
		STEP G	52.1170	4169.36	9033.61	108403.36
		STEP H	53.4041	4272.32	9256.71	111080.52
		STEP I	54.7230	4377.84	9485.32	113823.84
		STEP J	56.0744	4485.95	9719.56	116634.75
		STEP K	57.4592	4596.73	9959.59	119515.13
		STEP L	58.8782	4710.25	10205.55	122466.65
		STEP M	60.3323	4826.58	10457.59	125491.18

B741 ELECTRIC ENGINEERING TECH SUPV

	STEP A	47.8512	3828.09	8294.20	99530.49
	STEP B	49.0323	3922.58	8498.93	101987.18
	STEP C	50.2432	4019.45	8708.82	104505.85
	STEP D	51.4840	4118.72	8923.89	107086.72
	STEP E	52.7555	4220.44	9144.28	109731.44
	STEP F	54.0583	4324.66	9370.10	112441.26
	STEP G	55.3934	4431.47	9601.52	115218.27
	STEP H	56.7614	4540.91	9838.64	118063.71
	STEP I	58.1631	4653.04	10081.60	120979.24
	STEP J	59.5995	4767.96	10330.58	123966.96
	STEP K	61.0714	4885.71	10585.70	127028.51
	STEP L	62.5796	5006.36	10847.13	130165.56
	STEP M	64.1251	5130.00	11115.01	133380.20

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B742	ELECTRIC LINE CONST SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	61.4415	4915.32	10649.86	127798.32
		STEP B	62.9581	5036.64	10912.73	130952.84
		STEP C	64.5129	5161.03	11182.23	134186.83
		STEP D	66.1061	5288.48	11458.39	137500.68
		STEP E	67.7387	5419.09	11741.37	140896.49
		STEP F	69.4116	5552.92	12031.34	144376.12
		STEP G	71.1258	5690.06	12328.47	147941.66
		STEP H	72.8823	5830.58	12632.93	151595.18
		STEP I	74.6822	5974.57	12944.91	155338.97
		STEP J	76.5265	6122.12	13264.59	159175.12
		STEP K	78.4164	6273.31	13592.17	163106.11
		STEP L	80.3530	6428.24	13927.85	167134.24
		STEP M	82.3374	6586.99	14271.81	171261.79
B941	ELECTRIC CUSTOMER PROGRAMS SUPV					
		STEP A	54.7676	4381.40	9493.05	113916.60
		STEP B	56.1194	4489.55	9727.36	116728.35
		STEP C	57.5054	4600.43	9967.60	119611.23
		STEP D	58.9255	4714.04	10213.75	122565.04
		STEP E	60.3807	4830.45	10465.98	125591.85
		STEP F	61.8719	4949.75	10724.46	128693.55
		STEP G	63.3999	5071.99	10989.31	131871.79
		STEP H	64.9656	5197.24	11260.70	135128.44
		STEP I	66.5700	5325.60	11538.80	138465.60
		STEP J	68.2140	5457.12	11823.76	141885.12
		STEP K	69.8986	5591.88	12115.75	145389.08
		STEP L	71.6249	5729.99	12414.98	148979.79
		STEP M	73.3937	5871.49	12721.57	152658.89
B743	ELECTRIC OPERATIONS MANAGER					
		STEP A	67.5845	5406.76	11714.64	140575.76
		STEP B	69.2528	5540.22	12003.81	144045.82
		STEP C	70.9631	5677.04	12300.27	147603.24
		STEP D	72.7156	5817.24	12604.03	151248.44
		STEP E	74.5114	5960.91	12915.30	154983.71
		STEP F	76.3515	6108.12	13234.26	158811.12
		STEP G	78.2371	6258.96	13561.09	162733.16

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
		STEP H	80.1692	6413.53	13895.99	166751.93
		STEP I	82.1491	6571.92	14239.17	170870.12
		STEP J	84.1778	6734.22	14590.81	175089.82
		STEP K	86.2567	6900.53	14951.16	179413.93
		STEP L	88.3869	7070.95	15320.39	183844.75
		STEP M	90.5697	7245.57	15698.74	188384.97

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B744	ELECTRIC RATES & FINANCL ADMIN					
		STEP A	58.3337	4666.69	10111.17	121334.09
		STEP B	59.7736	4781.88	10360.75	124329.08
		STEP C	61.2497	4899.97	10616.61	127399.37
		STEP D	62.7623	5020.98	10878.79	130545.58
		STEP E	64.3123	5144.98	11147.46	133769.58
		STEP F	65.9006	5272.04	11422.77	137073.24
		STEP G	67.5281	5402.24	11704.87	140458.44
		STEP H	69.1957	5535.65	11993.92	143927.05
		STEP I	70.9046	5672.36	12290.13	147481.56
		STEP J	72.6557	5812.45	12593.65	151123.85
		STEP K	74.4500	5956.00	12904.66	154856.00
		STEP L	76.2886	6103.08	13223.35	158680.28
		STEP M	78.1726	6253.80	13549.91	162599.00

B745 ELECTRIC REGU COMPLNCE ADMNSTR

STEP A	67.5845	5406.76	11714.64	140575.76
STEP B	69.2528	5540.22	12003.81	144045.82
STEP C	70.9631	5677.04	12300.27	147603.24
STEP D	72.7156	5817.24	12604.03	151248.44
STEP E	74.5114	5960.91	12915.30	154983.71
STEP F	76.3515	6108.12	13234.26	158811.12
STEP G	78.2371	6258.96	13561.09	162733.16
STEP H	80.1692	6413.53	13895.99	166751.93
STEP I	82.1491	6571.92	14239.17	170870.12
STEP J	84.1778	6734.22	14590.81	175089.82
STEP K	85.2567	6820.53	14777.82	177333.93
STEP L	88.3869	7070.95	15320.39	183844.75
STEP M	90.5697	7245.57	15698.74	188384.97

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B746	ELECTRIC RESOURCES ANALYST I					
	STEP A		47.9688	3837.50	8314.59	99775.10
	STEP B		49.1529	3932.23	8519.83	102238.03
	STEP C		50.3668	4029.34	8730.24	104762.94
	STEP D		51.6107	4128.85	8945.85	107350.25
	STEP E		52.8852	4230.81	9166.76	110001.21
	STEP F		54.1913	4335.30	9393.15	112717.90
	STEP G		55.5296	4442.36	9625.13	115501.56
	STEP H		56.9010	4552.08	9862.84	118354.08
	STEP I		58.3062	4664.49	10106.40	121276.89
	STEP J		59.7461	4779.68	10355.99	124271.88
	STEP K		61.2216	4897.72	10611.74	127340.92
	STEP L		62.7335	5018.68	10873.80	130485.68
	STEP M		64.2828	5142.62	11142.35	133708.22

B747 ELECTRIC RESOURCES ANALYST II

STEP A	52.7703	4221.62	9146.85	109762.22
STEP B	54.0729	4325.83	9372.63	112471.63
STEP C	55.4083	4432.66	9604.10	115249.26
STEP D	56.7766	4542.12	9841.27	118095.32
STEP E	58.1788	4654.30	10084.32	121011.90
STEP F	59.6156	4769.24	10333.37	124000.44
STEP G	61.0878	4887.02	10588.55	127062.62
STEP H	62.5965	5007.72	10850.06	130200.72
STEP I	64.1424	5131.39	11118.01	133416.19
STEP J	65.7264	5258.11	11392.57	136710.91
STEP K	67.3496	5387.96	11673.93	140087.16
STEP L	69.0129	5521.03	11962.23	143546.83
STEP M	70.7172	5657.37	12257.64	147091.77

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGBM MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B749	ELECTRIC RISK MGMT ADMNSTR					
		STEP A	64.1688	5133.50	11122.59	133471.10
		STEP B	65.7529	5260.23	11397.16	136766.03
		STEP C	67.3767	5390.13	11678.62	140143.53
		STEP D	69.0406	5523.24	11967.03	143604.44
		STEP E	70.7457	5659.65	12262.58	147151.05
		STEP F	72.4928	5799.42	12565.41	150785.02
		STEP G	74.2831	5942.64	12875.73	154508.84
		STEP H	76.1176	6089.40	13193.71	158324.60
		STEP I	77.9974	6239.79	13519.54	162234.59
		STEP J	79.9236	6393.88	13853.42	166241.08
		STEP K	81.8974	6551.79	14195.54	170346.59
		STEP L	83.9199	6713.59	14546.11	174553.39
		STEP M	85.9924	6879.39	14905.34	178864.19

CITY OF ROSEVILLE

SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B750	ELECTRIC SAFETY COORDINATOR					
		STEP A	36.5871	2926.96	6341.76	76101.16
		STEP B	37.4902	2999.21	6498.30	77979.61
		STEP C	38.4160	3073.28	6658.77	79905.28
		STEP D	39.3647	3149.17	6823.21	81878.57
		STEP E	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
		STEP F	41.3331	3306.64	7164.40	85972.84
		STEP G	42.3538	3388.30	7341.32	88095.90
		STEP H	43.3998	3471.98	7522.63	90271.58
		STEP I	44.4716	3557.72	7708.41	92500.92
		STEP J	45.5699	3645.59	7898.78	94785.39
		STEP K	46.6952	3735.61	8093.83	97126.01
		STEP L	47.8484	3827.87	8293.72	99524.67
		STEP M	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60

B751 ELECTRIC SUBSTATION SUPERVISOR

STEP A	61.4415	4915.32	10649.86	127798.32
STEP B	62.9581	5036.64	10912.73	130952.84
STEP C	64.5129	5161.03	11182.23	134186.83
STEP D	66.1061	5288.48	11458.39	137500.68
STEP E	67.7387	5419.09	11741.37	140896.49
STEP F	69.4116	5552.92	12031.34	144376.12
STEP G	71.1258	5690.06	12328.47	147941.66
STEP H	72.8823	5830.58	12632.93	151595.18
STEP I	74.6822	5974.57	12944.91	155338.97
STEP J	76.5265	6122.12	13264.59	159175.12
STEP K	78.4164	6273.31	13592.17	163106.11
STEP L	80.3530	6428.24	13927.85	167134.24
STEP M	82.3374	6586.99	14271.81	171261.79

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B752	ELECTRIC TECHNOLOGY SYST SUPV					
		STEP A	50.0104	4000.83	8668.46	104021.63
		STEP B	51.2449	4099.59	8882.44	106589.39
		STEP C	52.5104	4200.83	9101.80	109221.63
		STEP D	53.8072	4304.57	9326.58	111918.97
		STEP E	55.1361	4410.88	9556.92	114683.08
		STEP F	56.4977	4519.81	9792.93	117515.21
		STEP G	57.8930	4631.44	10034.78	120417.44
		STEP H	59.3227	4745.81	10282.60	123391.21
		STEP I	60.7877	4863.01	10536.53	126438.41
		STEP J	62.2889	4983.11	10796.74	129560.91
		STEP K	63.8272	5106.17	11063.38	132760.57
		STEP L	65.4035	5232.28	11336.60	136039.28
		STEP M	67.0187	5361.49	11616.57	139398.89

B753 ELECTRIC UTILITY DIRECTOR

Step A	92.9432	7435.46	16110.15	193321.86
Step B	95.2374	7618.99	16507.81	198093.71
Step C	97.5893	7807.15	16915.49	202985.83
Step D	99.9994	7999.95	17333.23	207998.77
Step E	102.4690	8197.52	17761.29	213135.51
Step F	104.9996	8399.97	18199.93	218399.10
Step G	107.5926	8607.41	18649.39	223792.69
Step H	110.2497	8819.98	19109.96	229319.47
Step I	112.9725	9037.80	19581.90	234982.74
Step J	115.7624	9261.00	20065.49	240785.88
Step K	118.6213	9489.70	20561.03	246732.32
Step L	121.5508	9724.06	21068.80	252825.63
Step M	124.5526	9964.21	21589.12	259069.41

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B754	ELECTRONIC MAINT COORDINATOR					
		STEP A	35.2965	2823.72	6118.06	73416.72
		STEP B	36.1682	2893.45	6269.15	75229.85
		STEP C	37.0614	2964.91	6423.97	77087.71
		STEP D	37.9766	3038.12	6582.61	78991.32
		STEP E	38.9145	3113.16	6745.18	80942.16
		STEP F	39.8755	3190.04	6911.75	82941.04
		STEP G	40.8603	3268.82	7082.45	84989.42
		STEP H	41.8694	3349.55	7257.36	87088.35
		STEP I	42.9034	3432.27	7436.58	89239.07
		STEP J	43.9629	3517.03	7620.23	91442.83
		STEP K	45.0486	3603.88	7808.42	93701.08
		STEP L	46.1612	3692.89	8001.27	96015.29
		STEP M	47.3012	3784.09	8198.87	98386.49

B755 EMS QUAL ASSURANCE COORDINATOR

STEP A	45.1917	3615.33	7833.22	93998.73
STEP B	46.3073	3704.58	8026.59	96319.18
STEP C	47.4509	3796.07	8224.82	98697.87
STEP D	48.6228	3889.82	8427.95	101135.42
STEP E	49.8236	3985.88	8636.09	103633.08
STEP F	51.0540	4084.32	8849.36	106192.32
STEP G	52.3148	4185.18	9067.89	108814.78
STEP H	53.6068	4288.54	9291.84	111502.14
STEP I	54.9307	4394.45	9521.32	114255.85
STEP J	56.2873	4502.98	9756.46	117077.58
STEP K	57.6773	4614.18	9997.39	119968.78
STEP L	59.1017	4728.13	10244.29	122931.53
STEP M	60.5613	4844.90	10497.29	125967.50

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B939	ENERGY SERVICES ACCOUNT REP I					
		STEP A	39.3599	3148.79	6822.38	81868.59
		STEP B	40.3314	3226.51	6990.77	83889.31
		STEP C	41.3274	3306.19	7163.41	85960.99
		STEP D	42.3480	3387.84	7340.32	88083.84
		STEP E	43.3939	3471.51	7521.60	90259.31
		STEP F	44.4655	3557.24	7707.35	92488.24
		STEP G	45.5636	3645.08	7897.69	94772.28
		STEP H	46.6889	3735.11	8092.74	97112.91
		STEP I	47.8419	3827.35	8292.59	99511.15
		STEP J	49.0234	3921.87	8497.38	101968.67
		STEP K	50.2341	4018.72	8707.24	104486.92
		STEP L	51.4747	4117.97	8922.28	107067.37
		STEP M	52.7459	4219.67	9142.62	109711.47

B756 ENERGY SERVICES ACCOUNT REP II

	STEP A	43.2959	3463.67	7504.62	90055.47
	STEP B	44.3646	3549.16	7689.86	92278.36
	STEP C	45.4602	3636.81	7879.76	94557.21
	STEP D	46.5829	3726.63	8074.36	96892.43
	STEP E	47.7333	3818.66	8273.77	99285.26
	STEP F	48.9122	3912.97	8478.11	101737.37
	STEP G	50.1201	4009.60	8687.48	104249.80
	STEP H	51.3579	4108.63	8902.03	106824.43
	STEP I	52.6262	4210.09	9121.87	109462.49
	STEP J	53.9259	4314.07	9347.15	112165.87
	STEP K	55.2576	4420.60	9577.98	114935.80
	STEP L	56.6223	4529.78	9814.53	117774.38
	STEP M	58.0206	4641.64	10056.90	120682.84

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B757	ENGINEERING MANAGER					
		STEP A	56.5013	4520.10	9793.55	117522.70
		STEP B	57.8958	4631.66	10035.27	120423.26
		STEP C	59.3256	4746.04	10283.10	123397.24
		STEP D	60.7907	4863.25	10537.05	126444.65
		STEP E	62.2920	4983.36	10797.28	129567.36
		STEP F	63.8304	5106.43	11063.93	132767.23
		STEP G	65.4068	5232.54	11337.17	136046.14
		STEP H	67.0220	5361.76	11617.14	139405.76
		STEP I	68.6772	5494.17	11904.04	142848.57
		STEP J	70.3733	5629.86	12198.03	146376.46
		STEP K	72.1112	5768.89	12499.27	149991.29
		STEP L	73.8921	5911.36	12807.96	153695.56
		STEP M	75.7169	6057.35	13124.26	157491.15

B758 ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR

	STEP A	42.0752	3366.01	7293.03	87516.41
	STEP B	43.1139	3449.11	7473.07	89676.91
	STEP C	44.1786	3534.28	7657.62	91891.48
	STEP D	45.2697	3621.57	7846.74	94160.97
	STEP E	46.3877	3711.01	8040.53	96486.41
	STEP F	47.5333	3802.66	8239.10	98869.26
	STEP G	48.7071	3896.56	8442.56	101310.76
	STEP H	49.9100	3992.80	8651.06	103812.80
	STEP I	51.1426	4091.40	8864.71	106376.60
	STEP J	52.4056	4192.44	9083.63	109003.64
	STEP K	53.6998	4295.98	9307.96	111695.58
	STEP L	55.0260	4402.08	9537.84	114454.08
	STEP M	56.3849	4510.79	9773.38	117280.59

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B761	ENVIRONMENTAL UTIL COMPL ADMIN					
		STEP A	42.0733	3365.86	7292.70	87512.46
		STEP B	43.1117	3448.93	7472.69	89672.33
		STEP C	44.1764	3534.11	7657.24	91886.91
		STEP D	45.2674	3621.39	7846.34	94156.19
		STEP E	46.3853	3710.82	8040.11	96481.42
		STEP F	47.5308	3802.46	8238.67	98864.06
		STEP G	48.7046	3896.36	8442.13	101305.56
		STEP H	49.9074	3992.59	8650.61	103807.39
		STEP I	51.1400	4091.20	8864.26	106371.20
		STEP J	52.4029	4192.23	9083.16	108998.03
		STEP K	53.6970	4295.76	9307.48	111689.76
		STEP L	55.0231	4401.84	9537.33	114448.04
		STEP M	56.3820	4510.56	9772.88	117274.56

B759 ENVIRONMENTAL UTIL DIRECTOR

STEP A	74.5054	5960.43	12914.26	154971.23
STEP B	76.3445	6107.56	13233.04	158796.56
STEP C	78.2299	6258.39	13559.84	162718.19
STEP D	80.1619	6412.95	13894.72	166736.75
STEP E	82.1416	6571.32	14237.87	170854.52
STEP F	84.1701	6733.60	14589.48	175073.80
STEP G	86.2488	6899.90	14949.79	179397.50
STEP H	88.3788	7070.30	15318.99	183827.90
STEP I	90.5614	7244.91	15697.30	188367.71
STEP J	92.7979	7423.83	16084.96	193019.63
STEP K	95.0896	7607.16	16482.19	197786.36
STEP L	97.4380	7795.04	16889.25	202671.04
STEP M	99.8443	7987.54	17306.34	207676.14

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B760	EQUIPMENT MAINT SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	31.4681	2517.44	5454.47	65453.64
		STEP B	32.2449	2579.59	5589.11	67069.39
		STEP C	33.0412	2643.29	5727.14	68725.69
		STEP D	33.8572	2708.57	5868.58	70422.97
		STEP E	34.6934	2775.47	6013.52	72162.27
		STEP F	35.5501	2844.00	6162.01	73944.20
		STEP G	36.4281	2914.24	6314.20	75770.44
		STEP H	37.3277	2986.21	6470.13	77641.61
		STEP I	38.2496	3059.96	6629.93	79559.16
		STEP J	39.1942	3135.53	6793.66	81523.93
		STEP K	40.1621	3212.96	6961.43	83537.16
		STEP L	41.1540	3292.32	7133.36	85600.32
		STEP M	42.1703	3373.62	7309.51	87714.22

B851 ERP MANAGER

STEP A	48.3018	3864.14	8372.31	100467.74
STEP B	49.4942	3959.53	8578.99	102947.93
STEP C	50.7165	4057.32	8790.86	105490.32
STEP D	51.9690	4157.52	9007.96	108095.52
STEP E	53.2524	4260.19	9230.41	110764.99
STEP F	54.5675	4365.40	9458.36	113500.40
STEP G	55.9151	4473.20	9691.95	116303.40
STEP H	57.2960	4583.68	9931.30	119175.68
STEP I	58.7110	4696.88	10176.57	122118.88
STEP J	60.1609	4812.87	10427.88	125134.67
STEP K	61.6467	4931.73	10685.42	128225.13
STEP L	63.1691	5053.52	10949.31	131391.72
STEP M	64.7291	5178.32	11219.71	134636.52

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGBB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B847	EU BUSINESS SVCS ADMINISTRATOR					
		STEP A	42.9160	3433.28	7438.77	89265.28
		STEP B	43.9753	3518.02	7622.38	91468.62
		STEP C	45.0614	3604.91	7810.64	93727.71
		STEP D	46.1742	3693.93	8003.52	96042.33
		STEP E	47.3145	3785.16	8201.18	98414.16
		STEP F	48.4830	3878.64	8403.72	100844.64
		STEP G	49.6803	3974.42	8611.25	103335.02
		STEP H	50.9072	4072.57	8823.91	105886.97
		STEP I	52.1644	4173.15	9041.82	108501.95
		STEP J	53.4527	4276.21	9265.13	111181.61
		STEP K	54.7728	4381.82	9493.95	113927.42
		STEP L	56.1254	4490.03	9728.40	116740.83
		STEP M	57.5115	4600.92	9968.66	119623.92

B848 EU RATE ANALYST I

STEP A	34.4334	2754.67	5968.45	71621.47
STEP B	35.2833	2822.66	6115.77	73389.26
STEP C	36.1547	2892.37	6266.81	75201.77
STEP D	37.0476	2963.80	6421.58	77059.00
STEP E	37.9625	3037.00	6580.16	78962.00
STEP F	38.9000	3112.00	6742.66	80912.00
STEP G	39.8607	3188.85	6909.18	82910.25
STEP H	40.8451	3267.60	7079.81	84957.80
STEP I	41.8538	3348.30	7254.65	87055.90
STEP J	42.8874	3430.99	7433.81	89205.79
STEP K	43.9466	3515.72	7617.41	91408.92
STEP L	45.0319	3602.55	7805.52	93666.35
STEP M	46.1440	3691.52	7998.29	95979.52

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGBB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B849	EU RATE ANALYST II					
		STEP A	37.3182	2985.45	6468.48	77621.85
		STEP B	38.2394	3059.15	6628.16	79537.95
		STEP C	39.1838	3134.70	6791.85	81502.30
		STEP D	40.1515	3212.12	6959.59	83515.12
		STEP E	41.1431	3291.44	7131.47	85577.64
		STEP F	42.1591	3372.72	7307.57	87690.92
		STEP G	43.2003	3456.02	7488.05	89856.62
		STEP H	44.2672	3541.37	7672.98	92075.77
		STEP I	45.3604	3628.83	7862.46	94349.63
		STEP J	46.4806	3718.44	8056.63	96679.64
		STEP K	47.6285	3810.28	8255.60	99067.28
		STEP L	48.8047	3904.37	8459.48	101513.77
		STEP M	50.0100	4000.80	8668.40	104020.80

B762 FACILITIES MANAGER

	STEP A	40.8297	3266.38	7077.15	84925.77
	STEP B	41.8376	3347.01	7251.85	87022.16
	STEP C	42.8708	3429.66	7430.94	89171.26
	STEP D	43.9295	3514.36	7614.45	91373.43
	STEP E	45.0144	3601.15	7802.50	93629.99
	STEP F	46.1261	3690.09	7995.19	95942.27
	STEP G	47.2652	3781.22	8192.64	98311.66
	STEP H	48.4325	3874.60	8394.96	100739.57
	STEP I	49.6286	3970.29	8602.29	103227.43
	STEP J	50.8542	4068.34	8814.73	105776.74
	STEP K	52.1101	4168.81	9032.42	108389.00
	STEP L	53.3970	4271.76	9255.48	111065.78
	STEP M	54.7157	4377.26	9484.05	113808.66

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B763	FINANCE DIRECTOR					
		STEP A	67.0881	5367.04	11628.60	139543.24
		STEP B	68.7443	5499.54	11915.67	142988.14
		STEP C	70.4421	5635.36	12209.96	146519.56
		STEP D	72.1817	5774.53	12511.49	150137.93
		STEP E	73.9643	5917.14	12820.47	153845.74
		STEP F	75.7909	6063.27	13137.08	157645.07
		STEP G	77.6626	6213.00	13461.51	161538.20
		STEP H	79.5806	6366.44	13793.97	165527.64
		STEP I	81.5459	6523.67	14134.62	169615.47
		STEP J	83.5598	6684.78	14483.69	173804.38
		STEP K	85.6234	6849.87	14841.38	178096.67
		STEP L	87.7379	7019.03	15207.90	182494.83
		STEP M	89.9047	7192.37	15583.48	187001.77

B764 FINANCE MANAGER

STEP A	44.7525	3580.20	7757.10	93085.15
STEP B	45.8572	3668.58	7948.58	95382.95
STEP C	46.9897	3759.17	8144.88	97738.53
STEP D	48.1501	3852.01	8346.02	100152.28
STEP E	49.3393	3947.14	8552.14	102625.64
STEP F	50.5577	4044.62	8763.34	105160.08
STEP G	51.8063	4144.50	8979.76	107757.12
STEP H	53.0857	4246.86	9201.52	110418.29
STEP I	54.3967	4351.74	9428.76	113145.18
STEP J	55.7401	4459.21	9661.62	115939.41
STEP K	57.1167	4569.33	9900.22	118802.65
STEP L	58.5272	4682.18	10144.72	121736.60
STEP M	59.9726	4797.81	10395.25	124743.01

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B765	FINANCE SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	36.3377	2907.01	6298.53	75582.41
		STEP B	37.2345	2978.76	6453.98	77447.76
		STEP C	38.1540	3052.32	6613.36	79360.32
		STEP D	39.0963	3127.70	6776.69	81320.30
		STEP E	40.0618	3204.94	6944.04	83328.54
		STEP F	41.0511	3284.08	7115.52	85386.28
		STEP G	42.0649	3365.19	7291.24	87494.99
		STEP H	43.1038	3448.30	7471.32	89655.90
		STEP I	44.1683	3533.46	7655.83	91870.06
		STEP J	45.2591	3620.72	7844.91	94138.92
		STEP K	46.3768	3710.14	8038.64	96463.74
		STEP L	47.5221	3801.76	8237.16	98845.96
		STEP M	48.6957	3895.65	8440.58	101287.05

B766 FIRE BATTALLION CHIEF (8HR)

STEP A	51.1945	4095.56	8873.71	106484.56
STEP B	51.8769	4150.15	8992.00	107903.95
STEP C	53.1581	4252.64	9214.07	110568.84
STEP D	54.4709	4357.67	9441.62	113299.47
STEP E	55.8161	4465.28	9674.79	116097.48
STEP F	57.1945	4575.56	9913.71	118964.56
STEP G	58.6070	4688.56	10158.54	121902.56
STEP H	60.0544	4804.35	10409.42	124913.15
STEP I	61.5375	4923.00	10666.50	127998.00
STEP J	63.0572	5044.57	10929.91	131158.97
STEP K	64.6145	5169.16	11199.84	134398.16
STEP L	66.2102	5296.81	11476.43	137717.21
STEP M	67.8453	5427.62	11759.85	141118.22

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B767	FIRE BATTALION CHIEF (24HR)					
		STEP A	36.1622	4050.16	8775.36	105304.32
		STEP B	37.0549	4150.14	8991.98	107903.86
		STEP C	37.9700	4252.64	9214.05	110568.64
		STEP D	38.9077	4357.66	9441.60	113299.22
		STEP E	39.8686	4465.28	9674.78	116097.36
		STEP F	40.8532	4575.55	9913.70	118964.51
		STEP G	41.8621	4688.55	10158.53	121902.43
		STEP H	42.8959	4804.34	10409.40	124912.86
		STEP I	43.9553	4922.99	10666.48	127997.83
		STEP J	45.0408	5044.56	10929.90	131158.80
		STEP K	46.1532	5169.15	11199.84	134398.11
		STEP L	47.2930	5296.81	11476.43	137717.21
		STEP M	48.4609	5427.62	11759.84	141118.14

B768 FIRE CHIEF

	STEP A	72.7667	5821.33	12612.89	151354.73
	STEP B	74.5628	5965.02	12924.21	155090.62
	STEP C	76.4042	6112.33	13243.39	158920.73
	STEP D	78.2911	6263.28	13570.45	162845.48
	STEP E	80.2246	6417.96	13905.59	166867.16
	STEP F	82.2058	6576.46	14249.00	170988.06
	STEP G	84.2360	6738.88	14600.90	175210.88
	STEP H	86.3163	6905.30	14961.49	179537.90
	STEP I	88.4479	7075.83	15330.96	183971.63
	STEP J	90.6322	7250.57	15709.58	188514.97
	STEP K	92.8705	7429.64	16097.55	193170.64
	STEP L	95.1640	7613.12	16495.09	197941.12
	STEP M	97.5142	7801.13	16902.46	202829.53

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B769	FIRE DIVISION CHIEF					
		STEP A	55.6902	4455.21	9652.96	115835.61
		STEP B	57.0648	4565.18	9891.23	118694.78
		STEP C	58.4741	4677.92	10135.51	121626.12
		STEP D	59.9182	4793.45	10385.82	124629.85
		STEP E	61.3979	4911.83	10642.30	127707.63
		STEP F	62.9142	5033.13	10905.12	130861.53
		STEP G	64.4679	5157.43	11174.43	134093.23
		STEP H	66.0600	5284.80	11450.40	137404.80
		STEP I	67.6915	5415.32	11733.19	140798.32
		STEP J	69.3632	5549.05	12022.95	144275.45
		STEP K	71.0762	5686.09	12319.87	147838.49
		STEP L	72.8315	5826.52	12624.12	151489.52
		STEP M	74.6301	5970.40	12935.88	155230.60

B770 FLEET MANAGER

	STEP A	40.8297	3266.38	7077.15	84925.77
	STEP B	41.8376	3347.01	7251.85	87022.16
	STEP C	42.8708	3429.66	7430.94	89171.26
	STEP D	43.9295	3514.36	7614.45	91373.43
	STEP E	45.0144	3601.15	7802.50	93629.99
	STEP F	46.1261	3690.09	7995.19	95942.27
	STEP G	47.2652	3781.22	8192.64	98311.66
	STEP H	48.4325	3874.60	8394.96	100739.57
	STEP I	49.6286	3970.29	8602.29	103227.43
	STEP J	50.8542	4068.34	8814.73	105776.74
	STEP K	52.1101	4168.81	9032.42	108389.00
	STEP L	53.3970	4271.76	9255.48	111065.78
	STEP M	54.7157	4377.26	9484.05	113808.66

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B771	GOVERNMENT RELATIONS ADMINISTR					
		STEP A	43.9043	3512.34	7610.07	91320.94
		STEP B	44.9880	3599.04	7797.92	93575.04
		STEP C	46.0990	3687.92	7990.49	95885.92
		STEP D	47.2374	3778.99	8187.81	98253.79
		STEP E	48.4040	3872.32	8390.02	100680.32
		STEP F	49.5994	3967.95	8597.22	103166.75
		STEP G	50.8243	4065.94	8809.54	105714.54
		STEP H	52.0795	4166.36	9027.11	108325.36
		STEP I	53.3656	4269.24	9250.03	111000.44
		STEP J	54.6835	4374.68	9478.47	113741.68
		STEP K	56.0340	4482.72	9712.56	116550.72
		STEP L	57.4178	4593.42	9952.41	119429.02
		STEP M	58.8358	4706.86	10198.20	122378.46

B844 HOUSING MANAGER

	STEP A	43.4430	3475.44	7530.12	90361.44
	STEP B	44.5172	3561.37	7716.31	92595.77
	STEP C	45.6166	3649.32	7906.87	94882.52
	STEP D	46.7432	3739.45	8102.15	97225.85
	STEP E	47.8976	3831.80	8302.25	99627.00
	STEP F	49.0804	3926.43	8507.26	102087.23
	STEP G	50.2925	4023.40	8717.36	104608.40
	STEP H	51.5345	4122.76	8932.64	107191.76
	STEP I	52.8072	4224.57	9153.24	109838.97
	STEP J	54.1114	4328.91	9379.30	112551.71
	STEP K	55.4477	4435.81	9610.93	115331.21
	STEP L	56.8170	4545.36	9848.28	118179.36
	STEP M	58.2202	4657.61	10091.50	121098.01

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B772	HOUSING SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	36.5872	2926.97	6341.78	76101.37
		STEP B	37.4902	2999.21	6498.30	77979.61
		STEP C	38.4160	3073.28	6658.77	79905.28
		STEP D	39.3647	3149.17	6823.21	81878.57
		STEP E	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
		STEP F	41.3331	3306.64	7164.40	85972.84
		STEP G	42.3538	3388.30	7341.32	88095.90
		STEP H	43.3998	3471.98	7522.63	90271.58
		STEP I	44.4716	3557.72	7708.41	92500.92
		STEP J	45.5699	3645.59	7898.78	94785.39
		STEP K	46.6952	3735.61	8093.83	97126.01
		STEP L	47.8484	3827.87	8293.72	99524.67
		STEP M	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60

B773 HUMAN RESOURCES ANALYST I

STEP A	32.3413	2587.31	5605.83	67270.00
STEP B	33.1397	2651.18	5744.21	68930.56
STEP C	33.9581	2716.65	5886.07	70632.87
STEP D	34.7967	2783.74	6031.43	72377.22
STEP E	35.6561	2852.49	6180.39	74164.65
STEP F	36.5366	2922.93	6333.02	75996.22
STEP G	37.4390	2995.12	6489.42	77873.02
STEP H	38.3635	3069.08	6649.68	79796.17
STEP I	39.3110	3144.88	6813.90	81766.82
STEP J	40.2818	3222.54	6982.18	83786.13
STEP K	41.2766	3302.13	7154.61	85855.31
STEP L	42.2960	3383.68	7331.30	87975.59
STEP M	43.3405	3467.24	7512.35	90148.24

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B774	HUMAN RESOURCES ANALYST II					
		STEP A	35.5826	2846.61	6167.65	74011.83
		STEP B	36.4610	2916.88	6319.90	75838.80
		STEP C	37.3614	2988.91	6475.98	77711.72
		STEP D	38.2841	3062.73	6635.91	79630.89
		STEP E	39.2295	3138.36	6799.79	81597.45
		STEP F	40.1984	3215.87	6967.72	83612.58
		STEP G	41.1911	3295.29	7139.79	85677.48
		STEP H	42.2084	3376.67	7316.11	87793.37
		STEP I	43.2507	3460.06	7496.79	89961.52
		STEP J	44.3188	3545.51	7681.93	92183.20
		STEP K	45.4133	3633.07	7871.65	94459.76
		STEP L	46.5349	3722.79	8066.04	96792.54
		STEP M	47.6841	3814.73	8265.24	99182.93

B775 HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR

STEP A	61.0708	4885.66	10585.60	127027.26
STEP B	62.5784	5006.27	10846.92	130163.07
STEP C	64.1238	5129.90	11114.79	133377.50
STEP D	65.7074	5256.59	11389.28	136671.39
STEP E	67.3301	5386.40	11670.55	140046.60
STEP F	68.9929	5519.43	11958.76	143505.23
STEP G	70.6968	5655.74	12254.11	147049.34
STEP H	72.4427	5795.41	12556.73	150680.81
STEP I	74.2318	5938.54	12866.84	154402.14
STEP J	76.0650	6085.20	13184.60	158215.20
STEP K	77.9435	6235.48	13510.20	162122.48
STEP L	79.8684	6389.47	13843.85	166126.27
STEP M	81.8408	6547.26	14185.73	170228.86

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B776	HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGER					
		STEP A	41.6683	3333.46	7222.50	86670.06
		STEP B	42.6971	3415.76	7400.83	88809.96
		STEP C	43.7516	3500.12	7583.61	91003.32
		STEP D	44.8320	3586.56	7770.88	93250.56
		STEP E	45.9392	3675.13	7962.79	95553.53
		STEP F	47.0737	3765.89	8159.44	97913.29
		STEP G	48.2363	3858.90	8360.95	100331.50
		STEP H	49.4275	3954.20	8567.43	102809.20
		STEP I	50.6482	4051.85	8779.02	105348.25
		STEP J	51.8990	4151.92	8995.82	107949.92
		STEP K	53.1807	4254.45	9217.98	110615.85
		STEP L	54.4940	4359.52	9445.62	113347.52
		STEP M	55.8398	4467.18	9678.89	116146.78

B777 INFO SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR

STEP A	42.8581	3428.64	7428.73	89144.84
STEP B	43.9160	3513.28	7612.10	91345.28
STEP C	45.0006	3600.04	7800.10	93601.24
STEP D	46.1119	3688.95	7992.72	95912.75
STEP E	47.2507	3780.05	8190.12	98281.45
STEP F	48.4176	3873.40	8392.38	100708.60
STEP G	49.6133	3969.06	8599.63	103195.66
STEP H	50.8385	4067.08	8812.00	105744.08
STEP I	52.0941	4167.52	9029.64	108355.72
STEP J	53.3806	4270.44	9252.63	111031.64
STEP K	54.6989	4375.91	9481.14	113773.71
STEP L	56.0497	4483.97	9715.28	116583.37
STEP M	57.4339	4594.71	9955.20	119462.51

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B778	INTERPRETIVE SRVCS SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	31.2307	2498.45	5413.32	64959.85
		STEP B	32.0020	2560.16	5547.01	66564.16
		STEP C	32.7923	2623.38	5684.00	68207.98
		STEP D	33.6022	2688.17	5824.38	69892.57
		STEP E	34.4320	2754.56	5968.21	71618.56
		STEP F	35.2823	2822.58	6115.59	73387.18
		STEP G	36.1537	2892.29	6266.64	75199.69
		STEP H	37.0465	2963.72	6421.39	77056.72
		STEP I	37.9614	3036.91	6579.97	78959.71
		STEP J	38.8989	3111.91	6742.47	80909.71
		STEP K	39.8596	3188.76	6909.00	82907.96
		STEP L	40.8439	3267.51	7079.60	84955.31
		STEP M	41.8526	3348.20	7254.45	87053.40

B779 IT DIVISION MANAGER

	STEP A	44.7165	3577.32	7750.86	93010.32
	STEP B	45.8208	3665.66	7942.27	95307.26
	STEP C	46.9524	3756.19	8138.41	97660.99
	STEP D	48.1119	3848.95	8339.39	100072.75
	STEP E	49.3001	3944.00	8545.35	102544.20
	STEP F	50.5176	4041.40	8756.38	105076.60
	STEP G	51.7652	4141.21	8972.63	107671.61
	STEP H	53.0436	4243.48	9194.22	110330.68
	STEP I	54.3535	4348.28	9421.27	113055.28
	STEP J	55.6958	4455.66	9653.93	115847.26
	STEP K	57.0713	4565.70	9892.35	118708.30
	STEP L	58.4807	4678.45	10136.65	121639.85
	STEP M	59.9250	4794.00	10387.00	124644.00

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B781	IT PROGRAM MANAGER					
		STEP A	40.6545	3252.36	7046.78	84561.36
		STEP B	41.6585	3332.68	7220.80	86649.68
		STEP C	42.6873	3414.98	7399.13	88789.58
		STEP D	43.7415	3499.32	7581.86	90982.32
		STEP E	44.8217	3585.73	7769.09	93229.13
		STEP F	45.9286	3674.28	7960.95	95531.48
		STEP G	47.0629	3765.03	8157.56	97890.83
		STEP H	48.2252	3858.01	8359.03	100308.41
		STEP I	49.4161	3953.28	8565.45	102785.48
		STEP J	50.6365	4050.92	8776.99	105323.92
		STEP K	51.8870	4150.96	8993.74	107924.96
		STEP L	53.1684	4253.47	9215.85	110590.27
		STEP M	54.4815	4358.52	9443.46	113321.52

B782 KEY ACCOUNTS REPRESENTATIVE

STEP A	47.6233	3809.86	8254.70	99056.46
STEP B	48.7987	3903.89	8458.44	101501.29
STEP C	50.0039	4000.31	8667.34	104008.11
STEP D	51.2388	4099.10	8881.39	106576.70
STEP E	52.5042	4200.33	9100.72	109208.73
STEP F	53.8008	4304.06	9325.47	111905.66
STEP G	55.1295	4410.36	9555.78	114669.36
STEP H	56.4909	4519.27	9791.75	117501.07
STEP I	57.8860	4630.88	10033.57	120402.88
STEP J	59.3156	4745.24	10281.37	123376.44
STEP K	60.7805	4862.44	10535.28	126423.44
STEP L	62.2815	4982.52	10795.46	129545.52
STEP M	63.8196	5105.56	11062.06	132744.76

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGBB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B783	LIBRARY SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	32.1157	2569.25	5566.72	66800.65
		STEP B	32.9086	2632.68	5704.15	68449.88
		STEP C	33.7213	2697.70	5845.02	70140.30
		STEP D	34.5541	2764.32	5989.37	71872.52
		STEP E	35.4075	2832.60	6137.30	73647.60
		STEP F	36.2819	2902.55	6288.86	75466.35
		STEP G	37.1779	2974.23	6444.16	77330.03
		STEP H	38.0960	3047.68	6603.30	79239.68
		STEP I	39.0369	3122.95	6766.39	81196.75
		STEP J	40.0009	3200.07	6933.48	83201.87
		STEP K	40.9888	3279.10	7104.72	85256.70
		STEP L	42.0010	3360.08	7280.17	87362.08
		STEP M	43.0383	3443.06	7459.97	89519.66

B784 MANAGEMENT ANALYST

	STEP A	38.4165	3073.32	6658.86	79906.32
	STEP B	39.3646	3149.16	6823.19	81878.36
	STEP C	40.3367	3226.93	6991.69	83900.33
	STEP D	41.3329	3306.63	7164.36	85972.43
	STEP E	42.3537	3388.29	7341.30	88095.69
	STEP F	43.3996	3471.96	7522.59	90271.16
	STEP G	44.4714	3557.71	7708.37	92500.51
	STEP H	45.5697	3645.57	7898.74	94784.97
	STEP I	46.6951	3735.60	8093.81	97125.80
	STEP J	47.8483	3827.86	8293.70	99524.46
	STEP K	49.0299	3922.39	8498.51	101982.19
	STEP L	50.2408	4019.26	8708.40	104500.86
	STEP M	51.4815	4118.52	8923.46	107081.52

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B785	MAPPING SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	36.5871	2926.96	6341.76	76101.16
		STEP B	37.4902	2999.21	6498.30	77979.61
		STEP C	38.4160	3073.28	6658.77	79905.28
		STEP D	39.3647	3149.17	6823.21	81878.57
		STEP E	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
		STEP F	41.3331	3306.64	7164.40	85972.84
		STEP G	42.3538	3388.30	7341.32	88095.90
		STEP H	43.3998	3471.98	7522.63	90271.58
		STEP I	44.4716	3557.72	7708.41	92500.92
		STEP J	45.5699	3645.59	7898.78	94785.39
		STEP K	46.6952	3735.61	8093.83	97126.01
		STEP L	47.8484	3827.87	8293.72	99524.67
		STEP M	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B787	OPEN SPACE SUPERINTENDENT					
		STEP A	37.0282	2962.25	6418.22	77018.65
		STEP B	37.9426	3035.40	6576.71	78920.60
		STEP C	38.8797	3110.37	6739.14	80869.77
		STEP D	39.8398	3187.18	6905.56	82866.78
		STEP E	40.8237	3265.89	7076.10	84913.29
		STEP F	41.8319	3346.55	7250.86	87010.35
		STEP G	42.8650	3429.20	7429.93	89159.20
		STEP H	43.9236	3513.88	7613.42	91361.08
		STEP I	45.0083	3600.66	7801.43	93617.26
		STEP J	46.1198	3689.58	7994.09	95929.18
		STEP K	47.2588	3780.70	8191.52	98298.30
		STEP L	48.4259	3874.07	8393.82	100725.87
		STEP M	49.6218	3969.74	8601.11	103213.34

B788 PARK DEVELOPMENT ANALYST I

	STEP A	33.2609	2660.87	5765.22	69182.67
	STEP B	34.0820	2726.56	5907.54	70890.56
	STEP C	34.9236	2793.88	6053.42	72641.08
	STEP D	35.7861	2862.88	6202.92	74435.08
	STEP E	36.6699	2933.59	6356.11	76273.39
	STEP F	37.5755	3006.04	6513.08	78157.04
	STEP G	38.5035	3080.28	6673.94	80087.28
	STEP H	39.4543	3156.34	6838.74	82064.94
	STEP I	40.4287	3234.29	7007.64	84091.69
	STEP J	41.4271	3314.16	7180.69	86168.36
	STEP K	42.4502	3396.01	7358.03	88296.41
	STEP L	43.4986	3479.88	7539.75	90477.08
	STEP M	44.5728	3565.82	7725.95	92711.42

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B789	PARK DEVELOPMENT ANALYST II					
		STEP A	36.5872	2926.97	6341.78	76101.37
		STEP B	37.4902	2999.21	6498.30	77979.61
		STEP C	38.4160	3073.28	6658.77	79905.28
		STEP D	39.3647	3149.17	6823.21	81878.57
		STEP E	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
		STEP F	41.3331	3306.64	7164.40	85972.84
		STEP G	42.3538	3388.30	7341.32	88095.90
		STEP H	43.3998	3471.98	7522.63	90271.58
		STEP I	44.4716	3557.72	7708.41	92500.92
		STEP J	45.5699	3645.59	7898.78	94785.39
		STEP K	46.6952	3735.61	8093.83	97126.01
		STEP L	47.8484	3827.87	8293.72	99524.67
		STEP M	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60

B790 PARK PLANNING & DEVELOPMT SUPT

	STEP A	37.0282	2962.25	6418.22	77018.65
	STEP B	37.9426	3035.40	6576.71	78920.60
	STEP C	38.8797	3110.37	6739.14	80869.77
	STEP D	39.8398	3187.18	6905.56	82866.78
	STEP E	40.8237	3265.89	7076.10	84913.29
	STEP F	41.8319	3346.55	7250.86	87010.35
	STEP G	42.8650	3429.20	7429.93	89159.20
	STEP H	43.9236	3513.88	7613.42	91361.08
	STEP I	45.0083	3600.66	7801.43	93617.26
	STEP J	46.1198	3689.58	7994.09	95929.18
	STEP K	47.2588	3780.70	8191.52	98298.30
	STEP L	48.4259	3874.07	8393.82	100725.87
	STEP M	49.6218	3969.74	8601.11	103213.34

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B791	PARKS SUPERINTENDENT					
		STEP A	37.0282	2962.25	6418.22	77018.65
		STEP B	37.9426	3035.40	6576.71	78920.60
		STEP C	38.8797	3110.37	6739.14	80869.77
		STEP D	39.8398	3187.18	6905.56	82866.78
		STEP E	40.8237	3265.89	7076.10	84913.29
		STEP F	41.8319	3346.55	7250.86	87010.35
		STEP G	42.8650	3429.20	7429.93	89159.20
		STEP H	43.9236	3513.88	7613.42	91361.08
		STEP I	45.0083	3600.66	7801.43	93617.26
		STEP J	46.1198	3689.58	7994.09	95929.18
		STEP K	47.2588	3780.70	8191.52	98298.30
		STEP L	48.4259	3874.07	8393.82	100725.87
		STEP M	49.6218	3969.74	8601.11	103213.34

B792 PARKS SUPERVISOR

STEP A	29.9659	2397.27	5194.08	62329.07
STEP B	30.7059	2456.47	5322.35	63868.27
STEP C	31.4642	2517.13	5453.79	65445.53
STEP D	32.2413	2579.30	5588.49	67061.90
STEP E	33.0375	2643.00	5726.50	68718.00
STEP F	33.8534	2708.27	5867.92	70415.07
STEP G	34.6895	2775.16	6012.84	72154.16
STEP H	35.5461	2843.68	6161.32	73935.88
STEP I	36.4240	2913.92	6313.49	75761.92
STEP J	37.3235	2985.88	6469.40	77632.88
STEP K	38.2453	3059.62	6629.18	79550.22
STEP L	39.1898	3135.18	6792.89	81514.78
STEP M	40.1576	3212.60	6960.65	83527.80

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B794	PARKS,REC & LIBRARIES DIRECTOR					
		STEP A	66.0802	5286.41	11453.90	137446.81
		STEP B	67.7114	5416.91	11736.64	140839.71
		STEP C	69.3836	5550.68	12026.49	144317.88
		STEP D	71.0971	5687.76	12323.49	147881.96
		STEP E	72.8529	5828.23	12627.83	151534.03
		STEP F	74.6521	5972.16	12939.69	155276.36
		STEP G	76.4957	6119.65	13259.25	159111.05
		STEP H	78.3848	6270.78	13586.69	163040.38
		STEP I	80.3206	6425.64	13922.23	167066.84
		STEP J	82.3042	6584.33	14266.06	171192.73
		STEP K	84.3368	6746.94	14618.37	175420.54
		STEP L	86.4196	6913.56	14979.39	179752.76
		STEP M	88.5538	7084.30	15349.32	184191.90

B793 PARKS,REC & LIBRARY BUS ADMSTR

STEP A	37.0442	2963.53	6420.99	77051.93
STEP B	37.9591	3036.72	6579.57	78954.92
STEP C	38.8965	3111.72	6742.06	80904.72
STEP D	39.8571	3188.56	6908.56	82902.76
STEP E	40.8414	3267.31	7079.17	84950.11
STEP F	41.8500	3348.00	7254.00	87048.00
STEP G	42.8836	3430.68	7433.15	89197.88
STEP H	43.9426	3515.40	7616.71	91400.60
STEP I	45.0278	3602.22	7804.81	93657.82
STEP J	46.1398	3691.18	7997.56	95970.78
STEP K	47.2793	3782.34	8195.07	98340.94
STEP L	48.4469	3875.75	8397.46	100769.55
STEP M	49.6433	3971.46	8604.83	103258.06

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B795	PLANNING MANAGER					
		STEP A	55.5189	4441.51	9623.27	115479.31
		STEP B	56.8894	4551.15	9860.82	118329.95
		STEP C	58.2944	4663.55	10104.36	121252.35
		STEP D	59.7340	4778.72	10353.89	124246.72
		STEP E	61.2092	4896.73	10609.59	127315.13
		STEP F	62.7208	5017.66	10871.60	130459.26
		STEP G	64.2698	5141.58	11140.09	133681.18
		STEP H	65.8570	5268.56	11415.21	136982.56
		STEP I	67.4834	5398.67	11697.12	140365.47
		STEP J	69.1500	5532.00	11986.00	143832.00
		STEP K	70.8577	5668.61	12282.00	147384.01
		STEP L	72.6076	5808.60	12585.31	151023.80
		STEP M	74.4007	5952.05	12896.12	154753.45

B796 POLICE CAPTAIN

STEP A	58.5500	4684.00	10148.67	121784.00
STEP B	59.9953	4799.62	10399.19	124790.23
STEP C	61.4769	4918.16	10656.00	127872.05
STEP D	62.9952	5039.61	10919.16	131029.98
STEP E	64.5509	5164.07	11188.82	134265.89
STEP F	66.1451	5291.60	11465.14	137581.72
STEP G	67.7786	5422.29	11748.29	140979.44
STEP H	69.4524	5556.19	12038.42	144461.07
STEP I	71.1676	5693.41	12335.72	148028.68
STEP J	72.9252	5834.02	12640.37	151684.40
STEP K	74.7262	5978.09	12952.53	155430.39
STEP L	76.5716	6125.73	13272.41	159268.90
STEP M	78.4626	6277.01	13600.18	163202.21

CITY OF ROSEVILLE

SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B797	POLICE CHIEF					
		STEP A	77.9578	6236.62	13512.68	162152.22
		STEP B	79.8820	6390.56	13846.21	166154.56
		STEP C	81.8548	6548.38	14188.16	170257.98
		STEP D	83.8763	6710.10	14538.55	174462.70
		STEP E	85.9477	6875.81	14897.60	178771.21
		STEP F	88.0702	7045.61	15265.50	183186.01
		STEP G	90.2452	7219.61	15642.50	187710.01
		STEP H	92.4739	7397.91	16028.80	192345.71
		STEP I	94.7577	7580.61	16424.66	197096.01
		STEP J	97.0978	7767.82	16830.28	201963.42
		STEP K	99.4957	7959.65	17245.92	206951.05
		STEP L	101.9529	8156.23	17671.83	212062.03
		STEP M	104.4707	8357.65	18108.25	217299.05

B798 POLICE LIEUTENANT

STEP A	53.1477	4251.82	9212.27	110547.21
STEP B	54.4596	4356.77	9439.67	113276.06
STEP C	55.8046	4464.37	9672.79	116073.53
STEP D	57.1827	4574.62	9911.67	118940.08
STEP E	58.5949	4687.59	10156.45	121877.43
STEP F	60.0420	4803.36	10407.28	124887.31
STEP G	61.5248	4921.98	10664.29	127971.53
STEP H	63.0442	5043.54	10927.66	131131.91
STEP I	64.6011	5168.09	11197.53	134370.35
STEP J	66.1965	5295.72	11474.06	137688.76
STEP K	67.8313	5426.50	11757.43	141089.12
STEP L	69.5065	5560.52	12047.79	144573.45
STEP M	71.2230	5697.84	12345.32	148143.84

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B799	POLICE SERVICES ADMINISTRATOR					
		STEP A	41.4691	3317.52	7187.97	86255.72
		STEP B	42.4929	3399.43	7365.43	88385.23
		STEP C	43.5424	3483.39	7547.34	90568.19
		STEP D	44.6177	3569.41	7733.73	92804.81
		STEP E	45.7196	3657.56	7924.73	95096.76
		STEP F	46.8486	3747.88	8120.42	97445.08
		STEP G	48.0056	3840.44	8320.97	99851.64
		STEP H	49.1912	3935.29	8526.47	102317.69
		STEP I	50.4060	4032.48	8737.04	104844.48
		STEP J	51.6508	4132.06	8952.80	107433.66
		STEP K	52.9264	4234.11	9173.90	110086.91
		STEP L	54.2335	4338.68	9400.47	112805.68
		STEP M	55.5728	4445.82	9632.61	115591.42

B800 POLICE SOCIAL SVCS ADMINSTR

	STEP A	43.9043	3512.34	7610.07	91320.94
	STEP B	44.9880	3599.04	7797.92	93575.04
	STEP C	46.0990	3687.92	7990.49	95885.92
	STEP D	47.2374	3778.99	8187.81	98253.79
	STEP E	48.4040	3872.32	8390.02	100680.32
	STEP F	49.5994	3967.95	8597.22	103166.75
	STEP G	50.8243	4065.94	8809.54	105714.54
	STEP H	52.0795	4166.36	9027.11	108325.36
	STEP I	53.3656	4269.24	9250.03	111000.44
	STEP J	54.6835	4374.68	9478.47	113741.68
	STEP K	56.0340	4482.72	9712.56	116550.72
	STEP L	57.4178	4593.42	9952.41	119429.02
	STEP M	58.8358	4706.86	10198.20	122378.46

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B801	POWER ENGINEERING MANAGER					
		STEP A	67.5845	5406.76	11714.64	140575.76
		STEP B	69.2528	5540.22	12003.81	144045.82
		STEP C	70.9631	5677.04	12300.27	147603.24
		STEP D	72.7156	5817.24	12604.03	151248.44
		STEP E	74.5114	5960.91	12915.30	154983.71
		STEP F	76.3515	6108.12	13234.26	158811.12
		STEP G	78.2371	6258.96	13561.09	162733.16
		STEP H	80.1692	6413.53	13895.99	166751.93
		STEP I	82.1491	6571.92	14239.17	170870.12
		STEP J	84.1778	6734.22	14590.81	175089.82
		STEP K	86.2567	6900.53	14951.16	179413.93
		STEP L	88.3869	7070.95	15320.39	183844.75
		STEP M	90.5697	7245.57	15698.74	188384.97

B802 POWER GENERATION SUPERTINDENT

	STEP A	62.0272	4962.17	10751.38	129016.57
	STEP B	63.5584	5084.67	11016.78	132201.47
	STEP C	65.1281	5210.24	11288.87	135466.44
	STEP D	66.7365	5338.92	11567.66	138811.92
	STEP E	68.3846	5470.76	11853.33	142239.96
	STEP F	70.0734	5605.87	12146.05	145752.67
	STEP G	71.8040	5744.32	12446.02	149352.32
	STEP H	73.5772	5886.17	12753.38	153040.57
	STEP I	75.3943	6031.54	13068.34	156820.14
	STEP J	77.2562	6180.49	13391.07	160692.89
	STEP K	79.1641	6333.12	13721.77	164661.32
	STEP L	81.1192	6489.53	14060.66	168727.93
	STEP M	83.1225	6649.80	14407.90	172894.80

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B803	POWER PLANT OPS & MAINT SUPV					
		STEP A	59.0692	4725.53	10238.66	122863.93
		STEP B	60.5273	4842.18	10491.39	125896.78
		STEP C	62.0221	4961.76	10750.49	129005.96
		STEP D	63.5538	5084.30	11015.99	132191.90
		STEP E	65.1233	5209.86	11288.03	135456.46
		STEP F	66.7316	5338.52	11566.81	138801.72
		STEP G	68.3796	5470.36	11852.46	142229.56
		STEP H	70.0683	5605.46	12145.17	145742.06
		STEP I	71.7987	5743.89	12445.10	149341.29
		STEP J	73.5719	5885.75	12752.46	153029.55
		STEP K	75.3888	6031.10	13067.39	156808.70
		STEP L	77.2506	6180.04	13390.10	160681.24
		STEP M	79.1584	6332.67	13720.78	164649.47

B804 POWER SUPPLY & PORTFOLIO ADMST

STEP A	64.1688	5133.50	11122.59	133471.10
STEP B	65.7529	5260.23	11397.16	136766.03
STEP C	67.3767	5390.13	11678.62	140143.53
STEP D	69.0406	5523.24	11967.03	143604.44
STEP E	70.7457	5659.65	12262.58	147151.05
STEP F	72.4928	5799.42	12565.41	150785.02
STEP G	74.2831	5942.64	12875.73	154508.84
STEP H	76.1176	6089.40	13193.71	158324.60
STEP I	77.9974	6239.79	13519.54	162234.59
STEP J	79.9236	6393.88	13853.42	166241.08
STEP K	81.8974	6551.79	14195.54	170346.59
STEP L	83.9199	6713.59	14546.11	174553.39
STEP M	85.9924	6879.39	14905.34	178864.19

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B805	PREVENTATIVE MAINT SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	42.7162	3417.29	7404.14	88849.69
		STEP B	43.7704	3501.63	7586.86	91042.43
		STEP C	44.8514	3588.11	7774.24	93290.91
		STEP D	45.9590	3676.72	7966.22	95594.72
		STEP E	47.0940	3767.52	8162.96	97955.52
		STEP F	48.2571	3860.56	8364.56	100374.76
		STEP G	49.4488	3955.90	8571.12	102853.50
		STEP H	50.6700	4053.60	8782.80	105393.60
		STEP I	51.9214	4153.71	8999.70	107996.51
		STEP J	53.2036	4256.28	9221.95	110663.48
		STEP K	54.5175	4361.40	9449.70	113396.40
		STEP L	55.8639	4469.11	9683.07	116196.91
		STEP M	57.2435	4579.48	9922.20	119066.48

B806 PRINCIPAL ENGINEER

STEP A	50.2219	4017.75	8705.12	104461.55
STEP B	51.4615	4116.92	8919.99	107039.92
STEP C	52.7324	4218.59	9140.28	109683.39
STEP D	54.0347	4322.77	9366.01	112392.17
STEP E	55.3691	4429.52	9597.31	115167.72
STEP F	56.7365	4538.92	9834.32	118011.92
STEP G	58.1377	4651.01	10077.20	120926.41
STEP H	59.5735	4765.88	10326.07	123912.88
STEP I	61.0447	4883.57	10581.08	126972.97
STEP J	62.5522	5004.17	10842.38	130108.57
STEP K	64.0970	5127.76	11110.14	133321.76
STEP L	65.6800	5254.40	11384.53	136614.40
STEP M	67.3020	5384.16	11665.68	139988.16

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B807	PRINCIPAL PLANNER					
		STEP A	46.3792	3710.33	8039.06	96468.73
		STEP B	47.5241	3801.92	8237.51	98850.12
		STEP C	48.6977	3895.81	8440.93	101291.21
		STEP D	49.9004	3992.03	8649.40	103792.83
		STEP E	51.1327	4090.61	8863.00	106356.01
		STEP F	52.3955	4191.64	9081.88	108982.64
		STEP G	53.6895	4295.16	9306.18	111674.16
		STEP H	55.0154	4401.23	9536.00	114432.03
		STEP I	56.3740	4509.92	9771.49	117257.92
		STEP J	57.7663	4621.30	10012.82	120153.90
		STEP K	59.1928	4735.42	10260.08	123121.02
		STEP L	60.6547	4852.37	10513.48	126161.77
		STEP M	62.1526	4972.20	10773.11	129277.40

B808 PUB AFFAIRS&COMMUNICAT ADMNSTR

	STEP A	43.9043	3512.34	7610.07	91320.94
	STEP B	44.9880	3599.04	7797.92	93575.04
	STEP C	46.0990	3687.92	7990.49	95885.92
	STEP D	47.2374	3778.99	8187.81	98253.79
	STEP E	48.4040	3872.32	8390.02	100680.32
	STEP F	49.5994	3967.95	8597.22	103166.75
	STEP G	50.8243	4065.94	8809.54	105714.54
	STEP H	52.0795	4166.36	9027.11	108325.36
	STEP I	53.3656	4269.24	9250.03	111000.44
	STEP J	54.6835	4374.68	9478.47	113741.68
	STEP K	56.0340	4482.72	9712.56	116550.72
	STEP L	57.4178	4593.42	9952.41	119429.02
	STEP M	58.8358	4706.86	10198.20	122378.46

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B809	PUBLIC AFFAIRS&COMMNCT DIRECTOR					
		STEP A	55.5188	4441.50	9623.25	115479.10
		STEP B	56.8894	4551.15	9860.82	118329.95
		STEP C	58.2943	4663.54	10104.34	121252.14
		STEP D	59.7339	4778.71	10353.87	124246.51
		STEP E	61.2091	4896.72	10609.57	127314.92
		STEP F	62.7207	5017.65	10871.58	130459.05
		STEP G	64.2697	5141.57	11140.08	133680.97
		STEP H	65.8569	5268.55	11415.19	136982.35
		STEP I	67.4833	5398.66	11697.10	140365.26
		STEP J	69.1499	5531.99	11985.98	143831.79
		STEP K	70.8576	5668.60	12281.98	147383.80
		STEP L	72.6075	5808.60	12585.30	151023.60
		STEP M	74.4006	5952.04	12896.10	154753.24
B810	PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER					
		STEP A	40.2377	3219.01	6974.53	83694.31
		STEP B	41.2309	3298.47	7146.69	85760.30
		STEP C	42.2492	3379.93	7323.19	87878.24
		STEP D	43.2925	3463.40	7504.04	90048.48
		STEP E	44.3617	3548.94	7689.36	92272.31
		STEP F	45.4572	3636.58	7879.26	94551.07
		STEP G	46.5799	3726.39	8073.84	96886.11
		STEP H	47.7302	3818.42	8273.23	99278.80
		STEP I	48.9089	3912.72	8477.55	101730.59
		STEP J	50.1168	4009.34	8686.91	104242.93
		STEP K	51.3545	4108.36	8901.44	106817.32
		STEP L	52.6227	4209.82	9121.27	109455.28
		STEP M	53.9223	4313.78	9346.53	112158.38

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B811	PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR					
		STEP A	60.9892	4879.13	10571.46	126857.53
		STEP B	62.4949	4999.59	10832.44	129989.39
		STEP C	64.0383	5123.06	11099.97	133199.66
		STEP D	65.6198	5249.58	11374.09	136489.18
		STEP E	67.2403	5379.22	11654.98	139859.82
		STEP F	68.9009	5512.07	11942.82	143313.87
		STEP G	70.6024	5648.19	12237.74	146852.99
		STEP H	72.3460	5787.68	12539.97	150479.68
		STEP I	74.1327	5930.61	12849.66	154196.01
		STEP J	75.9635	6077.08	13167.00	158004.08
		STEP K	77.8395	6227.16	13492.18	161906.16
		STEP L	79.7618	6380.94	13825.37	165904.54
		STEP M	81.7316	6538.52	14166.81	170001.72

B812 PURCHASING & WAREHOUSE MANAGER

STEP A	41.1306	3290.45	7129.30	85551.59
STEP B	42.1459	3371.67	7305.29	87663.42
STEP C	43.1867	3454.94	7485.70	89828.36
STEP D	44.2533	3540.26	7670.56	92046.76
STEP E	45.3461	3627.69	7860.00	94319.95
STEP F	46.4660	3717.28	8054.11	96649.27
STEP G	47.6135	3809.08	8253.01	99036.12
STEP H	48.7894	3903.15	8456.83	101481.92
STEP I	49.9943	3999.54	8665.68	103988.12
STEP J	51.2289	4098.32	8879.68	106556.21
STEP K	52.4941	4199.53	9098.98	109187.72
STEP L	53.7905	4303.24	9323.68	111884.22
STEP M	55.1189	4409.51	9553.94	114647.31

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B813	RECREATION MANAGER					
		STEP A	41.2998	3303.98	7158.63	85903.58
		STEP B	42.3197	3385.57	7335.41	88024.97
		STEP C	43.3649	3469.19	7516.58	90198.99
		STEP D	44.4358	3554.86	7702.20	92426.46
		STEP E	45.5332	3642.65	7892.42	94709.05
		STEP F	46.6577	3732.61	8087.33	97048.01
		STEP G	47.8099	3824.79	8287.04	99444.59
		STEP H	48.9907	3919.25	8491.72	101900.65
		STEP I	50.2005	4016.04	8701.42	104417.04
		STEP J	51.4403	4115.22	8916.31	106995.82
		STEP K	52.7106	4216.84	9136.50	109638.04
		STEP L	54.0124	4320.99	9362.14	112345.79
		STEP M	55.3463	4427.70	9593.35	115120.30

B814 RECREATION SUPERINTENDENT

STEP A	35.8423	2867.38	6212.66	74551.98
STEP B	36.7275	2938.20	6366.10	76393.20
STEP C	37.6345	3010.76	6523.31	78279.76
STEP D	38.5639	3085.11	6684.40	80212.91
STEP E	39.5163	3161.30	6849.49	82193.90
STEP F	40.4922	3239.37	7018.64	84223.77
STEP G	41.4922	3319.37	7191.98	86303.77
STEP H	42.5169	3401.35	7369.59	88435.15
STEP I	43.5669	3485.35	7551.59	90619.15
STEP J	44.6428	3571.42	7738.08	92857.02
STEP K	45.7453	3659.62	7929.18	95150.22
STEP L	46.8750	3750.00	8125.00	97500.00
STEP M	48.0326	3842.60	8325.65	99907.80

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B815	RECREATION SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	31.2307	2498.45	5413.32	64959.85
		STEP B	32.0020	2560.16	5547.01	66564.16
		STEP C	32.7923	2623.38	5684.00	68207.98
		STEP D	33.6022	2688.17	5824.38	69892.57
		STEP E	34.4320	2754.56	5968.21	71618.56
		STEP F	35.2823	2822.58	6115.59	73387.18
		STEP G	36.1537	2892.29	6266.64	75199.69
		STEP H	37.0465	2963.72	6421.39	77056.72
		STEP I	37.9614	3036.91	6579.97	78959.71
		STEP J	38.8989	3111.91	6742.47	80909.71
		STEP K	39.8596	3188.76	6909.00	82907.96
		STEP L	40.8439	3267.51	7079.60	84955.31
		STEP M	41.8526	3348.20	7254.45	87053.40

B846 REFUSE & STORMWATER MANAGER

STEP A	56.5013	4520.10	9793.55	117522.70
STEP B	57.8958	4631.66	10035.27	120423.26
STEP C	59.3256	4746.04	10283.10	123397.24
STEP D	60.7907	4863.25	10537.05	126444.65
STEP E	62.2920	4983.36	10797.28	129567.36
STEP F	63.8304	5106.43	11063.93	132767.23
STEP G	65.4068	5232.54	11337.17	136046.14
STEP H	67.0220	5361.76	11617.14	139405.76
STEP I	68.6772	5494.17	11904.04	142848.57
STEP J	70.3733	5629.86	12198.03	146376.46
STEP K	72.1112	5768.89	12499.27	149991.29
STEP L	73.8921	5911.36	12807.96	153695.56
STEP M	75.7169	6057.35	13124.26	157491.15

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B816	REFUSE SUPERINTENDENT					
		STEP A	40.0712	3205.69	6945.67	83348.09
		STEP B	41.0602	3284.81	7117.10	85405.21
		STEP C	42.0743	3365.94	7292.87	87514.54
		STEP D	43.1133	3449.06	7472.97	89675.66
		STEP E	44.1781	3534.24	7657.53	91890.44
		STEP F	45.2691	3621.52	7846.64	94159.72
		STEP G	46.3871	3710.96	8040.43	96485.16
		STEP H	47.5326	3802.60	8238.98	98867.80
		STEP I	48.7065	3896.52	8442.46	101309.52
		STEP J	49.9093	3992.74	8650.94	103811.34
		STEP K	51.1419	4091.35	8864.59	106375.15
		STEP L	52.4049	4192.39	9083.51	109002.19
		STEP M	53.6991	4295.92	9307.84	111694.12

B817 REFUSE SUPERVISOR

STEP A	33.7592	2700.73	5851.59	70219.13
STEP B	34.5920	2767.36	5995.94	71951.36
STEP C	35.4463	2835.70	6144.02	73728.30
STEP D	36.3217	2905.73	6295.76	75549.13
STEP E	37.2187	2977.49	6451.24	77414.89
STEP F	38.1379	3051.03	6610.56	79326.83
STEP G	39.0797	3126.37	6773.81	81285.77
STEP H	40.0448	3203.58	6941.09	83293.18
STEP I	41.0338	3282.70	7112.52	85350.30
STEP J	42.0471	3363.76	7288.16	87457.96
STEP K	43.0855	3446.84	7468.15	89617.84
STEP L	44.1496	3531.96	7652.59	91831.16
STEP M	45.2399	3619.19	7841.58	94098.99

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B818	REFUSE UTILITY MANAGER					
		STEP A	50.8512	4068.09	8814.20	105770.49
		STEP B	52.1063	4168.50	9031.75	108381.10
		STEP C	53.3931	4271.44	9254.80	111057.64
		STEP D	54.7117	4376.93	9483.36	113800.33
		STEP E	56.0629	4485.03	9717.56	116610.83
		STEP F	57.4474	4595.79	9957.54	119490.59
		STEP G	58.8662	4709.29	10203.47	122441.69
		STEP H	60.3199	4825.59	10455.44	125465.39
		STEP I	61.8096	4944.76	10713.66	128563.96
		STEP J	63.3360	5066.88	10978.24	131738.88
		STEP K	64.9002	5192.01	11249.36	134992.41
		STEP L	66.5029	5320.23	11527.16	138326.03
		STEP M	68.1453	5451.62	11811.85	141742.22

B819 RISK MANAGER

Step A	50.2260	4018.08	8705.85	104470.16
Step B	51.4659	4117.27	8920.75	107048.99
Step C	52.7369	4218.95	9141.06	109692.67
Step D	54.0393	4323.14	9366.80	112401.65
Step E	55.3738	4429.90	9598.13	115177.52
Step F	56.7413	4539.31	9835.16	118021.94
Step G	58.1426	4651.41	10078.05	120936.61
Step H	59.5785	4766.28	10326.94	123923.26
Step I	61.0498	4883.99	10581.97	126983.67
Step J	62.5575	5004.60	10843.30	130119.66
Step K	64.1024	5128.20	11111.09	133333.09
Step L	65.6855	5254.84	11385.49	136625.89
Step M	67.3077	5384.62	11666.67	140000.00

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B820	SAFETY COORDINATOR					
		STEP A	36.5871	2926.96	6341.76	76101.16
		STEP B	37.4902	2999.21	6498.30	77979.61
		STEP C	38.4160	3073.28	6658.77	79905.28
		STEP D	39.3647	3149.17	6823.21	81878.57
		STEP E	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
		STEP F	41.3331	3306.64	7164.40	85972.84
		STEP G	42.3538	3388.30	7341.32	88095.90
		STEP H	43.3998	3471.98	7522.63	90271.58
		STEP I	44.4716	3557.72	7708.41	92500.92
		STEP J	45.5699	3645.59	7898.78	94785.39
		STEP K	46.6952	3735.61	8093.83	97126.01
		STEP L	47.8484	3827.87	8293.72	99524.67
		STEP M	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60

B821 SR BUSINESS SYSTEMS ANALYST

	STEP A	34.7663	2781.30	6026.15	72313.90
	STEP B	35.6244	2849.95	6174.89	74098.75
	STEP C	36.5042	2920.33	6327.39	75928.73
	STEP D	37.4057	2992.45	6483.65	77803.85
	STEP E	38.3294	3066.35	6643.76	79725.15
	STEP F	39.2760	3142.08	6807.84	81694.08
	STEP G	40.2460	3219.68	6975.97	83711.68
	STEP H	41.2399	3299.19	7148.24	85778.99
	STEP I	42.2584	3380.67	7324.78	87897.47
	STEP J	43.3020	3464.16	7505.68	90068.16
	STEP K	44.3713	3549.70	7691.02	92292.30
	STEP L	45.4671	3637.36	7880.96	94571.56
	STEP M	46.5900	3727.20	8075.60	96907.20

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B822	SR DATABASE ANALYST					
		STEP A	35.3507	2828.05	6127.45	73529.45
		STEP B	36.2237	2897.89	6278.77	75345.29
		STEP C	37.1183	2969.46	6433.83	77206.06
		STEP D	38.0350	3042.80	6592.73	79112.80
		STEP E	38.9743	3117.94	6755.54	81066.54
		STEP F	39.9368	3194.94	6922.37	83068.54
		STEP G	40.9231	3273.84	7093.33	85120.04
		STEP H	41.9337	3354.69	7268.50	87222.09
		STEP I	42.9693	3437.54	7448.01	89376.14
		STEP J	44.0305	3522.44	7631.95	91583.44
		STEP K	45.1179	3609.43	7820.43	93845.23
		STEP L	46.2321	3698.56	8013.56	96162.76
		STEP M	47.3738	3789.90	8211.45	98537.50

B823 SR DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

STEP A	61.7590	4940.72	10704.90	128458.77
STEP B	63.2835	5062.68	10969.15	131629.77
STEP C	64.8464	5187.71	11240.04	134880.49
STEP D	66.4478	5315.83	11517.63	138211.50
STEP E	68.0888	5447.11	11802.06	141624.77
STEP F	69.7704	5581.63	12093.53	145122.34
STEP G	71.4934	5719.47	12392.19	148706.28
STEP H	73.2590	5860.72	12698.23	152378.73
STEP I	75.0682	6005.46	13011.82	156141.88
STEP J	76.9221	6153.77	13333.16	159997.96
STEP K	78.8218	6305.74	13662.44	163949.27
STEP L	80.7683	6461.47	13999.85	167998.16
STEP M	82.7630	6621.04	14345.59	172147.04

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B824	SR ELECTRIC BUSINESS ANALYST					
		STEP A	47.5668	3805.34	8244.91	98938.94
		STEP B	48.7411	3899.28	8448.45	101381.48
		STEP C	49.9448	3995.58	8657.09	103885.18
		STEP D	51.1782	4094.25	8870.88	106450.65
		STEP E	52.4421	4195.36	9089.96	109079.56
		STEP F	53.7372	4298.97	9314.44	111773.37
		STEP G	55.0643	4405.14	9544.47	114533.74
		STEP H	56.4242	4513.93	9780.19	117362.33
		STEP I	57.8177	4625.41	10021.73	120260.81
		STEP J	59.2455	4739.64	10269.22	123230.64
		STEP K	60.7087	4856.69	10522.84	126274.09
		STEP L	62.2079	4976.63	10782.70	129392.43
		STEP M	63.7442	5099.53	11048.99	132587.93

B825 SR ENERGY SERVICES ACCOUNT REP

STEP A	47.6233	3809.86	8254.70	99056.46
STEP B	48.7987	3903.89	8458.44	101501.29
STEP C	50.0039	4000.31	8667.34	104008.11
STEP D	51.2388	4099.10	8881.39	106576.70
STEP E	52.5042	4200.33	9100.72	109208.73
STEP F	53.8008	4304.06	9325.47	111905.66
STEP G	55.1295	4410.36	9555.78	114669.36
STEP H	56.4909	4519.27	9791.75	117501.07
STEP I	57.8860	4630.88	10033.57	120402.88
STEP J	59.3156	4745.24	10281.37	123376.44
STEP K	60.7805	4862.44	10535.28	126423.44
STEP L	62.2815	4982.52	10795.46	129545.52
STEP M	63.8196	5105.56	11062.06	132744.76

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B826	SR ENGINEER					
		STEP A	42.7247	3417.97	7405.61	88867.37
		STEP B	43.7794	3502.35	7588.42	91061.15
		STEP C	44.8605	3588.84	7775.82	93309.84
		STEP D	45.9684	3677.47	7967.85	95614.27
		STEP E	47.1037	3768.29	8164.64	97975.69
		STEP F	48.2669	3861.35	8366.26	100395.15
		STEP G	49.4589	3956.71	8572.87	102874.51
		STEP H	50.6804	4054.43	8784.60	105415.23
		STEP I	51.9320	4154.56	9001.54	108018.56
		STEP J	53.2145	4257.16	9223.84	110686.16
		STEP K	54.5287	4362.29	9451.64	113419.69
		STEP L	55.8753	4470.02	9685.05	116220.62
		STEP M	57.2552	4580.41	9924.23	119090.81

B827 SR HUMAN RESOURCES ANALYST

STEP A	38.4165	3073.32	6658.86	79906.32
STEP B	39.3646	3149.16	6823.19	81878.36
STEP C	40.3367	3226.93	6991.69	83900.33
STEP D	41.3329	3306.63	7164.36	85972.43
STEP E	42.3537	3388.29	7341.30	88095.69
STEP F	43.3996	3471.96	7522.59	90271.16
STEP G	44.4714	3557.71	7708.37	92500.51
STEP H	45.5697	3645.57	7898.74	94784.97
STEP I	46.6951	3735.60	8093.81	97125.80
STEP J	47.8483	3827.86	8293.70	99524.46
STEP K	49.0299	3922.39	8498.51	101982.19
STEP L	50.2408	4019.26	8708.40	104500.86
STEP M	51.4815	4118.52	8923.46	107081.52

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B828	SR IT ANALYST					
		STEP A	34.8115	2784.92	6033.99	72407.92
		STEP B	35.6707	2853.65	6182.92	74195.05
		STEP C	36.5516	2924.12	6335.61	76027.32
		STEP D	37.4543	2996.34	6492.07	77904.94
		STEP E	38.3793	3070.34	6652.41	79828.94
		STEP F	39.3271	3146.16	6816.69	81800.36
		STEP G	40.2983	3223.86	6985.03	83820.46
		STEP H	41.2935	3303.48	7157.54	85890.48
		STEP I	42.3133	3385.06	7334.30	88011.66
		STEP J	43.3583	3468.66	7515.43	90185.26
		STEP K	44.4291	3554.32	7701.04	92412.52
		STEP L	45.5263	3642.10	7891.22	94694.70
		STEP M	46.6506	3732.04	8086.10	97033.24

B829 SR PLANNER

	STEP A	40.3307	3226.45	6990.65	83887.85
	STEP B	41.3263	3306.10	7163.22	85958.70
	STEP C	42.3469	3387.75	7340.12	88081.55
	STEP D	43.3927	3471.41	7521.40	90256.81
	STEP E	44.4643	3557.14	7707.14	92485.74
	STEP F	45.5624	3644.99	7897.48	94769.79
	STEP G	46.6876	3735.00	8092.51	97110.20
	STEP H	47.8406	3827.24	8292.37	99508.44
	STEP I	49.0220	3921.76	8497.14	101965.76
	STEP J	50.2327	4018.61	8707.00	104484.01
	STEP K	51.4732	4117.85	8922.02	107064.25
	STEP L	52.7444	4219.55	9142.36	109708.35
	STEP M	54.0470	4323.76	9368.14	112417.76

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B830	SR POWER ENGINEER					
		STEP A	59.8134	4785.07	10367.65	124411.87
		STEP B	61.2900	4903.20	10623.60	127483.20
		STEP C	62.8036	5024.28	10885.95	130631.48
		STEP D	64.3546	5148.36	11154.79	133857.56
		STEP E	65.9439	5275.51	11430.27	137163.31
		STEP F	67.5725	5405.80	11712.56	140550.80
		STEP G	69.2412	5539.29	12001.80	144021.69
		STEP H	70.9512	5676.09	12298.20	147578.49
		STEP I	72.7034	5816.27	12601.92	151223.07
		STEP J	74.4989	5959.91	12913.14	154957.71
		STEP K	76.3387	6107.09	13232.04	158784.49
		STEP L	78.2240	6257.92	13558.82	162705.92
		STEP M	80.1558	6412.46	13893.67	166724.06

B831 SR POWER PLANT ENGINEER

STEP A	59.8134	4785.07	10367.65	124411.87
STEP B	61.2900	4903.20	10623.60	127483.20
STEP C	62.8036	5024.28	10885.95	130631.48
STEP D	64.3546	5148.36	11154.79	133857.56
STEP E	65.9439	5275.51	11430.27	137163.31
STEP F	67.5725	5405.80	11712.56	140550.80
STEP G	69.2412	5539.29	12001.80	144021.69
STEP H	70.9512	5676.09	12298.20	147578.49
STEP I	72.7034	5816.27	12601.92	151223.07
STEP J	74.4989	5959.91	12913.14	154957.71
STEP K	76.3387	6107.09	13232.04	158784.49
STEP L	78.2240	6257.92	13558.82	162705.92
STEP M	80.1558	6412.46	13893.67	166724.06

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B833	STREET MAINT SUPERINTENDENT					
		STEP A	42.7162	3417.29	7404.14	88849.69
		STEP B	43.7704	3501.63	7586.86	91042.43
		STEP C	44.8514	3588.11	7774.24	93290.91
		STEP D	45.9590	3676.72	7966.22	95594.72
		STEP E	47.0940	3767.52	8162.96	97955.52
		STEP F	48.2571	3860.56	8364.56	100374.76
		STEP G	49.4488	3955.90	8571.12	102853.50
		STEP H	50.6700	4053.60	8782.80	105393.60
		STEP I	51.9214	4153.71	8999.70	107996.51
		STEP J	53.2036	4256.28	9221.95	110663.48
		STEP K	54.5175	4361.40	9449.70	113396.40
		STEP L	55.8639	4469.11	9683.07	116196.91
		STEP M	57.2435	4579.48	9922.20	119066.48

B832 STREET MAINT SUPERVISOR

STEP A	32.5766	2606.12	5646.60	67759.24
STEP B	33.3807	2670.46	5785.99	69431.87
STEP C	34.2051	2736.41	5928.88	71146.56
STEP D	35.0498	2803.98	6075.30	72903.59
STEP E	35.9154	2873.23	6225.33	74704.02
STEP F	36.8024	2944.19	6379.08	76548.91
STEP G	37.7112	3016.90	6536.61	78439.36
STEP H	38.6425	3091.40	6698.04	80376.50
STEP I	39.5969	3167.75	6863.46	82361.48
STEP J	40.5747	3245.98	7032.96	84395.48
STEP K	41.5768	3326.14	7206.64	86479.71
STEP L	42.6036	3408.28	7384.62	88615.41
STEP M	43.6557	3492.46	7566.99	90803.86

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B834	URBAN FORESTER					
		STEP A	34.8445	2787.56	6039.71	72476.56
		STEP B	35.7046	2856.36	6188.79	74265.56
		STEP C	36.5863	2926.90	6341.62	76099.50
		STEP D	37.4899	2999.19	6498.24	77978.99
		STEP E	38.4157	3073.25	6658.72	79904.65
		STEP F	39.3644	3149.15	6823.16	81877.95
		STEP G	40.3366	3226.92	6991.67	83900.12
		STEP H	41.3327	3306.61	7164.33	85972.01
		STEP I	42.3535	3388.28	7341.27	88095.28
		STEP J	43.3995	3471.96	7522.58	90270.96
		STEP K	44.4713	3557.70	7708.35	92500.30
		STEP L	45.5695	3645.56	7898.71	94784.56
		STEP M	46.6949	3735.59	8093.78	97125.39

B835 WATER CONSERVATION ADMINSTR

STEP A	38.4381	3075.04	6662.60	79951.24
STEP B	39.3871	3150.96	6827.09	81925.16
STEP C	40.3598	3228.78	6995.69	83948.38
STEP D	41.3565	3308.52	7168.46	86021.52
STEP E	42.3778	3390.22	7345.48	88145.82
STEP F	43.4244	3473.95	7526.89	90322.75
STEP G	44.4968	3559.74	7712.77	92553.34
STEP H	45.5957	3647.65	7903.25	94839.05
STEP I	46.7217	3737.73	8098.42	97181.13
STEP J	47.8756	3830.04	8298.43	99581.24
STEP K	49.0579	3924.63	8503.36	102040.43
STEP L	50.2694	4021.55	8713.36	104560.35
STEP M	51.5109	4120.87	8928.55	107142.67

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B836	WATER DISTRIBUTION SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	34.8445	2787.56	6039.71	72476.56
		STEP B	35.7046	2856.36	6188.79	74265.56
		STEP C	36.5863	2926.90	6341.62	76099.50
		STEP D	37.4899	2999.19	6498.24	77978.99
		STEP E	38.4157	3073.25	6658.72	79904.65
		STEP F	39.3644	3149.15	6823.16	81877.95
		STEP G	40.3366	3226.92	6991.67	83900.12
		STEP H	41.3327	3306.61	7164.33	85972.01
		STEP I	42.3535	3388.28	7341.27	88095.28
		STEP J	43.3995	3471.96	7522.58	90270.96
		STEP K	44.4713	3557.70	7708.35	92500.30
		STEP L	45.5695	3645.56	7898.71	94784.56
		STEP M	46.6949	3735.59	8093.78	97125.39

B850 WATER DISTRIBUTION SUPT

STEP A	42.0794	3366.35	7293.76	87525.15
STEP B	43.7636	3501.08	7585.69	91028.28
STEP C	44.8444	3587.55	7773.02	93276.35
STEP D	45.9519	3676.15	7965.00	95579.95
STEP E	47.0867	3766.93	8161.69	97940.33
STEP F	48.2495	3859.96	8363.24	100358.96
STEP G	49.4411	3955.28	8569.79	102837.48
STEP H	50.6621	4052.96	8781.43	105377.16
STEP I	51.9133	4153.06	8998.30	107979.66
STEP J	53.1953	4255.62	9220.51	110646.22
STEP K	54.5090	4360.72	9448.22	113378.72
STEP L	55.8552	4468.41	9681.56	116178.81
STEP M	57.2346	4578.76	9920.66	119047.96

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B837	WATER QUALITY LAB SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	36.5854	2926.83	6341.46	76097.63
		STEP B	37.4883	2999.06	6497.97	77975.66
		STEP C	38.4141	3073.12	6658.44	79901.32
		STEP D	39.3628	3149.02	6822.88	81874.62
		STEP E	40.3349	3226.79	6991.38	83896.59
		STEP F	41.3310	3306.48	7164.04	85968.48
		STEP G	42.3517	3388.13	7340.96	88091.53
		STEP H	43.3977	3471.81	7522.26	90267.21
		STEP I	44.4694	3557.55	7708.02	92496.35
		STEP J	45.5676	3645.40	7898.38	94780.60
		STEP K	46.6930	3735.44	8093.45	97121.44
		STEP L	47.8461	3827.68	8293.32	99519.88
		STEP M	49.0277	3922.21	8498.13	101977.61
B838	WATER TRMT PLT CHIEF OPERATOR					
		STEP A	41.8116	3344.92	7247.34	86968.12
		STEP B	42.8437	3427.49	7426.24	89114.89
		STEP C	43.9018	3512.14	7609.64	91315.74
		STEP D	44.9859	3598.87	7797.55	93570.67
		STEP E	46.0969	3687.75	7990.12	95881.55
		STEP F	47.2353	3778.82	8187.45	98249.42
		STEP G	48.4019	3872.15	8389.66	100675.95
		STEP H	49.5972	3967.77	8596.84	103162.17
		STEP I	50.8220	4065.76	8809.14	105709.76
		STEP J	52.0771	4166.16	9026.69	108320.36
		STEP K	53.3632	4269.05	9249.62	110995.45
		STEP L	54.6811	4374.48	9478.05	113736.68
		STEP M	56.0315	4482.52	9712.12	116545.52

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B839	WATER UTILITY MANAGER					
		STEP A	56.5013	4520.10	9793.55	117522.70
		STEP B	57.8958	4631.66	10035.27	120423.26
		STEP C	59.3256	4746.04	10283.10	123397.24
		STEP D	60.7907	4863.25	10537.05	126444.65
		STEP E	62.2920	4983.36	10797.28	129567.36
		STEP F	63.8304	5106.43	11063.93	132767.23
		STEP G	65.4068	5232.54	11337.17	136046.14
		STEP H	67.0220	5361.76	11617.14	139405.76
		STEP I	68.6772	5494.17	11904.04	142848.57
		STEP J	70.3733	5629.86	12198.03	146376.46
		STEP K	72.1112	5768.89	12499.27	149991.29
		STEP L	73.8921	5911.36	12807.96	153695.56
		STEP M	75.7169	6057.35	13124.26	157491.15

B840 WSTWTR COLLECTION SUPT

STEP A	42.7094	3416.75	7402.96	88835.55
STEP B	43.7636	3501.08	7585.69	91028.28
STEP C	44.8444	3587.55	7773.02	93276.35
STEP D	45.9519	3676.15	7965.00	95579.95
STEP E	47.0867	3766.93	8161.69	97940.33
STEP F	48.2496	3859.96	8363.26	100359.16
STEP G	49.4411	3955.28	8569.79	102837.48
STEP H	50.6621	4052.96	8781.43	105377.16
STEP I	51.9133	4153.06	8998.30	107979.66
STEP J	53.1953	4255.62	9220.51	110646.22
STEP K	54.5090	4360.72	9448.22	113378.72
STEP L	55.8552	4468.41	9681.56	116178.81
STEP M	57.2346	4578.76	9920.66	119047.96

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B841	WSTWTR COLLECTION SUPV					
		STEP A	34.8446	2787.56	6039.73	72476.76
		STEP B	35.7046	2856.36	6188.79	74265.56
		STEP C	36.5863	2926.90	6341.62	76099.50
		STEP D	37.4899	2999.19	6498.24	77978.99
		STEP E	38.4157	3073.25	6658.72	79904.65
		STEP F	39.3644	3149.15	6823.16	81877.95
		STEP G	40.3366	3226.92	6991.67	83900.12
		STEP H	41.3327	3306.61	7164.33	85972.01
		STEP I	42.3535	3388.28	7341.27	88095.28
		STEP J	43.3995	3471.96	7522.58	90270.96
		STEP K	44.4713	3557.70	7708.35	92500.30
		STEP L	45.5695	3645.56	7898.71	94784.56
		STEP M	46.6949	3735.59	8093.78	97125.39

B842 WSTWTR TRMT PLT CHIEF OPERATOR

STEP A	45.9928	3679.42	7972.08	95665.02
STEP B	47.1280	3770.24	8168.85	98026.24
STEP C	48.2919	3863.35	8370.59	100447.15
STEP D	49.4845	3958.76	8577.31	102927.76
STEP E	50.7066	4056.52	8789.14	105469.72
STEP F	51.9588	4156.70	9006.19	108074.30
STEP G	53.2420	4259.36	9228.61	110743.36
STEP H	54.5569	4364.55	9456.52	113478.35
STEP I	55.9042	4472.33	9690.06	116280.73
STEP J	57.2848	4582.78	9929.36	119152.38
STEP K	58.6995	4695.96	10174.58	122094.96
STEP L	60.1492	4811.93	10425.86	125110.33
STEP M	61.6346	4930.76	10683.33	128199.96

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B843	WSTWTR UTILITY MANAGER					
		STEP A	56.5013	4520.10	9793.55	117522.70
		STEP B	57.8958	4631.66	10035.27	120423.26
		STEP C	59.3256	4746.04	10283.10	123397.24
		STEP D	60.7907	4863.25	10537.05	126444.65
		STEP E	62.2920	4983.36	10797.28	129567.36
		STEP F	63.8304	5106.43	11063.93	132767.23
		STEP G	65.4068	5232.54	11337.17	136046.14
		STEP H	67.0220	5361.76	11617.14	139405.76
		STEP I	68.6772	5494.17	11904.04	142848.57
		STEP J	70.3733	5629.86	12198.03	146376.46
		STEP K	72.1112	5768.89	12499.27	149991.29
		STEP L	73.8921	5911.36	12807.96	153695.56
		STEP M	75.7169	6057.35	13124.26	157491.15

ORDINANCE NO. 5796

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AMENDING
ORDINANCE NO. 5774, THE SALARY ORDINANCE FOR ELECTRIC PERSONNEL
REPRESENTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL
WORKERS, AFL-CIO, LOCAL NO. 1245, SALARY SCHEDULES A AND B, AS
AMENDED BY APPENDIX "D" TO BE EFFECTIVE JANUARY 21, 2017, AS AN
URGENCY MEASURE

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. Title and Purpose.

Ordinance No. 5774, the Salary Ordinance for electric personnel represented by the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO, Local No. 1245, Salary Schedules A and B, is hereby amended as shown on Appendix "D" attached hereto.

ADDITION OF CLASSIFICATION:

<u>Classification No.</u>	<u>Position Title</u>	<u>Salary Range</u>
9250/B256	Electric Utility Inspection Technician	5722

SECTION 2. Salary Plan Effective Date.

This Ordinance shall be effective January 21, 2017 as an urgency measure.

SECTION 3. Urgency Ordinance.

This ordinance is hereby declared to be an urgency measure, immediately necessary for the public peace, health and safety and shall take effect January 21, 2017. A statement of urgency is as follows:

It is necessary to amend the Salary Ordinance to comply with recently approved changes for the orderly and necessary continuance of operations of the City.

SECTION 4. Posting.

The City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to post a true copy of the foregoing ordinance in each of three (3) conspicuous locations in the City and she shall immediately after such posting enter in the Ordinance Book under the record of the ordinance a certificate under her hand stating the time and place of said publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20____, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

IBEW Job Code	IBEW-A Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
150 ELECTRIC APPRENTICE LINE TECH						
		STEP A	40.9159	3273.27	7092.08	85105.07
		STEP B	44.0632	3525.05	7637.62	91651.45
		STEP C	47.2106	3776.84	8183.17	98198.04
		STEP D	50.3579	4028.63	8728.70	104744.43
		STEP E	53.5054	4280.43	9274.26	111291.23
		STEP F	56.6527	4532.21	9819.80	117837.61
2328 ELECTRIC DRAFTING TECH I						
		STEP A	25.6527	2052.21	4446.46	53357.61
		STEP B	26.9354	2154.83	4668.80	56025.63
		STEP C	28.2821	2262.56	4902.23	58826.76
		STEP D	29.6963	2375.70	5147.35	61768.30
		STEP E	31.1811	2494.48	5404.72	64856.68
		STEP F	32.7401	2619.20	5674.95	68099.40
		STEP G	34.3772	2750.17	5958.71	71504.57
		STEP H	36.0959	2887.67	6256.62	75079.47
2330 ELECTRIC DRAFTING TECH II						
		STEP A	28.2146	2257.16	4890.53	58686.36
		STEP B	29.6252	2370.01	5135.03	61620.41
		STEP C	31.1066	2488.52	5391.81	64701.72
		STEP D	32.6619	2612.95	5661.39	67936.75
		STEP E	34.2951	2743.60	5944.48	71333.80
		STEP F	36.0097	2880.77	6241.68	74900.17
		STEP G	37.8103	3024.82	6553.78	78645.42
		STEP H	39.7008	3176.06	6881.47	82577.66
2340 ELECTRIC ENGINEERING TECH I						
		STEP A	33.1445	2651.56	5745.04	68940.56
		STEP B	34.8017	2784.13	6032.29	72387.53
		STEP C	36.5418	2923.34	6333.91	76006.94
		STEP D	38.3690	3069.52	6650.62	79807.52
		STEP E	40.2875	3223.00	6983.16	83798.00
		STEP F	42.3019	3384.15	7332.32	87987.95
		STEP G	44.4170	3553.36	7698.94	92387.36
		STEP H	46.6378	3731.02	8083.88	97006.62

2345 ELECTRIC ENGINEERING TECH II

STEP A	36.4595	2916.76	6319.64	75835.76
STEP B	38.2825	3062.60	6635.63	79627.60
STEP C	40.1966	3215.72	6967.41	83608.92
STEP D	42.2063	3376.50	7315.75	87789.10
STEP E	44.3167	3545.33	7681.56	92178.73
STEP F	46.5325	3722.60	8065.63	96787.60
STEP G	48.8591	3908.72	8468.91	101626.92
STEP H	51.3022	4104.17	8892.38	106708.57

2285 ELECTRIC LINE TECH

STEP A	62.9475	5035.80	10910.90	130930.80
--------	---------	---------	----------	-----------

2286 ELECTRIC LINE TROUBLESHOOTER

STEP A	46.9724	3757.79	8141.88	97702.59
STEP B	49.3209	3945.67	8548.95	102587.47
STEP C	51.7870	4142.96	8976.41	107716.96
STEP D	54.3764	4350.11	9425.24	113102.91
STEP E	57.0952	4567.61	9896.50	118758.01
STEP F	59.9500	4796.00	10391.33	124696.00
STEP G	62.9475	5035.80	10910.90	130930.80
STEP H	66.0947	5287.57	11456.41	137476.97

2210 ELECTRIC MATERIALS TECH I

STEP A	27.3487	2187.89	4740.44	56885.29
STEP B	28.7158	2297.26	4977.40	59728.86
STEP C	30.1515	2412.12	5226.26	62715.12
STEP D	31.6590	2532.72	5487.56	65850.72
STEP E	33.2420	2659.36	5761.94	69143.36
STEP F	34.9043	2792.34	6050.07	72600.94
STEP G	36.6493	2931.94	6352.54	76230.54
STEP H	38.4819	3078.55	6670.19	80042.35

2212 ELECTRIC MATERIALS TECH II

STEP A	30.0833	2406.66	5214.43	62573.26
STEP B	31.5875	2527.00	5475.16	65702.00
STEP C	33.1666	2653.32	5748.87	68986.52
STEP D	34.8250	2786.00	6036.33	72436.00
STEP E	36.5662	2925.29	6338.14	76057.69
STEP F	38.3948	3071.58	6655.09	79861.18
STEP G	40.3142	3225.13	6987.79	83853.53
STEP H	42.3301	3386.40	7337.21	88046.60

2421 ELECTRIC PRE-APPRENTICE

STEP A	26.5953	2127.62	4609.85	55318.22
STEP B	28.6411	2291.28	4964.45	59573.48
STEP C	30.6868	2454.94	5319.04	63828.54
STEP D	32.7327	2618.61	5673.66	68084.01
STEP E	34.7784	2782.27	6028.25	72339.07
STEP F	36.8243	2945.94	6382.87	76594.54

2254 ELECTRIC PREV DATA SYSTEM TECH

STEP A	24.8600	1988.80	4309.06	51708.80
STEP B	26.1030	2088.24	4524.52	54294.24
STEP C	27.4082	2192.65	4750.75	57009.05
STEP D	28.7786	2302.28	4988.29	59859.48
STEP E	30.2174	2417.39	5237.68	62852.19
STEP F	31.7283	2538.26	5499.57	65994.86
STEP G	33.3148	2665.18	5774.56	69294.78
STEP H	34.9804	2798.43	6063.26	72759.23

2350 ELECTRIC SYSTEM DISPATCHER

STEP A	49.2091	3936.72	8529.57	102354.92
STEP B	51.6697	4133.57	8956.08	107472.97
STEP C	54.2530	4340.24	9403.85	112846.24
STEP D	56.9658	4557.26	9874.07	118488.86
STEP E	59.8140	4785.12	10367.76	124413.12
STEP F	62.8047	5024.37	10886.14	130633.77
STEP G	65.9450	5275.60	11430.46	137165.60
STEP H	69.2423	5539.38	12002.00	144023.98

2359 ELECTRIC TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS TECH

STEP A	39.7257	3178.05	6885.78	82629.45
STEP B	41.7120	3336.96	7230.08	86760.96
STEP C	43.7975	3503.80	7591.56	91098.80
STEP D	45.9875	3679.00	7971.16	95654.00
STEP E	48.2867	3862.93	8369.69	100436.33
STEP F	50.7011	4056.08	8788.19	105458.28
STEP G	53.2361	4258.88	9227.59	110731.08
STEP H	55.8980	4471.84	9688.98	116267.84

9250 ELECTRIC UTILITY INSPECTION TECHNICIAN

STEP A	40.6687	3253.50	7049.25	84590.98
STEP B	42.7022	3416.17	7401.71	88820.53
STEP C	44.8373	3586.98	7771.80	93261.55
STEP D	47.0791	3766.33	8160.39	97924.63
STEP E	49.4331	3954.65	8568.41	102820.86
STEP F	51.9048	4152.38	8996.83	107961.90
STEP G	54.5000	4360.00	9446.67	113360.00
STEP H	57.2250	4578.00	9919.00	119028.00

2360 ELECTRIC UTILITY TECHNICIAN I

STEP A	40.8975	3271.80	7088.90	85066.80
STEP B	42.9423	3435.38	7443.33	89319.98
STEP C	45.0895	3607.16	7815.51	93786.16
STEP D	47.3441	3787.52	8206.31	98475.72
STEP E	49.7110	3976.88	8616.57	103398.88
STEP F	52.1966	4175.72	9047.41	108568.92
STEP G	54.8065	4384.52	9499.79	113997.52
STEP H	57.5468	4603.74	9974.77	119697.34

2362 ELECTRIC UTILITY TECHNICIAN II

STEP A	44.9897	3599.17	7798.21	93578.57
STEP B	47.2392	3779.13	8188.12	98257.53
STEP C	49.6011	3968.08	8597.52	103170.28
STEP D	52.0812	4166.49	9027.40	108328.89
STEP E	54.6854	4374.83	9478.80	113745.63
STEP F	57.4196	4593.56	9952.73	119432.76
STEP G	60.2905	4823.24	10450.35	125404.24
STEP H	63.3052	5064.41	10972.90	131674.81

2380 ELECTRONICS TECHNICIAN I

STEP A	33.1479	2651.83	5745.63	68947.63
STEP B	34.8053	2784.42	6032.91	72395.02
STEP C	36.5455	2923.64	6334.55	76014.64
STEP D	38.3727	3069.81	6651.26	79815.21
STEP E	40.2915	3223.32	6983.86	83806.32
STEP F	42.3060	3384.48	7333.04	87996.48
STEP G	44.4213	3553.70	7699.69	92396.30
STEP H	46.6423	3731.38	8084.66	97015.98

2385 ELECTRONICS TECHNICIAN II

STEP A	36.4625	2917.00	6320.16	75842.00
STEP B	38.2857	3062.85	6636.18	79634.25
STEP C	40.2001	3216.00	6968.01	83616.20
STEP D	42.2102	3376.81	7316.43	87797.21
STEP E	44.3205	3545.64	7682.22	92186.64
STEP F	46.5368	3722.94	8066.37	96796.54
STEP G	48.8631	3909.04	8469.60	101635.24
STEP H	51.3064	4104.51	8893.10	106717.31

3608 INSTRUMENT & CONTROL TECH

STEP A	43.7019	3496.15	7575.00	90899.95
STEP B	45.8868	3670.94	7953.71	95444.54
STEP C	48.1812	3854.49	8351.40	100216.89
STEP D	50.5900	4047.20	8768.93	105227.20
STEP E	53.1196	4249.56	9207.39	110488.76
STEP F	55.7757	4462.05	9667.78	116013.45
STEP G	58.5644	4685.15	10151.16	121813.95
STEP H	61.4927	4919.41	10658.73	127904.81

4520 MATERIALS TECHNICIAN

STEP A	29.4699	2357.59	5108.11	61297.39
STEP B	30.9433	2475.46	5363.50	64362.06
STEP C	32.4902	2599.21	5631.63	67579.61
STEP D	34.1149	2729.19	5913.24	70958.99
STEP E	35.8206	2865.64	6208.90	74506.84
STEP F	37.6118	3008.94	6519.37	78232.54
STEP G	39.4921	3159.36	6845.29	82143.56
STEP H	41.4669	3317.35	7187.59	86251.15

5316 PLANT & EQUIPMENT MAINT WKR I

STEP A	20.0632	1605.05	3477.62	41731.45
STEP B	21.0667	1685.33	3651.56	43818.73
STEP C	22.1196	1769.56	3834.06	46008.76
STEP D	23.2258	1858.06	4025.80	48309.66
STEP E	24.3872	1950.97	4227.11	50725.37
STEP F	25.6065	2048.52	4438.46	53261.52
STEP G	26.8868	2150.94	4660.37	55924.54
STEP H	28.2310	2258.48	4893.37	58720.48

5319 PLANT & EQUIPMENT MAINT WKR II

STEP A	22.1423	1771.38	3838.00	46055.98
STEP B	23.2496	1859.96	4029.93	48359.16
STEP C	24.4118	1952.94	4231.37	50776.54
STEP D	25.6325	2050.60	4442.96	53315.60
STEP E	26.9144	2153.15	4665.16	55981.95
STEP F	28.2600	2260.80	4898.40	58780.80
STEP G	29.6728	2373.82	5143.28	61719.42
STEP H	31.1564	2492.51	5400.44	64805.31

5327 PLANT & EQUIPMENT MECHANIC I

STEP A	24.3549	1948.39	4221.51	50658.19
STEP B	25.5727	2045.81	4432.60	53191.21
STEP C	26.8514	2148.11	4654.24	55850.91
STEP D	28.1938	2255.50	4886.92	58643.10
STEP E	29.6037	2368.29	5131.30	61575.69
STEP F	31.0836	2486.68	5387.82	64653.88
STEP G	32.6378	2611.02	5657.21	67886.62
STEP H	34.2696	2741.56	5940.06	71280.76

5328 PLANT & EQUIPMENT MECHANIC II

STEP A	26.7904	2143.23	4643.66	55724.03
STEP B	28.1301	2250.40	4875.88	58510.60
STEP C	29.5365	2362.92	5119.66	61435.92
STEP D	31.0133	2481.06	5375.63	64507.66
STEP E	32.5642	2605.13	5644.46	67733.53
STEP F	34.1922	2735.37	5926.64	71119.77
STEP G	35.9017	2872.13	6222.96	74675.53
STEP H	37.6966	3015.72	6534.07	78408.92

5401 PREDICTIVE MAINTENANCE TECH I

STEP A	33.1479	2651.83	5745.63	68947.63
STEP B	34.8053	2784.42	6032.91	72395.02
STEP C	36.5455	2923.64	6334.55	76014.64
STEP D	38.3727	3069.81	6651.26	79815.21
STEP E	40.2915	3223.32	6983.86	83806.32
STEP F	42.3060	3384.48	7333.04	87996.48
STEP G	44.4213	3553.70	7699.69	92396.30
STEP H	46.6423	3731.38	8084.66	97015.98

5402 PREDICTIVE MAINTENANCE TECH II

STEP A	36.4625	2917.00	6320.16	75842.00
STEP B	38.2857	3062.85	6636.18	79634.25
STEP C	40.2001	3216.00	6968.01	83616.20
STEP D	42.2102	3376.81	7316.43	87797.21
STEP E	44.3205	3545.64	7682.22	92186.64
STEP F	46.5368	3722.94	8066.37	96796.54
STEP G	48.8631	3909.04	8469.60	101635.24
STEP H	51.3064	4104.51	8893.10	106717.31

5500 PREVENTATIVE MAINT TECH I

STEP A	28.8242	2305.93	4996.19	59954.33
STEP B	30.2655	2421.24	5246.02	62952.24
STEP C	31.7787	2542.29	5508.30	66099.69
STEP D	33.3676	2669.40	5783.71	69404.60
STEP E	35.0360	2802.88	6072.90	72874.88
STEP F	36.7878	2943.02	6376.55	76518.62
STEP G	38.6272	3090.17	6695.38	80344.57
STEP H	40.5586	3244.68	7030.15	84361.88

5502 PREVENTATIVE MAINT TECH II

STEP A	31.7066	2536.52	5495.81	65949.72
STEP B	33.2920	2663.36	5770.61	69247.36
STEP C	34.9564	2796.51	6059.10	72709.31
STEP D	36.7045	2936.36	6362.11	76345.36
STEP E	38.5394	3083.15	6680.16	80161.95
STEP F	40.4666	3237.32	7014.21	84170.52
STEP G	42.4898	3399.18	7364.89	88378.78
STEP H	44.6145	3569.16	7733.18	92798.16

5533 PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE COORD

STEP A	30.6530	2452.24	5313.18	63758.24
STEP B	32.1856	2574.84	5578.83	66946.04
STEP C	33.7949	2703.59	5857.78	70293.39
STEP D	35.4845	2838.76	6150.64	73807.76
STEP E	37.2586	2980.68	6458.15	77497.88
STEP F	39.1219	3129.75	6781.12	81373.55
STEP G	41.0778	3286.22	7120.15	85441.82
STEP H	43.1318	3450.54	7476.17	89714.14

5595 PWR ENGINEER I

STEP A	42.5046	3400.36	7367.46	88409.56
STEP B	44.6298	3570.38	7735.83	92829.98
STEP C	46.8614	3748.91	8122.64	97471.71
STEP D	49.2044	3936.35	8528.76	102345.15
STEP E	51.6646	4133.16	8955.19	107462.36
STEP F	54.2479	4339.83	9402.96	112835.63
STEP G	56.9602	4556.81	9873.10	118477.21
STEP H	59.8083	4784.66	10366.77	124401.26

5596 PWR ENGINEER II

STEP A	46.7571	3740.56	8104.56	97254.76
STEP B	49.0950	3927.60	8509.80	102117.60
STEP C	51.5497	4123.97	8935.28	107223.37
STEP D	54.1271	4330.16	9382.03	112584.36
STEP E	56.8334	4546.67	9851.12	118213.47
STEP F	59.6753	4774.02	10343.71	124124.62
STEP G	62.6589	5012.71	10860.87	130330.51
STEP H	65.7917	5263.33	11403.89	136846.73

5590 PWR PLNT ENGINEER I

STEP A	42.5046	3400.36	7367.46	88409.56
STEP B	44.6298	3570.38	7735.83	92829.98
STEP C	46.8614	3748.91	8122.64	97471.71
STEP D	49.2044	3936.35	8528.76	102345.15
STEP E	51.6646	4133.16	8955.19	107462.36
STEP F	54.2479	4339.83	9402.96	112835.63
STEP G	56.9602	4556.81	9873.10	118477.21
STEP H	59.8083	4784.66	10366.77	124401.26

5591 PWR PLNT ENGINEER II

STEP A	46.7571	3740.56	8104.56	97254.76
STEP B	49.0950	3927.60	8509.80	102117.60
STEP C	51.5497	4123.97	8935.28	107223.37
STEP D	54.1271	4330.16	9382.03	112584.36
STEP E	56.8334	4546.67	9851.12	118213.47
STEP F	59.6753	4774.02	10343.71	124124.62
STEP G	62.6589	5012.71	10860.87	130330.51
STEP H	65.7917	5263.33	11403.89	136846.73

5526 PWR PLNT MECHANIC

STEP A	38.9403	3115.22	6749.65	80995.82
STEP B	40.8874	3270.99	7087.14	85045.79
STEP C	42.9317	3434.53	7441.49	89297.93
STEP D	45.0782	3606.25	7813.55	93762.65
STEP E	47.3322	3786.57	8204.24	98450.97
STEP F	49.6988	3975.90	8614.45	103373.50
STEP G	52.1837	4174.69	9045.17	108542.09
STEP H	54.7928	4383.42	9497.41	113969.02

5522 PWR PLNT OPERATOR/TECH I

STEP A	38.7826	3102.60	6722.31	80667.80
STEP B	40.7217	3257.73	7058.42	84701.13
STEP C	42.7578	3420.62	7411.35	88936.22
STEP D	44.8959	3591.67	7781.95	93383.47
STEP E	47.1407	3771.25	8171.05	98052.65
STEP F	49.4975	3959.80	8579.56	102954.80
STEP G	51.9725	4157.80	9008.56	108102.80
STEP H	54.5712	4365.69	9459.00	113508.09

5523 PWR PLNT OPERATOR/TECH II

STEP A	42.6615	3412.92	7394.66	88735.92
STEP B	44.7945	3583.56	7764.38	93172.56
STEP C	47.0343	3762.74	8152.61	97831.34
STEP D	49.3860	3950.88	8560.24	102722.88
STEP E	51.8553	4148.42	8988.25	107859.02
STEP F	54.4481	4355.84	9437.67	113252.04
STEP G	57.1704	4573.63	9909.53	118914.43
STEP H	60.0289	4802.31	10405.00	124860.11

7020 SCADA SYSTEM TECHNICIAN

STEP A	36.4625	2917.00	6320.16	75842.00
STEP B	38.2857	3062.85	6636.18	79634.25
STEP C	40.2001	3216.00	6968.01	83616.20
STEP D	42.2102	3376.81	7316.43	87797.21
STEP E	44.3205	3545.64	7682.22	92186.64
STEP F	46.5368	3722.94	8066.37	96796.54
STEP G	48.8631	3909.04	8469.60	101635.24
STEP H	51.3064	4104.51	8893.10	106717.31

7118 SR ELECTRIC LINE TECHNICIAN

STEP A	49.2091	3936.72	8529.57	102354.92
STEP B	51.6697	4133.57	8956.08	107472.97
STEP C	54.2530	4340.24	9403.85	112846.24
STEP D	56.9658	4557.26	9874.07	118488.86
STEP E	59.8140	4785.12	10367.76	124413.12
STEP F	62.8047	5024.37	10886.14	130633.77
STEP G	65.9450	5275.60	11430.46	137165.60
STEP H	69.2423	5539.38	12002.00	144023.98

7169 SR ELECTRIC MATERIALS TECH

STEP A	33.0917	2647.33	5735.89	68830.73
STEP B	34.7462	2779.69	6022.67	72272.09
STEP C	36.4836	2918.68	6323.82	75885.88
STEP D	38.3081	3064.64	6640.07	79680.84
STEP E	40.2232	3217.85	6972.02	83664.25
STEP F	42.2344	3378.75	7320.62	87847.55
STEP G	44.3463	3547.70	7686.69	92240.30
STEP H	46.5635	3725.08	8071.00	96852.08

7124 SR ELECTRIC METERING TECH

STEP A	49.4887	3959.09	8578.04	102936.49
STEP B	51.9631	4157.04	9006.93	108083.24
STEP C	54.5612	4364.89	9457.27	113487.29
STEP D	57.2895	4583.16	9930.18	119162.16
STEP E	60.1539	4812.31	10426.67	125120.11
STEP F	63.1615	5052.92	10947.99	131375.92
STEP G	66.3196	5305.56	11495.39	137944.76
STEP H	69.6357	5570.85	12070.18	144842.25

7126 SR ELECTRIC SUBSTATION TECH

STEP A	49.4887	3959.09	8578.04	102936.49
STEP B	51.9631	4157.04	9006.93	108083.24
STEP C	54.5612	4364.89	9457.27	113487.29
STEP D	57.2895	4583.16	9930.18	119162.16
STEP E	60.1539	4812.31	10426.67	125120.11
STEP F	63.1615	5052.92	10947.99	131375.92
STEP G	66.3196	5305.56	11495.39	137944.76
STEP H	69.6357	5570.85	12070.18	144842.25

7168 SR ELECTRIC SYSTEM DISPATCHER

STEP A	54.1301	4330.40	9382.55	112590.60
STEP B	56.8365	4546.92	9851.66	118219.92
STEP C	59.6783	4774.26	10344.23	124130.86
STEP D	62.6622	5012.97	10861.44	130337.37
STEP E	65.7953	5263.62	11404.51	136854.22
STEP F	69.0851	5526.80	11974.75	143697.00
STEP G	72.5394	5803.15	12573.49	150881.95
STEP H	76.1664	6093.31	13202.17	158426.11

7170 SR ELECTRONICS TECHNICIAN

STEP A	40.1088	3208.70	6952.19	83426.30
STEP B	42.1142	3369.13	7299.79	87597.53
STEP C	44.2200	3537.60	7664.80	91977.60
STEP D	46.4310	3714.48	8048.04	96576.48
STEP E	48.7527	3900.21	8450.46	101405.61
STEP F	51.1903	4095.22	8872.98	106475.82
STEP G	53.7496	4299.96	9316.59	111799.16
STEP H	56.4372	4514.97	9782.44	117389.37

7205 SR PLANT & EQUIPMENT MECHANIC

STEP A	29.4665	2357.32	5107.52	61290.32
STEP B	30.9399	2475.19	5362.91	64354.99
STEP C	32.4870	2598.96	5631.08	67572.96
STEP D	34.1111	2728.88	5912.59	70951.08
STEP E	35.8167	2865.33	6208.22	74498.73
STEP F	37.6076	3008.60	6518.65	78223.80
STEP G	39.4881	3159.04	6844.60	82135.24
STEP H	41.4624	3316.99	7186.81	86241.79

7284 SR PREVENTATIVE MAINT TECH

STEP A	40.1996	3215.96	6967.93	83615.16
STEP B	42.2094	3376.75	7316.29	87795.55
STEP C	44.3198	3545.58	7682.09	92185.18
STEP D	46.5358	3722.86	8066.20	96794.46
STEP E	48.8626	3909.00	8469.51	101634.20
STEP F	51.3058	4104.46	8893.00	106716.06
STEP G	53.8710	4309.68	9337.64	112051.68
STEP H	56.5647	4525.17	9804.54	117654.57

7152 SR PWR PLNT OPERATOR/TECH

STEP A	46.9266	3754.12	8133.94	97607.32
STEP B	49.2729	3941.83	8540.63	102487.63
STEP C	51.7366	4138.92	8967.67	107612.12
STEP D	54.3235	4345.88	9416.07	112992.88
STEP E	57.0395	4563.16	9886.84	118642.16
STEP F	59.8916	4791.32	10381.21	124574.52
STEP G	62.8861	5030.88	10900.25	130803.08
STEP H	66.0304	5282.43	11445.26	137343.23

2375 TRAFFIC SIGNAL MAINT WKR I

STEP A	24.2515	1940.12	4203.59	50443.12
STEP B	25.4640	2037.12	4413.76	52965.12
STEP C	26.7373	2138.98	4634.46	55613.58
STEP D	28.0740	2245.92	4866.16	58393.92
STEP E	29.4777	2358.21	5109.46	61313.61
STEP F	30.9516	2476.12	5364.94	64379.32
STEP G	32.4993	2599.94	5633.21	67598.54
STEP H	34.1241	2729.92	5914.84	70978.12

2376 TRAFFIC SIGNAL MAINT WKR II

STEP A	26.6765	2134.12	4623.92	55487.12
STEP B	28.0104	2240.83	4855.13	58261.63
STEP C	29.4109	2352.87	5097.88	61174.67
STEP D	30.8815	2470.52	5352.79	64233.52
STEP E	32.4256	2594.04	5620.43	67445.24
STEP F	34.0469	2723.75	5901.46	70817.55
STEP G	35.7491	2859.92	6196.51	74358.12
STEP H	37.5366	3002.92	6506.34	78076.12

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

IBEW	IBEW-B					
Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B200	ELECTRIC APPRENTICE LINE TECH					
		STEP A	40.9159	3273.27	7092.08	85105.07
		STEP B	44.0632	3525.05	7637.62	91651.45
		STEP C	47.2106	3776.84	8183.17	98198.04
		STEP D	50.3579	4028.63	8728.70	104744.43
		STEP E	53.5054	4280.43	9274.26	111291.23
		STEP F	56.6527	4532.21	9819.80	117837.61
B201	ELECTRIC DRAFTING TECH I					
		STEP A	25.6527	2052.21	4446.46	53357.61
		STEP B	26.2861	2102.88	4556.25	54675.08
		STEP C	26.9353	2154.82	4668.78	56025.42
		STEP D	27.6004	2208.03	4784.06	57408.83
		STEP E	28.2820	2262.56	4902.21	58826.56
		STEP F	28.9804	2318.43	5023.26	60279.23
		STEP G	29.6961	2375.68	5147.32	61767.88
		STEP H	30.4295	2434.36	5274.44	63293.36
		STEP I	31.1810	2494.48	5404.70	64856.48
		STEP J	31.9510	2556.08	5538.17	66458.08
		STEP K	32.7400	2619.20	5674.93	68099.20
		STEP L	33.5486	2683.88	5815.09	69781.08
		STEP M	34.3771	2750.16	5958.69	71504.36
		STEP N	35.2260	2818.08	6105.84	73270.08
		STEP O	36.0959	2887.67	6256.62	75079.47
B202	ELECTRIC DRAFTING TECH II					
		STEP A	28.2146	2257.16	4890.53	58686.36
		STEP B	28.9112	2312.89	5011.27	60135.29
		STEP C	29.6252	2370.01	5135.03	61620.41
		STEP D	30.3568	2428.54	5261.84	63142.14
		STEP E	31.1065	2488.52	5391.79	64701.52
		STEP F	31.8746	2549.96	5524.93	66299.16
		STEP G	32.6618	2612.94	5661.37	67936.54
		STEP H	33.4684	2677.47	5801.18	69614.27
		STEP I	34.2950	2743.60	5944.46	71333.60
		STEP J	35.1418	2811.34	6091.24	73094.94
		STEP K	36.0097	2880.77	6241.68	74900.17
		STEP L	36.8990	2951.92	6395.82	76749.92
		STEP M	37.8103	3024.82	6553.78	78645.42
		STEP N	38.7439	3099.51	6715.60	80587.31
		STEP O	39.7008	3176.06	6881.47	82577.66

B203	ELECTRIC ENGINEERING TECH I				
	STEP A	33.1445	2651.56	5745.04	68940.56
	STEP B	33.9630	2717.04	5886.92	70643.04
	STEP C	34.8017	2784.13	6032.29	72387.53
	STEP D	35.6611	2852.88	6181.25	74175.08
	STEP E	36.5418	2923.34	6333.91	76006.94
	STEP F	37.4442	2995.53	6490.32	77883.93
	STEP G	38.3689	3069.51	6650.60	79807.31
	STEP H	39.3164	3145.31	6814.84	81778.11
	STEP I	40.2873	3222.98	6983.13	83797.58
	STEP J	41.2822	3302.57	7155.58	85866.97
	STEP K	42.3018	3384.14	7332.31	87987.74
	STEP L	43.3464	3467.71	7513.37	90160.51
	STEP M	44.4169	3553.35	7698.92	92387.15
	STEP N	45.5138	3641.10	7889.05	94668.70
	STEP O	46.6378	3731.02	8083.88	97006.62
B204	ELECTRIC ENGINEERING TECH II				
	STEP A	36.4595	2916.76	6319.64	75835.76
	STEP B	37.3597	2988.77	6475.68	77708.17
	STEP C	38.2823	3062.58	6635.59	79627.18
	STEP D	39.2277	3138.21	6799.46	81593.61
	STEP E	40.1964	3215.71	6967.37	83608.51
	STEP F	41.1891	3295.12	7139.44	85673.32
	STEP G	42.2063	3376.50	7315.75	87789.10
	STEP H	43.2486	3459.88	7496.42	89957.08
	STEP I	44.3166	3545.32	7681.54	92178.52
	STEP J	45.4111	3632.88	7871.25	94455.08
	STEP K	46.5325	3722.60	8065.63	96787.60
	STEP L	47.6816	3814.52	8264.81	99177.72
	STEP M	48.8591	3908.72	8468.91	101626.92
	STEP N	50.0657	4005.25	8678.05	104136.65
	STEP O	51.3022	4104.17	8892.38	106708.57
B205	ELECTRIC LINE TECH				
	STEP A	62.9475	5035.80	10910.90	130930.80
B206	ELECTRIC LINE TROUBLESHOOTER				
	STEP A	46.9724	3757.79	8141.88	97702.59
	STEP B	48.1320	3850.56	8342.88	100114.56
	STEP C	49.3207	3945.65	8548.92	102587.05
	STEP D	50.5387	4043.09	8760.04	105120.49
	STEP E	51.7867	4142.93	8976.36	107716.33
	STEP F	53.0656	4245.24	9198.03	110376.44
	STEP G	54.3762	4350.09	9425.20	113102.49
	STEP H	55.7190	4457.52	9657.96	115895.52
	STEP I	57.0950	4567.60	9896.46	118757.60
	STEP J	58.5050	4680.40	10140.86	121690.40
	STEP K	59.9498	4795.98	10391.29	124695.58
	STEP L	61.4303	4914.42	10647.91	127775.02
	STEP M	62.9474	5035.79	10910.88	130930.59
	STEP N	64.5018	5160.14	11180.31	134163.74
	STEP O	66.0947	5287.57	11456.41	137476.97

B207	ELECTRIC MATERIALS TECH I				
	STEP A	27.3487	2187.89	4740.44	56885.29
	STEP B	28.0237	2241.89	4857.44	58289.29
	STEP C	28.7157	2297.25	4977.38	59728.65
	STEP D	29.4248	2353.98	5100.29	61203.58
	STEP E	30.1515	2412.12	5226.26	62715.12
	STEP F	30.8960	2471.68	5355.30	64263.68
	STEP G	31.6591	2532.72	5487.57	65850.92
	STEP H	32.4409	2595.27	5623.08	67477.07
	STEP I	33.2420	2659.36	5761.94	69143.36
	STEP J	34.0630	2725.04	5904.25	70851.04
	STEP K	34.9041	2792.32	6050.04	72600.52
	STEP L	35.7662	2861.29	6199.47	74393.69
	STEP M	36.6493	2931.94	6352.54	76230.54
	STEP N	37.5545	3004.36	6509.44	78113.36
	STEP O	38.4819	3078.55	6670.19	80042.35
B208	ELECTRIC MATERIALS TECH II				
	STEP A	30.0833	2406.66	5214.43	62573.26
	STEP B	30.8260	2466.08	5343.17	64118.08
	STEP C	31.5873	2526.98	5475.13	65701.58
	STEP D	32.3673	2589.38	5610.33	67323.98
	STEP E	33.1667	2653.33	5748.89	68986.73
	STEP F	33.9857	2718.85	5890.85	70690.25
	STEP G	34.8250	2786.00	6036.33	72436.00
	STEP H	35.6850	2854.80	6185.40	74224.80
	STEP I	36.5662	2925.29	6338.14	76057.69
	STEP J	37.4693	2997.54	6494.67	77936.14
	STEP K	48.6546	3892.36	8433.46	101201.56
	STEP L	39.3428	3147.42	6819.41	81833.02
	STEP M	40.3143	3225.14	6987.81	83853.74
	STEP N	41.3099	3304.79	7160.38	85924.59
	STEP O	42.3301	3386.40	7337.21	88046.60
B209	ELECTRIC PRE-APPRENTICE				
	STEP A	26.5953	2127.62	4609.85	55318.22
	STEP B	28.6411	2291.28	4964.45	59573.48
	STEP C	30.6868	2454.94	5319.04	63828.54
	STEP D	32.7327	2618.61	5673.66	68084.01
	STEP E	34.7784	2782.27	6028.25	72339.07
	STEP F	36.8243	2945.94	6382.87	76594.54
B210	ELECTRIC PREV DATA SYSTEM TECH				
	STEP A	24.8600	1988.80	4309.06	51708.80
	STEP B	25.4737	2037.89	4415.44	52985.29
	STEP C	26.1029	2088.23	4524.50	54294.03
	STEP D	26.7475	2139.80	4636.23	55634.80
	STEP E	27.4081	2192.64	4750.73	57008.84
	STEP F	28.0849	2246.79	4868.04	58416.59
	STEP G	28.7784	2302.27	4988.25	59859.07
	STEP H	29.4891	2359.12	5111.44	61337.32
	STEP I	30.2173	2417.38	5237.66	62851.98
	STEP J	30.9636	2477.08	5367.02	64404.28
	STEP K	31.7282	2538.25	5499.55	65994.65
	STEP L	32.5118	2600.94	5635.37	67624.54
	STEP M	33.3147	2665.17	5774.54	69294.57
	STEP N	34.1374	2730.99	5917.14	71005.79
	STEP O	34.9804	2798.43	6063.26	72759.23

B211 ELECTRIC SYSTEM DISPATCHER

STEP A	49.2091	3936.72	8529.57	102354.92
STEP B	50.4242	4033.93	8740.19	104882.33
STEP C	51.6695	4133.56	8956.04	107472.56
STEP D	52.9455	4235.64	9177.22	110126.64
STEP E	54.2529	4340.23	9403.83	112846.03
STEP F	55.5928	4447.42	9636.08	115633.02
STEP G	56.9657	4557.25	9874.05	118488.65
STEP H	58.3724	4669.79	10117.88	121414.59
STEP I	59.8140	4785.12	10367.76	124413.12
STEP J	61.2911	4903.28	10623.79	127485.48
STEP K	62.8047	5024.37	10886.14	130633.77
STEP L	64.3556	5148.44	11154.97	133859.64
STEP M	65.9450	5275.60	11430.46	137165.60
STEP N	67.5735	5405.88	11712.74	140552.88
STEP O	69.2423	5539.38	12002.00	144023.98

B212 ELECTRIC TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS TECH

STEP A	39.7257	3178.05	6885.78	82629.45
STEP B	40.7066	3256.52	7055.81	84669.72
STEP C	41.7118	3336.94	7230.04	86760.54
STEP D	42.7419	3419.35	7408.59	88903.15
STEP E	43.7974	3503.79	7591.54	91098.59
STEP F	44.8790	3590.32	7779.02	93348.32
STEP G	45.9874	3678.99	7971.14	95653.79
STEP H	47.1229	3769.83	8167.96	98015.63
STEP I	48.2867	3862.93	8369.69	100436.33
STEP J	49.4792	3958.33	8576.39	102916.73
STEP K	50.7011	4056.08	8788.19	105458.28
STEP L	51.9532	4156.25	9005.22	108062.65
STEP M	53.2362	4258.89	9227.60	110731.29
STEP N	54.5509	4364.07	9455.48	113465.87
STEP O	55.8980	4471.84	9688.98	116267.84

B256 ELECTRIC UTILITY INSPECTION TECHNICIAN

STEP A	40.6687	3253.50	7049.25	84590.98
STEP B	41.6729	3333.83	7223.30	86679.60
STEP C	42.7020	3416.16	7401.68	88820.19
STEP D	43.7566	3500.52	7584.47	91013.64
STEP E	44.8371	3586.97	7771.77	93261.26
STEP F	45.9444	3675.55	7963.70	95564.38
STEP G	47.0790	3766.32	8160.37	97924.38
STEP H	48.2417	3859.33	8361.89	100342.66
STEP I	49.4330	3954.64	8568.39	102820.67
STEP J	50.6538	4052.30	8779.99	105359.86
STEP K	51.9047	4152.38	8996.81	107961.77
STEP L	53.1865	4254.92	9218.99	110627.93
STEP M	54.5000	4360.00	9446.66	113359.93
STEP N	55.8459	4467.67	9679.95	116159.40
STEP O	57.2250	4578.00	9919.00	119028.00

B213 ELECTRIC UTILITY TECHNICIAN I

STEP A	40.8975	3271.80	7088.90	85066.80
STEP B	41.9073	3352.58	7263.93	87167.18
STEP C	42.9421	3435.36	7443.29	89319.56
STEP D	44.0026	3520.20	7627.11	91525.40
STEP E	45.0893	3607.14	7815.47	93785.74
STEP F	46.2027	3696.21	8008.46	96101.61
STEP G	47.3437	3787.49	8206.24	98474.89
STEP H	48.5130	3881.04	8408.92	100907.04
STEP I	49.7110	3976.88	8616.57	103398.88
STEP J	50.9386	4075.08	8829.35	105952.28
STEP K	52.1966	4175.72	9047.41	108568.92
STEP L	53.4856	4278.84	9270.83	111250.04
STEP M	54.8065	4384.52	9499.79	113997.52
STEP N	56.1600	4492.80	9734.40	116812.80
STEP O	57.5468	4603.74	9974.77	119697.34

B214 ELECTRIC UTILITY TECHNICIAN II

STEP A	44.9897	3599.17	7798.21	93578.57
STEP B	46.1006	3688.04	7990.77	95889.24
STEP C	47.2392	3779.13	8188.12	98257.53
STEP D	48.4058	3872.46	8390.33	100684.06
STEP E	49.6011	3968.08	8597.52	103170.28
STEP F	50.8261	4066.08	8809.85	105718.28
STEP G	52.0812	4166.49	9027.40	108328.89
STEP H	53.3674	4269.39	9250.34	111004.19
STEP I	54.6853	4374.82	9478.78	113745.42
STEP J	56.0358	4482.86	9712.87	116554.46
STEP K	57.4197	4593.57	9952.74	119432.97
STEP L	58.8376	4707.00	10198.51	122382.20
STEP M	60.2906	4823.24	10450.37	125404.44
STEP N	61.7796	4942.36	10708.46	128501.56
STEP O	63.3052	5064.41	10972.90	131674.81

B215 ELECTRONICS TECHNICIAN I

STEP A	30.1076	2408.60	5218.65	62623.80
STEP B	30.8510	2468.08	5347.50	64170.08
STEP C	31.6129	2529.03	5479.56	65754.83
STEP D	32.3936	2591.48	5614.89	67378.68
STEP E	33.1936	2655.48	5753.55	69042.68
STEP F	34.0133	2721.06	5895.63	70747.66
STEP G	34.8533	2788.26	6041.23	72494.86
STEP H	35.7140	2857.12	6190.42	74285.12
STEP I	36.5960	2927.68	6343.30	76119.68
STEP J	37.4998	2999.98	6499.96	77999.58
STEP K	38.4259	3074.07	6660.48	79925.87
STEP L	39.3747	3149.97	6824.94	81899.37
STEP M	40.3471	3227.76	6993.49	83921.96
STEP N	41.3435	3307.48	7166.20	85994.48
STEP O	42.3645	3389.16	7343.18	88118.16

B216 ELECTRONICS TECHNICIAN II

STEP A	33.1183	2649.46	5740.50	68886.06
STEP B	33.9361	2714.88	5882.25	70587.08
STEP C	34.7742	2781.93	6027.52	72330.33
STEP D	35.6330	2850.64	6176.38	74116.64
STEP E	36.5129	2921.03	6328.90	75946.83
STEP F	37.4146	2993.16	6485.19	77822.36
STEP G	38.3386	3067.08	6645.35	79744.28
STEP H	39.2853	3142.82	6809.45	81713.42
STEP I	40.2555	3220.44	6977.62	83731.44
STEP J	41.2497	3299.97	7149.94	85799.37
STEP K	42.2683	3381.46	7326.50	87918.06
STEP L	43.3122	3464.97	7507.44	90089.37
STEP M	44.3818	3550.54	7692.84	92314.14
STEP N	45.4779	3638.23	7882.83	94594.03
STEP O	46.6009	3728.07	8077.48	96929.87

B217 INSTRUMENT & CONTROL TECH

STEP A	43.7019	3496.15	7575.00	90899.95
STEP B	44.7807	3582.45	7761.98	93143.85
STEP C	45.8866	3670.92	7953.67	95444.12
STEP D	47.0198	3761.58	8150.09	97801.18
STEP E	48.1810	3854.48	8351.37	100216.48
STEP F	49.3708	3949.66	8557.60	102691.26
STEP G	50.5901	4047.20	8768.95	105227.40
STEP H	51.8394	4147.15	8985.49	107825.95
STEP I	53.1196	4249.56	9207.39	110488.76
STEP J	54.4315	4354.52	9434.79	113217.52
STEP K	55.7756	4462.04	9667.77	116013.24
STEP L	57.1530	4572.24	9906.52	118878.24
STEP M	58.5644	4685.15	10151.16	121813.95
STEP N	60.0107	4800.85	10401.85	124822.25
STEP O	61.4927	4919.41	10658.73	127904.81

B218 MATERIALS TECHNICIAN

STEP A	29.4699	2357.59	5108.11	61297.39
STEP B	30.1973	2415.78	5234.19	62810.38
STEP C	30.9430	2475.44	5363.45	64361.44
STEP D	31.7072	2536.57	5495.91	65950.97
STEP E	32.4902	2599.21	5631.63	67579.61
STEP F	33.2926	2663.40	5770.71	69248.60
STEP G	34.1148	2729.18	5913.23	70958.78
STEP H	34.9573	2796.58	6059.26	72711.18
STEP I	35.8205	2865.64	6208.88	74506.64
STEP J	36.7051	2936.40	6362.21	76346.60
STEP K	37.6116	3008.92	6519.34	78232.12
STEP L	38.5405	3083.24	6680.35	80164.24
STEP M	39.4922	3159.37	6845.31	82143.77
STEP N	40.4675	3237.40	7014.36	84172.40
STEP O	41.4668	3317.34	7187.57	86250.94

B220	PLANT & EQUIPMENT MAINT WKR I				
	STEP A	20.0632	1605.05	3477.62	41731.45
	STEP B	20.5586	1644.68	3563.49	42761.88
	STEP C	21.0663	1685.30	3651.49	43817.90
	STEP D	21.5865	1726.92	3741.66	44899.92
	STEP E	22.1196	1769.56	3834.06	46008.76
	STEP F	22.6659	1813.27	3928.75	47145.07
	STEP G	23.2257	1858.05	4025.78	48309.45
	STEP H	23.7992	1903.93	4125.19	49502.33
	STEP I	24.3870	1950.96	4227.08	50724.96
	STEP J	24.9892	1999.13	4331.46	51977.53
	STEP K	25.6063	2048.50	4438.42	53261.10
	STEP L	26.2387	2099.09	4548.04	54576.49
	STEP M	26.8866	2150.92	4660.34	55924.12
	STEP N	27.5507	2204.05	4775.45	57305.45
	STEP O	28.2310	2258.48	4893.37	58720.48
B219	PLANT & EQUIPMENT MAINT WKR II				
	STEP A	22.1423	1771.38	3838.00	46055.98
	STEP B	22.6890	1815.12	3932.76	47193.12
	STEP C	23.2494	1859.95	4029.89	48358.75
	STEP D	23.8235	1905.88	4129.40	49552.88
	STEP E	24.4118	1952.94	4231.37	50776.54
	STEP F	25.0147	2001.17	4335.88	52030.57
	STEP G	25.6325	2050.60	4442.96	53315.60
	STEP H	26.2654	2101.23	4552.66	54632.03
	STEP I	26.9140	2153.12	4665.09	55981.12
	STEP J	27.5787	2206.29	4780.30	57363.69
	STEP K	28.2597	2260.77	4898.34	58780.17
	STEP L	28.9576	2316.60	5019.31	60231.80
	STEP M	29.6727	2373.81	5143.26	61719.21
	STEP N	30.4056	2432.44	5270.30	63243.64
	STEP O	31.1564	2492.51	5400.44	64805.31
B221	PLANT & EQUIPMENT MECHANIC I				
	STEP A	24.3549	1948.39	4221.51	50658.19
	STEP B	24.9561	1996.48	4325.72	51908.68
	STEP C	25.5724	2045.79	4432.54	53190.59
	STEP D	26.2039	2096.31	4542.00	54504.11
	STEP E	26.8510	2148.08	4654.17	55850.08
	STEP F	27.5141	2201.12	4769.11	57229.32
	STEP G	28.1937	2255.49	4886.90	58642.89
	STEP H	28.8899	2311.19	5007.58	60090.99
	STEP I	29.6034	2368.27	5131.25	61575.07
	STEP J	30.3344	2426.75	5257.96	63095.55
	STEP K	31.0835	2486.68	5387.80	64653.68
	STEP L	31.8511	2548.08	5520.85	66250.28
	STEP M	32.6377	2611.01	5657.20	67886.41
	STEP N	33.4437	2675.49	5796.90	69562.89
	STEP O	34.2696	2741.56	5940.06	71280.76

B222	PLANT & EQUIPMENT MECHANIC II				
	STEP A	26.7904	2143.23	4643.66	55724.03
	STEP B	27.4518	2196.14	4758.31	57099.74
	STEP C	28.1296	2250.36	4875.79	58509.56
	STEP D	28.8243	2305.94	4996.21	59954.54
	STEP E	29.5362	2362.89	5119.60	61435.29
	STEP F	30.2656	2421.24	5246.03	62952.44
	STEP G	31.0130	2481.04	5375.58	64507.04
	STEP H	31.7789	2542.31	5508.34	66100.11
	STEP I	32.5637	2605.09	5644.37	67732.49
	STEP J	33.3679	2669.43	5783.76	69405.23
	STEP K	34.1919	2735.35	5926.59	71119.15
	STEP L	35.0363	2802.90	6072.95	72875.50
	STEP M	35.9015	2872.12	6222.92	74675.12
	STEP N	36.7881	2943.04	6376.60	76519.24
	STEP O	37.6966	3015.72	6534.07	78408.92
B223	PREDICTIVE MAINTENANCE TECH I				
	STEP A	30.1076	2408.60	5218.65	62623.80
	STEP B	30.8510	2468.08	5347.50	64170.08
	STEP C	31.6129	2529.03	5479.56	65754.83
	STEP D	32.3936	2591.48	5614.89	67378.68
	STEP E	33.1936	2655.48	5753.55	69042.68
	STEP F	34.0133	2721.06	5895.63	70747.66
	STEP G	34.8533	2788.26	6041.23	72494.86
	STEP H	35.7140	2857.12	6190.42	74285.12
	STEP I	36.5960	2927.68	6343.30	76119.68
	STEP J	37.4998	2999.98	6499.96	77999.58
	STEP K	38.4259	3074.07	6660.48	79925.87
	STEP L	39.3747	3149.97	6824.94	81899.37
	STEP M	40.3471	3227.76	6993.49	83921.96
	STEP N	41.3435	3307.48	7166.20	85994.48
	STEP O	42.3645	3389.16	7343.18	88118.16
B224	PREDICTIVE MAINTENANCE TECH II				
	STEP A	33.1183	2649.46	5740.50	68886.06
	STEP B	33.9362	2714.89	5882.27	70587.29
	STEP C	34.7742	2781.93	6027.52	72330.33
	STEP D	35.6330	2850.64	6176.38	74116.64
	STEP E	36.5130	2921.04	6328.92	75947.04
	STEP F	37.4146	2993.16	6485.19	77822.36
	STEP G	38.3386	3067.08	6645.35	79744.28
	STEP H	39.2854	3142.83	6809.46	81713.63
	STEP I	40.2556	3220.44	6977.63	83731.64
	STEP J	41.2497	3299.97	7149.94	85799.37
	STEP K	42.2684	3381.47	7326.52	87918.27
	STEP L	43.3122	3464.97	7507.44	90089.37
	STEP M	44.3819	3550.55	7692.86	92314.35
	STEP N	45.4779	3638.23	7882.83	94594.03
	STEP O	46.6009	3728.07	8077.48	96929.87

B225	PREVENTATIVE MAINT TECH I				
	STEP A	26.1804	2094.43	4537.93	54455.23
	STEP B	26.8270	2146.16	4650.01	55800.16
	STEP C	27.4895	2199.16	4764.84	57178.16
	STEP D	28.1683	2253.46	4882.50	58590.06
	STEP E	28.8639	2309.11	5003.07	60036.91
	STEP F	29.5768	2366.14	5126.64	61519.74
	STEP G	30.3072	2424.57	5253.24	63038.97
	STEP H	31.0557	2484.45	5382.98	64595.85
	STEP I	31.8226	2545.80	5515.91	66191.00
	STEP J	32.6084	2608.67	5652.12	67825.47
	STEP K	33.4137	2673.09	5791.70	69500.49
	STEP L	34.2390	2739.12	5934.76	71217.12
	STEP M	35.0845	2806.76	6081.31	72975.76
	STEP N	35.9508	2876.06	6231.47	74777.66
	STEP O	36.8387	2947.09	6385.37	76624.49
B226	PREVENTATIVE MAINT TECH II				
	STEP A	28.7985	2303.88	4991.74	59900.88
	STEP B	29.5097	2360.77	5115.01	61380.17
	STEP C	30.2385	2419.08	5241.34	62896.08
	STEP D	30.9852	2478.81	5370.76	64449.21
	STEP E	31.7504	2540.03	5503.40	66040.83
	STEP F	32.5345	2602.76	5639.31	67671.76
	STEP G	33.3379	2667.03	5778.56	69342.83
	STEP H	34.1612	2732.89	5921.27	71055.29
	STEP I	35.0049	2800.39	6067.51	72810.19
	STEP J	35.8693	2869.54	6217.34	74608.14
	STEP K	36.7551	2940.40	6370.88	76450.60
	STEP L	37.6628	3013.02	6528.21	78338.62
	STEP M	38.5929	3087.43	6689.43	80273.23
	STEP N	39.5459	3163.67	6854.62	82255.47
	STEP O	40.5226	3241.80	7023.91	84287.00
B227	PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE COORD				
	STEP A	30.6530	2452.24	5313.18	63758.24
	STEP B	31.4099	2512.79	5444.38	65332.59
	STEP C	32.1855	2574.84	5578.82	66945.84
	STEP D	32.9804	2638.43	5716.60	68599.23
	STEP E	33.7948	2703.58	5857.76	70293.18
	STEP F	34.6293	2770.34	6002.41	72028.94
	STEP G	35.4845	2838.76	6150.64	73807.76
	STEP H	36.3608	2908.86	6302.53	75630.46
	STEP I	37.2588	2980.70	6458.19	77498.30
	STEP J	38.1789	3054.31	6617.67	79412.11
	STEP K	39.1218	3129.74	6781.11	81373.34
	STEP L	40.0879	3207.03	6948.56	83382.83
	STEP M	41.0779	3286.23	7120.16	85442.03
	STEP N	42.0924	3367.39	7296.01	87552.19
	STEP O	43.1318	3450.54	7476.17	89714.14

B228	PWR ENGINEER I				
	STEP A	42.5046	3400.36	7367.46	88409.56
	STEP B	43.5541	3484.32	7549.37	90592.52
	STEP C	44.6297	3570.37	7735.81	92829.77
	STEP D	45.7319	3658.55	7926.86	95122.35
	STEP E	46.8612	3748.89	8122.60	97471.29
	STEP F	48.0184	3841.47	8323.18	99878.27
	STEP G	49.2043	3936.34	8528.74	102344.94
	STEP H	50.4195	4033.56	8739.38	104872.56
	STEP I	51.6645	4133.16	8955.18	107462.16
	STEP J	52.9405	4235.24	9176.35	110116.24
	STEP K	54.2478	4339.82	9402.95	112835.42
	STEP L	55.5876	4447.00	9635.18	115622.20
	STEP M	56.9602	4556.81	9873.10	118477.21
	STEP N	58.3669	4669.35	10116.92	121403.15
	STEP O	59.8083	4784.66	10366.77	124401.26
B229	PWR ENGINEER II				
	STEP A	46.7571	3740.56	8104.56	97254.76
	STEP B	47.9114	3832.91	8304.64	99655.71
	STEP C	49.0946	3927.56	8509.73	102116.76
	STEP D	50.3070	4024.56	8719.88	104638.56
	STEP E	51.5494	4123.95	8935.22	107222.75
	STEP F	52.8224	4225.79	9155.88	109870.59
	STEP G	54.1269	4330.15	9382.00	112583.95
	STEP H	55.4636	4437.08	9613.69	115364.28
	STEP I	56.8332	4546.65	9851.08	118213.05
	STEP J	58.2368	4658.94	10094.37	121132.54
	STEP K	59.6749	4773.99	10343.64	124123.79
	STEP L	61.1487	4891.89	10599.10	127189.29
	STEP M	62.6587	5012.69	10860.84	130330.09
	STEP N	64.2062	5136.49	11129.07	133548.89
	STEP O	65.7917	5263.33	11403.89	136846.73
B230	PWR PLNT ENGINEER I				
	STEP A	42.5046	3400.36	7367.46	88409.56
	STEP B	43.5541	3484.32	7549.37	90592.52
	STEP C	44.6297	3570.37	7735.81	92829.77
	STEP D	45.7319	3658.55	7926.86	95122.35
	STEP E	46.8612	3748.89	8122.60	97471.29
	STEP F	48.0184	3841.47	8323.18	99878.27
	STEP G	49.2043	3936.34	8528.74	102344.94
	STEP H	50.4195	4033.56	8739.38	104872.56
	STEP I	51.6645	4133.16	8955.18	107462.16
	STEP J	52.9405	4235.24	9176.35	110116.24
	STEP K	54.2478	4339.82	9402.95	112835.42
	STEP L	55.5876	4447.00	9635.18	115622.20
	STEP M	56.9602	4556.81	9873.10	118477.21
	STEP N	58.3669	4669.35	10116.92	121403.15
	STEP O	59.8083	4784.66	10366.77	124401.26

B231	PWR PLNT ENGINEER II				
	STEP A	46.7571	3740.56	8104.56	97254.76
	STEP B	47.9114	3832.91	8304.64	99655.71
	STEP C	49.0946	3927.56	8509.73	102116.76
	STEP D	50.3070	4024.56	8719.88	104638.56
	STEP E	51.5494	4123.95	8935.22	107222.75
	STEP F	52.8224	4225.79	9155.88	109870.59
	STEP G	54.1269	4330.15	9382.00	112583.95
	STEP H	55.4636	4437.08	9613.69	115364.28
	STEP I	56.8332	4546.65	9851.08	118213.05
	STEP J	58.2369	4658.95	10094.39	121132.75
	STEP K	59.6749	4773.99	10343.64	124123.79
	STEP L	61.1487	4891.89	10599.10	127189.29
	STEP M	62.6587	5012.69	10860.84	130330.09
	STEP N	64.2062	5136.49	11129.07	133548.89
	STEP O	65.7917	5263.33	11403.89	136846.73
B232	PWR PLNT MECHANIC				
	STEP A	38.9403	3115.22	6749.65	80995.82
	STEP B	39.9017	3192.13	6916.29	82995.53
	STEP C	40.8871	3270.96	7087.09	85045.16
	STEP D	41.8968	3351.74	7262.11	87145.34
	STEP E	42.9314	3434.51	7441.44	89297.31
	STEP F	43.9917	3519.33	7625.22	91502.73
	STEP G	45.0780	3606.24	7813.52	93762.24
	STEP H	46.1912	3695.29	8006.47	96077.69
	STEP I	47.3320	3786.56	8204.21	98450.56
	STEP J	48.5009	3880.07	8406.82	100881.87
	STEP K	49.6986	3975.88	8614.42	103373.08
	STEP L	50.9259	4074.07	8827.15	105925.87
	STEP M	52.1836	4174.68	9045.15	108541.88
	STEP N	53.4722	4277.77	9268.51	111222.17
	STEP O	54.7928	4383.42	9497.41	113969.02
B233	PWR PLNT OPERATOR/TECH I				
	STEP A	38.7826	3102.60	6722.31	80667.80
	STEP B	39.7403	3179.22	6888.31	82659.82
	STEP C	40.7217	3257.73	7058.42	84701.13
	STEP D	41.7273	3338.18	7232.73	86792.78
	STEP E	42.7578	3420.62	7411.35	88936.22
	STEP F	43.8138	3505.10	7594.39	91132.70
	STEP G	44.8957	3591.65	7781.92	93383.05
	STEP H	46.0045	3680.36	7974.11	95689.36
	STEP I	47.1406	3771.24	8171.03	98052.44
	STEP J	48.3047	3864.37	8372.81	100473.77
	STEP K	49.4976	3959.80	8579.58	102955.00
	STEP L	50.7200	4057.60	8791.46	105497.60
	STEP M	51.9725	4157.80	9008.56	108102.80
	STEP N	53.2560	4260.48	9231.04	110772.48
	STEP O	54.5712	4365.69	9459.00	113508.09

B234 PWR PLNT OPERATOR/TECH II

STEP A	42.6615	3412.92	7394.66	88735.92
STEP B	43.7148	3497.18	7577.23	90926.78
STEP C	44.7943	3583.54	7764.34	93172.14
STEP D	45.9006	3672.04	7956.10	95473.24
STEP E	47.0341	3762.72	8152.57	97830.92
STEP F	48.1956	3855.64	8353.90	100246.84
STEP G	49.3858	3950.86	8560.20	102722.46
STEP H	50.6054	4048.43	8771.60	105259.23
STEP I	51.8552	4148.41	8988.23	107858.81
STEP J	53.1357	4250.85	9210.18	110522.25
STEP K	54.4479	4355.83	9437.63	113251.63
STEP L	55.7925	4463.40	9670.70	116048.40
STEP M	57.1704	4573.63	9909.53	118914.43
STEP N	58.5822	4686.57	10154.24	121850.97
STEP O	60.0289	4802.31	10405.00	124860.11

B235 SCADA SYSTEM TECHNICIAN

STEP A	33.1183	2649.46	5740.50	68886.06
STEP B	33.9362	2714.89	5882.27	70587.29
STEP C	34.7742	2781.93	6027.52	72330.33
STEP D	35.6330	2850.64	6176.38	74116.64
STEP E	36.5130	2921.04	6328.92	75947.04
STEP F	37.4146	2993.16	6485.19	77822.36
STEP G	38.3386	3067.08	6645.35	79744.28
STEP H	39.2854	3142.83	6809.46	81713.63
STEP I	40.2556	3220.44	6977.63	83731.64
STEP J	41.2497	3299.97	7149.94	85799.37
STEP K	42.2684	3381.47	7326.52	87918.27
STEP L	43.3122	3464.97	7507.44	90089.37
STEP M	44.3819	3550.55	7692.86	92314.35
STEP N	45.4779	3638.23	7882.83	94594.03
STEP O	46.6009	3728.07	8077.48	96929.87

B236 SR ELECTRIC LINE TECHNICIAN

STEP A	49.2091	3936.72	8529.57	102354.92
STEP B	50.4242	4033.93	8740.19	104882.33
STEP C	51.6695	4133.56	8956.04	107472.56
STEP D	52.9455	4235.64	9177.22	110126.64
STEP E	54.2529	4340.23	9403.83	112846.03
STEP F	55.5928	4447.42	9636.08	115633.02
STEP G	56.9657	4557.25	9874.05	118488.65
STEP H	58.3724	4669.79	10117.88	121414.59
STEP I	59.8140	4785.12	10367.76	124413.12
STEP J	61.2911	4903.28	10623.79	127485.48
STEP K	62.8047	5024.37	10886.14	130633.77
STEP L	64.3556	5148.44	11154.97	133859.64
STEP M	65.9450	5275.60	11430.46	137165.60
STEP N	67.5735	5405.88	11712.74	140552.88
STEP O	69.2423	5539.38	12002.00	144023.98

B237 SR ELECTRIC MATERIALS TECH

STEP A	33.0917	2647.33	5735.89	68830.73
STEP B	33.9089	2712.71	5877.54	70530.51
STEP C	34.7462	2779.69	6022.67	72272.09
STEP D	35.6044	2848.35	6171.42	74057.15
STEP E	36.4835	2918.68	6323.80	75885.68
STEP F	37.3846	2990.76	6480.00	77759.96
STEP G	38.3078	3064.62	6640.01	79680.22
STEP H	39.2538	3140.30	6803.99	81647.90
STEP I	40.2232	3217.85	6972.02	83664.25
STEP J	41.2166	3297.32	7144.21	85730.52
STEP K	42.2344	3378.75	7320.62	87847.55
STEP L	43.2774	3462.19	7501.41	90016.99
STEP M	44.3462	3547.69	7686.67	92240.09
STEP N	45.4412	3635.29	7876.47	94517.69
STEP O	46.5635	3725.08	8071.00	96852.08

B238 SR ELECTRIC METERING TECH

STEP A	49.4887	3959.09	8578.04	102936.49
STEP B	50.7108	4056.86	8789.87	105478.46
STEP C	51.9631	4157.04	9006.93	108083.24
STEP D	53.2463	4259.70	9229.35	110752.30
STEP E	54.5612	4364.89	9457.27	113487.29
STEP F	55.9087	4472.69	9690.84	116290.09
STEP G	57.2894	4583.15	9930.16	119161.95
STEP H	58.7041	4696.32	10175.37	122104.52
STEP I	60.1539	4812.31	10426.67	125120.11
STEP J	61.6394	4931.15	10684.16	128209.95
STEP K	63.1616	5052.92	10948.01	131376.12
STEP L	64.7214	5177.71	11218.37	134620.51
STEP M	66.3197	5305.57	11495.41	137944.97
STEP N	67.9575	5436.60	11779.30	141351.60
STEP O	69.6357	5570.85	12070.18	144842.25

B239 SR ELECTRIC SUBSTATION TECH

STEP A	49.4887	3959.09	8578.04	102936.49
STEP B	50.7108	4056.86	8789.87	105478.46
STEP C	51.9631	4157.04	9006.93	108083.24
STEP D	53.2463	4259.70	9229.35	110752.30
STEP E	54.5612	4364.89	9457.27	113487.29
STEP F	55.9087	4472.69	9690.84	116290.09
STEP G	57.2894	4583.15	9930.16	119161.95
STEP H	58.7041	4696.32	10175.37	122104.52
STEP I	60.1539	4812.31	10426.67	125120.11
STEP J	61.6394	4931.15	10684.16	128209.95
STEP K	63.1616	5052.92	10948.01	131376.12
STEP L	64.7214	5177.71	11218.37	134620.51
STEP M	66.3197	5305.57	11495.41	137944.97
STEP N	67.9575	5436.60	11779.30	141351.60
STEP O	69.6357	5570.85	12070.18	144842.25

B240 SR ELECTRIC SYSTEM DISPATCHER

STEP A	54.1301	4330.40	9382.55	112590.60
STEP B	55.4666	4437.32	9614.21	115370.52
STEP C	56.8364	4546.91	9851.64	118219.71
STEP D	58.2400	4659.20	10094.93	121139.20
STEP E	59.6782	4774.25	10344.22	124130.65
STEP F	61.1520	4892.16	10599.68	127196.16
STEP G	62.6621	5012.96	10861.43	130337.16
STEP H	64.2096	5136.76	11129.66	133555.96
STEP I	65.7953	5263.62	11404.51	136854.22
STEP J	67.4202	5393.61	11686.16	140234.01
STEP K	69.0851	5526.80	11974.75	143697.00
STEP L	70.7912	5663.29	12270.47	147245.69
STEP M	72.5394	5803.15	12573.49	150881.95
STEP N	74.3308	5946.46	12884.00	154608.06
STEP O	76.1664	6093.31	13202.17	158426.11

B241 SR ELECTRONICS TECHNICIAN

STEP A	36.4301	2914.40	6314.55	75774.60
STEP B	37.3298	2986.38	6470.49	77645.98
STEP C	38.2516	3060.12	6630.27	79563.32
STEP D	39.1963	3135.70	6794.02	81528.30
STEP E	40.1642	3213.13	6961.79	83541.53
STEP F	41.1561	3292.48	7133.72	85604.68
STEP G	42.1725	3373.80	7309.90	87718.80
STEP H	43.2140	3457.12	7490.42	89885.12
STEP I	34.0211	2721.68	5896.99	70763.88
STEP J	45.3746	3629.96	7864.93	94379.16
STEP K	46.4952	3719.61	8059.16	96710.01
STEP L	47.6434	3811.47	8258.18	99098.27
STEP M	48.8201	3905.60	8462.15	101545.80
STEP N	50.0256	4002.04	8671.10	104053.24
STEP O	51.2610	4100.88	8885.24	106622.88

B242 SR PLANT & EQUIPMENT MECHANIC

STEP A	29.4665	2357.32	5107.52	61290.32
STEP B	30.1942	2415.53	5233.66	62803.93
STEP C	30.9397	2475.17	5362.88	64354.57
STEP D	31.7038	2536.30	5495.32	65943.90
STEP E	32.4868	2598.94	5631.04	67572.54
STEP F	33.2891	2663.12	5770.11	69241.32
STEP G	34.1111	2728.88	5912.59	70951.08
STEP H	34.9536	2796.28	6058.62	72703.48
STEP I	35.8167	2865.33	6208.22	74498.73
STEP J	36.7013	2936.10	6361.55	76338.70
STEP K	37.6076	3008.60	6518.65	78223.80
STEP L	38.5364	3082.91	6679.64	80155.71
STEP M	39.4880	3159.04	6844.58	82135.04
STEP N	40.4632	3237.05	7013.62	84163.45
STEP O	41.4624	3316.99	7186.81	86241.79

B244 SR PREVENTATIVE MAINT TECH

STEP A	36.4301	2914.40	6314.55	75774.60
STEP B	37.3298	2986.38	6470.49	77645.98
STEP C	38.2516	3060.12	6630.27	79563.32
STEP D	39.1963	3135.70	6794.02	81528.30
STEP E	40.1642	3213.13	6961.79	83541.53
STEP F	41.1561	3292.48	7133.72	85604.68
STEP G	42.1725	3373.80	7309.90	87718.80
STEP H	43.2140	3457.12	7490.42	89885.12
STEP I	44.2811	3542.48	7675.39	92104.68
STEP J	45.3746	3629.96	7864.93	94379.16
STEP K	46.4952	3719.61	8059.16	96710.01
STEP L	47.6434	3811.47	8258.18	99098.27
STEP M	48.8201	3905.60	8462.15	101545.80
STEP N	50.0256	4002.04	8671.10	104053.24
STEP O	51.2610	4100.88	8885.24	106622.88

B243 SR PWR PLNT OPERATOR/TECH

STEP A	46.9266	3754.12	8133.94	97607.32
STEP B	48.0852	3846.81	8334.76	100017.21
STEP C	49.2727	3941.81	8540.60	102487.21
STEP D	50.4896	4039.16	8751.53	105018.36
STEP E	51.7364	4138.91	8967.64	107611.71
STEP F	53.0140	4241.12	9189.09	110269.12
STEP G	54.3232	4345.85	9416.02	112992.25
STEP H	55.6647	4453.17	9648.54	115782.57
STEP I	57.0394	4563.15	9886.82	118641.95
STEP J	58.4480	4675.84	10130.98	121571.84
STEP K	59.8914	4791.31	10381.17	124574.11
STEP L	61.3705	4909.64	10637.55	127650.64
STEP M	62.8860	5030.88	10900.24	130802.88
STEP N	64.4391	5155.12	11169.44	134033.32
STEP O	66.0304	5282.43	11445.26	137343.23

B245 SR WATER DISTRIBUTION WORKER

STEP A	26.7364	2138.91	4634.30	55611.71
STEP B	27.3964	2191.71	4748.70	56984.51
STEP C	28.0729	2245.83	4865.96	58391.63
STEP D	28.7662	2301.29	4986.14	59833.69
STEP E	29.4766	2358.12	5109.27	61311.32
STEP F	30.2045	2416.36	5235.44	62825.36
STEP G	30.9504	2476.03	5364.73	64376.83
STEP H	31.7148	2537.18	5497.23	65966.78
STEP I	32.4979	2599.83	5632.96	67595.63
STEP J	33.3006	2664.04	5772.10	69265.24
STEP K	34.1229	2729.83	5914.63	70975.63
STEP L	34.9656	2797.24	6060.70	72728.44
STEP M	35.8290	2866.32	6210.36	74524.32
STEP N	36.7139	2937.11	6363.74	76364.91
STEP O	37.6205	3009.64	6520.88	78250.64

B246 SR WSTWTR UTILITY MAINT WKR

STEP A	26.7364	2138.91	4634.30	55611.71
STEP B	27.3964	2191.71	4748.70	56984.51
STEP C	28.0729	2245.83	4865.96	58391.63
STEP D	28.7662	2301.29	4986.14	59833.69
STEP E	29.4766	2358.12	5109.27	61311.32
STEP F	30.2045	2416.36	5235.44	62825.36
STEP G	30.9504	2476.03	5364.73	64376.83
STEP H	31.7148	2537.18	5497.23	65966.78
STEP I	32.4979	2599.83	5632.96	67595.63
STEP J	33.3006	2664.04	5772.10	69265.24
STEP K	34.1229	2729.83	5914.63	70975.63
STEP L	34.9656	2797.24	6060.70	72728.44
STEP M	35.8290	2866.32	6210.36	74524.32
STEP N	36.7139	2937.11	6363.74	76364.91
STEP O	37.6205	3009.64	6520.88	78250.64

B247 TRAFFIC SIGNAL MAINT WKR I

STEP A	24.2515	1940.12	4203.59	50443.12
STEP B	24.8501	1988.00	4307.35	51688.20
STEP C	25.4639	2037.11	4413.74	52964.91
STEP D	26.0927	2087.41	4522.73	54272.81
STEP E	26.7370	2138.96	4634.41	55612.96
STEP F	27.3974	2191.79	4748.88	56986.59
STEP G	28.0739	2245.91	4866.14	58393.71
STEP H	28.7673	2301.38	4986.33	59835.98
STEP I	29.4777	2358.21	5109.46	61313.61
STEP J	30.2056	2416.44	5235.63	62827.64
STEP K	30.9515	2476.12	5364.92	64379.12
STEP L	31.7159	2537.27	5497.42	65969.07
STEP M	32.4992	2599.93	5633.19	67598.33
STEP N	33.3017	2664.13	5772.29	69267.53
STEP O	34.1241	2729.92	5914.84	70978.12

B248 TRAFFIC SIGNAL MAINT WKR II

STEP A	26.6765	2134.12	4623.92	55487.12
STEP B	27.3352	2186.81	4738.10	56857.21
STEP C	28.0103	2240.82	4855.11	58261.42
STEP D	28.7020	2296.16	4975.01	59700.16
STEP E	29.4108	2352.86	5097.87	61174.46
STEP F	30.1371	2410.96	5223.76	62685.16
STEP G	30.8814	2470.51	5352.77	64233.31
STEP H	31.6440	2531.52	5484.96	65819.52
STEP I	32.4255	2594.04	5620.42	67445.04
STEP J	33.2263	2658.10	5759.22	69110.70
STEP K	34.0468	2723.74	5901.44	70817.34
STEP L	34.8876	2791.00	6047.18	72566.20
STEP M	35.7491	2859.92	6196.51	74358.12
STEP N	36.6320	2930.56	6349.54	76194.56
STEP O	37.5366	3002.92	6506.34	78076.12

B249 WATER CONSERVATION SPECIALIST

STEP A	26.7364	2138.91	4634.30	55611.71
STEP B	27.3964	2191.71	4748.70	56984.51
STEP C	28.0729	2245.83	4865.96	58391.63
STEP D	28.7662	2301.29	4986.14	59833.69
STEP E	29.4766	2358.12	5109.27	61311.32
STEP F	30.2045	2416.36	5235.44	62825.36
STEP G	30.9504	2476.03	5364.73	64376.83
STEP H	31.7148	2537.18	5497.23	65966.78
STEP I	32.4979	2599.83	5632.96	67595.63
STEP J	33.3006	2664.04	5772.10	69265.24
STEP K	34.1229	2729.83	5914.63	70975.63
STEP L	34.9656	2797.24	6060.70	72728.44
STEP M	35.8290	2866.32	6210.36	74524.32
STEP N	36.7139	2937.11	6363.74	76364.91
STEP O	37.6205	3009.64	6520.88	78250.64

B250 WATER CONSERVATION WORKER I

STEP A	20.3493	1627.94	3527.21	42326.54
STEP B	20.8517	1668.13	3614.29	43371.53
STEP C	21.3667	1709.33	3703.56	44442.73
STEP D	21.8943	1751.54	3795.01	45540.14
STEP E	22.4350	1794.80	3888.73	46664.80
STEP F	22.9891	1839.12	3984.77	47817.32
STEP G	23.5568	1884.54	4083.17	48998.14
STEP H	24.1385	1931.08	4184.00	50208.08
STEP I	24.7346	1978.76	4287.33	51447.96
STEP J	25.3455	2027.64	4393.22	52718.64
STEP K	25.9714	2077.71	4501.70	54020.51
STEP L	26.6128	2129.02	4612.88	55354.62
STEP M	27.2700	2181.60	4726.80	56721.60
STEP N	27.9434	2235.47	4843.52	58122.27
STEP O	28.6335	2290.68	4963.14	59557.68

B251 WATER CONSERVATION WORKER II

STEP A	24.2516	1940.12	4203.61	50443.32
STEP B	24.8501	1988.00	4307.35	51688.20
STEP C	25.4639	2037.11	4413.74	52964.91
STEP D	26.0927	2087.41	4522.73	54272.81
STEP E	26.7370	2138.96	4634.41	55612.96
STEP F	27.3974	2191.79	4748.88	56986.59
STEP G	28.0739	2245.91	4866.14	58393.71
STEP H	28.7673	2301.38	4986.33	59835.98
STEP I	29.4777	2358.21	5109.46	61313.61
STEP J	30.2056	2416.44	5235.63	62827.64
STEP K	30.9515	2476.12	5364.92	64379.12
STEP L	31.7159	2537.27	5497.42	65969.07
STEP M	32.4992	2599.93	5633.19	67598.33
STEP N	33.3017	2664.13	5772.29	69267.53
STEP O	34.1241	2729.92	5914.84	70978.12

B252 WATER DISTRIBUTION WORKER I

STEP A	20.3493	1627.94	3527.21	42326.54
STEP B	20.8517	1668.13	3614.29	43371.53
STEP C	21.3667	1709.33	3703.56	44442.73
STEP D	21.8943	1751.54	3795.01	45540.14
STEP E	22.4350	1794.80	3888.73	46664.80
STEP F	22.9891	1839.12	3984.77	47817.32
STEP G	23.5568	1884.54	4083.17	48998.14
STEP H	24.1385	1931.08	4184.00	50208.08
STEP I	24.7346	1978.76	4287.33	51447.96
STEP J	25.3455	2027.64	4393.22	52718.64
STEP K	25.9714	2077.71	4501.70	54020.51
STEP L	26.6128	2129.02	4612.88	55354.62
STEP M	27.2700	2181.60	4726.80	56721.60
STEP N	27.9434	2235.47	4843.52	58122.27
STEP O	28.6335	2290.68	4963.14	59557.68

B253 WATER DISTRIBUTION WORKER II

STEP A	24.2516	1940.12	4203.61	50443.32
STEP B	24.8501	1988.00	4307.35	51688.20
STEP C	25.4639	2037.11	4413.74	52964.91
STEP D	26.0927	2087.41	4522.73	54272.81
STEP E	26.7370	2138.96	4634.41	55612.96
STEP F	27.3974	2191.79	4748.88	56986.59
STEP G	28.0739	2245.91	4866.14	58393.71
STEP H	28.7673	2301.38	4986.33	59835.98
STEP I	29.4777	2358.21	5109.46	61313.61
STEP J	30.2056	2416.44	5235.63	62827.64
STEP K	30.9515	2476.12	5364.92	64379.12
STEP L	31.7159	2537.27	5497.42	65969.07
STEP M	32.4992	2599.93	5633.19	67598.33
STEP N	33.3017	2664.13	5772.29	69267.53
STEP O	34.1241	2729.92	5914.84	70978.12

B254 WSTWTR UTILITY MAINT WKR I

STEP A	20.3493	1627.94	3527.21	42326.54
STEP B	20.8517	1668.13	3614.29	43371.53
STEP C	21.3667	1709.33	3703.56	44442.73
STEP D	21.8943	1751.54	3795.01	45540.14
STEP E	22.4350	1794.80	3888.73	46664.80
STEP F	22.9891	1839.12	3984.77	47817.32
STEP G	23.5568	1884.54	4083.17	48998.14
STEP H	24.1385	1931.08	4184.00	50208.08
STEP I	24.7346	1978.76	4287.33	51447.96
STEP J	25.3455	2027.64	4393.22	52718.64
STEP K	25.9714	2077.71	4501.70	54020.51
STEP L	26.6128	2129.02	4612.88	55354.62
STEP M	27.2700	2181.60	4726.80	56721.60
STEP N	27.9434	2235.47	4843.52	58122.27
STEP O	28.6335	2290.68	4963.14	59557.68

B255 WSTWTR UTILITY MAINT WKR II

STEP A	24.2516	1940.12	4203.61	50443.32
STEP B	24.8501	1988.00	4307.35	51688.20
STEP C	25.4639	2037.11	4413.74	52964.91
STEP D	26.0927	2087.41	4522.73	54272.81
STEP E	26.7370	2138.96	4634.41	55612.96
STEP F	27.3974	2191.79	4748.88	56986.59
STEP G	28.0739	2245.91	4866.14	58393.71
STEP H	28.7673	2301.38	4986.33	59835.98
STEP I	29.4777	2358.21	5109.46	61313.61
STEP J	30.2056	2416.44	5235.63	62827.64
STEP K	30.9515	2476.12	5364.92	64379.12
STEP L	31.7159	2537.27	5497.42	65969.07
STEP M	32.4992	2599.93	5633.19	67598.33
STEP N	33.3017	2664.13	5772.29	69267.53
STEP O	34.1241	2729.92	5914.84	70978.12

Position Allocation/Staffing Report
by Department and Location ("Division")

Tim	Position Title	Allocated FTE	Staffed FTE	(Over)/ Under Staffed Variance
Department: 20 CITY ATTORNEY				
Div/Loc: 02000 - CITY ATTORNEY				
020000245	ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY	1.000	1.000	
020001200	CITY ATTORNEY	1.000	1.000	
020001658	DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY II	2.000	3.000	(1.000)
020004094	LEGAL CLERK I (C)	0.000	0.750	(.750)
020004096	LEGAL CLERK II (C)	2.000	1.000	1.000
020005015	PARALEGAL (C)	1.000	1.000	
020007123	SR DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY	2.000	1.000	1.000
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 02000 - CITY ATTORNEY:		9.000	8.750	.250
TOTAL FOR DEPARTMENT 20 - CITY ATTORNEY:		9.000	8.750	.250
Department: 30 CITY MANAGER				
Div/Loc: 01500 - CITY MANAGER - ADMINISTRATION				
015001245	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER	1.000	1.000	
015001240	CITY MANAGER	1.000	1.000	
015002551	EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT	1.000	1.000	
015004457	MANAGEMENT ASSISTANT II	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 01500 - CITY MANAGER - ADMINISTRATION:		4.000	4.000	
Div/Loc: 01520 - PUBLIC AFFAIRS & COMMUNICATION				
015203451	GOVERNMENT RELATIONS ADMISTRAT	1.000	1.000	
015205615	PUB AFFAIRS&COMMUNICATN ADMNST	1.000	1.000	
015205610	PUBLIC AFFAIRS-COMMUNIC DIRECT	1.000	1.000	
015205565	PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 01520 - PUBLIC AFFAIRS & COMMUNICATION:		4.000	4.000	
Div/Loc: 08100 - DEVELOPMENT AND OPS-ADMIN				
081000325	ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER	1.000	1.000	
081002540	ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR	1.000	1.000	
081002551	EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08100 - DEVELOPMENT AND OPS-ADMIN:		3.000	3.000	
TOTAL FOR DEPARTMENT 30 - CITY MANAGER:		11.000	11.000	
Department: 31 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT				
Div/Loc: 08110 - HOUSING ADMIN				
081100050	ADMIN ANALYST II	1.000	1.000	
081103402	HOUSING ANALYST II	2.000	2.000	
081103589	HOUSING MANAGER	1.000	0.000	1.000
081103590	HOUSING SUPERVISOR	1.000	0.000	1.000
081103592	HOUSING TECHNICIAN II	3.000	3.000	
081104957	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	1.000	0.000	1.000
081107148	SR HOUSING TECHNICIAN	1.000	1.000	
08110B456	HOUSING ANALYST I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
08110B489	OFFICE ASSISTANT I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
08110B844	HOUSING MANAGER	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08110 - HOUSING ADMIN:		10.000	10.000	
Div/Loc: 08123 - ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT				
081231675	DEVELOPMENT ANALYST II	1.000	1.000	
081231710	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR	1.000	1.000	
081231712	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT MANAGER	1.000	1.000	

Position Allocation/Staffing Report
by Department and Location ("Division")

PCN	Position Title	Allocated FTE	Staffed FTE	(Over)/ Under Staffed Variance
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08123 - ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:		3.000	3.000	
TOTAL FOR DEPARTMENT 31 - ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:		13.000	13.000	
Department: 41 FINANCE				
Div/Loc: 05000 - FINANCE ADMINISTRATION				
050000050	ADMIN ANALYST II	1.000	1.000	
050000071	ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT (C)	1.000	1.000	
050006520	ERP MANAGER	1.000	0.000	1.000
050003301	FINANCE DIRECTOR	1.000	1.000	
05000B851	ERP MANAGER	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 05000 - FINANCE ADMINISTRATION:		4.000	4.000	
Div/Loc: 05010 - BUDGET				
050100915	BUDGET ANALYST II	2.750	2.500	.250
050100930	BUDGET MANAGER	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 05010 - BUDGET:		3.750	3.500	.250
Div/Loc: 05011 - PAYROLL				
050112900	FINANCE MANAGER	1.000	1.000	
050115103	PAYROLL CLERK II (C)	1.600	0.600	1.000
050115101	PAYROLL TECHNICIAN II	2.000	2.000	
050117141	SR PAYROLL TECHNICIAN	1.000	1.000	
05011B111	PAYROLL CLERK I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 05011 - PAYROLL:		5.600	5.600	
Div/Loc: 05012 - ACCOUNTS PAYABLE				
050123335	FINANCE CLERK II	2.000	3.000	(1.000)
050124957	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	0.625	0.625	
050127146	SR FINANCE CLERK	1.000	0.000	1.000
050127147	SR FINANCE TECHNICIAN	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 05012 - ACCOUNTS PAYABLE:		4.625	4.625	
Div/Loc: 05030 - CASH MANAGEMENT				
050303335	FINANCE CLERK II	0.500	0.000	.500
050303326	FINANCE TECHNICIAN II	1.000	1.000	
050303318	FINANCIAL ANALYST II	1.000	1.000	
05030B445	FINANCE CLERK I	0.000	0.500	(.500)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 05030 - CASH MANAGEMENT:		2.500	2.500	
Div/Loc: 05040 - UTIL BILLING & SERV - ADMIN				
050400920	BILLING SERVICES MANAGER	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 05040 - UTIL BILLING & SERV - ADMIN:		1.000	1.000	
Div/Loc: 05041 - UTIL BILLING & SRV-FIELD SRV				
050413310	FINANCE SUPERVISOR	1.000	1.000	
050414540	METER READER	4.500	3.500	1.000
050414534	METER SERVICE WORKER	2.000	1.000	1.000
050417200	SR METER SERVICE WORKER	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 05041 - UTIL BILLING & SRV-FIELD SRV:		8.500	6.500	2.000
Div/Loc: 05042 - UTIL BILLING & SRV - BILLING				
050423326	FINANCE TECHNICIAN II	3.000	4.000	(1.000)
050423318	FINANCIAL ANALYST II	1.000	0.000	1.000
050427147	SR FINANCE TECHNICIAN	2.000	2.000	

Position Allocation/Staffing Report
by Department and Location ("Division")

PCN	Position Title	Allocated FTE	Staffed FTE	(Over)/ Under Staffed Variance
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 05042 - UTIL BILLING & SRV - BILLING:		6.000	6.000	
Div/Loc: 05043 - UTIL BILLING & SRV-SERVICES				
050433335	FINANCE CLERK II	11.750	9.750	2.000
050433310	FINANCE SUPERVISOR	1.000	1.000	
050433326	FINANCE TECHNICIAN II	1.000	1.000	
050437146	SR FINANCE CLERK	1.000	0.000	1.000
050433334	FINANCE CLERK I	0.000	1.500	(1.500)
05043B446	FINANCE CLERK II	0.000	0.500	(.500)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 05043 - UTIL BILLING & SRV-SERVICES:		14.750	13.750	1.000
Div/Loc: 05050 - GEN ACCT - ADMINISTRATION				
050500040	ACCOUNTANT II	1.000	1.000	
050500043	ACCOUNTING SUPERVISOR	1.000	1.000	
050501370	CONTROLLER	1.000	0.000	1.000
050500041	ACCOUNTING MANAGER	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 05050 - GEN ACCT - ADMINISTRATION:		3.000	3.000	
Div/Loc: 05053 - GEN ACCT - ACCOUNTING				
050530040	ACCOUNTANT II	1.000	0.000	1.000
050533318	FINANCIAL ANALYST II	2.000	2.000	
05053B401	ACCOUNTANT II	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 05053 - GEN ACCT - ACCOUNTING:		3.000	3.000	
TOTAL FOR DEPARTMENT 41 - FINANCE:		56.725	53.475	3.250
Department: 42 HUMAN RESOURCES				
Div/Loc: 03100 - HUMAN RESOURCES				
031000071	ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT (C)	1.000	1.000	
031000484	ASST HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR	1.000	1.000	
031003594	HUMAN RESOURCES ANALYST I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
031003596	HUMAN RESOURCES ANALYST II	2.000	0.000	2.000
031003598	HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR	1.000	1.000	
031003599	HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGER	1.000	1.000	
031005235	HUMAN RESOURCES TECH (C)	5.000	3.000	2.000
031007178	SR HUMAN RESOURCES TECH (C)	1.000	1.000	
03100B102	HUMAN RESOURCES TECH (C)	0.000	2.000	(2.000)
03100B774	HUMAN RESOURCES ANALYST II	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 03100 - HUMAN RESOURCES:		12.000	12.000	
Div/Loc: 03110 - RISK MGMT - ADMINISTRATION				
031105235	HUMAN RESOURCES TECH (C)	1.000	0.000	1.000
031106450	RISK MANAGER	1.000	1.000	
031107178	SR HUMAN RESOURCES TECH (C)	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 03110 - RISK MGMT - ADMINISTRATION:		3.000	2.000	1.000
TOTAL FOR DEPARTMENT 42 - HUMAN RESOURCES:		15.000	14.000	1.000
Department: 43 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY				
Div/Loc: 03120 - IT-STRAT PLNNG&DIGITAL COMMUN				
031201362	BUSINESS SYSTEMS ANALYST II	2.000	1.000	1.000
031201180	CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER	1.000	1.000	
031203625	INFO SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR	1.000	1.000	
031203616	IT PLANNING & POLICY TECH	1.000	0.000	1.000

Position Allocation/Staffing Report
by Department and Location ("Division")

PCN	Position Title	Allocated FTE	Staffed FTE	(Over)/ Under Staffed Variance
031203602	IT PROGRAM MANAGER	1.000	1.000	
031207130	SR BUSINESS SYSTEMS ANALYST	1.000	1.000	
03120B414	BUSINESS SYSTEMS ANALYST I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
03120B469	IT PLANNING & POLICY TECH	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 03120 - IT-STRAT PLNNG&DIGITAL COMMUN:		7.000	7.000	
Div/Loc: 03121 - IT-DATABASE & CLOUD SOLUTION				
031213794	IT ANALYST II	1.000	1.000	
031213601	IT DIVISION MANAGER	1.000	1.000	
031217145	SR DATABASE ANALYST	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 03121 - IT-DATABASE & CLOUD SOLUTION:		3.000	3.000	
Div/Loc: 03122 - IT-NETWORK & INFRASTRUCTURE				
031223794	IT ANALYST II	6.000	5.000	1.000
031223602	IT PROGRAM MANAGER	1.000	1.000	
031227149	SR IT TECHNICIAN	1.000	1.000	
031223793	IT ANALYST I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 03122 - IT-NETWORK & INFRASTRUCTURE:		8.000	8.000	
Div/Loc: 03123 - IT-BUSINESS & CLOUD SOLUTIONS				
031231362	BUSINESS SYSTEMS ANALYST II	4.000	3.000	1.000
031233602	IT PROGRAM MANAGER	1.000	1.000	
031237130	SR BUSINESS SYSTEMS ANALYST	1.000	0.000	1.000
03123B415	BUSINESS SYSTEMS ANALYST II	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 03123 - IT-BUSINESS & CLOUD SOLUTIONS:		6.000	5.000	1.000
Div/Loc: 03124 - IT-GIS & ANALYTICS				
031243794	IT ANALYST II	2.000	2.000	
031243602	IT PROGRAM MANAGER	1.000	1.000	
031247130	SR BUSINESS SYSTEMS ANALYST	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 03124 - IT-GIS & ANALYTICS:		4.000	4.000	
Div/Loc: 03125 - IT:CLIENT SERVICES				
031253601	IT DIVISION MANAGER	1.000	1.000	
031253618	IT TECHNICIAN II	3.000	2.000	1.000
031257194	SR IT ANALYST	1.000	0.000	1.000
031257149	SR IT TECHNICIAN	2.000	2.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 03125 - IT:CLIENT SERVICES:		7.000	5.000	2.000
Div/Loc: 03126 - IT-ENTERPRISE SOLUTIONS				
031261362	BUSINESS SYSTEMS ANALYST II	3.000	2.000	1.000
031263602	IT PROGRAM MANAGER	1.000	1.000	
031267130	SR BUSINESS SYSTEMS ANALYST	1.000	2.000	(1.000)
03126B415	BUSINESS SYSTEMS ANALYST II	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 03126 - IT-ENTERPRISE SOLUTIONS:		5.000	6.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR DEPARTMENT 43 - INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY:		40.000	38.000	2.000

Department: 44 CITY CLERK

Div/Loc: 03200 - CITY CLERK - ADMINISTRATION

032000250	ASST CITY CLERK	1.000	1.000	
032001220	CITY CLERK	1.000	1.000	
032001227	CITY CLERK TECHNICIAN II	2.000	2.000	
032001665	DEPUTY CITY CLERK II	3.500	3.000	.500

Position Allocation/Staffing Report
by Department and Location ("Division")

PCN	Position Title	Allocated FTE	Staffed FTE	(Over)/ Under Staffed Variance
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 03200 - CITY CLERK - ADMINISTRATION:		7.500	7.000	.500
TOTAL FOR DEPARTMENT 44 - CITY CLERK:		7.500	7.000	.500
Department: 45 CENTRAL SERVICES				
Div/Loc: 03300 - CENTRAL SERV - ADMINISTRATION				
033000050	ADMIN ANALYST II	1.000	1.000	
033000071	ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT (C)	1.000	1.000	
033001125	CENTRAL SERVICES DIRECTOR	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 03300 - CENTRAL SERV - ADMINISTRATION:		3.000	3.000	
Div/Loc: 03311 - PURCHASING				
033110084	ADMIN TECHNICIAN	1.000	1.000	
033111060	BUYER II	3.000	1.000	2.000
033115652	PURCHASING & WAREHOUSE MANAGER	1.000	1.000	
033117139	SENIOR BUYER	1.000	1.000	
03311B416	BUYER I	0.000	2.000	(2.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 03311 - PURCHASING:		6.000	6.000	
Div/Loc: 03312 - CENTRAL STORES				
033121450	COURIER	1.000	1.000	
033127203	SR WAREHOUSE WORKER	1.000	1.000	
033128952	WAREHOUSE WORKER II	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 03312 - CENTRAL STORES:		3.000	3.000	
Div/Loc: 03321 - AUTOMOTIVE SERVICES				
033212565	EQUIPMENT MAINT. SUPERVISOR	1.000	1.000	
033212560	EQUIPMENT SERVICEWORKER	4.000	3.000	1.000
033213392	FLEET MANAGER	1.000	1.000	
033214501	MECHANIC II	8.000	6.000	2.000
033214957	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	1.000	1.000	
033217189	SR MECHANIC	2.000	2.000	
033218938	VEHICLE MAINT PARTS BUYER	1.000	0.000	1.000
033218940	VEHICLE MAINT SERVICEWRITER	1.000	1.000	
033218952	WAREHOUSE WORKER II	1.000	1.000	
033214500	MECHANIC I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
03321B444	EQUIPMENT SERVICEWORKER	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
03321B482	MECHANIC I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
03321B530	VEHICLE MAINT PARTS BUYER	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 03321 - AUTOMOTIVE SERVICES:		20.000	20.000	
Div/Loc: 03322 - AUTO REPLACEMENT				
033223319	FLEET MANAGEMENT TECHNICIAN	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 03322 - AUTO REPLACEMENT:		1.000	1.000	
Div/Loc: 03331 - BUILDING MAINTENANCE				
033319425	BLDG MAINTENANCE AIDE	1.000	0.000	1.000
033311032	BLDG MAINTENANCE WORKER II	4.000	3.000	1.000
033313395	FACILITIES MANAGER	1.000	1.000	
033314957	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	0.750	0.662	.087
033315560	PROJECT COORDINATOR	1.000	1.000	
033317119	SR BUILDING MAINTENANCE WORKER	2.000	2.000	
03331B411	BLDG MAINTENANCE WORKER II	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 03331 - BUILDING MAINTENANCE:		9.750	8.662	1.087
Page:		5	Date: 01/21/2017	
Report: HR_ALLOC_STAFF_DEPT_LOC_ROSEV - HR: Allocation by Department, DivLoc - No Names			Time: 13:16:06	

Position Allocation/Staffing Report
by Department and Location ("Division")

PCN	Position Title	Allocated FTE	Staffed FTE	(Over)/ Under Staffed Variance
Div/Loc: 03332 - JANITORIAL				
033321485	CUSTODIAN	5.000	4.000	1.000
033327144	SR CUSTODIAN	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 03332 - JANITORIAL:		6.000	5.000	1.000
TOTAL FOR DEPARTMENT 45 - CENTRAL SERVICES:		48.750	46.662	2.087
Department: 50 POLICE				
Div/Loc: 05500 - POLICE - ADMINISTRATION				
055000050	ADMIN ANALYST II	1.000	1.000	
055000071	ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT (C)	1.000	1.000	
055000510	ASSISTANT POLICE CHIEF	1.000	1.000	
055005400	POLICE CAPTAIN	2.000	2.000	
055005410	POLICE CHIEF	1.000	1.000	
055005420	POLICE LIEUTENANT	1.000	2.000	(1.000)
055005430	POLICE OFFICER	1.000	1.000	
055005440	POLICE RECORDS CLERK II	1.000	1.000	
055005470	POLICE SERGEANT	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 05500 - POLICE - ADMINISTRATION:		10.000	11.000	(1.000)
Div/Loc: 05511 - RECORDS-PROPERTY				
055115434	POLICE PROP & EVIDENCE CLRK II	3.000	2.000	1.000
055115429	POLICE PROPERTY & EVIDENCE SUP	1.000	1.000	
055115435	POLICE RECORDS CLERK I	0.000	2.000	(2.000)
055115440	POLICE RECORDS CLERK II	8.000	5.000	3.000
055115494	POLICE SCENE TECHNICIAN II	4.000	3.000	1.000
055115489	POLICE SERVICES ADMINISTRATOR	1.000	1.000	
055115748	RECORDS SUPERVISOR	1.000	1.000	
055115492	POLICE SCENE TECHNICIAN I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
05511B929	POLICE RECORDS CLERK I	0.000	2.000	(2.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 05511 - RECORDS-PROPERTY:		18.000	18.000	
Div/Loc: 05513 - POLICE COMMUNICATIONS				
055131430	COMMUNICATIONS SUPERVISOR	3.000	3.000	
055131700	DISPATCHER II	19.500	15.500	4.000
055135489	POLICE SERVICES ADMINISTRATOR	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 05513 - POLICE COMMUNICATIONS:		23.500	19.500	4.000
Div/Loc: 05514 - COMMUNITY SERVICES				
055141645	DEPT PUBLIC INFO OFFICER	1.000	1.000	
055145430	POLICE OFFICER	6.000	9.000	(3.000)
055145470	POLICE SERGEANT	1.000	2.000	(1.000)
055145485	POLICE SOCIAL SVCS ADMINSTR	1.000	1.000	
055145654	PUB SAFETY OUTREACH & COMM REL	1.000	1.000	
055145657	PUBLIC SAFETY PROGRAM COORD	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 05514 - COMMUNITY SERVICES:		11.000	15.000	(4.000)
Div/Loc: 05531 - PATROL				
055311380	COMMUNITY SVCS OFFICER II	9.000	4.000	5.000
055315420	POLICE LIEUTENANT	4.000	4.000	
055315430	POLICE OFFICER	74.000	66.000	8.000
055315470	POLICE SERGEANT	9.000	7.000	2.000
055315710	RANGEMASTER	1.000	1.000	
05531B918	COMMUNITY SVCS OFFICER II	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
05531B925	POLICE OFFICER TRAINEE	0.000	3.000	(3.000)

Position Allocation/Staffing Report
by Department and Location ("Division")

PCN	Position Title	Allocated FTE	Staffed FTE	(Over)/ Under Staffed Variance
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 05531 - PATROL:		97.000	86.000	11.000
Div/Loc: 05532 - INVESTIGATIONS				
055321380	COMMUNITY SVCS OFFICER II	2.000	2.000	
055321475	CRIME ANALYST	2.000	2.000	
055325420	POLICE LIEUTENANT	1.000	1.000	
055325430	POLICE OFFICER	17.000	16.000	1.000
055325440	POLICE RECORDS CLERK II	2.000	1.000	1.000
055325470	POLICE SERGEANT	2.000	2.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 05532 - INVESTIGATIONS:		26.000	24.000	2.000
Div/Loc: 05533 - ANIMAL CONTROL				
055330100	ANIMAL CONTROL OFFICER	2.000	2.000	
055330110	ANIMAL CONTROL SUPERVISOR	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 05533 - ANIMAL CONTROL:		3.000	3.000	
Div/Loc: 05535 - POLICE TRAFFIC				
055355420	POLICE LIEUTENANT	1.000	1.000	
055355430	POLICE OFFICER	7.000	6.000	1.000
055355470	POLICE SERGEANT	1.000	1.000	
055351380	COMMUNITY SVCS OFFICER II	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 05535 - POLICE TRAFFIC:		9.000	9.000	
TOTAL FOR DEPARTMENT 50 - POLICE:		197.500	185.500	12.000

Department: 60 FIRE

Div/Loc: 06000 - FIRE - ADMINISTRATION

060000071	ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT (C)	1.000	1.000	
060000084	ADMINISTRATIVE TECHNICIAN	1.000	1.000	
060003330	FIRE CHIEF	1.000	1.000	
060004957	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	1.000	0.000	1.000
060005654	PUB SAFETY OUTREACH & COMM REL	0.500	0.000	.500
06000B490	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 06000 - FIRE - ADMINISTRATION:		4.500	4.000	.500

Div/Loc: 06011 - FIRE PREVENTION

060111645	DEPT PUBLIC INFO OFFICER	1.000	1.000	
060113377	FIRE & ENVIR SAFETY INSPEC II	1.000	2.000	(1.000)
060113332	FIRE DIVISION CHIEF	1.000	1.000	
060113382	FIRE INSPECTION SUPERVISOR	2.000	2.000	
060113385	FIRE INSPECTOR II	2.000	1.000	1.000
060113454	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS INSPECTOR	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 06011 - FIRE PREVENTION:		8.000	8.000	

Div/Loc: 06021 - FIRE OPERATIONS

060210480	ASST FIRE CHIEF	1.000	1.000	
060213391	FIRE BATALLION CHIEF (8HR)	1.000	1.000	
060210905	FIRE BATTALION CHIEF	3.000	3.000	
060213320	FIRE CAPTAIN	30.000	30.000	
060213340	FIRE ENGINEER	30.000	28.000	2.000
060213355	FIREFIGHTER PARAMEDIC II	36.000	29.000	7.000
060213353	FIREFIGHTER PARAMEDIC I	0.000	5.000	(5.000)
06021F355	FIREFIGHTER PARAMEDIC	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 06021 - FIRE OPERATIONS:		101.000	98.000	3.000

Position Allocation/Staffing Report
by Department and Location ("Division")

PCN	Position Title	Allocated FTE	Staffed FTE	(Over)/ Under Staffed Variance
Div/Loc: 06022 - FIRE TRAINING				
060222415	EMS QUAL ASSURANCE COORDINATOR	1.000	0.000	1.000
060223391	FIRE BATALLION CHIEF (8HR)	1.000	1.000	
06022B755	EMS QUAL ASSURANCE COORDINATOR	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 06022 - FIRE TRAINING:		2.000	2.000	
Div/Loc: 06025 - FIRE LOGISTICS				
060250050	ADMINISTRATIVE ANALYST II	1.000	1.000	
060250480	ASST FIRE CHIEF	1.000	1.000	
060253412	GIS ANALYST II	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 06025 - FIRE LOGISTICS:		3.000	3.000	
Div/Loc: 06040 - EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS				
060403332	FIRE DIVISION CHIEF	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 06040 - EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS:		1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR DEPARTMENT 60 - FIRE:		119.500	116.000	3.500
Department: 71 PARKS AND RECREATION				
Div/Loc: 08500 - PARKS & REC - ADMINISTRATION				
085000084	ADMIN TECHNICIAN	1.000	0.000	1.000
085000050	ADMINISTRATIVE ANALYST II	1.000	1.000	
085000071	ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT (C)	1.000	1.000	
085004517	MARKET & COMMUNICATIONS ANA II	1.000	1.000	
085005010	PARKS,REC & LIB BUS ADMINISTR	1.000	1.000	
085005082	PARKS,REC & LIBRARIES DIRECTOR	1.000	1.000	
08500B402	ADMINISTRATIVE TECHNICIAN	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08500 - PARKS & REC - ADMINISTRATION:		6.000	6.000	
Div/Loc: 08501 - PARK DEVELOPMENT				
085015022	PARK DEVELOPMENT ANALYST II	1.000	1.000	
085015024	PARK PLANNING & DEV SUPERINTEN	1.000	1.000	
085017192	SR PARKS MAINTENANCE WORKER	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08501 - PARK DEVELOPMENT:		3.000	3.000	
Div/Loc: 08505 - RECREATION STAFFING				
085051401	COMMUNITY RELATIONS ANALYST	1.000	1.000	
085054957	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	4.000	1.000	3.000
085056122	RECREATION COORDINATOR II	6.000	5.000	1.000
085056125	RECREATION MANAGER	1.000	1.000	
085056145	RECREATION SUPERINTENDENT	3.000	3.000	
085056147	RECREATION SUPERVISOR	3.000	3.000	
085054956	OFFICE ASSISTANT I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
08505B490	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
08505B502	RECREATION COORDINATOR II	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08505 - RECREATION STAFFING:		18.000	17.000	1.000
Div/Loc: 08521 - MAIDU MUSEUM & HISTORIC SITE				
085213732	INTERPRETIVE SRVCS SPECIAL II	1.000	0.000	1.000
085213740	INTERPRETIVE SRVCS SUPERVISOR	1.000	1.000	
085214957	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08521 - MAIDU MUSEUM & HISTORIC SITE:		3.000	2.000	1.000
Div/Loc: 08530 - AQUATICS				
085305080	PARKS MAINTENANCE WORKER II	1.000	1.000	

Position Allocation/Staffing Report
by Department and Location ("Division")

PCN	Position Title	Allocated FTE	Staffed FTE	(Over)/ Under Staffed Variance
085308304	RECREATION LEADER	1.000	0.000	1.000
	TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08530 - AQUATICS:	2.000	1.000	1.000
Div/Loc: 08541 - ADVENTURE CLUBS				
085410376	ASSISTANT CHILD CARE SITE COOR	4.000	2.000	2.000
085411225	CHILD CARE SITE COORDINATOR	13.000	12.000	1.000
085414957	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	1.000	1.000	
085415045	PARKS, REC, & LIBRARIES TECH	1.000	0.000	1.000
085416147	RECREATION SUPERVISOR	3.000	2.000	1.000
085410084	ADMIN TECHNICIAN	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
08541B418	CHILD CARE SITE COORDINATOR	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
08541B815	RECREATION SUPERVISOR	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
	TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08541 - ADVENTURE CLUBS:	22.000	20.000	2.000
Div/Loc: 08545 - AFTER SCHOOL EDUCATION SAFETY				
085451225	CHILD CARE SITE COORDINATOR	1.000	2.000	(1.000)
	TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08545 - AFTER SCHOOL EDUCATION SAFETY:	1.000	2.000	(1.000)
Div/Loc: 08546 - CDE-CHILD DEVELOPMENT				
085461225	CHILD CARE SITE COORDINATOR	3.000	2.000	1.000
	TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08546 - CDE-CHILD DEVELOPMENT:	3.000	2.000	1.000
Div/Loc: 08550 - PARK OPERATIONS - ADMIN				
085504957	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	1.000	1.000	
085505090	PARKS SUPERINTENDENT	1.000	1.000	
085505069	PARKS SUPERVISOR	3.000	3.000	
085505045	PARKS, REC, & LIBRARIES TECH	1.000	1.000	
	TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08550 - PARK OPERATIONS - ADMIN:	6.000	6.000	
Div/Loc: 08551 - OPEN SPACE/TREE MAINTENANCE				
085518300	ARBORIST TECHNICIAN	1.000	0.000	1.000
085514862	NATURAL RESOURCES TECHNICIAN	1.000	1.000	
085514872	NATURAL RESOURCES WORKER II	1.000	0.000	1.000
085514960	OPEN SPACE SUPERINTENDENT	1.000	1.000	
085517154	SR NATURAL RESOURCES WORKER	1.000	1.000	
085518310	TREE TRIMMER	1.000	1.000	
085518762	URBAN FORESTER	1.000	1.000	
	TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08551 - OPEN SPACE/TREE MAINTENANCE:	7.000	5.000	2.000
Div/Loc: 08555 - PARKS - MAINTENANCE				
085558302	AQUATICS MAINTENANCE TECH	1.000	0.000	1.000
085555075	IRRIGATION TECHNICIAN	1.000	1.000	
085555070	PARKS MAINTENANCE WORKER I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
085555080	PARKS MAINTENANCE WORKER II	17.000	15.000	2.000
085557192	SR PARKS MAINTENANCE WORKER	10.000	10.000	
08555B491	PARKS MAINTENANCE WORKER I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
	TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08555 - PARKS - MAINTENANCE:	29.000	28.000	1.000
	TOTAL FOR DEPARTMENT 71 - PARKS AND RECREATION:	100.000	92.000	8.000
Department: 72 LIBRARY				
Div/Loc: 06500 - LIBRARY - ADMIN/TECH SERVICES				
065001224	CITY LIBRARIAN	1.000	1.000	
065004152	LIBRARIAN II	7.500	5.500	2.000
065004210	LIBRARY ASSISTANT II	7.000	5.000	2.000

Position Allocation/Staffing Report
by Department and Location ("Division")

PCN	Position Title	Allocated FTE	Staffed FTE	(Over)/ Under Staffed Variance
065004246	LIBRARY SUPERVISOR	4.000	4.000	
065004250	LIBRARY TECHNICIAN	5.000	5.000	
065004151	LIBRARIAN I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
06500B478	LIBRARY ASSISTANT II	0.000	2.000	(2.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 06500 - LIBRARY - ADMIN/TECH SERVICES:		24.500	23.500	1.000
TOTAL FOR DEPARTMENT 72 - LIBRARY:		24.500	23.500	1.000
TOTAL FOR DEPARTMENT 80 - DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATIONS:		0.000	0.000	
TOTAL FOR DEPARTMENT 82 - PLANNING,REDEVELOPMENT,HOUSING:		0.000	0.000	
Department: 83 PUBLIC WORKS				
Div/Loc: 08300 - PUBLIC WORKS - ADMINISTRATION				
083000071	ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT (C)	1.000	1.000	
083005635	PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08300 - PUBLIC WORKS - ADMINISTRATION:		2.000	2.000	
Div/Loc: 08320 - ENGINEERING				
083200084	ADMIN TECHNICIAN	1.000	1.000	
083200820	ASSOC ENGINEER	3.000	3.000	
083200338	ASST ENGINEER	8.000	7.000	1.000
083203792	JR ENGINEER	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
083205514	PRINCIPAL ENGINEER	1.000	1.000	
083207142	SR ENGINEER	2.750	2.750	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08320 - ENGINEERING:		15.750	15.750	
Div/Loc: 08321 - FLOOD ALERT				
083210338	ASST ENGINEER	1.000	0.000	1.000
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08321 - FLOOD ALERT:		1.000	0.000	1.000
Div/Loc: 08335 - TRAFFIC SIGNALS				
083352380	ELECTRONICS TECHNICIAN I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
083352385	ELECTRONICS TECHNICIAN II	5.000	2.000	3.000
083355519	PREVENTATIVE MAINT SUPERVISOR	1.000	1.000	
083357170	SR ELECTRIC TECHNICIAN	1.000	2.000	(1.000)
083352376	TRAFFIC SIGNAL MAINT WKR II	1.000	0.000	1.000
083352375	TRAFFIC SIGNAL MAINT WKR I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08335 - TRAFFIC SIGNALS:		8.000	7.000	1.000
Div/Loc: 08340 - STREETS - ADMINISTRATION				
083400084	ADMINISTRATIVE TECHNICIAN	1.000	1.000	
083404957	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	2.000	1.000	1.000
083407522	STREET MAINTENANCE SUPERVISOR	3.000	3.000	
083407520	STREET MAINTENANCE SUPT	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08340 - STREETS - ADMINISTRATION:		7.000	6.000	1.000
Div/Loc: 08342 - STREET DRAINAGE				
083427187	SR STREET MAINTENANCE WORKER	1.000	1.000	
083427530	STREET MAINTENANCE WORKER II	1.000	1.000	
08342B526	STREET MAINTENANCE WORKER I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08342 - STREET DRAINAGE:		2.000	3.000	(1.000)
Div/Loc: 08343 - PAVING				
083437162	SR ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN	1.000	0.000	1.000

Position Allocation/Staffing Report
by Department and Location ("Division")

PCN	Position Title	Allocated FTE	Staffed FTE	(Over)/ Under Staffed Variance
083437187	SR STREET MAINTENANCE WORKER	2.000	2.000	
083437525	STREET MAINTENANCE WORKER I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
083437530	STREET MAINTENANCE WORKER II	11.000	8.000	3.000
083431350	ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN II	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
08343B526	STREET MAINTENANCE WORKER I	0.000	2.000	(2.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08343 - PAVING:		14.000	14.000	
Div/Loc: 08344 - STREET SIGNS				
083447187	SR STREET MAINTENANCE WORKER	1.000	1.000	
083447530	STREET MAINTENANCE WORKER II	2.000	1.000	1.000
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08344 - STREET SIGNS:		3.000	2.000	1.000
Div/Loc: 08345 - STREET PAINT				
083457187	SR STREET MAINTENANCE WORKER	1.000	1.000	
083457530	STREET MAINTENANCE WORKER II	2.000	1.000	1.000
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08345 - STREET PAINT:		3.000	2.000	1.000
Div/Loc: 08348 - STREET SWEEPING				
083487187	SR STREET MAINTENANCE WORKER	1.000	1.000	
083487530	STREET MAINTENANCE WORKER II	1.000	0.000	1.000
083487540	STREET SWEEPER OPERATOR	4.000	4.000	
083487525	STREET MAINTENANCE WORKER I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08348 - STREET SWEEPING:		6.000	6.000	
Div/Loc: 08350 - TRANSPORTATION-ADMIN				
083500084	ADMIN TECHNICIAN	1.000	1.000	
083500088	ALTERNATIVE TRANSP ANALYST II	1.000	1.000	
083500090	ALTERNATIVE TRANSP MGR	1.000	2.000	(1.000)
083503318	FINANCIAL ANALYST II	1.000	0.000	1.000
083504957	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	1.750	0.000	1.750
083503316	FINANCIAL ANALYST I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
083504956	OFFICE ASSISTANT I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08350 - TRANSPORTATION-ADMIN:		5.750	6.000	(.250)
Div/Loc: 08352 - TRANSPORTATION				
083520088	ALTERNATIVE TRANSP ANALYST II	1.750	0.750	1.000
083520338	ASST ENGINEER	1.000	0.000	1.000
083524517	MARKET & COMMUNICATIONS ANA II	1.000	1.000	
083524957	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	0.750	0.750	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08352 - TRANSPORTATION:		4.500	2.500	2.000
Div/Loc: 08354 - CTSA				
083541401	COMMUNITY RELATIONS ANALYST	0.500	0.500	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08354 - CTSA:		0.500	0.500	
TOTAL FOR DEPARTMENT 83 - PUBLIC WORKS:		72.500	66.750	5.750

Department: 84 ENVIRONMENTAL UTILITIES

Div/Loc: 08400 - ENV UTIL - ADMINISTRATION

084000050	ADMIN ANALYST II	3.000	0.000	3.000
084000071	ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT (C)	1.000	1.000	
084001050	BUSINESS SVCS ADMINISTRATOR	1.000	0.000	1.000
084001548	DATA MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST II	1.000	0.000	1.000
084001645	DEPT PUBLIC INFO OFFICER	1.000	1.000	
084001684	ENVIRONMENTAL UTIL. DIRECTOR	1.000	1.000	

Position Allocation/Staffing Report
by Department and Location ("Division")

PCN	Position Title	Allocated FTE	Staffed FTE	(Over)/ Under Staffed Variance
084002548	EU BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR	1.000	1.000	
084002547	EU RATE ANALYST II	3.000	3.000	
084004517	MARKETING & COMMUNIC ANALYST II	1.000	0.000	1.000
08400B428	DATA MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08400 - ENV UTIL - ADMINISTRATION:		13.000	8.000	5.000
Div/Loc: 08402 - EU ASSET MANAGEMENT				
084020084	ADMIN TECHNICIAN	1.000	1.000	
084025533	PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE COORD	1.000	1.000	
084025514	PRINCIPAL ENGINEER	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08402 - EU ASSET MANAGEMENT:		3.000	3.000	
Div/Loc: 08405 - ENV UTIL-ENGINEERING				
084050411	ASSISTANT EU DIRECTOR	1.000	1.000	
084050820	ASSOC ENGINEER	3.000	2.000	1.000
084051434	CONSTRUCTION INSPECTOR II	2.000	1.000	1.000
084051672	DEVELOPMENT TECHNICIAN II	1.000	1.000	
084051350	ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN II	1.000	1.000	
084053412	GIS ANALYST II	3.000	1.000	2.000
084054509	MAPPING SUPERVISOR	1.000	1.000	
084054957	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	1.000	1.000	
084055514	PRINCIPAL ENGINEER	1.000	0.000	1.000
084056500	SAFETY COORDINATOR	1.000	1.000	
084057121	SR CONSTRUCTION INSPECTOR	1.000	1.000	
084057142	SR ENGINEER	3.000	3.000	
084050338	ASST ENGINEER	0.000	2.000	(2.000)
084051684	ENVIRONMENTAL UTIL DIRECTOR	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
08405B425	CONSTRUCTION INSPECTOR II	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
08405B440	ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
08405B455	GIS ANALYST II	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08405 - ENV UTIL-ENGINEERING:		19.000	20.000	(1.000)
Div/Loc: 08410 - SOLID WASTE - ADMINISTRATION				
084103335	FINANCE CLERK II	2.000	1.000	1.000
084104957	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	1.000	0.000	1.000
084106244	REFUSE & STORMWATER MANAGER	1.000	1.000	
084106231	REFUSE SUPERINTENDENT	1.000	1.000	
084106242	REFUSE UTILITY MANAGER	1.000	0.000	1.000
084107324	SOLID WASTE BILLING TECHNICIAN	1.000	1.000	
084103334	FINANCE CLERK I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08410 - SOLID WASTE - ADMINISTRATION:		7.000	5.000	2.000
Div/Loc: 08411 - RESIDENTIAL SOLID WASTE PICKUP				
084116235	REFUSE SUPERVISOR	1.000	1.000	
084116302	REFUSE TRUCK DRIVER I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
084116304	REFUSE TRUCK DRIVER II	11.000	9.000	2.000
084117129	SR REFUSE TRUCK DRIVER	2.000	2.000	
08411B505	REFUSE TRUCK DRIVER I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08411 - RESIDENTIAL SOLID WASTE PICKUP:		14.000	14.000	
Div/Loc: 08412 - COMMERCIAL SOLID WASTE PICKUP				
084126235	REFUSE SUPERVISOR	1.000	1.000	
084126302	REFUSE TRUCK DRIVER I	0.000	2.000	(2.000)
084126304	REFUSE TRUCK DRIVER II	15.000	10.000	5.000
084127129	SR REFUSE TRUCK DRIVER	2.000	2.000	

Position Allocation/Staffing Report
by Department and Location ("Division")

PCN	Position Title	Allocated FTE	Staffed FTE	(Over)/ Under Staffed Variance
08412B505	REFUSE TRUCK DRIVER I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
08412B506	REFUSE TRUCK DRIVER II	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08412 - COMMERCIAL SOLID WASTE PICKUP:		18.000	17.000	1.000
Div/Loc: 08413 - SOLID WASTE MAINTENANCE				
084136226	REFUSE MAINT. WORKER II	4.000	2.000	2.000
084137129	SR REFUSE TRUCK DRIVER	1.000	1.000	
08413B503	REFUSE MAINT. WORKER I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08413 - SOLID WASTE MAINTENANCE:		5.000	4.000	1.000
Div/Loc: 08415 - RECYCLING				
084156304	REFUSE TRUCK DRIVER II	3.000	3.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08415 - RECYCLING:		3.000	3.000	
Div/Loc: 08416 - GREEN WASTE PROGRAM				
084166302	REFUSE TRUCK DRIVER I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
084166304	REFUSE TRUCK DRIVER II	4.000	3.000	1.000
084167129	SR REFUSE TRUCK DRIVER	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08416 - GREEN WASTE PROGRAM:		5.000	5.000	
Div/Loc: 08419 - ORGANIC WASTE PROGRAM				
084196150	RECYCLING & ORGANICS COORDNTR	1.000	1.000	
084196304	REFUSE TRUCK DRIVER II	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08419 - ORGANIC WASTE PROGRAM:		2.000	2.000	
Div/Loc: 08420 - WASTEWATER - ADMINISTRATION				
084205514	PRINCIPAL ENGINEER	1.000	1.000	
084207142	SR ENGINEER	1.000	1.000	
084209045	WSTWTR UTILITY MANAGER	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08420 - WASTEWATER - ADMINISTRATION:		3.000	3.000	
Div/Loc: 08421 - WATER TREATMENT/STORAGE				
084219175	WATER TRMT PLT CHIEF OPERATOR	1.000	1.000	
084219234	WATER TRMT PLT OPR GD II 8HR	1.000	0.000	1.000
084219230	WATER TRMT PLT OPR GRD III 24	4.000	4.000	
08421B535	WATER TRMT PLT OPR GD I 8HR	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08421 - WATER TREATMENT/STORAGE:		6.000	6.000	
Div/Loc: 08422 - DRY CREEK WWTP				
084224957	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	1.000	1.000	
084229010	WSTWTR TRMT PLT OPR GD II	2.000	1.000	1.000
084229020	WSTWTR TRMT PLT OPR GD III 24H	4.000	4.000	
084229030	WSTWTR TRMT PLT OPR IV	1.000	1.000	
08422B540	WSTWTR TRMT PLT OPR GD I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08422 - DRY CREEK WWTP:		8.000	8.000	
Div/Loc: 08424 - ENVIRONMENTAL UTIL-MAINTENANCE				
084242378	ELECTRONIC MAINT COORDINATOR	1.000	1.000	
084242385	ELECTRONICS TECHNICIAN II	4.000	4.000	
084244520	MATERIALS TECHNICIAN	1.000	1.000	
084245319	PLANT & EQUIPMENT MAINT WOR II	1.000	2.000	(1.000)
084245328	PLANT & EQUIPMENT MECHANIC II	5.000	4.000	1.000
084245402	PREDICTIVE MAINTENANCE TECH II	1.000	1.000	
084245519	PREVENTATIVE MAINT SUPERVISOR	1.000	1.000	
084245502	PREVENTATIVE MAINT TECH II	5.000	3.000	2.000
084245533	PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE COORD	2.000	2.000	

Position Allocation/Staffing Report
by Department and Location ("Division")

PCN	Position Title	Allocated FTE	Staffed FTE	(Over)/ Under Staffed Variance
084247020	SCADA SYSTEM TECHNICIAN	2.000	2.000	
084247205	SR PLANT & EQUIPMENT MECHANIC	1.000	1.000	
084247284	SR PREVENTATIVE MAINT TECH	2.000	2.000	
084245327	PLANT & EQUIPMENT MECHANIC I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
08424B226	PREVENTATIVE MAINT TECH II	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08424 - ENVIRONMENTAL UTIL-MAINTENANCE:		26.000	26.000	
Div/Loc: 08425 - INDUSTRIAL TREATMENT				
084253604	INDUSTRIAL WASTE SPECIALIST	1.000	0.000	1.000
084253610	INDUSTRIAL WASTE TECHNICIAN	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08425 - INDUSTRIAL TREATMENT:		2.000	1.000	1.000
Div/Loc: 08426 - ENVIRONMENTAL TREATMENT LAB				
084261548	DATA MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST II	1.000	1.000	
084262541	EU COMPLIANCE ADMINISTRATOR	1.000	1.000	
084264020	LABORATORY TECHNICIAN II	4.000	4.000	
084269101	WATER QUALITY LAB SUPERVISOR	1.000	0.000	1.000
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08426 - ENVIRONMENTAL TREATMENT LAB:		7.000	6.000	1.000
Div/Loc: 08427 - PLEASANT GROVE WWTP				
084274957	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	1.000	1.000	
084279040	WSTWTR TRMT PLT CHIEF OPERATOR	1.000	1.000	
084279025	WSTWTR TRMT PLT OPR GD III	4.000	4.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08427 - PLEASANT GROVE WWTP:		6.000	6.000	
Div/Loc: 08430 - WATER - ADMINISTRATION				
084309244	WATER UTILITY MANAGER	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08430 - WATER - ADMINISTRATION:		1.000	1.000	
Div/Loc: 08431 - WATER DISTRIBUTION				
084314957	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	3.000	3.000	
084317204	SR WATER DISTRIBUTION WORKER	4.000	2.000	2.000
084319084	WATER DISTRIBUTION SUPERVISOR	2.000	2.000	
084319085	WATER DISTRIBUTION SUPT	1.000	1.000	
084319248	WATER DISTRIBUTION WORKER II	22.000	20.000	2.000
08431B252	WATER DISTRIBUTION WORKER I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
08431B253	WATER DISTRIBUTION WORKER II	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08431 - WATER DISTRIBUTION:		32.000	30.000	2.000
Div/Loc: 08432 - WASTEWATER COLLECTION				
084323610	INDUSTRIAL WASTE TECHNICIAN	1.000	1.000	
084324957	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	1.000	0.000	1.000
084327202	SR WSTWTR UTILITY MAINT WKR	4.000	4.000	
084328980	WSTWTR COLLECTION SUPT	1.000	1.000	
084328978	WSTWTR COLLECTION SUPV	1.000	1.000	
084329027	WSTWTR UTILITY MAINT WKR I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
084329029	WSTWTR UTILITY MAINT WKR II	22.000	17.000	5.000
084324956	OFFICE ASSISTANT I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
08432B254	WSTWTR UTILITY MAINT WKR I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08432 - WASTEWATER COLLECTION:		30.000	27.000	3.000
Div/Loc: 08433 - WATER EFFICIENCY				
084330084	ADMIN TECHNICIAN	1.000	0.775	.225
084334957	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	1.750	1.750	
084339047	WATER CONSERVATION ADMINSTR	1.000	1.000	
084339078	WATER CONSERVATION SPECIALIST	1.000	1.000	

Position Allocation/Staffing Report
by Department and Location ("Division")

PCN	Position Title	Allocated FTE	Staffed FTE	(Over)/ Under Staffed Variance
084339049	WATER CONSERVATION WORKER I	0.000	3.000	(3.000)
084339051	WATER CONSERVATION WORKER II	4.000	1.000	3.000
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08433 - WATER EFFICIENCY:		8.750	8.525	.225
Div/Loc: 08441 - RECYCLED WATER				
084417162	SR ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN	1.000	0.000	1.000
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08441 - RECYCLED WATER:		1.000	0.000	1.000
Div/Loc: 08450 - STORM WATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM				
084501350	ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN II	1.000	1.000	
084502544	ENVIRONMENTAL COMPL SPEC II	2.000	2.000	
084507142	SR ENGINEER	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08450 - STORM WATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM:		4.000	4.000	
Div/Loc: 08527 - UTILITY EXPLORATION CENTER				
085273732	INTERPRETIVE SRVCS SPECIAL II	2.000	2.000	
085273740	INTERPRETIVE SRVCS SUPERVISOR	1.000	1.000	
085274517	MARKET & COMMUNICATIONS ANA II	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08527 - UTILITY EXPLORATION CENTER:		4.000	4.000	
TOTAL FOR DEPARTMENT 84 - ENVIRONMENTAL UTILITIES:		227.750	211.525	16.225
Department: 86 ROSEVILLE ELECTRIC				
Div/Loc: 08600 - ELECTRIC - ADMINISTRATION				
086000084	ADMIN TECHNICIAN	1.000	1.000	
086000071	ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT (C)	1.000	1.000	
086001548	DATA MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST II	1.000	1.000	
086001645	DEPT PUBLIC INFO OFFICER	1.000	1.000	
086001312	ELECTRIC BUSINESS ANALYST II	3.000	2.000	1.000
086002346	ELECTRIC RATES & FINANCIAL ADM	1.000	1.000	
086002358	ELECTRIC TECHNOLOGY SYST SUPV	1.000	1.000	
086002359	ELECTRIC TECHNOLOGY SYSTS TECH	3.000	2.000	1.000
086002320	ELECTRIC UTILITY DIRECTOR	1.000	1.000	
086004517	MARKET & COMMUNICATIONS ANA II	1.000	1.000	
086007128	SR ELECTRIC BUSINESS ANALYST	2.000	2.000	
08600B739	ELECTRIC BUSINESS ANALYST II	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08600 - ELECTRIC - ADMINISTRATION:		16.000	15.000	1.000
Div/Loc: 08605 - ELEC REGULATORY-LEGISLATIVE SV				
086050084	ADMIN TECHNICIAN	1.000	1.000	
086050050	ADMINISTRATIVE ANALYST II	1.000	1.000	
086052335	ELECTRIC COMPLIANCE ANALYST	2.000	2.000	
086052348	ELECTRIC REG COMPL ADMINSTR	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08605 - ELEC REGULATORY-LEGISLATIVE SV:		5.000	5.000	
Div/Loc: 08611 - ELECTRIC ENGINEERING				
086110084	ADMIN TECHNICIAN	1.000	1.000	
086110395	ASSISTANT ELECTRIC UTILITY DIR	1.000	1.000	
086112330	ELECTRIC DRAFTING TECH II	2.000	2.000	
086112345	ELECTRIC ENGINEERING TECH II	4.000	3.000	1.000
086112284	ELECTRIC ENGINEERING TECH SUPV	1.000	1.000	
086113412	GIS ANALYST II	1.000	0.000	1.000
086114957	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	2.000	1.000	1.000
086115596	POWER ENGINEER II	4.000	3.000	1.000
086115505	POWER ENGINEERING MANAGER	1.000	1.000	

Position Allocation/Staffing Report
by Department and Location ("Division")

PCN	Position Title	Allocated FTE	Staffed FTE	(Over)/ Under Staffed Variance
086117151	SR POWER ENGINEER	2.000	2.000	
086112340	ELECTRIC ENGINEERING TECH I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
08611B229	PWR ENGINEER II	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
08611B454	GIS ANALYST I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08611 - ELECTRIC ENGINEERING:		19.000	18.000	1.000
Div/Loc: 08614 - ELECT CONST & MAINTENANCE				
086149250	ELEC UTILITY INSPECTION TECH	2.000	0.000	2.000
086140150	ELECTRIC APPRENTICE LINE TECH	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
086142280	ELECTRIC LINE CONST SUPERVISOR	2.000	2.000	
086142285	ELECTRIC LINE TECH	14.000	10.000	4.000
086142286	ELECTRIC LINE TROUBLESHOOTER	4.000	3.000	1.000
086142212	ELECTRIC MATERIALS TECH II	3.000	3.000	
086142338	ELECTRIC OPERATIONS MANAGER	1.000	1.000	
086142254	ELECTRIC PREV DATA SYSTEM TECH	2.000	1.000	1.000
086142352	ELECTRIC SAFETY COORDINATOR	1.000	1.000	
086142319	ELECTRIC SUBSTATION SUPERVISOR	1.000	1.000	
086142350	ELECTRIC SYSTEM DISPATCHER	3.000	3.000	
086142360	ELECTRIC UTILITY TECHNICIAN I	0.000	3.000	(3.000)
086142362	ELECTRIC UTILITY TECHNICIAN II	17.000	11.000	6.000
086144957	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	1.000	1.000	
086147118	SR ELECTRIC LINE TECHNICIAN	5.000	5.000	
086147169	SR ELECTRIC MATERIALS TECH	1.000	1.000	
086147124	SR ELECTRIC METERING TECH	1.000	1.000	
086147126	SR ELECTRIC SUBSTATION TECH	3.000	3.000	
086147168	SR ELECTRIC SYSTEM DISPATCHER	1.000	1.000	
086142421	ELECTRIC PRE-APPRENTICE	0.000	2.000	(2.000)
08614B213	ELECTRIC UTILITY TECHNICIAN I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
08614B214	ELECTRIC UTILITY TECHNICIAN II	0.000	2.000	(2.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08614 - ELECT CONST & MAINTENANCE:		62.000	57.000	5.000
Div/Loc: 08616 - ELECTRIC POWER PLANT				
086162210	ELECTRIC MATERIALS TECH I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
086162212	ELECTRIC MATERIALS TECH II	1.000	0.000	1.000
086162362	ELECTRIC UTILITY TECHNICIAN II	1.000	1.000	
086163608	INSTRUMENT & CONTROL TECH	2.000	2.000	
086164957	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	1.000	1.000	
086165600	POWER GENERATION SUPERINTENDEN	1.000	1.000	
086165591	POWER PLANT ENGINEER II	1.000	1.000	
086165530	POWER PLANT OPS & MAINT SUPVS	2.000	2.000	
086165526	PWR PLNT MECHANIC	3.000	1.000	2.000
086165523	PWR PLNT OPERATOR/TECH II	8.000	8.000	
086165555	SR POWER PLANT ENGINEER	1.000	1.000	
086167152	SR POWER PLANT OPERATOR/TECH	4.000	4.000	
08616B232	POWER PLANT MECHANIC	0.000	2.000	(2.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08616 - ELECTRIC POWER PLANT:		25.000	25.000	
Div/Loc: 08621 - POWER SUPPLY				
086210084	ADMIN TECHNICIAN	1.000	1.000	
086218553	ASST ELEC UTIL DIR-RESOURCES	1.000	1.000	
086212314	ELECTRIC RESOURCES ANALYST I	0.000	2.000	(2.000)
086212316	ELECTRIC RESOURCES ANALYST II	7.000	2.000	5.000
086212354	ELECTRIC RISK MGMT ADMINISTRAT	1.000	1.000	
086215535	POWER SUPPLY & PORTFOLIO ADMST	1.000	1.000	
086211312	ELECTRIC BUSINESS ANALYST II	0.000	1.000	(1.000)

Position Allocation/Staffing Report
by Department and Location ("Division")

PCN	Position Title	Allocated FTE	Staffed FTE	(Over)/ Under Staffed Variance
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08621 - POWER SUPPLY:		11.000	9.000	2.000
Div/Loc: 08623 - RETAIL SRVCS-PUBLIC BENEFITS				
086231312	ELECTRIC BUSINESS ANALYST II	1.000	1.000	
086236280	ELECTRIC RETAIL SERVICES SUPV	2.000	0.000	2.000
086232466	ENERGY PROGRAM TECHNICIAN	4.000	4.000	
086232501	ENERGY SERVICES ACCOUNT REP II	2.000	2.000	
086233810	KEY ACCOUNTS REPRESENTATIVE	1.000	0.000	1.000
086234957	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	1.000	0.000	1.000
086237163	SR ENERGY SERVICES ACCOUNT REP	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08623 - RETAIL SRVCS-PUBLIC BENEFITS:		12.000	8.000	4.000
TOTAL FOR DEPARTMENT 86 - ROSEVILLE ELECTRIC:		150.000	137.000	13.000
Department: 88 DEVELOPMENT SERVICES				
Div/Loc: 08200 - PLANNING				
082000900	ASSOC PLANNER	5.000	4.000	1.000
082004957	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	2.000	2.000	
082005309	PLANNING MANAGER	2.000	2.000	
082005513	PRINCIPAL PLANNER	1.000	0.000	1.000
082007180	SR PLANNER	1.000	1.750	(.750)
082003410	GIS ANALYST I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
08200B407	ASST PLANNER	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08200 - PLANNING:		11.000	11.750	(.750)
Div/Loc: 08800 - DEV SVCS- ADMINISTRATION				
088000050	ADMINISTRATIVE ANALYST II	1.000	0.000	1.000
088000071	ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT (C)	1.000	1.000	
088001676	DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR	1.000	1.000	
088001695	DEVELOPMENT SERVICES MANAGER	1.000	1.000	
088000045	ADMINISTRATIVE ANALYST I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08800 - DEV SVCS- ADMINISTRATION:		4.000	4.000	
Div/Loc: 08801 - DEV SVCS- PERMIT CENTER				
088013412	GIS ANALYST II	1.000	0.000	1.000
088014509	MAPPING SUPERVISOR	1.000	1.000	
088015245	PERMIT ANALYST	1.000	1.000	
088015279	PERMIT TECHNICIAN II	4.000	3.000	1.000
088015311	PLANNING SYSTEMS ANALYST	1.000	1.000	
088015315	PLANNING SYSTEMS TECHNICIAN II	1.000	1.000	
088015562	PROJECT PLANNER	1.000	1.000	
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08801 - DEV SVCS- PERMIT CENTER:		10.000	8.000	2.000
Div/Loc: 08810 - DEV SVCS- BUILDING INSPECTION				
088101017	BLDG INSPECTION SUPERVISOR	1.000	1.000	
088101019	BLDG INSPECTOR II	4.000	3.000	1.000
088101043	BLDG OFFICIAL	1.000	1.000	
088101047	BLDG PLANS EXAMINER II	4.000	2.000	2.000
088101672	DEVELOPMENT TECHNICIAN II	2.000	2.000	
088104957	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	1.000	0.000	1.000
088107117	SR BUILDING INSPECTOR	1.000	1.000	
088107195	SR BUILDING PLANS EXAMINER	1.000	1.000	
088101018	BLDG INSPECTOR I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
08810B408	BLDG INSPECTOR I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
08810B412	BLDG PLANS EXAMINER I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)

Position Allocation/Staffing Report
by Department and Location ("Division")

PCN	Position Title	Allocated FTE	Staffed FTE	(Over)/ Under Staffed Variance
08810B490	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08810 - DEV SVCS- BUILDING INSPECTION:		15.000	15.000	
Div/Loc: 08815 - DEV SVCS- CODE ENFORCEMENT				
088151019	BLDG INSPECTOR II	2.000	0.000	2.000
088151366	CODE ENFORCEMENT INSPECTOR	2.000	1.000	1.000
088157134	SR CODE ENFORCEMENT INSPECTOR	1.000	1.000	
088151018	BLDG INSPECTOR I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
08815B421	CODE ENFORCEMENT INSPECTOR	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08815 - DEV SVCS- CODE ENFORCEMENT:		5.000	4.000	1.000
Div/Loc: 08820 - DEV SVCS- ENGINEERING				
088200820	ASSOC ENGINEER	1.000	1.000	
088200338	ASST ENGINEER	3.000	3.000	
088201248	CONSTRUCTION INSPECTION SUPV	1.000	1.000	
088201434	CONSTRUCTION INSPECTOR II	3.000	3.000	
088201277	ENGINEERING MANAGER	1.000	1.000	
088201350	ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN II	1.000	0.000	1.000
088203326	FINANCE TECHNICIAN II	1.000	1.000	
088205514	PRINCIPAL ENGINEER	1.000	1.000	
088207121	SR CONSTRUCTION INSPECTOR	2.000	2.000	
088207142	SR ENGINEER	2.000	2.000	
088201300	ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN I	0.000	1.000	(1.000)
TOTAL FOR LOC/DIV 08820 - DEV SVCS- ENGINEERING:		16.000	16.000	
TOTAL FOR DEPARTMENT 88 - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES:		61.000	58.750	2.250
Grand Totals:				
		1,153.725	1,082.912	70.812



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8185
File #: 0800-02

Title: Second Reading - Municipal Code Amendment - Urban Stormwater
Contact: Delyn Ellison-Lloyd 916-746-1748 dellison-Lloyd@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017
Item #: 6.35.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

ORDINANCE NO. 5787 OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AMENDING SECTIONS 14.20.020 THROUGH 14.20.060, SECTIONS 14.20.080 THROUGH 14.20.260, SECTIONS 14.20.290 THROUGH 14.20.430 AND SECTIONS 14.20.450 THROUGH 14.20.540 OF CHAPTER 14.20 OF TITLE 14 AND ADDING SECTION 14.20.560 OF CHAPTER 14.20 OF TITLE 14 OF THE ROSEVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING URBAN STORMWATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT AND DISCHARGE CONTROL, for second reading and adoption.

BACKGROUND

Not applicable.

FISCAL IMPACT

Not applicable.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Not applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Not applicable.

Respectfully Submitted,

Delyn Ellison-Lloyd, Senior Engineer

Richard Plecker, Environmental Utilities Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Ordinance No. 5787

ORDINANCE NO. 5787

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AMENDING SECTIONS 14.20.020 THROUGH 14.20.060, SECTIONS 14.20.080 THROUGH 14.20.260, SECTIONS 14.20.290 THROUGH 14.20.430 AND SECTIONS 14.20.450 THROUGH 14.20.540 OF CHAPTER 14.20 OF TITLE 14 AND ADDING SECTION 14.20.560 OF CHAPTER 14.20 OF TITLE 14 OF THE ROSEVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING URBAN STORMWATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT AND DISCHARGE CONTROL

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. Section 14.20.020 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.020 Findings.

The City Council adopts this chapter based upon the following findings:

A. The Federal Clean Water Act regulates the discharge of pollutants into the waters of the United States and requires National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits requiring the reduction of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable for all discharges of stormwater and urban runoff discharges from the City's stormwater conveyance system.

B. Stormwater and urban runoff may flow from individual properties to the City's municipal storm drain system and then ultimately to the waters of the United States.

C. The City holds a permit under the Waste Discharge Requirements for Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (Order No. (Order No. 2013-0001-DWQ), which also serves as an NPDES Permit (No. CAS000004) under the Federal Clean Water Act. Under the provisions of this NPDES Permit, the City is required to possess the necessary legal authority and implement appropriate procedures to regulate the entry of pollutants and non-stormwater discharges into the City's stormwater conveyance system.

SECTION 2. Section 14.20.030 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.030 Purpose and intent.

The purpose and intent of this chapter is to ensure the health, safety, and general welfare of citizens, and protect and enhance the water quality of watercourses and water bodies in a manner pursuant to and consistent with the Federal Clean Water Act and the City's NPDES Permit by reducing pollutants in stormwater discharges to the maximum extent practicable and by effectively prohibiting non-stormwater discharges to the City's stormwater conveyance system.

SECTION 3. Section 14.20.040 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.040 Definitions.

For the purposes of this chapter, the following definitions shall apply:

“Best management practice” or “BMP” means activities, practices, and procedures to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants directly or indirectly to the City’s municipal storm drain system and waters of the United States to the maximum extent practicable. Best management practices may include, but are not limited to: treatment facilities to remove pollutants from stormwater; operating and maintenance procedures; facility management and good housekeeping practices to control urban runoff, spillage, or leaks of non-stormwater; proper waste disposal; controlling drainage from materials storage;; erosion and sediment control practices; the prohibition of specific activities, practices, and procedures; and such other provisions as the City determines appropriate for the control and reduction of pollutants. Please refer to the City of Roseville BMP guidance series as discussed further in Section 14.20.290 herein, for specific requirements.

“Board of Appeals” means the board established pursuant to City Ordinance, Chapter 2.26.

“CFR” means the Code of Federal Regulations.

“City” means the City of Roseville.

“City Council” means the controlling leadership of the City’s municipal body having legislative and administrative powers, such as passing ordinances and appropriating funds.

“City Engineer” means the city engineer of the City of Roseville or the city engineer’s authorized representative.

“Clean Water Act” means the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. Section 1251 *et seq.*), and any amendments thereto.

“Commercial” means property use types that include the distribution, sale and rental of goods, and the provision of services.

“Construction activity” means construction projects or activities resulting in land and soil disturbance and include, but are not limited to, clearing and grubbing, grading, excavating, demolition and utility work. These activities may also be subject to the State Water Resources Control Board’s NPDES construction permit requirements if land disturbance area exceeds one acre.

“Director” means the Environmental Utilities Director of the City of Roseville or the Director’s authorized representative.

“Enforcement Officer” means any city employee or agent of the city with the authority to enforce any provision of this chapter and the authority to make any decision on behalf of the director or city engineer required or called for by this chapter.

“Garbage” means trash or other solid waste from domestic, commercial, and industrial sources, and includes wastes from the preparation, cooking, and dispensing of food, and from the handling, storage and sale of produce.

“Hazardous materials” means any material that, because of its quantity, concentration, or physical or chemical characteristics, poses a significant present or potential hazard to human health and safety or to the environment if released into the environment. “Hazardous materials” include, but are not limited to, hazardous substances, hazardous waste, and any material that a

handler or the administering agency has a reasonable basis for believing would be injurious to the health and safety of persons or harmful to the environment if released into the environment.

“Illegal discharge” means any direct or indirect non-stormwater discharge to the City’s storm drain system, including sewage, process wastewater, and wash water from organized car washes, mobile cleaning, and pressure washing operations, except as specified by the exemptions listed in Section 14.20.130 of this chapter.

“Illicit connection” is defined as any pipe, drain, conveyance or other physical or non-physical connection, whether on the surface or subsurface, which allows an illegal discharge to enter the City’s storm drain system, regardless of whether said drain or connection had been previously allowed, permitted, or approved by a government agency, or had been documented in plans, maps, or equivalent records and approved by the City.

“Incidental runoff” means unintended amounts (volume) of non-stormwater runoff, such as minimal over spray from sprinklers that escapes the area of intended use. Water leaving an intended use area is not considered “incidental runoff” if runoff is part of the facility design, is due to excessive application, is due to intentional overflow or application, or is due to negligence.

“Industrial activity” means industrial business or activities, such as manufacturing, finishing, production, or processing of products, and materials or waste recycling, transportation, or storage, whether or not subject to NPDES industrial permit requirements as defined in 40 CFR Section 122.26(b)(14).

“Industrial stormwater NPDES permit” means an NPDES permit issued to an industry or group of industries that regulates the pollution levels associated with industrial stormwater discharges or specifies on-site pollution reduction and control strategies.

“Industrial wastes” means the liquid wastes from industrial manufacturing processes, trade, or business.

“Landowner” means the legal or beneficial owner of land or any other person holding proprietary right to land.

“Local Health Officer” means the Placer County health officer.

“National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater discharge permits” means general, group, and individual stormwater discharge permits that regulate facilities defined in federal NPDES regulations pursuant to the Clean Water Act. The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region and the State Water Resources Control Board have adopted general stormwater discharge permits that regulate small municipal separate storm sewer systems, general construction activity, and general industrial activity.

“Natural outlet” means any non-man made outlet into a watercourse, pond, ditch, lake or other body of surface or groundwater.

“Non-stormwater discharge” means any discharge to the storm drain system that is not composed entirely of stormwater.

“Person” means any individual, partnership, co-partnership, firm, company, corporation, association, joint stock company, trust, estate, municipality, State or Federal agency, governmental entity, or any other legal entity, or their legal representatives, agents or assigns.

“Pollutant” means dredged spoil, solid waste, incinerator residue, sewage, garbage, sewage sludge, munitions, chemical wastes, biological materials, radioactive materials, heat, wrecked or discarded equipment, rock, sand, cellar dirt and industrial, municipal and agricultural waste. Pollutants may also include paints, varnishes, and solvents; oil and other automotive fluids; non-hazardous liquid and solid wastes; yard wastes, refuse, rubbish, garbage, litter, or

other discarded or abandoned objects, articles, and accumulations; floatables; pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers; hazardous substances and wastes; water or waste containing fecal coliform and pathogens, including animal wastes; dissolved and particulate metals; construction and industrial wastes.

“Pollution” means the alteration of the quality of water by wastes or other materials in concentrations sufficient unreasonably affect the designated beneficial uses of water (e.g., agricultural supply; municipal or industrial supply; recreation and aesthetic enjoyment; groundwater recharge; preservation and enhancement of fish, wildlife, and other aquatic resources). Pollution may include “contamination” as defined in California Water Code section 13050(k).

“Porter-Cologne Act” means the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act and as amended (California Water Code Section 13000 *et seq.*).

“Premises” means any building, lot, parcel of land, or portion of land, whether improved or unimproved, including adjacent sidewalks and parking strips.

“Redevelopment” or “Development” means any significant construction, alteration or improvement to any portion of real property that replaces or creates more than 2,500 square feet of impervious surface (including projects with no net increase in impervious footprint, and detached single family homes that are not part of a larger plan of development), or as otherwise defined in the city’s most current NPDES permit. This includes, but is not limited to: creation or expansion of a building footprint; replacement of a structure; replacement of an impervious surface that is not part of routine maintenance activity; land-disturbing activities related to structural or impervious surfaces; and significant construction, alteration, or improvement to multiple adjacent parcels owned by the same person.

“Regional Board” means the California Regional Water Quality Control Board for the Central Valley Region.

“Regulated Projects” means and includes all Development or Redevelopment projects that create and/or replace 5,000 square feet or more of impervious surface. However, “Regulated Projects” do not include:

- Detached single family home projects that are not part of a larger plan of development;
- Interior remodels;
- Routine maintenance or repair such as: exterior wall surface replacement, pavement resurfacing within the existing footprint; or
- Linear Underground/overhead Projects (LUPs) - Unless the LUP has a discrete location that has 5,000 square feet or more of newly constructed contiguous impervious surface. When the LUP has a discrete location that has 5,000 square foot or more of new contiguous impervious surface, only that specific discrete location is a “Regulated Project.”

“Rubbish” means any and all solid waste materials, including, but not limited to, paper, rags, bottles, cans, glass, boxes, packing material, yard waste and trimmings from lawns, trees and gardens, magazines, books, ashes, and construction debris.

“Sewage” means a combination of the municipal wastewater from residences, business buildings, institutions, portable restroom facilities, and industrial establishments, combined with any groundwater, surface water, and stormwater that may be present.

“Site Design Measures” means measures to reduce project site runoff from Development or Redevelopment projects, and can include one or more of the following:

(a) Stream Setbacks and Buffers - a vegetated area including trees, shrubs, and herbaceous vegetation that exists or is established to protect a stream system, lake, reservoir, or wetland area;

(b) Soil Quality Improvement and Maintenance - improvement and maintenance soil through soil amendments and creation of microbial community;

(c) Tree Planting and Preservation - planting and preservation of healthy, established trees that include both evergreens and deciduous, as applicable;

(d) Rooftop and Impervious Area Disconnection - rerouting of rooftop drainage pipes to drain rainwater to rain barrels, cisterns, or permeable areas instead of the storm sewer;

(e) Porous Pavement - pavement that allows runoff to pass through it, thereby reducing the runoff from a site and surrounding areas and filtering pollutants;

(f) Green Roofs - a vegetative layer grown on a roof (rooftop garden);

(g) Vegetated Swales - a vegetated, open-channel management practice designed specifically to treat and attenuate storm water runoff; and/or

(h) Rain Barrels and Cisterns - system that collects and stores storm water runoff from a roof or other impervious surface.

“Spill” means any leaking, pumping, pouring, emitting, emptying, discharging, injecting, escaping, leaching, dumping, or disposing of any liquid or solid waste into the environment, unless permitted or authorized by a regulatory agency.

“Storm drain system” means publicly-owned facilities operated by the City by which stormwater is collected and/or conveyed, including, but not limited to, any roads with drainage systems, municipal streets, gutters, curbs, inlets, piped storm drains, pumping facilities, retention and detention basins, natural and human-made or altered drainage channels, reservoirs, and other drainage structures which are within the city and are not part of a publicly owned treatment works as defined at 40 CFR Section 122.2 or privately owned facilities outletting to waters of the United States or connected to the city storm drain system.

“Stormwater” means surface flow, urban runoff, and drainage consisting entirely of water from precipitation events such as rain, snow, sleet, or hail.

“Stormwater control maintenance agreement” means a legally recorded document that stipulates the long term maintenance obligations for stormwater control measures, and can include, but is not limited to, sales or lease agreement conditions, recorded property deed restriction, contract, or other legal mechanism.

“Stormwater control measures” means post-construction source control measures, structural control measures, and treatment control measures as defined in the City’s Stormwater Quality Design Manual.

“Urban runoff” means water runoff generated in or by urbanized areas, including precipitation and dry weather flows from a drainage area that reaches a receiving water body. Dry weather flows include incidental nuisance flows, such as excess irrigation water and washing activities.

“Watercourse” means a channel or depression in which a flow of water occurs, either continuously or intermittently.

“Water of the United States” means surface watercourses and water bodies as defined within 40 CFR Section 122.2, including waters such as lakes, rivers, streams, and wetlands.

“West Placer Storm Water Quality Design Manual” means the most recent version of the design manual for the Sacramento and South Placer regions, which sets forth the design criteria and operation and maintenance requirements for stormwater control measures for Development

and Redevelopment Projects and Regulated Projects. A copy of the Stormwater Quality Design Manual is available to view in the City's Development Services Department and can be found on the City's website.

"Wetland" means an area that is inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions (commonly known as hydrophytic vegetation). Wetlands may be regulated by either the United States Army Corps of Engineers or the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, or both.

Any term(s) defined in the Federal Clean Water Act, as amended, and/or defined in the regulations for the stormwater discharge permitting program issued by the Environmental Protection Agency, as amended, and which are not specifically defined in this section shall, when used in this chapter, have the same meaning as set forth in said act or regulation.

SECTION 4. Section 14.20.050 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.050 Applicability.

This chapter shall apply to all water or other material entering the storm drain system generated on any developed and undeveloped lands lying within the City of Roseville, unless an exemption or waiver is granted by the City or the Regional Board.

SECTION 5. Section 14.20.060 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.060 Responsibility for administration.

The Director and the City Engineer shall administer, implement, inspect, and enforce the provisions of this chapter. Any powers granted or duties of the director and the City Engineer may be delegated by them to persons or entities acting in the beneficial interest of or in the employ of the City.

SECTION 6. Section 14.20.080 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.080 Regulatory consistency.

This chapter shall be construed to assure consistency with the requirements of the Clean Water Act and Porter-Cologne Act and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, or any applicable implementing regulations, including the City's current NPDES stormwater permit.

SECTION 7. Section 14.20.090 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.090 Conflicts.

In the event of any conflict between this chapter and any federal or state law, regulation, order, or permit, the requirement establishing the higher standard for public health or safety shall

govern. To the extent permitted by law, nothing in this chapter shall preclude enforcement of any other applicable law, regulation, order, or permit.

SECTION 8. Section 14.20.100 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.100 Disclaimer of liability.

The standards set forth herein and promulgated pursuant to this chapter are minimum standards. Therefore this chapter does not intend nor imply that compliance by any person with this chapter will ensure that there will be no contamination, pollution, or unauthorized discharge of pollutants into waters of the United States caused by said person. This chapter shall not create liability on the part of the City or any agent or employee thereof for any damages that result from any discharger's reliance on this chapter or any administrative decision lawfully made thereunder.

SECTION 9. Section 14.20.110 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.110 Indemnification.

Any discharge that threatens, results in, or contributes to a violation of the city's NPDES permit(s) or any amendment, revision, or reissuance thereof, either separately considered or when combined with other discharges, is prohibited. Liability for any such discharge shall be the responsibility of the person(s) causing or responsible for the discharge, and such person(s) shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City against any claim, expense, liability, or payment for injury or damage to any person or property and shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City in any administrative or judicial enforcement or any legal action against the City resulting from such discharge.

SECTION 10. Section 14.20.120 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.120 Prohibition of illegal discharges.

It is unlawful to discharge, permit to be discharged, or cause to be discharged any sewage, industrial waste, pollutant, garbage, or rubbish into any municipal storm drain system, watercourse, natural outlet, creek, or channel, except in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 14.20.130, or with the terms of a state or federally issued NPDES permit or City stormwater permit. Non-storm water runoff discharge that is not incidental is prohibited, unless otherwise specified in section 14.20.130.

SECTION 11. Section 14.20.130 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.130 Exemptions.

The commencement, conduct, or continuance of any illegal discharge to the storm drain system is prohibited except as follows:

A. The following non-storm water discharges are not prohibited provided any significant sources of pollutants present in the discharges are identified and appropriate control measures are developed and implemented to minimize the impacts of such discharges:

1. Water line flushing;
2. Individual residential car washing;
3. Diverted stream flows;
4. Rising groundwater;
5. Uncontaminated groundwater infiltration (as defined at 40 CFR Section 35.2005(20)) to separate storm sewers;
6. Uncontaminated pumped groundwater;
7. Discharges from potable water sources;
8. Foundation drains;
9. Air conditioning condensation;
10. Springs;
11. Water from crawl space pumps;
12. Footing drains;
13. Flows from riparian habitats and wetlands;
14. Dechlorinated swimming pool discharges;
15. Incidental runoff from landscaped areas, and
16. Discharges or flows from fire-fighting activities are excluded from effective prohibition against non-storm water and need only be addressed where they are identified as significant sources of pollutants.

B. The prohibition in chapter 14.20.120 shall not apply to any non-stormwater discharge permitted under an NPDES permit, waiver, or waste discharge order issued to the discharger and administered by the State of California or the federal Environmental Protection Agency, provided that the discharger is in full compliance with all requirements of the permit, waiver, or order and other applicable laws and regulations, and provided that approval has been granted by the City for any discharge to the City's storm drain system. However, this exemption provision does not obviate the need to obtain any other necessary permits for such discharges. Further, if the City or the Regional Board determines that any individual or class of non-storm water discharge(s) listed above may be a significant source of pollutants to waters of the U.S. or to the physically interconnected MS4, or poses a threat to water quality standards (beneficial uses), the City may require the discharger to monitor and submit a report and to implement BMPs on the discharge.

C. Any discharge that the Director, Enforcement Officer, the Local health officer, or the Regional Board determines in writing is necessary for the protection of public health and safety.

D. With concurrence of the Regional Board, the City may exempt in writing other non-stormwater discharges that are not a significant source of pollutants to the storm drain system or waters of the United States.

SECTION 12. Section 14.20.140 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.140 Exceptions to otherwise applicable exemptions.

A. Notwithstanding the exemptions provided for in the previous section above, if the Regional Board or the Director determines that a discharge that is otherwise exempt from the prohibition on illegal discharges causes or significantly contributes to a violation of any NPDES permit requirement or results in the conveyance of significant quantities of pollutants to surface waters, or is otherwise a danger to public health or safety, the Director may give written notice to the owner or operator of the facility that the discharge exception shall not apply to the discharge at issue and require elimination of the discharges pursuant to section 14.20.300.

B. Discharges in excess of an amount deemed to be incidental runoff shall be controlled. Parties responsible for controlling runoff in excess of incidental runoff shall:

1. Detect leaks (for example, from broken sprinkler heads) and correct the leaks within 72 hours of learning of the leak;
2. Properly design and aim sprinkler heads;
3. Not irrigate during precipitation events; and
4. Manage ponds containing recycled water such that no discharge occurs unless the discharge is a result of a 25 year, 24-hour storm event or greater. In the case of such discharge, the Regional Board is to be notified by an email sent no later than 24 hours after the discharge that includes identifying information, including the discharger's name and address.

SECTION 13. Section 14.20.150 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.150 Solid waste disposal prohibitions.

No person shall throw, deposit, leave, maintain, keep, or permit to be thrown, deposited, left, or maintained, in or upon any public or private property, driveway, parking area, street, alley, sidewalk, component of the storm drain system, or waters of the United States, any refuse, rubbish, garbage, litter or other discarded or abandoned objects, articles, and accumulations, so that the same may cause or contribute to pollution. Wastes properly deposited in streets in proper waste receptacles or pursuant to a City sponsored collection program are exempted from this prohibition.

SECTION 14. Section 14.20.160 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.160 Discharges in violation of industrial or construction activity NPDES stormwater discharge permit.

It is unlawful for any person subject to an industrial stormwater NPDES permit, construction stormwater NPDES permit, or City stormwater permit to violate any conditions of such permit. Proof of compliance with said permits may be required in a form acceptable to the Director for all industrial stormwater NPDES permit holders, and the City Engineer for all construction stormwater NPDES permit holders, prior to or as a condition of a approval of a subdivision map, site plan, building permit, or Development or Redevelopment plan; upon

inspection of the facility; during any enforcement proceeding or action; or for any other reasonable cause.

SECTION 15. Section 14.20.170 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.170 Stormwater management plans.

Site development construction plans must be accompanied by a stormwater management plan as required by the Stormwater Quality Design Manual. Prior to the issuance of a permit to construct and prior to installation and implementation of the specified BMPs, the construction plan and stormwater management plan shall have been reviewed and accepted by the City Engineer. The stormwater management plan shall detail how stormwater generated from a site will be controlled, managed, and treated, including but not limited to incorporation of Low Impact Development (LID) and hydromodification management concepts. The stormwater management plan shall evaluate the environmental characteristics of the project site and the potential impacts of all proposed development plans for the site on the water resources, and shall demonstrate the effectiveness of the type of stormwater control measures proposed for managing stormwater generated from the site. The stormwater management plan together with the site development construction plans shall indicate the size and location of all stormwater control measures, but need not include any information protected by Homeland Security laws or regulations.

SECTION 16. Section 14.20.180 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.180 Stormwater maintenance plans.

A stormwater BMP maintenance plan shall be developed for all post-construction stormwater control measures and shall include a schedule for when and how often maintenance of the stormwater control measures will occur, a list of any special equipment or skills required for proper maintenance, the estimated cost of maintenance, and a schedule for periodic inspections to ensure proper performance between maintenance events.

SECTION 17. Section 14.20.190 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.190 Stormwater control maintenance agreement required.

As a condition of issuance of the annual stormwater management permit, a stormwater control maintenance agreement shall be entered into by and between the developer of the Development or Redevelopment project and the current or future landowner(s) of all privately owned stormwater control measures. Certification of legal transfer and the existence of a stormwater control maintenance agreement shall be provided to the City upon the transfer of any land containing privately owned stormwater control measures from a Development or Redevelopment project. For new Development and Redevelopment, the stormwater control maintenance agreement shall run with the land and be recorded in the office of the Placer County

recorder. The stormwater control maintenance agreement shall be irrevocable and shall obligate all current and future landowners to bear all costs for the annual maintenance, replacement, record keeping, and annual permitting of all stormwater control measures.

SECTION 18. Section 14.20.200 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.200 Stormwater management permit required.

No landowner shall own or operate one or more post-construction stormwater control measures without obtaining an annual stormwater management permit as provided in this chapter. Each stormwater management permit shall be valid for one year and must thereafter be annually renewed.

SECTION 19. Section 14.20.210 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.210 Prerequisites for permit issuance.

Applications for annual stormwater management permits shall be filed with the City's Development Services Department. The initial stormwater management permit application must be accompanied by a stormwater management plan (for new construction only), a post-construction stormwater BMP maintenance plan, and a stormwater control maintenance agreement as detailed in Sections 14.20.170, 14.20.180 and 14.20.190. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of completion or a certificate to occupy, satisfactory stormwater management and post-construction stormwater BMP maintenance plans and a stormwater control maintenance agreement shall have been reviewed and accepted by the City Engineer.

SECTION 20. Section 14.20.220 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.220 Fees.

If applicable, every application for an annual stormwater management permit or renewal shall be accompanied by a nonrefundable fee, as established by resolution adopted by the City Council from time to time.

SECTION 21. Section 14.20.230 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.230 Stormwater quality design requirements and waivers.

A. All stormwater control measures for Development and Redevelopment, and Regulated Projects shall be constructed and designed in accordance with the Stormwater Quality Design Manual (2007), the West Placer Storm Water Quality Design Manual (LID Manual) (2015), or updates to same.

B. A waiver from the requirements of the West Placer Storm Water Quality Design Manual may be requested if impracticability for a specific property can be established. A waiver

for impracticability shall be granted only when all other stormwater control measures have been considered and rejected as infeasible. The City Engineer may grant a waiver for the following situations of impracticability:

1. Extreme limitations of space for treatment on a Development or Redevelopment project;
2. Unfavorable or unstable soil conditions at a site to attempt infiltration;
3. Risk of ground water contamination because a known unconfined aquifer or an area of contamination lies beneath the land surface, or an existing or potential underground source of drinking water is less than 10 feet from the soil surface.

C. All requests to waive the post-construction stormwater quality design requirements, or any portions thereof, shall be submitted in writing to the City Engineer for review. All requests shall be accompanied by a proposed stormwater management plan, including site plans and design documentation, which demonstrates the claimed impracticability. The City Engineer will review and make a final written decision on all waiver requests, and may consult with the Regional Board prior to making a final determination.

D. When a waiver is granted pursuant to this section, the landowner may be required to provide offsite mitigation, or pay a stormwater control measure mitigation fee as established by resolution adopted by the City Council from time to time.

E. Where any Development or Redevelopment project involves a new or rehabilitated flood management project associated with the City's municipal stormwater system, the landowner will need to coordinate with the City and any other local flood control entities to incorporate water quality and habitat enhancement features into the project.

SECTION 22. Section 14.20.240 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.240 Self certification reports and inspections.

A. All persons that own or operate one or more post-construction stormwater control measures, whether covered by a stormwater management permit or not, shall annually submit to the City Engineer a self-certification report, submitted under penalty of perjury, demonstrating compliance with the accepted post-construction stormwater BMP maintenance plan. The self-certification report shall verify that the operating condition of the stormwater control measures is in good working order and that the post-construction stormwater BMP maintenance plan has been executed to ensure that the stormwater control measures continue to perform adequately. The City Engineer may conduct inspections of the stormwater control measures to confirm the information filed in the self-certification report. It shall be unlawful to make any false statement or representation in a self-certification report submitted to the City Engineer.

B. If an owner or operator of post-construction stormwater control measures or a stormwater management permittee fails to submit the required self-certification report, the City Engineer or its Enforcement Officer may conduct an inspection of the stormwater control measures to verify compliance with the accepted post-construction stormwater BMP maintenance plan. If the City Engineer or Enforcement Officer determines the owner, operator, or stormwater management permittee is not in compliance with the post-construction stormwater BMP maintenance plan, or the stormwater control measures are not in good working order, the City Ennengineer or Ennnforcement Officer may issue a compliance order pursuant to Section

14.20.430 setting forth a schedule for compliance or may take other authorized enforcement actions under this chapter.

C. The City Engineer or Enforcement Officer shall perform a follow-up re-inspection at the conclusion of any prescribed schedule for compliance. Each time a re-inspection is required beyond the initial follow-up re-inspection for the compliance order, a re-inspection fee will be charged to the permittee, until such time that the permittee comes into compliance. The amount of the re-inspection fee shall be established by City Council resolution. Any unpaid costs owed by the permittee may be charged to the landowner, and if not paid, the City shall have the authority to place a lien against the property.

SECTION 23. Section 14.20.250 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.250 Replacement of stormwater control measures.

Once a post-construction stormwater control measure reaches the end of its life cycle or has been damaged and can no longer operate as designed, that stormwater control measure shall be replaced by the landowner at the landowner's expense and inspected by the City Engineer. Replacement stormwater control measures replaced in kind or with different technologies shall, at a minimum, meet the requirements of the then current Stormwater Quality Design Manual, LID Manual, and the requirements prescribed in this chapter.

SECTION 24. Section 14.20.260 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.260 Records of installation and maintenance.

Persons responsible for the operation and maintenance of stormwater control measures shall retain records of the initial installation of the stormwater control measures and records of all maintenance and repairs for the life of that control measure, but in no case less than five years. These records shall be made available to the City during inspection of the stormwater control measures and at other reasonable times upon request.

SECTION 25. Section 14.20.290 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.290 Requirement to prevent, control, and reduce stormwater pollutants.

A. The City will establish guidance documents identifying best management practices for any activity, operation, or facility that may cause or contribute to pollution or contamination of stormwater, the storm drain system, or waters of the United States as a separate BMP guidance series. Where BMP requirements are promulgated by the City or any federal, state of California, or regional agency for any activity, operation, or facility that would otherwise cause the discharge of pollutants to the storm drain system or waters of the United States, every person undertaking such activity or operation, or owning or operating such facility, shall comply with such promulgated requirements. BMPs developed by these other entities will be included or incorporated by reference in the City's BMP guidance series. The BMP guidance series includes

suggested structural and/or operational best management practices for various activities, operations and facilities and may be obtained from the City's Environmental Utilities Department and/or the City's Development Services Department, or viewed on the City's website.

B. Notwithstanding the presence or absence of requirements promulgated pursuant to subsection A, any person engaged in activities or operations, or owning or operating facilities or property that will or may result in pollutants entering stormwater, the municipal storm drain system, or waters of the United States shall implement best management practices to the extent they are technologically achievable and economically feasible to prevent and reduce such pollutants. The owner or operator of a commercial or industrial establishment shall provide reasonable protection from discharge of prohibited materials or other wastes into the municipal storm drain system or watercourses. Facilities to prevent discharge of prohibited materials or other wastes shall be provided and maintained at the owner's or operator's expense.

C. Any landowner or person responsible for construction activities that is required by the State Water Resources Control Board to prepare a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) must, at a minimum, adhere to the reviewed SWPPP. If the reviewed SWPPP, or any element thereof, is not fully implemented or is not functioning as needed to protect the waters of the United States, the responsible party will be required to immediately correct insufficiencies or will be subject to the enforcement procedures set forth in this chapter. The City has made available on its website a Stormwater Quality Best Management Practices (BMP) Guidance Manual for Construction Activities, which addresses proper best management practice installation and stormwater quality site management. This manual is consistent with the California Storm Water Quality Association (CASQA) Best Management Practices Handbook, and is part of the city's BMP guidance series available at the City's Development Services Department.

D. As required by Section 14.20.230, any landowner or person responsible for new Development or Redevelopment projects or Regulated Projects shall implement City requirements that address the volume, rate and potential pollutant load of stormwater runoff from said projects per the latest version of the West Placer Storm Water Quality Design Manual. The City has established the West Placer Storm Water Quality Design Manual which addresses appropriate design considerations for post-construction BMPs, and is part of the City's BMP guidance series, available at the City's Development Services Department and on the City's website.

SECTION 26. Section 14.20.300 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.300 Requirement to eliminate illegal discharges.

Notwithstanding the requirements of this chapter, the Director or City Engineer may require by written notice that a person responsible for an illegal discharge immediately or by a specified date discontinue the discharge and, if necessary, take measures to eliminate the source of the discharge to prevent the occurrence of future illegal discharges.

SECTION 27. Section 14.20.310 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.310 Prohibition of illicit connections.

The construction, use, maintenance, or continued existence of illicit connections to the storm drain system is prohibited. This prohibition expressly includes, without limitation, illicit connections made in the past regardless of whether the connection was permissible under law or practices applicable or prevailing at the time of connection.

SECTION 28. Section 14.20.320 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.320 Requirement to eliminate or secure approval for illicit connections.

A. The Director or City Engineer may require by written notice that a person responsible for an illicit connection to the storm drain system comply with the requirements of this chapter to eliminate or secure approval for the connection by a specified date, regardless of whether or not the connection or discharges to it had been established or approved prior to the effective date of this chapter.

B. If, subsequent to eliminating a connection found to be in violation of this chapter, the responsible person can demonstrate that an illegal discharge will no longer occur, said person may request City approval to reconnect. If allowed by the City, the reconnection or reinstallation of the connection shall be at the responsible person's expense.

SECTION 29. Section 14.20.330 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.330 Watercourse protection.

Every person owning property through which a watercourse passes, or such person's lessee, shall keep and maintain that part of the watercourse within the property reasonably free of trash, debris, excessive or overgrown vegetation, and other obstacles that would pollute, contaminate, or significantly retard the flow of water through the watercourse. In addition, the owner or lessee shall maintain existing privately owned structures within or adjacent to a watercourse, so that such structures will not become a hazard to the use, function, or physical integrity of the watercourse. The owner or lessee shall not remove healthy bank vegetation beyond that actually necessary for utility or other construction and/or maintenance, flood control, or fire protection, nor remove said vegetation in such a manner as to increase the vulnerability of the watercourse to unnaturally high rates of erosion. These maintenance activities within the watercourse may require federal and/or state permits or approvals.

SECTION 30. Section 14.20.340 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.340 Prohibition of spills.

It shall be unlawful for any person to allow a spill to discharge into the City's municipal storm drain system or any watercourse.

SECTION 31. Section 14.20.350 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.350 Notification of spills.

A. Notwithstanding other requirements of law, any person responsible for a spill into stormwater, the municipal storm drain system, any watercourse, or waters of the United States shall take all necessary steps to ensure the discovery, containment, and cleanup of such release. In the event of such a release of a hazardous material, said person shall immediately notify emergency response officials of the occurrence via emergency dispatch services or by calling “911.”

B. Notwithstanding other requirements of law, as soon as any person responsible for a facility or operation, or responsible for emergency response for a facility or operation has information of any known or suspected release of materials that are resulting or may result in illegal discharges or pollutants discharging into stormwater, the City’s municipal storm drain system, any watercourse, or waters of the United States from said facility, said person shall take all necessary steps to ensure the discovery, containment, and cleanup of such release. In the event of such a release of a hazardous material, said person shall immediately notify emergency response officials of the occurrence via emergency dispatch services or by calling “911.” In the event of a release of non-hazardous materials, said person shall notify the City’s Environmental Utilities Department’s Stormwater Management Program, the City’s stormwater discharge hotline (916-746-1000), or non-emergency dispatch services (916-774-5000). If the discharge of prohibited materials emanates from a commercial or industrial establishment, the owner or operator of such establishment shall also retain an on-site written record of the discharge and clean-up records and best management practices or corrective actions taken to prevent its recurrence. Such records shall be retained for at least five years and be made available for inspection by the City on request.

SECTION 32. Section 14.20.360 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.360 Hazardous materials response.

Any person engaged in activities that may result in pollutants entering the municipal storm drain system shall undertake the measures set forth below to reduce the risk of non-stormwater discharge and/or pollutant discharge.

A. Any business requiring a hazardous materials release response and inventory plan under Chapter 6.95 (commencing with Section 25500) of Division 20 of the California Health and Safety Code or amendments thereto, shall include in that plan provisions for compliance with this chapter, including the provisions prohibiting non-stormwater discharges and illegal discharges or connections, and requiring the reduction of pollutants in all stormwater discharges.

B. Any business requiring a hazardous waste transfer, treatment, storage, and disposal facility contingency plan and emergency procedures pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Chapter 15, Sections 66265.51 to 66265.56, shall include in that plan provisions for compliance with this chapter, including the provisions prohibiting non-stormwater discharges and illegal discharges, and requiring the reduction of pollutants in all stormwater discharges.

SECTION 33. Section 14.20.370 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.370 Authority to inspect and enter property.

Whenever necessary to make an inspection to enforce any provision of this chapter, or whenever the Director or City Engineer has cause to believe that there exists, or potentially exists, in or upon any premises any condition which constitutes a violation of this chapter, the City may enter such premises at all reasonable times to inspect the same, and to inspect and copy records related to stormwater compliance. In the event the owner or occupant refuses entry after a request to enter and inspect has been made, the City is hereby empowered to seek assistance from any court of competent jurisdiction in obtaining such entry.

SECTION 34. Section 14.20.380 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.380 Authority to sample, establish sampling devices, and test.

During any inspection as provided herein, a City representative may take samples, perform any testing deemed necessary, and take photographs to aid in the pursuit of the inquiry or to record site activities. This authority may include the installation of sampling and metering devices on private property, or requiring the person owning or occupying the premises to supply samples. The Enforcement Officer may require monitoring, analysis, and reporting of discharges from any premises to the City's municipal storm drain system. Upon service of written notice by the Enforcement Officer, the burden, including the cost of these activities, analyses, and reports incurred in complying with the requirement, shall, to the extent permitted by law, be borne by the landowner or occupant of the facility or activity for which testing and monitoring has been requested or performed.

SECTION 35. Section 14.20.390 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.390 Requirement to monitor and analyze.

The Director or City Engineer may require by written notice that any person engaged in any activity and/or owning or operating any facility that may cause or contribute to stormwater pollution, illegal discharges, and/or non-stormwater discharges to the storm drain system or waters of the United States, to undertake at said person's expense such monitoring and analyses and furnish such reports to the City as deemed necessary to determine compliance with this chapter.

SECTION 36. Section 14.20.400 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.400 Requirement to remediate.

Whenever the Director or City Engineer finds that a discharge of pollutants is taking place or has occurred that will result in or has resulted in pollution of stormwater, the storm drain system, or waters of the United States, the Director or City Engineer may require by written notice to the owner of the property and/or the responsible person that the pollution be remediated and the affected property restored at the landowner or other responsible person's expense within a specified time pursuant to the provisions of this chapter.

SECTION 37. Section 14.20.410 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.410 Violations.

It is unlawful for any person to violate any provision or fail to comply with any of the requirements of this chapter. Causing, permitting, aiding, abetting or concealing a violation of any provision of this chapter shall constitute a violation of this chapter. A violation of the provisions of this chapter shall occur irrespective of the negligence or intent of the violator to construct, maintain, operate or utilize an illicit connection or to cause, allow or facilitate any prohibited discharge. A violation of or failure to comply with any of the requirements of this chapter may be addressed pursuant to the City's Enforcement Response Plan and/or may be charged as either an infraction or a misdemeanor in the discretion of the City Attorney.

SECTION 38. Section 14.20.420 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.420 Acts potentially resulting in a violation of the Clean Water Act and/or Porter-Cologne Act.

Any person who violates any provision of this chapter or any provision of any requirement issued pursuant to this chapter may also be in violation of the Clean Water Act and/or the Porter-Cologne Act and may be subject to the sanctions of those acts, including civil and criminal penalties. Any enforcement action authorized under this chapter shall also include written notice to the violator of such potential liability.

SECTION 39. Section 14.20.430 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.430 Enforcement authority.

A. Cease and Desist Orders

Whenever the director, City Engineer or Enforcement Officer determines that a person has violated a prohibition or failed to meet a requirement of this chapter, the City shall require:

- 1) The discharger to effectively abate and clean up the discharge, spill, or pollutant release within 72 hours of notification, with high risk spills being order to be cleaned up as soon as possible;
- 2) Uncontrolled sources of pollutants that could pose an environmental threat to be abated within 30 days of notification;

- 3) Activities discharging pollutants to cease until such discharges are adequately addressed; and/or
- 4) If clean-up activities cannot be completed within the timeframes listed above, the discharger shall notify the Regional Board in writing within five (5) business days of the determination that the timeframe requires revision.

Nothing in the section shall be in conflict with the State Water Resources Control Board's notification requirements associated with the construction stormwater NPDES permit or the industrial stormwater NPDES permit.

B. Other Enforcement Authority

An administrative citation pursuant to Chapter 2.50, or a written compliance order pursuant to Chapter 2.52 may be issued to any person responsible for the violation. Any compliance order issued may require without limitation any or all of the following:

1. The performance of monitoring, analyses, and reporting;
2. The elimination of illicit connections or illegal discharges;
3. The cessation of violating discharges, practices, or operations;
4. The abatement or remediation of stormwater pollution or contamination hazards and the restoration of any affected property;
5. The implementation, maintenance, and documentation of source control, treatment, or operational best management practices;
6. Compliance with a post-construction stormwater BMP maintenance plan, stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) or other City-reviewed action plan; and
7. The maintenance, repair or replacement of stormwater control measures.

Any compliance order shall set forth a deadline within which the requirements of the compliance order must be completed. Said compliance order shall further advise that, should the violator fail to comply with the compliance order within the established deadline, a hearing on the compliance order shall be set.

SECTION 40. Section 14.20.450 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.450 Appeal.

Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 14.20.440, any person receiving a cease and desist order, administrative citation, or compliance order under Section 14.20.430 may appeal that determination of the Director, City Engineer or Enforcement Officer to a hearing panel drawn from the membership of the City's Board of Appeals. Filing of the appeal does not suspend the need to comply with the terms of the citation or order if compliance is ordered to be accomplished in less than 15 days. The notice of appeal must be received by the City within 10 days from the date of the citation or order. Notice of hearing and hearing on the appeal will be conducted pursuant to the requirements of Chapter 2.52.

SECTION 41. Section 14.20.460 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.460 Abatement by the City.

A. If correction of the violation has not occurred within the time period specified by the hearing panel after a hearing conducted pursuant to Section 14.20.440 or Section 14.20.450, the continuing violation shall be deemed a public nuisance and the City or a contracting agent hired by the City is authorized to enter upon the private property on which the violation exists for the purpose of abating the violation. It shall be unlawful for any person, owner, agent or person in possession of any premises to refuse to allow the City or its contracting agents to enter upon the premises for the purpose of abating the violation.

B. The cost of any such abatement by City authorized herein shall be borne by the property owner, which cost shall include administrative costs as well as the actual cost of abatement. The cost of abatement, including administrative costs, may be enforced as a personal obligation against the property owner, and shall be invoiced to the property owner. If the invoice is not paid within 60 days, the City shall have the authority to place a lien upon and against the property. Any relief under this section shall not prevent the City from seeking other and further relief authorized under this chapter.

SECTION 42. Section 14.20.470 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.470 Administrative costs.

If the City prevails in any administrative, civil, or criminal proceeding initiated under this chapter, the City shall be entitled to seek reimbursement for all costs incurred in connection with said proceeding. Such reimbursable expenses may include, but are not limited to, costs of investigations and inspections, staffing costs, administrative overhead, out-of-pocket expenses, costs of administrative hearings, and costs of suit. If any such costs are awarded or granted to the City, said costs shall be recoverable pursuant to Section 14.20.460(B).

SECTION 43. Section 14.20.480 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.480 Stop work orders.

Whenever any work is being done contrary to the provisions of this chapter, the City Engineer or Enforcement Officer may order the work stopped by notice in writing served on any persons engaged in the doing or causing such work to be done, and any such persons shall forthwith stop such work until authorized to proceed with the work by the City Engineer or Enforcement Officer.

SECTION 44. Section 14.20.490 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.490 Urgency abatement on private property.

The Director or City Engineer is authorized to require immediate abatement of any violation of this chapter that constitutes an immediate threat to the health, safety or well-being of the public or the environment, or is a violation of any NPDES permit. If any such violation is not abated immediately as directed by the Director or City Engineer, the City or the City's

designated agent is authorized to enter onto private property and to take any and all measures required to abate the violation. It shall be unlawful for any person, owner, agent or person in possession of any premises to refuse to allow the City or its contracting agents to enter upon the premises for the purpose of abating the violation. The cost of any such abatement by City authorized herein shall be borne by the property owner and/or responsible party, which cost shall include administrative costs as well as the actual cost of abatement. These costs may be enforced as a personal obligation against the property owner, and shall be invoiced to the landowner and/or responsible party. If the invoice is not paid within 60 days, the City shall have the authority to place a lien upon and against the property. Any relief under this section shall not prevent the City from seeking other and further relief authorized under this chapter.

SECTION 45. Section 14.20.500 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.500 Urgency abatement of municipal storm drain system.

The City is authorized to immediately abate or require the abatement of any illegal discharge or spill into the municipal storm drain system when, in the opinion of the Enforcement Officer, the discharge may constitute an immediate threat to the public health, safety or well-being, or to the environment, or may cause or contribute to a violation of any NPDES permit. The cost of any such abatement by the City, as authorized herein, shall be borne by the property owner and/or responsible party, which cost shall include administrative costs as well as the actual cost of abatement. These costs may be enforced as a personal obligation against the property owner, and shall be invoiced to the landowner and/or responsible party. If the invoice is not paid within 60 days, the city shall have the authority to place a lien upon and against the property. Any relief under this section shall not prevent the city from seeking other and further relief authorized under this chapter.

SECTION 46. Section 14.20.510 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.510 Compensatory actions.

In lieu of or in addition to enforcement proceedings, penalties, and remedies authorized by this chapter and Chapters 2.50 and 2.52, the Director or City Engineer may impose upon a violator one or more alternative compensatory actions including, but not limited to, storm drain stenciling, attendance at compliance workshops, creek cleanup activities, and staff training sessions. Any alternative compensatory actions shall be imposed on the violator in writing by the Director or City Engineer. Failure to comply with the terms of the compensatory actions may result in the enforcement proceedings, penalties, and remedies authorized by this chapter and Chapters 2.50 and 2.52.

SECTION 47. Section 14.20.520 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.520 Separate offense for each day and each violation.

Any person that violates any provision of this chapter shall be guilty of a separate offense for each violation and for every day during any portion of which any such person commits, continues, permits, or causes a violation(s) thereof, and shall be punished accordingly.

SECTION 48. Section 14.20.530 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.530 Public nuisance.

In addition to the enforcement processes and penalties hereinbefore provided, any condition caused or permitted to exist in violation of any of the provisions of this chapter is a threat to public health, safety, and welfare, and is declared and deemed a nuisance, and may be summarily abated or restored by the City at the violator's expense, and/or through a civil action to abate, enjoin, or otherwise compel the cessation of such nuisance brought by the City.

SECTION 49. Section 14.20.540 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.540 Remedies not exclusive.

Remedies under this chapter are in addition to and do not supersede or limit any and all other available civil or criminal remedies. The remedies provided for herein shall be cumulative and not exclusive.

SECTION 50. Section 14.20.560 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby added to read as follows:

14.20.560 Appeal of City abatement costs.

Within sixty (60) calendar days after the city's abatement of the violation, the Director, or his or her designee, will notify the owner of the property of the cost of abatement. The property owner and/or responsible party may file a written protest objecting to the amount of the abatement assessment within ten (10) calendar days after the City's issuance of the notice. The Director, as applicable, shall conduct a hearing on the appeal within thirty (30) calendar days from the date of receipt of the notice of the appeal. Appellant may appear at the hearing in person or may submit a written statement signed under penalty of perjury in lieu of a hearing. Following the hearing, the Director shall make written findings of fact as to whether the abatement was proper. The Director's decision shall be final.

SECTION 51. This ordinance shall be effective at the expiration of thirty (30) days from the date of adoption.

SECTION 52. The City Clerk is hereby directed to cause this ordinance to be published in full at least once within fourteen (14) days after it is adopted in a newspaper of general circulation in the City, or shall within fourteen (14) days after its adoption cause this ordinance to be posted in full in at least three (3) public places in the City and enter in the Ordinance Book a certificate stating the time and place of said publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8218

File #: 0600

Title: Insurance Certificate Tracking Policy Change
Contact: Dave Rawe 916-774-5207 drawe@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 6.36.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff requests that Council approve a change to the City's current Insurance Certificate Tracking process to eliminate the need to track insurance certificates for all contracts and service agreements under \$21,745. Contracts and service agreements over \$21,745, as well as all contracts and service agreements involving hazardous activities, will continue to be tracked through Ebix, the City's third party administrator. All insurance requirements will remain the same.

BACKGROUND

The City's current practice is to track risk on all contracts and service agreements by requiring proof of insurance from all vendors. The contracts and service agreements initiated by the City state the required minimum insurance coverage required. By requesting proof of insurance, we are verifying that the vendor has the appropriate insurance coverage.

Risk Management staff currently tracks insurance certificates for 865 vendors who have business relationships with the City. The City uses a third party administrator, Ebix, for insurance tracking and management and is charged per vendor for the service.

In an effort to streamline processes and to determine potential loss and monitor cost-efficiency to the City, Risk Management recently reviewed our processes relating to verifying and tracking General Liability, Automotive, Workers' Compensation and Professional Liability insurance required by vendors entering into a service agreement or contract with the City of Roseville. The measures included identifying claims and assessing the frequency and severity of losses to determine whether to retain (absorb) or transfer (insurance) the risk from current practices. After a careful review of recent and past claims, Risk Management verified that 99% of City losses relate to damage to property or injury to persons as a result of the City's negligence (eg. tree claims, slip and fall, auto accidents) and are not related to contract indemnification protection or risk transfer. In the last 10 years, 7 claims have been tendered with associated contracts *over* \$21,745. In the last 10 years, 0 claims have been filed with contracts *under* \$21,745.

The potential risk of requiring insurance, but not requesting submission of proof of insurance at the time a contract is entered into is small. Risk Management is not reducing insurance requirements; all requirements will remain and will be self-certified by the vendor. Obtaining a certificate from the vendor if a claim is filed is not difficult but does pose a small risk that the vendor does not have the amount of coverage required by the City, even though they signed an

agreement confirming they have the coverage.

As a result of this potential change, there would be a reduction in the number of vendors we track to approximately 400 – essentially cut more than half of the current number of vendors in Ebix. This change would ease the burden on Risk Management, Purchasing, and other departments and create a huge efficiency by removing the need to track/enter/verify insurance for contracts/service agreements that pose minimal risk to the City. It would also create an approximate savings of \$6000 a year in Ebix costs alone, not to mention the savings of department staff time in administering the current standards.

FISCAL IMPACT

The fiscal impact is a savings of approximately \$6,000 annually.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

No new jobs may be created by this action.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Insurance tracking changes are not considered a “project” as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (CEQA Guidelines 15378). Consequently no CEQA action is required.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dave Rawe, Risk Manager

Gayle Satchwell, Human Resources Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8196

File #: 0103-32-02

Title: Legislative and Regulatory Platform for State and Federal Advocacy - 2017

Contact: Mark Wolinski 916-774-5179 mwolinski@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 6.37.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff recommends that Council adopt the attached Legislative Platform, which includes a set of priorities, legislative principles and platforms to guide the City's State and Federal legislative and judicial advocacy programs through 2017. (Attachment A)

BACKGROUND

The State and Federal priorities and legislative platform defined within the document are the result of the City Council's articulation of its goals and priorities during legislative updates and the City Council's Legislative Platform Workshop held December 14, 2016. The Legislative Platform conveys the Council's positions on issues that are currently, or are anticipated to be, the focus of future legislation by the State and Federal governments.

Council's adoption of these priorities authorizes the City's active participation to influence State and Federal decision-making on legislative, administrative, regulatory and funding issues and to support judicial advocacy consistent with the City's priorities. Using this document as a guide, the City will adopt positions on specific legislation, regulations and budget proposals, and respond to requests for amicus curiae support when the outcome of a pending lawsuit is likely to significantly affect a priority concern of the City. The Mayor will sign letters based on the City's identified interests; the Mayor and other Council Members will advance City interests through individual and regional advocacy efforts; and the Mayor will act on requests from the City Attorney to join in friend-of-the-court briefs.

Staff recommends that the Legislative Platform be updated annually to be responsive to changes to the State and Federal legislative and regulatory environments and to reflect the interests unique to Roseville and interests that may also be common to cities throughout the State.

Effective Platform Implementation

An assortment of internal and external resources is used to effectively administer the City's legislative platform, they include:

- The City Council Law and Regulation Committee is a standing, advisory committee of the City Council with review and recommendation authority. The Committee provides a forum to introduce,

discuss and more thoroughly analyze selected proposed State and Federal legislation, policies and regulations that have the potential to impact City departments, the community and the region.

- City staff works collaboratively with the City's Federal and State lobbyists to understand and develop strategies for influencing legislation. The City's Federal lobbyist also works closely with staff to help identify funding resources for departmental projects and will review grant applications before they are submitted.
- In addition to the City's lobbyists, city staff interacts and participates with organizations such as The League of California Cities, Sacramento Area Council of Governments, North State Water Alliance, Northern California Power Agency, California Municipal Utilities Association and the Roseville Chamber of Commerce to advocate on issues that are important to the City.
- Internally, government relations staff works with staff from each department on legislation, regulations, and project funding opportunities that are important to their departments. During the course of the legislative year staff monitors introduced legislation, develops priority lists of legislation for each department and makes recommendations on letters of support/opposition as the bills progress through the legislative process.
- Government relations staff works closely with the staff of the City's State and Federal representatives to ensure the City's position on legislation is clearly understood by Roseville's representatives. The development of this relationship and exchange of information with the City's representatives is an effort that continues throughout the entire year.

Working collaboratively with the Council's Law and Regulation Committee and the City's internal and external partners ensures that the City's advocacy strategy has the greatest ability to influence legislation and policies that are crucial to the City. The City has successfully demonstrated the ability to work with this process and to develop coalitions that take positions on legislation in a manner that is beneficial and supportive of the adopted platform.

Platform Modifications

Modifications were made throughout the 2017 platform to ensure the City is well positioned to effectively advocate for or against legislation, policies and regulations introduced during the 2017 legislative and congressional sessions. These modifications were reviewed and discussed with the City Council during the Council's December Legislative Platform workshop. Changes were also made to the platform that ensure the City is positioned successfully to compete for funding that may become available in 2017 through opportunities provided by the State or federal governments.

FISCAL IMPACT

The costs to implement the legislative advocacy program fall in two categories and are included in the City's approved budget. The first category is the ongoing staff time related to the various efforts. The second category is the use of the outside services provided by Gonsalves & Sons and the Ferguson Group. These two organizations provide a variety of functions related to the advocacy program. However, the Legislative Platform itself has no direct fiscal impact to the City's budget; the platform provides policy direction only.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Not applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not apply to activities that will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines §15061 (b) (3). Stating policy priorities does not include the potential for a significant environmental effect, and therefore is not subject to CEQA.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mark Wolinski, Government Relations Administrator

Megan MacPherson, Public Affairs & Communications Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Legislative Platform



City of Roseville

**2017 Legislative and Regulatory Platform
for State and Federal Advocacy**

Roseville City Council



*Back row from left: John Allard, Tim Herman, Scott Alvord
Front row from left: Mayor Susan Rohan, Vice Mayor Bonnie Gore,*

Contents

Background	4
Effective Platform Implementation	5
Priorities For 2017	6
<i>Administrative Services Goal</i>	7
<i>Community Development Goal</i>	9
<i>Public Safety Goal</i>	11
<i>Economic Development Goal</i>	12
<i>Electric And Environmental Utilities Goal</i>	13
Critical Concerns For Upcoming Legislative/Congressional Sessions.....	19

Background

The positions defined within this legislative and regulatory platform reflect the City Council's goals and priorities as well as its position on issues that are currently, or are anticipated to be, the focus of future legislation and regulation at the state and federal levels. Council's adoption of this platform authorizes the City's active participation to influence state and federal decision-making on legislative, administrative, regulatory and funding issues and to support judicial advocacy consistent with the City's priorities.

Using this document as a guide, the City will adopt positions on specific legislation, regulations and budget proposals, and respond to requests for amicus curiae support when the outcome of a pending lawsuit is likely to significantly affect a City priority. The Mayor will sign letters of support or opposition based on the City's identified interests, the Mayor and other Council Members will advance City interests through individual and regional advocacy efforts, and the Mayor will act on requests from the City Attorney to join in friend-of-the-court briefs.

Staff recommends that the Legislative and Regulatory Platform be updated annually to be responsive to changes to the state and federal legislative and regulatory environments and to reflect the interests unique to Roseville and interests that may also be common to cities throughout the state.

Strategies for Effective Platform Implementation

- City staff works collaboratively with our federal and state lobbyists to understand and develop strategies to influence legislation. The City's federal lobbyist also works closely with staff to help identify funding resources for projects and reviews grant applications before they are submitted. Staff will scrutinize grant requirements for matching funds, environmental review, or for new requirements required to ensure they have a reasonable correlation to the value of the funding and the benefit being derived from the grant.
- City staff participates in organizations such as The League of California Cities, Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce, North State Water Alliance, Northern California Power Agency (NCPA), California Municipal Utilities Association (CMUA), and the Roseville Chamber of Commerce to advocate on issues that are important to the City. This allows the City to have a stronger voice and a greater potential to influence key policy and legislative matters.
- Government relations staff works with staff from each department to develop awareness of and understanding of legislation, regulations, and project funding opportunities. During the course of the legislative year, staff monitors legislation, develops priority lists of legislation for each department, and makes recommendations on letters of support or opposition as bills progress through the legislative process.
- Government relations staff strategizes and coordinates with other jurisdictions, special districts and organizations on key issues of common interest to ensure a stronger voice on legislation, regulatory and policy matters.
- City advocacy letters are signed by the Mayor. In the event the Mayor is not available to sign an advocacy letter, the responsibility will reside with the Vice-Mayor.
- Government relations staff works closely with state and federal legislative staff to ensure the City's position on legislation and critical concerns is clearly understood by Roseville's elected representatives. The development of this relationship and exchange of information with the City's representatives continues throughout the year.
- Proposed City advocacy positions on bills that would result in the issuance of or a vote for a new state bond will be brought to the full Council for its consideration and direction.

Working collaboratively with the Council's Law and Regulation Committee and the City's internal and external partners ensures that the City has the greatest ability to influence legislation and policies that are important to the City. The City has successfully used this process of proactive advocacy and coalition development to take positions on legislation to effectively advance the legislative platform.

Priorities for 2017

Citywide Legislative Principles

1. The City of Roseville believes in local control and the ability of the City Council to make decisions that address the needs of residents and businesses within its jurisdiction. In general, the City of Roseville will oppose legislation that erodes local control and will support legislation that increases local control.
2. The City of Roseville also believes in fiscal responsibility and requires financial flexibility to carry out its mission and objectives for the community. The City will oppose legislation that hinders financial flexibility and will support legislation that encourages financial flexibility.
3. Oppose legislation that requires the City to provide a service or benefit without appropriate and full funding.
4. Oppose legislation that would negatively impact City revenues including but not limited to sales tax, property tax, other General Fund revenues and enterprise fund revenues.
5. Support legislation that protects and maintains City sales tax revenue and oppose legislation that erodes this revenue. Any advocacy on sales tax legislation beyond these guidelines will be brought to the full Council for consideration and direction.

Federal Funding Requests

Projects:

1. Washington Andora Widening Project
2. Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI)
3. Emerging Energy Technologies
4. Further development of the City's recycled water system
5. Water supply reliability improvements such as increased interconnections, expanded conjunctive use capacity, better access to water supplies
6. Expansion of wastewater digestion capacity to handle organics recycling and generate renewable energy

Initiatives: Promoting economic stimulus and infrastructure investment

- a. Projects that provide jobs especially in the areas of energy, water, transportation, public safety and community development.
- b. Assistance for business expansion and formation.

Priorities for 2017

City's Federal and State Legislative platform

1. Oppose state and federal actions that produce incompatible consequences and/or have an adverse impact on the City's ability to comply with state and federal regulations and/or legislation. The City will inform the community when these situations occur.
2. Support legislation that would further the stated missions of the City's departments and oppose legislation that would impede the ability of each department to effectively meet its operational objectives.
3. Support legislation and regulations that preserve City assets, infrastructure and projects.
4. Support legislation and policies that protect our residents and businesses from inconsistent, unnecessary and costly special district, state and federal regulations, mitigation requirements and permits.
5. Oppose legislation and regulations that would negatively impact or divert any City revenues to the state or any other entity.
6. Support legislation that would require the state to pay for mandates that are unfunded.
7. Oppose legislation that would impose significant compliance costs to the City and where a public benefit has not been identified to justify the costs.
8. Support the City's ability to continue to evaluate traffic on level-of-service basis and not rely solely on a vehicle-miles-traveled analysis.

Administrative Services Goal:

To protect the ability of the City to make decisions unencumbered by onerous policies and regulations that are costly and/or restrictive in how they must be implemented regarding areas of finance, human resources, city clerk, information technology and central services; to ensure the City's positions regarding pension reform are clearly articulated by providing input and expertise in response to future legislative efforts.

We take the following approaches to accomplish this:

Administrative Services Platform:

1. Support legislation and measures that protect the City's rights in the collective bargaining process.
2. Support legislation, policies and regulations that simplify the administration of public records, election code and Brown Act provisions and provide full-cost recovery.
3. Oppose legislation that diminishes enacted workers' compensation reforms and cost controls.
4. Support legislation that reforms unemployment insurance.
5. Support efforts that engage and include local government in future pension reform discussions and legislation.

Priorities for 2017

6. Oppose legislation and regulations that place new environmental requirements on local agencies that would inhibit the City's ability to fulfill its mission and are not accompanied by funding necessary for implementation.
7. Support legislation, policies and regulations that simplify public procurement and contracting.
8. Oppose legislation that restricts or diminishes the City's ability to procure goods and services efficiently and effectively.
9. Oppose legislation that alters the tax treatment of municipal bonds such as proposals that would cap or eliminate the current tax-exempt status.
10. Support reasonable and common-sense legislation and regulations that clarify conflict-of-interest rules.

Information Technology Platform:

1. Support legislation and regulations that ensure emergency communication capabilities and interoperability for information technology and public safety departments and agencies.
2. Support legislation that promotes and provides funding for increased ability to manage technology, assistance in adhering to regulatory compliance requirements and reducing the risk of cyber-attacks.
3. Oppose legislation that would require public agencies to share information in public settings that could be used by groups or individuals with malicious intent to compromise the systems, services or private information of public employees or citizens.
4. Support legislation and policies that encourage streamlining of business processes for responding to open records requests and that provide funding for these activities.
5. Support legislation for cost-effective environmental technology initiatives.
6. Oppose legislation that would restrict procurement practices or impact vendor interaction.
7. Support legislation that includes operational expenses as an acceptable use of public, educational, government access (PEG) funds collected from cable franchise fees per the Federal Communications Commission for government access stations.

Priorities for 2017

Community Development Goal:

The intent of our General Plan policies is to create an attractive, vibrant, well-planned city, demonstrated by balanced land uses with desirable neighborhoods, prosperous businesses, excellent schools, convenient public services and open space and recreation amenities all linked by superior transportation systems that include well-maintained streets, sidewalks, bike paths and transit in a cost-effective and financially sustainable manner. To monitor and act on legislation that would affect General Plan policies and/or restrict local control or impose new regulations that require increased costs and greater demands on the City's General Fund.

We take the following approaches to accomplish this:

Public Works and Transportation Platform

1. Support continued reauthorization of the nation's highway and transit funding bills.
2. Oppose legislation that reduces or eliminates transportation revenues for transportation purposes.
3. Support legislation that provides additional funding for local roadway maintenance, transportation and infrastructure.
4. Support measures that ensure reasonable and fiscally responsible accessibility of all public and private transportation services.
5. Oppose legislation that reduces the ability to use high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes by transit, paratransit and other high-occupancy use vehicles.
6. Support legislation, policies and regulations that allow the use of Medi-Cal funds for transportation purposes and support Medi-Cal policies that promote the use of transit/ paratransit as Medicaid providers.
7. Support legislation that provides tax incentives for people who use public transit and other alternatives to driving a single-occupant personal vehicle.
8. Support legislation that provides funding for cities to comply with state and federal mandates regarding flood-protection levels.

Development Services Platform

1. Support legislation that strengthens local control in the areas of transportation and land-use policies and assists local governments in integrating new growth.
2. Support legislation, policies and regulations that ensure local governments maintain local land-use control and maintain the ability to address local constituents' concerns.
3. Support legislation that ensures local control and flexibility in determining reduction measures for greenhouse gas requirements.

Priorities for 2017

4. Support legislation and regulations that streamline permitting processes and require agencies to consider the economic impacts and equities of mitigation measures regarding permits for water supply, flood control, air quality, water quality and sustainability. (This list is representative and not intended to be exhaustive.)
5. Oppose legislation for new wetlands regulations that duplicates similar requirements at the federal level.
6. Support Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) Section 214 permanence and the ability to process public/private projects through WRDA.
7. Support legislation for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) reform that streamlines the environmental review process and reduces opportunities for "green mail" lawsuits.
8. Support legislation that would purge laws and regulations that are redundant and/or no longer applicable or necessary.

Parks, Recreation & Libraries Platform

1. Support legislation and measures that fund recreation, fitness, and wellness, and prevention programs for youth and adults.
2. Support legislation that protects funding for the State Library Fund.
3. Support legislation and new measures for park, recreation, and library programs, services, and special events.
4. Support new initiatives that provide funding for park and public facilities development, rehabilitation, and operations.
5. Support full funding of state parks, recreation, bike trails, open space, and library grants; including, but not limited to, the Land and Water Conservation Fund.
6. Support legislation and budgets that fund development of capital park and open space improvements or rehabilitation.
7. Support legislation that funds ongoing operational values for recreation and library programming, including fitness, wellness, enrichment, maintenance, and books/technology for youth and adults.
8. Support legislation that would further fair and appropriate access to park and library resources for all persons; including, but not limited to, homeless persons.
9. Support legislation that defines appropriate penalties for incidents of vandalism and property theft.

Priorities for 2017

Building Inspection Platform

1. Promote public health and safety in building construction through responsible legislation that adopts building codes through the regulatory process and allows for local control of enforcement.
2. Support legislation that enhances code enforcement through a uniform approach at the state level with input from the local authority by going through the regulatory process.
3. Oppose legislation that mandates specific enforcement requirements through the legislative process.
4. Protect the ability to adopt local amendments to fire and building codes.
5. Oppose legislation that places additional burdens of enforcement on local officials but is not directly related to issues of health and safety.

Public Safety Goal:

To protect and enhance the safety and quality of life of our residents, businesses, customers and partners by providing effective responses to all service requests; to promote programs that minimize risk and maximize the safety for our entire community; and to deliver community risk-reduction programs and exceptional solutions as a cohesive team and in a collaborative manner.

We take the following approaches to accomplish this:

1. Oppose legislation that would decrease state and federal funding for programs and services including Homeland Security.
2. Support legislation that ensures flexibility for and local control of all grant resources and funding for public safety technology and mandatory reporting systems.
3. Protect the ability to adopt local amendments to fire and building codes.
4. Oppose legislation that would reduce or eliminate funding for disaster mitigation.
5. Oppose reductions to the levels of state and federal funding opportunities for public safety programs and/or services.
6. Oppose regulatory policies that negatively affect the police or fire departments.
7. Oppose legislation that reduces or eliminates local law enforcement flexibility or otherwise enacts broad sentencing reforms that reduce sentences for non-violent crimes in a general fashion.
8. Support legislation that provides municipalities with local control to provide para-transport, community para-medicine services and illness-prevention practices and programs.
9. Support legislation that provides adequate funding to cities for realignment services and oppose legislation that reduces or eliminates funding for those services.
10. Support legislation that results in regionalization of public safety functions and local control of regionalization of fire services.
11. Support legislation that requires the state to pay for unfunded mandates related to new public safety training requirements.

Priorities for 2017

Economic Development Goal:

To create a vibrant business and community environment that enhances the quality of life for our residents and provides outstanding potential for our businesses and partners to flourish. To provide exceptional facilities, programs, services, and affordable housing opportunities in a safe environment by maintaining neighborhoods and commercial districts. To create a vibrant economic development environment by forming effective partnerships for the purposes of supporting legislation that encourages and assists with the development of businesses and manufacturing and to maximize social and economic opportunities.

We take the following approaches to accomplish this:

Housing and Community Investment Platform

1. Support legislation that fully funds the federal Housing Choice Voucher (Section 8), Home Investment Partnerships (HOME) and Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) programs.
2. Support legislation and measures that create new state incentives for affordable housing and infill development.
3. Support legislation that increases flexibility in the state housing element process and streamlines environmental statutes.
4. Support appropriation of adequate funding for housing programs including CDBG and HOME.
5. Support streamlining of the requirements for the types of projects that can be funded with state and federal funding.

Economic Development Platform

1. Oppose legislation and measures that create competitive disadvantages for businesses at local and state levels.
2. Support legislation and measures that allow the City to grow the current economic base by providing the tools and resource needed for businesses to expand and flourish.
3. Support legislation, funding and policies that promote Regional Occupation Programs, trade schools, investment in research and development technology, and tax incentives for manufacturing.
4. Support legislation, policies, and regulations that require economic analysis and/or scientific validation of changes to state policies or regulations before modifications can be enacted.
5. Support legislation that promotes the state as an economically viable and strong destination for businesses to locate.
6. Oppose legislation that negatively impacts the City as it relates to the dissolution and wind-down of the Redevelopment Agency.

Priorities for 2017

Electric and Environmental Utilities Goal:

To protect local control over how utilities provide services to our customers; to protect our customers from state and federal legislation, policies, and regulations that have no clear benefit relative to cost; and to oppose legislation, policies, and regulations that create unfunded mandates and compliance requirements that negatively impact the utilities' ability to provide their services and products in the most safe, reliable and cost-effective manner.

Electric Utility Platform

Roseville Electric Utility's mission is to improve the quality of life in our community and to provide customers with reliable electricity, competitive prices, exceptional service and a culture of safety. With the ever-increasing technological advancements in the electric utility industry, as well as increased legislative and regulatory mandates, the electric utility will continue to transform its business model to best serve its customers in the most efficient, reliable and cost-effective way possible.

We take the following approaches to accomplish this:

1. Support legislation, policies, and regulations that ensure utility regulation and new environmental laws protect local authority and the ability to serve customers and consider cost/rate impacts.
2. Support legislation that develops cost-effective renewable-energy resources.
3. Support legislation and regulations that streamline permitting for new generating facilities.
4. Support legislation that provides for multiple approaches to meet energy peak usage.
5. Support newly formed joint-power action groups and new municipal power entities.
6. Support legislation that preserves public tax-exempt financing.
7. Oppose legislation that would reduce funding for energy programs.
8. Support legislation that streamlines the regulatory requirements at all levels regarding federal reliability standards and state environmental regulations.
9. Support legislation that improves the process used for evaluating reliability compliance including prioritizing on issues that pose the greatest risks to reliability of the grid and reduce regulatory burdens on users, owners, and operators.
10. Oppose legislation that makes changes to renewable energy regulations without comprehensive analysis, including a cost-benefit analysis and stakeholder input before enactment.
11. Support legislation and efforts that ensure future changes to transmission-system improvements and/or requirements include allocations of the costs for those activities to the parties that impact the systems and/or stand to benefit from those improvements. (The Beneficiary Pays Principle)

Priorities for 2017

12. Support legislation and reform efforts that require a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis for meeting new environmental regulations.
13. Oppose legislation that mandates power purchases from specific projects and/or specific resources, if other cost-effective opportunities are available.
14. Support legislation that would provide for greater flexibility to meet the Renewable Portfolio Standards (RPS).
15. Support legislation that allows Publicly Owned Utilities (POUs) the flexibility to set energy procurement targets for cost-effective new emerging technologies.
16. Work collaboratively with neighboring utilities on legislative issues that impact the electric utility industry as a whole.
17. Support legislation intended to meet current or future Greenhouse Gas (GHG) reduction targets in the most cost-effective manner possible.

As part of the legislative and regulatory platform Roseville Electric Utility also takes advocacy positions to promote the City's position before the applicable regulatory agencies. :

Environmental Utilities Platform

Roseville's Environmental Utilities (EU) Department provides water, wastewater, solid waste, stormwater, and recycled water utility services to Roseville's residents and businesses in an integrated and efficient manner that provides high value at some of the lowest rates in the region. EU's mission is to enhance community value by delivering quality environmental utility services. Many external factors influence how EU operates, how much services cost, and the quality of service EU provides to its customers.

A significant portion of the external influence comes from state and federal laws and regulations. It is EU's obligation, in light of the department's mission, to actively monitor, act upon and proactively advocate for policy positions that protect or enhance the integrity of the department's operation and ability to serve EU's rate-paying customers

Solid Waste Management:

Goal: Ensure timely, cost-effective, and continuous performance improvements in all facets of the City's solid waste operation. Maximize the efficient use of resources to minimize costs and increase customer service. Maintain awareness of operational technology development to continuously optimize the city's solid waste operation.

Priorities for 2017

We take the following approaches to accomplish this:

1. Support efforts to enact a comprehensive statewide Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) law that allocates end-of-life disposal costs with the producer of the product consistent with Council direction as outlined in Resolution 10-278.
2. Support product-by-product EPR laws as a second alternative to a statewide comprehensive EPR law consistent with Council direction as outlined in Resolution 10-278.
3. Oppose efforts to increase recycling diversion rates if determined not to be cost-effective relative to the benefits that could be achieved.
4. Support recycling market development by the state and federal government for recyclables, green waste, food waste, sewage sludge and other organics. Oppose mandated material-disposal bans or restrictions in circumstances where there is an insufficient capacity within the private recycling market to handle these materials in a more beneficial way besides landfilling.
5. Support efforts to streamline the permitting, construction, and funding of facilities that allow the City to transform usable waste into energy/beneficial byproducts; and efforts to provide state and federal funding for any potential City waste-to-energy projects.
6. Support efforts to reuse waste in a beneficial way if cost-effective relative to benefits.
7. Support efforts that protect solid waste worker safety.
8. Oppose efforts to increase statewide tipping fees where there is no clear benefit to Environmental Utilities ratepayers.

Water Supply and Delivery:

Goal: To protect local water reliability, allocate costs appropriately statewide for water infrastructure improvements, and protect ratepayers from state and federal mandates that have no clear local benefit relative to cost. To monitor and act on legislation that would be detrimental to running a financially sustainable water utility, affect quality of service provided, or degrade local control. To proactively develop policy recommendations that help Roseville increase its water supply reliability.

We take the following approaches to accomplish this:

1. Safeguard Roseville's water supply contracts from outside interests.
2. Support and advocate for efforts to develop, diversify, and fund the city and region's water supply portfolio and achieve a regional water supply that is reliable for generations to come.
3. Advocate for long-term Central Valley Projects (CVP) water service contracts that ensure a secure, long-term and reliable CVP water source from Folsom Reservoir.
4. Support efforts that allocate the costs for Delta and statewide water infrastructure improvements to the parties that either impact the Delta and/or stand to benefit from those improvements, known as the "Beneficiary Pays Principle".
5. Support Delta and statewide solutions that utilize sound science.

Priorities for 2017

6. Oppose efforts that impose arbitrary flow requirements on the American River that are not consistent with responsible water-supply management and undermine the locally developed flow-management principles under the Water Forum Agreement.
7. Support efforts to implement a locally developed Modified Flow Management Standard on the lower American River that supports the Water Forum effort and provides for a prudent carryover storage at Folsom Reservoir.
8. Encourage proactive and participatory approaches to developing Delta and statewide solutions.
9. Support efforts that help local governments maintain water-efficiency programs that meet state objectives, are cost-effective, and make sense for the local conditions.
10. Support state and federal efforts to increase water-efficiency ratings for common consumer products that use water.
11. Engage in discussions regarding water regulatory requirements that would add cost to the operation without a corresponding perceived benefit.
12. Protect Roseville's and the region's ability to locally manage groundwater resources.
13. Protect the City's land-use authority and its right to make land-use decisions with respect to water supply.
14. Oppose efforts to impose a Water Public Goods Charge where revenue is collected from local ratepayers and monies collected are allocated for statewide projects that have no direct benefit to Roseville's ratepayers.
15. Oppose efforts by the State of California to impose unrealistic water-efficiency targets as "the new normal" for urban water use.
16. Oppose long-term conservation targets that do not consider climate, land-use, and other region-specific attributes, fail to provide a reasonable standard for our customer base (both residential and commercial) to achieve, and fail to recognize previous water-supply reliability and conservation investments by the region and local community.
17. Oppose efforts to standardize water-supply contingency actions
18. Support efforts that allow local agencies to develop practical and locally controlled water-conservation and water-use efficiency solutions.

Priorities for 2017

Water Quality:

Goal: To protect and improve the environmental integrity of local waterways in a cost-effective manner.

We take the following approaches to accomplish this:

1. Oppose efforts to impose additional state-mandated stormwater program requirements without commensurate funding for those programs.
2. Support efforts to evaluate cost of compliance and ways to reduce costs to dischargers.
3. Support legislative efforts to reduce potential of third-party lawsuits pertaining to water quality issues.
4. Support legislation that revises the state Constitution to allow for stormwater programs to establish a funding mechanism that is similar to that of the utilities under the Proposition 218 reforms.
5. Support efforts to require pesticide manufacturers to produce products that are less harmful to the environment.
6. Support efforts to implement statewide Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) principles so that manufacturers design their products in a way that has less of an environmental impact upon local waterways (example: car brake pads).
7. Oppose efforts to increase whole effluent toxicity testing for recycled water, stormwater and wastewater when it is not cost-effective, has no clear benefit and/or is not based on sound science.
8. Oppose efforts to add contaminants of emerging concern for regulation and testing for recycled water, stormwater, and wastewater when it is not cost-effective, has no clear health benefit and/or is not based on sound science.
9. Actively track, comment, and advocate for proposed changes in NPDES Permits and Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) from the State Water Board and Regional Water Boards.
10. Participate in the Basin Plan Amendments to address proposed changes in the requirements.
11. Monitor and advocate for laboratory standards that are reasonable, cost-effective, and achieve a higher level of performance for the City's water quality lab.

Priorities for 2017

Greenhouse Gas (GHG) and Sustainability:

Goal: To protect the environment within our community, balancing benefits with cost to our utility ratepayers.

We take the following approaches to accomplish this:

1. Support efforts that reduce greenhouse gas emissions for the City's utilities where the benefits of the GHG-reduction measures are balanced with cost.
2. Support efforts that allow local governments to develop practical, local solutions to reduce and manage locally generated GHG emissions.
3. Oppose statewide or federal greenhouse gas emission estimating, monitoring, and reporting mandates affecting City utilities unless there is a clear need that provides demonstrated benefits to the environment.

Regulations and Permit's:

Goal: To protect our ratepayers from redundant and costly state and federal regulations and permits.

We take the following approaches to accomplish this:

1. Support legislative reform efforts that require a cost/benefit analysis for new regulations.
2. Support legislative reform efforts that require a cost/benefit analysis be completed as part of any permit writing process.

Develop Outside Funding Opportunities:

Goal: To develop outside state and federal funding opportunities for Roseville projects and programs.

We take the following approach to accomplish this:

1. Develop relationships and funding opportunities by actively promoting Roseville projects that provide a mutual benefit for our funding partners.

Critical Concerns for Upcoming Legislative/Congressional Session

- **Cal Water Fix (formerly known as the Bay Delta Conservation Plan)** – Cal Water Fix would significantly affect the City’s water supply and could interfere with future residential and commercial development, undermining the City’s ability to move forward with future land use decisions.
- **Water Public Goods Charge** – The City has increased concerns regarding the state legislature’s interest to impose a Water Public Goods Charge (SB 20) that would collect revenue from local ratepayers and allocate the money for statewide projects that have no direct benefit to Roseville’s ratepayers.
- **Possible Extension of the State’s Emergency Drought Regulations** – The City is concerned that the state will extend conservation targets that do not consider climate, land-use, and other region-specific attributes; that fail to recognize previous water-supply reliability and conservation investments by the region and local community; and that do not account for potential relief from positive weather outcomes.
- **Cost-Effective Utilities** – The ability to provide reliable and cost-effective utilities to the residents and businesses of Roseville continues to be a central concern for the City as new state and federal mandates are proposed that would increase the utilities operational costs.
- **Federal and State Funding for Infrastructure and Transportation Projects** – Maintaining or increasing funding for these types of projects and improvements is critical for the City’s ability to upgrade and maintain roadways and meet future infrastructure and transportation demands.
- **Cybersecurity** – Future state and federal laws regarding cybersecurity will continue to affect the City and the community. Implementing new cybersecurity requirements will add significant expense to the operation of the City’s information technology systems.
- **Changes to Tax-Exempt Status of Municipal Bonds** – Any proposals that would cap or eliminate the tax exemption on municipal bonds would significantly reduce the City’s ability to finance major projects. This would negatively and severely impact the City’s budget, increase rates for utility customers, and have a damaging effect on the community at large.
- **Modifications to Government-Operated Mortgage Programs** – The City will remain active in understanding the changes being considered at the federal level to modify government-operated mortgage programs, tax deductions, and to write new banking regulations regarding mortgage-related lending programs. These all have the potential to impact the fragile housing recovery throughout the region and the state.
- **Challenges with State and Federal Permitting Processes** – The City has concerns with various permitting processes at both the state and federal level that hamper the ability of development projects to gain approval within a reasonable amount of time.
- **Changing Economy** – The City is interested in discussions regarding local tax systems, tax-revenue leakage from internet sales, the fundamental shift from purchasing taxable commodities to purchasing non-taxable services, and how these affect the City’s ability to fund basic services.

- **Homelessness** – The City will remain active in addressing the needs of the City’s homeless population with a primary focus of reducing the population of chronically homeless by providing solutions that address the fundamental causes of homelessness and by supporting solutions that provide permanent housing.
- **Municipal-Based District Elections** – The City has concerns regarding the possibility of legislation that would require all cities to change to a district-based election system and would remove the ability to determine the election system that works best for a specific city from the local community and their elected officials.



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8235
File #: 0600-02

Title: Out-of-State Travel Request - City Manager's Office
Contact: Mark Wolinski 916-774-5179 mwolinski@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017
Item #: 6.38.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff recommends the City Council (1) approve out-of-state travel for: City Manager, Rob Jensen; Economic Development Director, Chris Robles; and Government Relations Administrator, Mark Wolinski to participate in the Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce "Capitol-to-Capitol" legislative advocacy program in Washington D.C. on April 28 - May 3, 2017; and, (2) approve out-of-state travel for Mayor Rohan to participate in the Capital Region Executive Leadership Mission trip to Washington D.C. on March 12-15, 2017.

BACKGROUND

The Sacramento Metro Chamber's annual four-day Capitol-to-Capitol legislative advocacy program in Washington, D.C. is the region's most comprehensive opportunity to advance specific issues important to Roseville and the region. Nearly 300 delegates, including the region's elected officials, business, education, and non-profit community leaders, present dozens of policy papers from 12 issue-specific teams to members of Congress, the Trump Administration and other federal agencies. Key personnel from various City departments routinely participate in this program.

With an increased focus on legislation, policy and regulatory matters at the federal level, participation in this program enhances participants' understanding of regional issues as well as responses to these issues from congressional and federal agencies representatives. Strategies are developed and policy matters discussed as participants network with regional colleagues to strengthen the City's diverse legislative advocacy strategy.

The Council's 2016-17 budget contains approval and funding for three Council members' participation in the Capitol-to-Capitol program. With a Council goal focused on legislative advocacy, and with a variety of critical issues facing the City and the region this year—including water, electricity, and transportation funding — this event will allow Mayor Rohan, Vice Mayor Gore, and Councilmember Alvord with the opportunity to advocate on these important issues.

In addition to the three Council representatives, city staff who are budgeted and approved to

participate in this year's program includes City Manager, Rob Jensen and Government Relations Administrator, Mark Wolinski. The Sacramento Metro Chamber of Commerce has asked Economic Development Director, Chris Robles to Co-Chair the Economic Development Team for this year's event. The Economic Development department's budget has funding to cover the costs for his participation.

Mayor Rohan's participation in the Inaugural Capital Region Executive Leadership Mission to Washington, D.C. on March 12-15, 2017 will offer opportunities to work with regional leaders and our congressional delegation to aggressively advocate for more federal resources for our region and to articulate issues important to Roseville and the region. The Executive Leadership Mission is expected to be a tool used to actively secure resources and to build a regional, collaborative effort for the benefit of the entire region.

FISCAL IMPACT

The estimated cost for travel, hotel and conference attendance for the Capitol-to-Capitol event for three Council members and three City staff is \$21,500.00 and was approved in the General Fund budget for FY2016-17. The estimated cost for travel and conference attendance for the Executive Leadership Mission is \$3,500. Funds are available in the General Fund Contingency Fund for fiscal year 2016-17 to cover the costs for Mayor Rohan's participation in the event.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Not applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not apply to activities that will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines §15061 (b) (3)). Stating policy priorities does not include the potential for a significant environmental effect, and therefore is not subject to CEQA.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mark Wolinski, Government Relations Administrator

Rob Jensen, City Manager



Rob Jensen, City Manager



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 5795
File #: 0102-10

Title: Resolution of Acknowledgment 316 Vernon Street Time Capsule
Contact: Heather Blanco 916-774-5265 hblanco@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017
Item #: 6.39.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Recommend the 316 Vernon Street Time Capsule be acknowledge and opened after 50 years.

BACKGROUND

Not Applicable

FISCAL IMPACT

Not Applicable

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Not Applicable

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Not Applicable

Respectfully Submitted,

Heather Blanco, Deputy City Clerk

Sonia Orozco, City Clerk

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Rob Jensen", with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:**Description**

Resolution of Acknowledgment to the 316 Vernon Street Time Capsule

City of Roseville RESOLUTION

of ACKNOWLEDGMENT

WHEREAS, 316 Vernon Street, originally built as a Presbyterian Church, was purchased by the City of Roseville to become the first Roseville City Hall operating from 1916 until 1987; and

WHEREAS, the newly constructed 316 Vernon Street is a four-story, 83,000 square feet building, will house multiple City departments, Sierra College, and retail; and

WHEREAS, a time capsule has been sealed in a historical display of the 316 Vernon Street lobby to commemorate the evolution of time and be opened after 50 years; and

WHEREAS, time capsule contents include letters to future community leaders, artifacts reflecting the history of writing, and artifacts reflecting the history of music listening; and

WHEREAS, other time capsule items to be recognized in the future include 2016 National, County, and City Election Information, a 2016 Roseville High School Yearbook, and a 2016 Roseville Phone Book; and

WHEREAS, unique time capsule items include a typewriter, a banned plastic bag, a lightbulb, and an iPhone, original Presbyterian Church artifacts such as bottles and bricks, and information about the Roseville Historical Society; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE, CALIFORNIA, the **316 VERNON STREET TIME CAPSULE** be acknowledged and opened after 50 years.

SIGNED AND APPROVED this 18th day of January, 2017.

SUSAN ROHAN, MAYOR

ATTEST:

SONIA OROZCO, CITY CLERK
CITY OF ROSEVILLE





COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8210

File #: 0103 & 0103-41-02 & 0103-04-02 & 0103-05-02 & 0103-06-02 & 0103-12-02 & 0103-13-02

Title: Board and Commission Bi-Annual Vacancies
Contact: Mary Esquivel 916-774-5266 mesquivel@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 7.1.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Appoint five (5) members to the Board of Appeals with terms ending December 31, 2020, from the following nine (9) individuals who submitted applications for consideration: Samson Badal, Pete Constant, Keith Diederich, Bruce Hagler, Denise Hexom, Linda Lane, Herbert Long, Sherry Rutledge, and Brian Stenklyft.

Appoint two (2) members to the Library Board with terms ending December 31, 2020, from the following eight (8) individuals who submitted applications for consideration: Matthew Bridge, David Dodds, Mike Leclere, Denise Hexom, Barbara Morkowitz, Ernest Perez, Judith Pinney, and Laxmi Rao.

Appoint four (4) members to the Parks & Recreation Commission with terms ending December 31, 2020, from the following seventeen (17) individuals who submitted applications for consideration: Matthew Bridge, David Dodds, Eric Eisenhammer, Mike Esparza, Audrey Huisking, Guriqbal Singh Kang, Kristi Kinzel, Allison Kozel, Mike Leclere, Scott Miller, Cynthia Moore, Denis Nishihara, Judith Pinney, Ryan Schrader, Sarah Shanmugam, Robert Smith, and Crystal Spencer.

Appoint three (3) members to the Personnel Board with terms ending December 31, 2020, from the following seven (7) individuals who submitted applications for consideration: Ellaison Carroll, Herbert Long, Truda Pauly, Laxmi Rao, Sherry Rutledge, Charles Sandoval, and Jonathan Young.

Appoint four (4) members to the Senior Commission with terms ending December 31, 2020, from the following seven (7) individuals who submitted applications for consideration: Penny Beingessner, Carol Drebin, Gary Hexom, Guriqbal Singh Kang, Bobbi Knapp, Brian Parry, and Jim Williams;

Appoint three (3) members to the Transportation Commission, with terms ending December 31, 2020, from the following four (4) individuals who submitted applications for consideration: Gary Hexom, Joseph Horton, Cynthia Moore, and Neil Peacock.

BACKGROUND

Appointments to the Board of Appeals, Library Board, Parks & Recreation Commission, Personnel Board, Senior Commission, and Transportation Commission are due to be made at this time as part of the bi-annual recruitment process. Recruitment for all vacancies occurred in December 2016, video interviews of all applicants were conducted by the City Clerk's department, and the City Attorney's office reviewed the Statement of Economic Interests (Form 700) for potential conflicts of interest. The applications, video interviews, and Attorney review were compiled and provided to the City Council for consideration.

FISCAL IMPACT

Not applicable.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Not applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Appointment of members to boards, commissions and committees are not considered a "project" as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (CEQA Guidelines Section 5378). Consequently, no CEQA action is required.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mary Esquivel, Deputy City Clerk

Sonia Orozco, City Clerk



Rob Jensen, City Manager



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8211

File #: 0103 & 0103-07-02

Title: Appointment to Planning Commission

Contact: Mary Esquivel 916-774-5266 mesquivel@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 7.2.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Appoint (1) one member to the Planning Commission with a term ending June 30, 2018, from the following (9) nine individuals who submitted applications for consideration: Peter Ashby, Samson Badal, Erich Brashears, Paul Frank, Paige Luben, Cynthia Moore, Neil Peacock, Robert Sanchez, Louise (Sandy) Santiago.

BACKGROUND

Appointment to the Planning Commission is due to an unscheduled vacancy. Recruitment occurred in November 2016, video interviews of all applicants were conducted by the City Clerk's department, and the City Attorney's office reviewed the Statement of Economic Interests (Form 700) for potential conflicts of interest. The applications, video interviews, and Attorney review were compiled and provided to the City Council for consideration.

FISCAL IMPACT

Not applicable.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Not applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Appointment of members to boards, commissions, and committees are not considered a "project" as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEAQ) (CEQA Guidelines Section 5378). Consequently, no CEQA action is required.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mary Esquivel, Deputy City Clerk

Sonia Orozco, City Clerk

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Sonia Orozco', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Rob Jensen, City Manager



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8230
File #: 0102-12

Title: City Council Appointments to Auxiliary Positions
Contact: Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 sorozco@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017
Item #: 7.3.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff recommends the City Council approve the appointment of city councilmembers to auxiliary positions, as designated in Exhibit A.

BACKGROUND

Membership on auxiliary agencies, boards, commissions, committees, and joint power authorities within Roseville and the Placer County and Sacramento County region is an essential function of elected officials. Regional cooperation and representation has resulted in successful partnerships

FISCAL IMPACT

No direct fiscal impact.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Not-applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The appointment of councilmembers to auxiliary positions is not considered a "project" as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). (CEQA Guidelines Section 5378). Consequently, no CEQA action is required.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sonia Orozco, City Clerk



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Exhibit A

Exhibit A

2017/18 Council Auxiliary Board Appointments

Mayor/Vice Mayor Appointments

Entity	2017 Representatives		
	Member	Member	Alternate
1 City County Border Committee	Rohan	Gore	Allard
2 City Selection Committee	Rohan	Gore	N/A
3 Placer County Remote Access Network Advisory Board	Rohan		Gore
4 Placer County Indian Gaming Local Community Benefit Committee	Rohan	Gore	N/A

2018 Representatives		
Member	Member	Alternate
Rohan	Gore	Allard
Rohan	Gore	N/A
Rohan		Gore
Rohan	Gore	N/A

Two Council Appointments with One Alternate

Entity	2017 Representatives		
	Member	Member	Alternate
5 Electric Utility Risk Oversight	Gore	Allard	Alvord
6 Law & Regulation Committee	Gore	Allard	Alvord
7 Naming of Facilities/Park Naming Subcommittee	Alvord	Allard	Gore
8 PCWA - Roseville Water Committee	Rohan	Alvord	Allard
9 South Placer Wastewater Joint Powers Authority	Gore	Allard	Alvord
10 Union Pacific/City of Roseville Committee	Allard	Gore	N/A

2018 Representatives		
Member	Member	Alternate
Gore	Allard	Alvord
Gore	Allard	Alvord
Alvord	Allard	Gore
Rohan	Alvord	Allard
Gore	Allard	Alvord
Allard	Gore	N/A

One Council Appointment with One Alternate

Entity	2017 Representatives	
	Member	Alternate
11 Economic Development Advisory Committee	Herman	Alvord
12 Highway 65 JPA	Alvord	Allard
13 Placer County Air Pollution Control District	Alvord	Gore
14 Placer County Economic Development Board	Alvord	Herman
15 Placer County Transportation Planning Agency	Rohan	Allard
16 Placer County Flood Control & Water Conservation Board	Alvord	Allard
17 South Placer Regional Transportation Agency	Rohan	Allard
18 Regional Water Authority	Rohan	Alvord
19 Roseville Police Athletic League BOD	Alvord	Gore
20 Sacramento Area Council Of Governments	Rohan	Allard
21 Western Placer Waste Management Authority	Allard	Rohan
22 Successor Agency/Former Redevelopment Agency Oversight Board	Allard	Gore

2018 Representatives	
Member	Alternate
Herman	Alvord
Alvord	Allard
Alvord	Gore
Alvord	Herman
Rohan	Allard
Alvord	Allard
Rohan	Allard
Rohan	Alvord
Gore	Allard
Rohan	Allard
Allard	Rohan
Allard	Gore

Two Council Appointments with One Designated Voting Member and One Alternate Voting Member

Entity	2017 Representatives	
	Voter	Member
23 League of California Cities	Gore	Allard
24 Northern California Power Agency	Gore	Allard

2018 Representatives	
Voter	Member
Gore	Allard
Gore	Allard

Proposed to become Rotation for All Council

25 School Districts/City of Roseville (2 Council by rotation)

Proposed to be Removed

26 Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Agency



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8187
File #: 0800-02

Title: American River Basin Study - Memorandum of Agreement
Contact: Sean Bigley 916-774-5513 sbigley@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017
Item #: 8.1.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff recommends that the City Council authorize the City Manager to sign the attached Memorandum of Agreement with the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) for the City of Roseville to participate in the American River Basin Study as a non-Federal Partner.

BACKGROUND

The Reclamation WaterSMART Basin Studies Program focuses on basins and subbasins in the 17 western states, including California. There are four foundational elements in any Basin Study:

- Projections of water supply and demand, including the impacts of climate change.
- Analysis of how existing water and power infrastructure will perform in response to changing water realities.
- Development of adaptation and mitigation strategies to improve operations and infrastructure in order to supply adequate water in the future.
- Trade-off analysis of the adaptation and mitigation strategies identified.

The resulting Basin Study recommendations do not constitute Federal decisions or project authorization; however, further feasibility studies for such purposes are permitted under the authorizing legislation.

Reclamation recently completed the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers Basin Study (SSJRBS) in March 2016, which forecasts the potential impacts of climate change on water supply, water quality, and critical habitat within California's Central Valley, and presents portfolios of broad adaptive strategies for consideration by water agencies and other interests.

In June 2016, a partnership of six local agencies (Placer County Water Agency, City of Roseville,

City of Sacramento, El Dorado County Water Agency, City of Folsom, and Regional Water Authority – collectively known as the “non-Federal Partners”) submitted a Letter Proposal to Reclamation for the American River Basin Study (ARBS).

In September 2016, Reclamation announced the award of the ARBS and began the study initiation process with the non-federal partners, which includes the City of Roseville.

American River Basin Study (ARBS)

The ARBS is an update study of the SSJRBS to refine data, tools, mitigation actions and adaptation strategies that are specific for the American River Basin under a changing climate.

With evolving statewide water management priorities and changing regulations, the future of regional water supplies will be closely tied to Reclamation’s operation of Folsom Dam, requiring an aligned vision.

The ARBS will:

- Further refine an assessment of water supplies and demands for the American River Basin over the data developed for the SSJRBS.
- Address regional demand-supply imbalance and infrastructure deficiencies under the threat of climate change. This effort will include development of:
 - Climate change information (e.g., temperature and hydrology) with sufficient resolution for the entire American River Basin for future mitigation and adaptation planning purposes.
 - A standard tool for the American River Basin facilities with commonly agreed assumptions and operations that incorporates the updates and refinements of upper watershed operations, facilitates direct linkage to regional groundwater models, and is connected to the Central Valley Project and State Water Project (CVP-SWP) system operation for integrated analyses.
 - Data and information to assist further detailed regional plan development (e.g., RWA’s Regional Water Reliability Study), and project-specific development and implementation (e.g., Alder Creek Dam and Reservoir project, and the RiverArc Project).
- Improve regional self-reliance and collaboration for sustainable water resources management and quality of life.
- Integrate regional water supply reliability with operational flexibility for Reclamation’s Folsom Dam and Reservoir to help meet all authorized purposes of the CVP.
- Align regional water management actions and planning efforts with those of Reclamation to balance long-term water supply needs under climate change conditions and statewide water management. Examples of water management strategies include a Federally-recognized water bank, upstream reservoir, and operational changes.

Alignment with Other Local and Regional Efforts

The future of water supply strategies for both individual agencies and the region tie closely to Reclamation’s operation of Folsom Dam and Reservoir. The ARBS will provide a unique

opportunity to align the water management strategies and planning efforts of the region with those of Reclamation and the CVP, and non-Federal Partners are committed to pursuing integrated water management solutions that benefit all parties.

The ARBS is complementary to and being coordinated with ongoing planning efforts being led by local agencies as well as regional planning efforts including the Regional Drought Contingency Plan, Regional Water Reliability Study, and the American River Basin Integrated Regional Water Management Plan 2018 Update; there is also the potential to leverage ongoing project investments around the region including Federal Energy Regulatory Commission relicensing efforts, the Alder Dam and Reservoir project, the RiverArc Project, and others.

The non-Federal Partners with Reclamation have prepared the attached Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) language which includes a Plan of Study that will serve as the project management plan for Reclamation and the non-Federal Partners. Reclamation requires an adopted resolution from the non-federal partners to authorize signature of the MOA by the non-federal partner governing boards once a copy is provided by Reclamation. Once the City Manager signs the MOA from Reclamation it will allow the City of Roseville to participate in the ARBS with the other non-federal partners.

FISCAL IMPACT

The MOA will cover a period of three years through November 2019. The total cost of the ARBS is \$2,856,000 and Reclamation will provide \$830,000 as the Federal cost-share partner. The non-Federal Partners will provide \$2.026 million. The City of Roseville's portion of the non-Federal cost share will include \$24,000 worth of Roseville staff time as an "in kind" contribution dedicated to completing the ARBS; as well as, \$52,000 as a cash contribution for a not to exceed amount of \$76,000. This in kind Roseville contribution will include participation in project management meetings and assisting in the required communications and community outreach aspects of the ARBS project.

The \$76,000 of Roseville staff time allocated for Roseville's in-kind non-federal contribution and the cash contribution towards the ARBS is funded partially in FY17 with the balance to be budgeted in FY18 funded by Environmental Utilities Water Operations rate revenue.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Not applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

This proposed MOA for the ARBS is not a "project" as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (CEQA Guideline Section 15378). The ARBS will not result in approval or authorization of any physical projects. Consequently, no CEQA action is required.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sean Bigley, Public Affairs Administrator

Richard Plecker, Environmental Utilities Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution No. 17-06

ARBS Memorandum of Agreement Language

RESOLUTION NO. 17-06

APPROVING AN AMERICAN RIVER BASIN STUDY MEMORANDUM OF
AGREEMENT, AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON
BEHALF OF
THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

WHEREAS, the United States Bureau of Reclamation (“Reclamation”) has implemented the WaterSMART Program to provide eligible agencies and organizations with grants to encourage water conservation and water use efficiency, increase the use of renewable energy and improve energy efficiency, benefit endangered and threatened species, facilitate water markets, and carry out activities to address climate-related impacts on water or prevent any water-related crises or conflict; and

WHEREAS, Reclamation recently completed a Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers Basin Study (SSJRBS) under the WaterSMART program; and

WHEREAS, the City of Roseville and other non-federal partners submitted a letter of proposal for an American River Basin Study (ARBS); and

WHEREAS, the City of Roseville received a letter from Reclamation notifying the proposal has been selected for funding; and

WHEREAS, the City of Roseville and other non-federal partners, along with Reclamation, will develop the ARBS to refine and update the data, tools, analyses, and adaptation strategies in the SSJRBS for local application; and

WHEREAS, the City of Roseville has already contributed \$6,000 through the Regional Water Authority’s Regional Water Reliability Study; and

WHEREAS, City of Roseville’s remaining cost-share balance is \$70,000, with \$24,000 as in-kind staff participation and \$46,000 as a cash contribution, with the not to exceed amount totaling \$76,000; and

WHEREAS, the funds have been budgeted in FY 17 and will be in subsequent years, and funds are available in the Water Operations Fund; and

WHEREAS, the Memorandum of Agreement will be in a form acceptable to the City of Roseville’s legal counsel:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that the City Manager, or his designee, is hereby authorized to execute a Memorandum of Agreement with the United States Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, to participate as a Non-Federal Partner for the American River Basin Study.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

**Department of Interior
Bureau of Reclamation**

AMERICAN RIVER BASIN STUDY
MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

The United States Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Placer County Water Agency (PCWA), the City of Roseville (Roseville), El Dorado County Water Agency (EDCWA), the City of Sacramento (Sacramento) the City of Folsom (Folsom) and the Sacramento Regional Water Authority (RWA) agree to work collaboratively to perform the American River Basin Study (ARBS or Study) as part of the WaterSMART Basin Study Program. This Memorandum of Agreement establishes the terms that will guide the performance of the Study.

The purpose of the ARBS is to refine and update the data, tools, analyses, and adaptation strategies in the SSJRBS, and local application. Specifically, the ARBS will update the SSJRBS to reflect basin-specific, integrated water management strategies to improve regional water supply reliability within the American River Basin, while improving Reclamation's flexibility in operating Folsom Reservoir to meet flow and water quality standards and protect endangered fishery species in the Lower American River.

The Study Area encompasses the American River Watershed which covers 2,140 square miles from Sacramento to the peaks of the northern Sierra Nevada mountains west of Lake Tahoe; together with the adjacent North and South Groundwater Subbasins.

The MOA will cover a period of three years through November 2019. The total cost of the ARBS is \$2,856,000 and Reclamation will provide \$830,000 as the Federal cost-share partner. The Non-Federal Study Partners are contributing approximately \$2.026 million, 71% percent of the total cost, through direct participation plus "in-kind services" in the form of relevant, ongoing modeling and other technical work. Reclamation is contributing up to 29% percent of the Study cost through direct participation by the Mid-Pacific Region (MP Region) and Technical Services Center (TSC) staff, and contract support.

The Study schedule consists of eight specific tasks or phases over a three year period. Oversight and direction of the Study will be provided by a joint Executive Steering Committee consisting of senior management representatives from Reclamation and each of the Non-Federal Partner Agencies. Project management and technical work necessary to complete the Study will be performed by a joint technical team of Reclamation and agency staff supported by contract specialists.

ARTICLES

I. Definitions

- A. Reclamation means the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation.
- B. Non-Federal Partner(s) means PCWA, Roseville, EDCWA, Sacramento, Folsom and RWA.
- C. Parties means Reclamation and Non-Federal Partner(s).
- D. Agreement means this Memorandum of Agreement.
- E. Contributed Funds Agreement means a legal agreement used to receive “all moneys ... from any State, municipality, corporation, association, firm, district, or individual for investigations, surveys, construction work, or any other development work incident thereto involving operations similar to those provided for by the reclamation law, are covered into the reclamation fund and shall be available for expenditure for the purposes for which contributed in like manner as if said sums had been specifically appropriated for said purposes,” 43 USC 395.
- F. Cost-Share means a specific percentage (%) of identified charges that are allocated to specific entities or Non-Federal Partner(s).
- G. In-kind Services means services provided by a non-Federal entity that substantially contribute to the completion of the work task or task identified.
- H. Confidential Information means trade secrets or commercial or financial information that is privileged or confidential under the meaning of 5 USC 552(b)(4).
- I. Intellectual Property means any invention that is legally protected through patents, copyrights, trademarks, and trade secrets or otherwise protectable under Title 35 of the United States Code, under 7 USC 2321, et seq., or under the patent laws of a foreign country.
- J. Key personnel means Reclamation and Non-Federal Partner Agency representatives to the ARBS Executive Steering Committee; Reclamation and Non-Federal Partner Agency representatives to the ARBS Project Management Team; and Reclamation and Non-Federal Partner Agency members of the ARBS Technical Team as supported by contract specialists.
- K. Subject Invention means any invention or other intellectual property conceived or first reduced to practice under this Agreement which is patentable or otherwise

protectable under Title 35 of the United States Code, under 7 USC 2321, et seq., or under the patent laws of a foreign country.

L. Scope of Agreement means those activities set forth in Appendix 1.

M. Term of Agreement means that period set forth under the Section IV, Article 9, Term of this Agreement.

II. Authorities and Financial Obligations

1. Authorities: Nothing in this Agreement alters the statutory authorities or any other authorities of the Non-Federal Partner(s) or Reclamation. This Agreement is intended to facilitate cooperative efforts for mutual provision of services and support, and technical assistance by both Parties in the conduct of meeting the objectives and scope of this Agreement. This Agreement does not supersede or void existing agreements between the Non-Federal Partner(s) and Reclamation.

Reclamation's authority to enter into this Agreement:

1. Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902 (ch. 1093, 32 Stat. 388; 43 U.S.C. 372, et seq.) and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.
2. Title IX of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-11, 123 Stat. 991).

Non-Federal Partner's authority to enter into this Agreement:

1. PCWA is authorized to enter into this Agreement by Board of Directors Resolution 17-XX dated January 19, 2017.
2. Roseville is authorized to enter into this Agreement by City Council resolution ____ dated January 18, 2017.
3. EDCWA is authorized to enter into this Agreement by Board of Supervisors resolution __ dated ____.
4. Sacramento is authorized to enter into this Agreement by City Council resolution __ dated ____.
5. Folsom is is authorized to enter into this Agreement by City Council resolution __ dated ____.
6. RWA is authorized to enter into this Agreement by Board of Directors Resolution 17-XX dated January 12, 2017.

2. Cost Sharing: The costs of the Basin Study will be shared between Reclamation and the Non-Federal Partner(s), with Reclamation providing up to \$830,000 and the Non-Federal Partner(s) providing \$2,026,000. The Non-Federal Partner(s) financial contribution will be in the form of in-kind products and services, predominately modeling and analyses, and staff participation). Reclamation's financial contribution to the Basin Study shall not exceed 50% of the total cost. All or part of the Non-Federal Partner's's share may be provided as

in-kind services. Valuation of in-kind services shall be in accordance with 2 CFR Part 225, Cost Principles for State, Local, and Indian Tribal Governments (OMB Circular A-87).

3. Financial Obligations: This Agreement is not a funding document and does not authorize the obligation or transfer of funds. If a subsequently identified activity or project is identified that may require Reclamation to receive or expend funds received from the Non-Federal Partner(s) for investigations, surveys, construction work, or any other development work incident thereto involving operations similar to those provided for by the Reclamation law, a supplemental Contributed Funds Agreement, pursuant to the Sundry Civil Expenses Appropriations Act for 1922 (43 USC 395), will be executed. Funds contributed by Non-Federal Partner(s) will only be used to pay for costs incurred by Reclamation associated with completing the tasks described in this Agreement or modifications to this Agreement.

4. Anti-Deficiency Act: All activities, responsibilities, and commitments made under or pursuant to this Agreement (including any Contributed Funds Agreement under this Agreement) are subject to the availability of appropriated funds and each Agency's budget priorities, as determined by each Agency, and neither the Non-Federal Partner(s) nor Reclamation are obligated in any way under this Agreement to expend appropriations or to enter into any contract, assistance agreement, Contributed Funds agreement, or other financial obligation. No provision herein shall be interpreted to require obligation or payment of funds in violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act, 31 U.S.C. 1341.

III. Publications, Reports, and Confidentiality

5. Publications: The parties understand and agree that this Agreement may be disclosed to the public in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act. Subject to the requirements of confidentiality and preservation of rights in Subject Inventions, either party may publish the results of this Agreement, PROVIDED:

- a. The other party is allowed to review the manuscript at least sixty (60) days prior to submission for publication by submission to the Authorized Agent.
- b. The publication shall acknowledge this Agreement and the contributions of each party's personnel.
- c. The final decision as to the publication content rests with the party that writes the publication.

6. Reports: The results of this Agreement and science, engineering, and technology data that are collected, compiled, and evaluated under this Agreement shall be shared and mutually interchanged by Non-Federal Partner(s) and

Reclamation. A final report summarizing all data shall be submitted to Reclamation and the Non-Federal Partner(s) through the key contacts identified in Sections V.15.A and B within the performance period of this Agreement, as defined in Section IV.10. The final report will be in the public domain, and will be published on Reclamation's website.

7. Confidentiality: Any confidential information used in this Agreement shall be clearly marked confidential or proprietary by the submitter and shall not be disclosed by the Recipient without permission of the owner. To the extent either party orally submits its Confidential Information to the other party, the submitting party will prepare a document marked "CONFIDENTIAL" embodying or identifying in reasonable detail such orally submitted Confidential Information and provide the document to the other party within thirty (30) days of disclosure.

Neither party shall be bound by confidentiality if the Confidential Information received from the other party:

- a. Already is available to the public or known to the recipient;
- b. Becomes available to the public through no fault of the recipient; or
- c. Is nonconfidentially received from another party legally entitled to it.

It shall not be a breach of this Agreement if the Non-Federal Partner(a) are required to disclose the Confidential Information by a valid order of a court or other government body, or as otherwise required by law, or as necessary to establish the rights of either party under this Agreement; PROVIDED THAT the Non-Federal Partner(s) shall provide prompt prior notice thereof to Reclamation to enable Reclamation to seek a protective order or otherwise prevent such disclosure, and PROVIDED FURTHER THAT the Confidential Information otherwise shall continue to be confidential.

8. Intellectual Property: Unless otherwise agreed by the Agencies, custody and administration of inventions made as a consequence of, or in direct relation to, the performance of activities under this Agreement shall remain with the respective inventing Party. In the event that an invention is made jointly by employees of the Parties or an employee of an Agency's contractor, the Parties shall consult and agree as to future actions toward establishment of patent protection for the invention.

IV. Term and Termination

9. Term: This Agreement shall take effect upon the approval of the Parties and, unless terminated per Section IV, Article 11, Termination, will expire three years from the date of the last signature to this Agreement. All Contributed Funds Agreement under this Agreement will be limited to an initial period of

performance not to exceed the term of this Agreement, although they may be renewed for additional periods of performance not to exceed the term of this Agreement for any renewal period.

10. Amendment: If either party desires a modification in this Agreement, the parties shall confer in good faith to determine the desirability of such modification. Such modification shall not be effective until a written amendment is signed, and dated by the undersigned representative(s) of both parties.

11. Termination: Either Party may terminate this Agreement prior to its expiration at any time, with or without cause, and without incurring any liability or obligation to the other parties, by giving the other parties at least ninety (90) calendar days prior written notice of termination.

V. General

12. Liability: It is understood and agreed that neither party to this Agreement shall be responsible for any damages or injuries arising out of the conduct of activities governed by this Agreement, except to the extent that such damages and/or injuries were caused by the negligent or wrongful acts or omissions of its employees, agents or officers. Reclamation's liability shall be limited by the Federal Tort Claims Act, 28 USC 2671, *et seq.*

13. Limitations: This Agreement sets out the Parties' intentions and objectives and does not direct or apply to any person outside the Non-Federal Partner(s) and Reclamation. This Agreement is not intended to, and does not create, any right, benefit, or trust responsibility, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or equity, by anyone against the United States, its agencies, its officers, or any person.

14. Notices and Key Personnel: Notices between the parties and copies of correspondence among the scientific and/or technical representatives of each party that interpret or may have a bearing on the legal effect of this Agreement's terms and conditions shall be sent to the key personnel below. Reclamation's key personnel is authorized to perform scientific and/or technical activities falling within the Scope of this Agreement. The key personnel is not authorized to change or interpret with authority the terms and conditions of this Agreement.

A. Non-Federal Partner(s): Name

Mr. Andy Fecko
Director of Resource Development
Placer County Water Agency
144 Ferguson Road
Auburn, CA 95604
mfecko@pcwa.net

Mr. Richard D. Plecker, P.E.
Environmental Utilities Director
City of Roseville
2005 Hilltop Circle
Roseville, CA 95747
rplecker@roseville.ca.us

(530) 308-4507

(916) 774-5714

Mr. Ken Payne
Interim General Manager
El Dorado County Water Agency
4110B Business Drive
Cameron Park, California 95682
kpayne@municipalcon.com
(916) 425-0734

Mr. James Peifer
Policy and Legislation Manager
City of Sacramento
1395 35th Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95822
jpeiffer@cityofsacramento.org
(916) 808-1416

Mr. Marcus Yasutake
Environmental and Water Resources
Director
City of Folsom
50 Natoma St.
Folsom, CA 95630
myasutake@folsom.ca.us
(916) 351-3528

Mr. Rob Swartz
Manager of Technical Services
Regional Water Authority
5620 Birdcage Street, Suite 180
Citrus Heights, CA 95610
rswartz@rwah2o.org
(916) 967-7692

B. Reclamation:

Ms. Michelle Denning
Regional Planning Office
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Mid-Pacific
Region
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825-1898
mdenning@usbr.gov
(916) 978-5060

15. Subcontracting Approval: A party hereto desiring to obtain and use the services of a third party via contract or otherwise shall give prior notice to the other party, including details of the contract or other arrangement. This requirement is to assure that confidentiality is not breached and rights in Subject Inventions are not compromised.

16. Assignment: Neither party has the right to assign this Agreement or any of its responsibilities hereunder.

17. Endorsement: The Non-Federal Partner(s) shall not in any way state or imply that this Agreement or the results of this Agreement is an endorsement by the Department of the Interior, Federal Government, or Reclamation of its organizational units, employees, products, or services except to the extent permission is granted by an authorized representative of Reclamation.

18. Regulatory Compliance: Both parties acknowledge and agree to comply with all applicable laws and regulations of the state, Federal, and local environmental and cultural and paleontological resource protection laws and regulations as applicable to the activities or projects for this Agreement. These regulatory compliance requirements may include but not limited to, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) including the Council on Environmental Quality and Department of the Interior regulations implementing NEPA, the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, consultation with potentially affected Tribes, and consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office.

19. Disputes: Any dispute arising under this Agreement, which cannot be readily resolved, shall be submitted jointly to the key personnel officials, identified in Section V, Article 14, Notices and Key Personnel. Each party agrees to seek in good faith to resolve the issue through negotiation or other forms of nonbinding dispute resolution processes mutually acceptable to the parties. Pending the resolution of any dispute or claim pursuant to Section V, Article 19, the parties agree that performance of all obligations shall be pursued diligently.

20. Force Majeure: Neither party shall be liable for any unforeseeable event beyond its reasonable control not caused by the fault or negligence of such party:

- a. Which causes the party to be unable to perform its obligations under this Agreement; and
- b. Which it has been unable to overcome by the exercise of due diligence.
- c. This includes, but is not limited to, flood, drought, earthquake, storm, fire, pestilence, lightning and other natural catastrophes, epidemic, war, riot, civil disturbance or disobedience, strikes, labor dispute, failure or sabotage of either party's facilities or any order or injunction made by a court or public agency.

21. Relationship between the Parties: The parties are and shall remain independent contractors and nothing herein shall be construed to create a partnership, agency, joint venture, or teaming agreement between the parties.

22. Severability: The illegality or invalidity of any provision of this Agreement shall not impair, affect, or invalidate the other provisions of this Agreement.

23. Governing Law: The construction, validity, performance, and effect of this entire Agreement shall be governed by the laws applicable to the Government of the United States of America in accordance with applicable Federal Law as interpreted by Federal Courts.

24. Waiver: The failure of either party to enforce any term hereof shall not be deemed a waiver of any rights contained herein.

25. Invalid Provision: In the event any provision of this Agreement is determined to be invalid or unenforceable under any controlling law, the invalidity or unenforceability of that provision shall not in any way affect the validity or enforceability of the remaining provisions of this Agreement.

26. Entire Agreement: The terms and conditions contained in this MOA and its appendices or attachments constitute the entire agreement and understanding by and between the parties and shall supersede all other communications, negotiations, arrangements and agreements either oral or written, with respect to the subject matter herein.

27. Counterparts: This Agreement may be executed in duplicate and each original shall be equally effective.



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8206
File #: 0800-02

Title: Sites Reservoir Project - Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement, Cost Share Agreement, and Budget Adjustment
Contact: Sean Bigley 916-774-5513 sbigley@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017
Item #: 8.2.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff recommends that the City Council:

- (1) Adopt a resolution stating the Council's support for the proposed Sites Reservoir Project based on its projected benefits to Folsom Reservoir;
- (2) Adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to sign the Fourth Amended and Restated Sites Project Authority Joint Exercise of Power Agreement and any related subsequent agreements;
- (3) Adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to sign the attached Cost Share Agreement between the City of Roseville and the Placer County Water Agency to partner on the Sites Reservoir project as well as work cooperatively on additional future projects that strategically benefit both agencies;
- (4) Adopt an ordinance approving the attached Budget Adjustment of \$70,000 to fund Roseville's share of work done under Phase 1 of the Sites Reservoir Project; and
- (5) State the City Council's initial agreement with Placer County Water Agency for seating an elected official on the Sites Joint Powers Authority Board.

BACKGROUND

The proposed Delta Offstream Storage Project (or Sites Reservoir Project) is a surface water storage project proposed to be built in the Antelope Valley of the Coast Range, on rangeland approximately 10 miles west of Maxwell in Colusa County (83 miles northwest of Roseville).

The proposed Sites Reservoir Project would divert water from the Sacramento River and its tributaries through existing canals during high flow periods (i.e., December, January, and February) into an off-stream reservoir, so the water would be available for use later in the same year or stored across years for drier periods of time. Sites Reservoir, as an off-stream reservoir, is unlike reservoirs of the past that were typically built directly on rivers and streams, blocking natural fish passage and altering natural flows.

The estimated reservoir storage capacity may vary, but at maximum, could hold up to 1.8 million

acre-feet (MAF) of water in storage to be operated for human consumption, the production of food, provide multiple environmental benefits, as well as provide for recreation. For context, Folsom Reservoir's full capacity is 977,000 acre-feet. 1.8 million acre-feet is enough water to meet the needs of approximately 3.6 million households.

The proposed Sites Reservoir project is being developed to operate in tandem with the Central Valley Project's Shasta and Folsom Reservoirs, and the State Water Project's Oroville Dam. It is estimated to provide up 1.5 MAF of additional water to the statewide water system on an average annual basis.

In a hypothetical estimate by the project proponents of Sites Reservoir, they estimated that if Sites Reservoir was in existence in 2015, it would have provided for 37,000 acre-feet of additional stored water in Folsom Reservoir due to the availability of water from Sites Reservoir that could have been used for cold water management and water quality requirements on the Sacramento River and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, in-lieu of releasing water from Folsom Reservoir.

The Sites Reservoir Project has been investigated and studied over many years by the state and federal government; and in 2010, a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) known as the Sites Reservoir JPA was formed to keep the project moving forward, secure project financing and ultimately move towards project construction.

As part of that effort, the Sites Reservoir JPA is preparing to submit a funding request to the California Water Commission for water storage funding from the Proposition 1 Water Bond that was approved by voters in November 2014. There is \$2.7 billion available under Chapter 8 of the Proposition 1 Water Bond and the California Water Commission is currently working to develop a Water Storage Investment Program to begin taking in water storage project funding applications in 2017.

Understanding that any Proposition 1 Water Bond funding that is secured will only fund a portion of the Sites Reservoir Project, the Sites Reservoir JPA is developing a program that allows interested parties to participate in project development and make investments in the project.

On July 29, 2016, the City of Roseville and the Placer County Water Agency submitted a Proposal to Participate in Phase 1 of the Sites Reservoir Project. The proposal acknowledged, "In the current California regulatory paradigm, Folsom [Reservoir] has become an over-taxed asset of the Central Valley Project; called upon frequently to provide Delta outflow and salinity control as well as provide a source of water for export to south of Delta CVP Contractors. The effects have been compounded in the last two years as federal fishery agencies demanded increased conservation of CVP water in Shasta [Reservoir] for further protection of winter-run Chinook salmon in the Sacramento."

The proposal further acknowledged that, "Sites Reservoir, operated efficiently, has the potential to alleviate some of the stress on Folsom [Reservoir] by making a pool of water available to the State of California under the public benefits of Proposition 1. By utilizing Sites Reservoir to aid system requirements such as Delta outflow, more water could remain in Folsom [Reservoir] throughout the summer and early fall season, which could lead to the dual benefit of increasing Folsom cold water pool volume for anadromous fisheries as well as ensuring that municipal intakes in Folsom [Reservoir] remain able to deliver water to our customers."

In summary, the joint PCWA and Roseville proposal was to participate on the Sites Joint Powers Authority Board and contribute to the formation of a Sites Reservoir operational plan of the public benefits portion of the project with the use of in-kind technical services through PCWA's consulting team as well as direct funding of the Sites Reservoir technical team.

In a letter dated October 11, 2016, the Sites Reservoir JPA approved PCWA and Roseville's Proposal to Participate, offering one shared Sites Joint Powers Authority Board seat and accepting PCWA and Roseville's offer of in-kind and a direct financial contribution to participate in Phase 1 of the project. The Sites Reservoir Project is planned out to completion over five phases.

Subsequently, Roseville and PCWA has received the attached Fourth Amended and Restated Sites Project Authority Joint Exercise of Power Agreement that needs to be considered for approval by the City Council.

In summary, this City Council item includes the following four elements necessary to participate, fund and implement the tasks necessary to participate in Phase 1 of the development of the Sites Reservoir Project:

Adoption of the attached resolution stating the Council's support for the proposed Sites Reservoir Project based on its projected benefits to Folsom Reservoir

The attached Resolution stating the City Council's support of the Sites Reservoir project establishes the City Council's policy direction on the project and direction on the use of advocacy, financial and communications resources to support the development, building and eventual operation of Sites Reservoir to benefit Folsom Reservoir, the source of Roseville's water supply, for the long-term benefit to Roseville's community and economy.

Authorize the City Manager to sign the Fourth Amended and Restated Sites Project Authority Joint Exercise of Power Agreement, and any subsequent implementing agreements

To participate in the Sites Reservoir JPA with PCWA as a partner, the City Council would have to authorize the City Manager to sign the Fourth Amended and Restated Sites Project Authority Joint Exercise of Power Agreement, and any related subsequent implementing agreements. This would allow the City of Roseville and PCWA to share one Sites Joint Powers Authority seat and participate in supporting the technical work needed to develop an operational plan for the proposed Sites Reservoir.

Authorize the City Manager to sign the attached Cost Share Agreement between the City of Roseville and the Placer County Water Agency to partner on the Sites Reservoir Project as well as work cooperatively on additional future projects that strategically benefit both agencies; with a related Budget Adjustment

To participate in the Sites Reservoir JPA with PCWA as a partner, attached is a Cost Share Agreement that allows for Roseville to reimburse PCWA for use of PCWA's technical team to help develop an operational plan for Sites Reservoir. The cost share agreement further recognizes that PCWA and Roseville will have future projects that they may wish to mutually work on together to the strategic benefit of both agencies and the proposed cost share agreement allows for the General Manager of PCWA and the City Manager or his designee, to partner on additional projects

that are mutually beneficial, on a task basis, provided that those projects have a budget which has been approved by the City Council.

If the City Council approves the attached Fourth Amended and Restated Sites Project Authority Joint Exercise of Power Agreement, Placer County Water Agency and Roseville anticipate Phase 1 costs for reimbursement of in-kind contributions by PCWA and direct payments at \$140,000. Phase 1 is estimated to last through June 2018.

For Roseville's share of Phase 1 costs is an attached Budget Adjustment for \$70,000 funded through the Water Operations Fund which derives its revenue from approved water utility rates.

Seating process of an elected official on the Sites Joint Powers Authority Board

Upon execution of the Fourth Amended and Restated Sites Project Authority Joint Exercise of Power Agreement, Roseville and Placer County Water Agency will need to agree on the seating of an elected official on the Sites Joint Powers Authority Board to represent both agency's interests.

Sites JPA Board meetings will be held monthly in Maxwell, CA which is approximately 80 miles northwest of Roseville. Typically, with travel time, attending a board meeting is a full day commitment.

Staff recommends that the shared seat be occupied on a two year rotation with recommendation made at the next PCWA-Roseville 2x2 Elected Official meeting which is noticed and open to the public. That recommendation would then be agendized and considered for approval by the Roseville City Council and the PCWA board. Before the end of the first two year rotation, the PCWA Board and Roseville City Council would utilize this process to appoint next elected official to be designated to the shared Sites JPA board seat.

Updates and coordination related to the Sites JPA would occur through PCWA-Roseville 2x2 Elected Official as well as future discussion items on the Roseville City Council and Placer County Water Agency Board agendas.

FISCAL IMPACT

For Roseville's share of Phase 1 costs for development of the Sites Reservoir Project is an attached Budget Adjustment for \$70,000 funded through the Water Operations Fund which derives its revenue from approved water utility rates. Based on the attached Resolution of Support for Sites Reservoir, the City Manager or his designee may direct additional staff time to provide the necessary advocacy and communications support to ensure the successful development and building of Sites Reservoir.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Not applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

This proposed resolution in support of the Sites Reservoir Project is not a "project" as defined by

the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (CEQA Guideline Section 15378). Consequently, no CEQA action is required.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sean Bigley, Public Affairs Administrator

Richard Plecker, Environmental Utilities Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution No. 17-19

Resolution No. 17-20

Sites Reservoir JPA Agreement

Sites Reservoir By-Laws

Resolution No. 17-21

Roseville-PCWA Cost Share Agreement

Ordinance No. 5781

Sites Reservoir Phase 1 Budget Adjustment

RESOLUTION NO. 17-19

SUPPORTING THE SITES RESERVOIR PROJECT ON BEHALF OF
THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

WHEREAS, the State of California is in the midst of a multi-year drought that has severely strained the state and federal water systems; and

WHEREAS, the City of Roseville, which relies on the Central Valley Project's Folsom Reservoir for its water supply; and

WHEREAS, Folsom Reservoir saw a record low reservoir level in 2015 with the reservoir reaching 135,000 acre-feet; and

WHEREAS, Folsom Reservoir provides beneficial cold water in the American River and is relied upon by the Bureau of Reclamation as a first responder reservoir to send water to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta to repel salinity and meet water quality objectives; and

WHEREAS, Roseville values the development of surface water storage infrastructure that provides for more water system reliability north of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta; and

WHEREAS, the proposed North of Delta Offstream Storage Project (or Sites Reservoir Project) would add up to 1.8 million acre-feet of potential off-stream water supply storage to be operated for human consumptive uses, the production of food, and environmental benefits; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Sites Reservoir Project is an offstream regulating reservoir that does not impede fish passage and it can provide an environmental block of water that could be used for various purposes, including: improved reliability of flows to support migratory birds of the Pacific Flyway, increased cold water pools available for salmon north of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, water quality and ecosystem improvements in the Delta and recreational value; and

WHEREAS, if Sites Reservoir is built, it could be operated in tandem to relieve pressure off of Folsom Reservoir in cold water and environmental releases of water; and

WHEREAS, if Sites Reservoir is built, could support the state's renewable energy goals; and

WHEREAS, the potential multiple benefits of Sites Reservoir could help Roseville's water supply reliability and ensure the city's future prosperity;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Roseville supports the construction and operation of Sites Reservoir; and directs the City Manager to allocate the appropriate advocacy, communications and technical resources to ensure that Sites Reservoir is built and operated, to benefit the Roseville community and economy, through added water supply reliability, for generations to come.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

RESOLUTION NO. 17-20

APPROVING THE FOURTH AMENDED AND RESTATED SITES PROJECT AUTHORITY
JOINT EXERCISE OF POWERS AGREEMENT, AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY
MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

WHEREAS, the Fourth Amended and Restated Sites Project Authority Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement, between the City of Roseville and Placer County Water Agency jointly, Colusa County Water District, County of Colusa County of Glenn, Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District, Maxwell Irrigation District, Orland-Artois Water District, Proberta Water District, Reclamation District 108, Tehama-Colusa Cana Authority, Westside Water District, and Western Cana Water District, has been reviewed by the City Council; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that said fourth amended and restated agreement is hereby approved and that the City Manager is authorized to execute it on behalf of the City of Roseville; and

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

FOURTH AMENDED AND RESTATED
SITES PROJECT AUTHORITY
JOINT EXERCISE OF POWERS AGREEMENT

This Joint Powers Agreement (“Agreement”) is made and entered into by and among Colusa County Water District (CCWD), County of Colusa (Colusa County), County of Glenn (Glenn County), Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District (GCID), Maxwell Irrigation District (MID), Orland-Artois Water District (OAWD), Proberta Water District (PWD), Reclamation District 108 (RD 108), Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority (TCCA), Westside Water District (WWD), and Western Canal Water District (WCWD), jointly, Placer County Water Agency and City of Roseville (PCWA/Roseville), and Reclamation District 2035 (RD 2035) hereinafter “Authority Members” or “Authority Member Agencies”.

RECITALS

The Authority Members are public entities located and operating in the Sacramento Valley, and are formed and operating under the laws of the State of California;

Congress and the State Legislature have declared that the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta watershed and California’s water infrastructure are in crisis and they have encouraged regional and local public agencies to form joint powers authorities to improve the operation of the state’s water system;

Sites Reservoir (sometimes referred to as North of Delta Offstream Storage) has been identified by the State of California and the federal government as an important component of integrated water management in the Sacramento River watershed that could support the state’s co-equal policy to improve water management and restore the ecological health for beneficial uses of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and the Sacramento River watershed;

The principal purpose of this Agreement is to establish an independent special agency, known as the Sites Project Authority (“Authority”), that will have as its mission, to be a proponent and facilitator to design and potentially acquire, construct, manage, govern, and operate Sites Reservoir and related facilities; to increase and develop water supplies; to improve the operation of the state’s water system; and to provide a net improvement in ecosystem and water quality conditions in the Sacramento River system and the Delta;

Each Authority Member is uniquely situated with respect to Sites Reservoir and the related facilities to help design, acquire, construct, manage, govern, and operate the project to provide local, regional, and statewide public benefits and improve the state’s water system;

Certain Authority Members executed the Memorandum of Understanding Between the Department of Water Resources, the United States Bureau of Reclamation, the Western Area Power Administration, the California Department of Fish and Game, the United States Fish and

Wildlife Service, the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District, the Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority, and Other CalFed Agencies and Local Interests Pursuant to the Directive with Respect to Sites Reservoir Contained in the CalFed Bay-Delta program Programmatic Record of Decision, August 28, 2000;

In August 2010, Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District, Reclamation District 108, Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority, Maxwell Irrigation District, County of Glenn, County of Colusa, Yolo County Flood and Water Conservation District entered into an Agreement creating a public entity known as the Authority.

By First Amendment to the Agreement in July 2015, Colusa County Water District, Westside Water District, Orland-Artois Water District and Proberta Water District became signatories to the Agreement and became Authority Members. In addition, Yolo County Flood and Water Conservation District has notified the Authority it is withdrawing as an Authority Member and will become an Associate Member, effective January 1, 2016. By this Amendment, Western Canal Water District, a joint participation by Placer County Water Agency and City of Roseville, and Reclamation District 2035 upon executing this Agreement became Authority Members.

AGREEMENT

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises, covenants, and conditions hereinafter set forth, it is agreed by and among the Authority Members as follows:

I. DEFINITIONS

As used in this Agreement, the meaning of the terms used hereafter shall be as follows:

1.1. Agreement: This Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement as it currently exists or as it may be amended or revised from time to time.

1.2. Authority: The legal entity defined in this Agreement for the Sites Project Authority as organized by this Agreement.

1.3. Authority Member: The signatories to this Agreement.

1.4. Board of Directors or Board: The governing body of the Authority as established in Article IV of this Agreement.

1.5. Bylaws: Additional requirements to those contained in the Agreement related to the implementation of the Sites Reservoir Project; emphasizing delegations of authority, decision-making and dispute resolution; roles and responsibilities for Board and Project Agreement Committee; membership types; and cost management.

1.6. Member: An Authority Member or another entity that meets the requirements of California Water Code § 79759 (a) or (b), respectively as defined for each membership type

established in the Bylaws. Generally, any Member can either be a signatory to a Project Agreement or participate in the Consultation Committee, but only Authority Members have representation on the Board.

1.7 Non-Member Participating Party: An agency, entity or company, that does not meet the Joint Powers Authority (“JPA”) membership requirements of California Water Code § 79759 (b) regarding for-profit corporations, including certain types of mutual water companies, and is not a Member of the Authority, but is deemed eligible by the Authority to participate by contract in certain elements of the Project. The Bylaws may provide for additional requirements for such non-members.

II. PURPOSES AND POWERS

2.1 Creation: Pursuant to the Joint Exercise of Powers Act (“Act”), California Government Code Section 6500 et seq., a public entity has been created to be known as the Sites Project Authority (“Authority”), which shall be an agency that is separate from its Authority Members.

2.2 Purpose: The purpose of this Agreement is to establish an independent joint powers authority (“JPA”) to exercise powers common to the Authority Members to, among other things, effectively study, promote, develop, design, finance, acquire, construct, manage, and operate Sites Reservoir and related facilities such as recreation and power generation. The purposes of pursuing and developing Sites Reservoir are to: (1) increase surface water storage and supply while enhancing water management flexibility and reliability in the Sacramento River watershed, (2) provide flood control benefits, (3) improve conditions for fish and wildlife in the Sacramento River watershed, including anadromous fish in the Sacramento River, and (4) improve the operation of the state’s water system to provide improvements in ecosystem and water quality conditions in the Bay-Delta while providing a more reliable water supply for the State of California.

2.3. Powers: The Authority shall have the power to pursue the purposes described above and to perform all acts necessary for the exercise of said powers, including, but not limited to, the ability to:

- 2.3.1. make and enter into contracts necessary for the full exercise of its powers;
- 2.3.2. perform studies, environmental review, engineering and design, and if appropriate, permitting, construction of water storage, and related conjunctive management;
- 2.3.3. contract for the services of engineers, attorneys, scientists, planners, financial consultants, and separate and apart therefrom, to employ such persons as it deems necessary;
- 2.3.4. hold or dispose of any property, including acquisition by eminent domain;

- 2.3.5. apply for, accept, and receive permits, licenses, grants, loans, or other funding from any federal, state or local public agency;
- 2.3.6. issue revenue bonds and other forms of indebtedness to the extent, and on the terms, provided by the Act;
- 2.3.7. incur debts, liabilities, and obligations;
- 2.3.8. adopt bylaws, rules, regulations, and procedures, governing the operation of the Authority; and
- 2.3.9. delegate levels of authority to Project Agreement Committees, Consultation Committee, and other advisory groups as the Board deems appropriate and consistent with the requirements specified in the Bylaws.

2.4. Manner of Exercise of Powers: To the extent not specifically provided for in this Agreement or the Act, the Authority shall exercise its powers subject to the restrictions upon the manner of exercising the powers under the laws applicable to Westside Water District.

2.5. GCID and TCCA Operations: The Authority Members anticipate that the Sites Reservoir Project will be within or adjacent to GCID and/or TCCA districts with at least a portion of the conveyance of water into the reservoir to be accomplished by wheeling water through GCID's Main Canal and/or the Tehama-Colusa Canal. The Authority shall not have the power, except with the express written consent of GCID and/or TCCA, depending on which facilities are at issue, to enter into any agreements or otherwise take any action that will, directly or indirectly, decrease, restrict, or in any manner alter, modify or limit water rights, water supplies or contractual entitlements to water of GCID and/or TCCA (and, in the case of TCCA, the water agencies it serves) or the operations of their facilities or any facilities they operate under contract.

2.6. MID Operations: The Authority Members anticipate that the pipeline connecting the reservoir to the Sacramento River will utilize an existing MID easement. The Authority shall not have the power, except with the express written consent of MID to enter into any agreements or otherwise take any action that will, directly or indirectly, decrease, restrict, or in any manner alter, modify or limit water rights, water supplies or contractual entitlements to water of MID or the operation of its facilities or any facilities that MID operates under contract.

2. 7. Counties' Powers: Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed as the surrender or relinquishment of the land use authorities as provided by law of the County of Colusa and County of Glenn.

III. AUTHORITY MEMBERSHIP

3.1. Generally: Authority membership is comprised of the public agencies (as defined in Section 6500 of the Act) that are authorized to be Authority Members and are signatories to this Agreement.

3.2. DWR and Bureau of Reclamation: The Authority may enter into a contract or other arrangement with the California Department of Water Resources (“DWR”) and/or the Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) to carry out the purposes of this Agreement. DWR, upon the approval of the Authority Board, may be a non-voting, ex-officio member of the Authority.

3.3. Addition of Members: Entities authorized by law to participate in a JPA located within the Sacramento River watershed may subsequently become Authority Members upon an affirmative vote of at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the total number of the Boards of the Authority Member Agencies and the new Member’s execution of this Agreement, as it may have been amended. An entity requesting to become an Authority Member shall provide certification of compliance with the membership requirements of the Agreement and the Bylaws. The entity requesting to become an Authority Member may represent a group of other entities. Terms and conditions for new Authority Member’s participation in the Authority, if any, shall be set forth in an amendment to this Agreement or in the Bylaws. Such terms and conditions shall be consistent with this Agreement and any contracts, resolutions, or indentures of the Authority then in effect.

3.4. Membership Types: The Board may approve the creation of different types of memberships that may include governmental agencies that meet the provisions of California Water Code Section 79759 (b) as it may be amended, other public agencies, entities, and companies, in funding and/or financing of the different elements of the Sites Reservoir Project. The creation of any additional membership types are defined in the Bylaws. Admission of non-Authority Members shall be upon the affirmative vote of at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the total number of Directors.

3.5. Consultation Committee: A Consultation Committee may be formed to provide a forum for public agencies and private entities to provide input on matters affecting the Authority. The charter for this committee, including the manner in which it conducts itself, will be established by the Board, and described in the Bylaws.

IV. GOVERNANCE AND INTERNAL ORGANIZATION

4.1. Board of Directors: The governing body of the Authority shall be a Board of Directors (Board) that will conduct all business on behalf of the Authority consistent with this Agreement and applicable law. The Board will consist of one representative of each Authority Member. To remain in an active status, each Authority Member having representation on the Board shall be in good standing as defined in the Bylaws.

4.2. Appointment: Each Authority Member Agency shall appoint a Director to the Board. Each Authority Member Agency shall also be entitled to appoint an Alternate Director to the

Authority. The role of the Alternate Director shall be to assume the duties of an Authority Member Agency's Director in case of the absence or unavailability of such Director.

Should a Director who is an officer of the Board not be in attendance, the Authority Member Agency's Alternate Director shall not assume the duties of the officer. Should the Chair be absent, the Vice-Chair shall assume the Chair's responsibilities until the Chair is present, and if both are absent the Board may appoint a temporary Chair.

Directors and Alternates both serve at the pleasure of the governing body of their respective Authority Member Agency. Authority Member Agencies shall communicate their initial Director and Alternate selections, and any subsequent changes thereto, to the Authority in writing. Each Authority Member Agency is only entitled to have one vote, either by its Director or the Alternate, at a meeting of the Board.

4.3. Meetings: The Board shall hold at least one regular meeting per year, and may hold regular or special meetings at more frequent intervals. All meetings of the Board shall be called, held, noticed, and conducted subject to the provisions of the Ralph M. Brown Act (Government Code section 54950, et seq.).

4.4. Quorum: A majority of the total number of Directors shall constitute a quorum.

4.5. Voting:

4.5.1. Routine Matters or Non-Material Change Items Before the Authority: The Board shall take action only upon an affirmative vote of a majority of the total number of Directors.

4.5.2. Material Change Items Before the Authority: Based on the thresholds established in the Bylaws regarding a Material Change, the Board shall take action only upon an affirmative vote of at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the total number of Directors.

4.6. Officers:

4.6.1. The Board shall select, from among the Directors, a Chair, who will be the presiding officer for all Board meetings, and a Vice-Chair, who will preside in the absence of the Chair.

4.6.2 The Board shall also select a Treasurer, who shall be the depository and have custody of all money of the Authority and shall perform the duties specified in Government Code section 6505.5. The Treasurer shall be bonded in accordance with Government Code section 6505.1 and shall pay all demands against the Authority that have been approved by the Board.

4.6.3. The Board shall also select a Secretary, who shall be responsible for keeping the minutes of all meetings of the Board and all other official records of the Authority. The Board may combine the positions of Secretary and Treasurer.

4.6.4. The Bylaws may further address the duties, responsibilities and administrative requirements for the respective offices.

4.7. General Manager. The Board may appoint a General Manager or assign staff of one or more Authority Members to conduct the business of the Authority in accordance with the policies of the Board; provided that no Authority Member's staff will be so assigned without the consent of that Authority Member. The General Manager serves at the pleasure of the Board and may be an employee or a contractor of the Authority.

4.8. Liability of Authority, Officers, and Employees: The Directors, officers, and any employees of the Authority shall use ordinary care and reasonable diligence in the exercise of their powers and in the performance of their duties pursuant to this Agreement. No Director, officer, employee or agent will be responsible for any act or omission by another board member, officer or employee. The Authority shall indemnify and hold harmless the individual board members, officers, employees, and agents of the Authority for any action taken lawfully and in good faith pursuant to this Agreement. Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the defenses available under the law, to the Authority Members, the Authority, or its Directors, officers, employees or agent.

V. FINANCIAL PROVISIONS

5.1. Fiscal year: The fiscal year shall run concurrent with the calendar year, unless the Directors decide otherwise and shall also apply to any Project Agreements.

5.2. Depository: All funds of the Authority shall be held in separate accounts in the name of the Authority and not commingled with the funds of any Member or any other person or entity. Regular reports shall be made as directed by the Board, but at least quarterly, to the Board of all receipts and disbursements. The books and records shall be open to inspection by the Board and individual Directors upon reasonable notice.

5.3. Budgets: A draft budget will be prepared for the Member Agencies to review at least 45 days before the beginning of the Authority's next fiscal year. The Board shall approve the budget no later than 15 days before the beginning of the fiscal year. The budget shall include:

5.3.1. General and administrative costs include the general operation and administration of the Authority. These costs do not include any costs incurred by the Authority directly as a result of a specific Project Agreement as described in Article VI.

5.3.2. Project specific costs shall be fully described and specified in a Project Agreement. The Board shall ensure that all costs incurred by the Authority directly relating to any specific project will be paid only by the parties to the Project Agreement and will not be paid for by the Authority as general and administrative costs. The Bylaws may include additional requirements and criteria for such costs.

5.4 Initial Contributions: Upon formation of the Authority, each Authority Member shall pay an application fee as prescribed in the Bylaws.

5.5. Recovery of General and Administrative Costs:

5.5.1. The Board may assess each Authority Member for the general and administrative costs to operate the Authority. Payments of public funds may be made to defray the costs incurred in carrying out such purposes, and advances of funds may be made for use in doing so, to be repaid as provided in this Agreement. Personnel, equipment or property of one or more of the Authority Members may be used in lieu of other contributions or advances, upon Board approval, and will be treated as a contribution from that Authority Member.

5.5.2. General and administrative costs incurred by the Authority in carrying out its purposes, as described in Section 5.3.1, shall be shared by the Authority Members as determined by the Board.

5.5.3. The Authority shall periodically, as necessary, issue an invoice to each Member reflecting the expenses attributable to that Member in accordance with this Agreement and/or Project Agreement, respectively. The Authority must receive payment within 60 days of the date listed on the invoice. Delinquent sums shall bear interest at a rate per year equal to the Federal Reserve's 11th District cost of funds index on the first business day of then current year plus eight percent (8%) . The Bylaws include additional requirements.

5.5.4. Upon request of any Member, the Authority shall produce and allow the inspection of all documents relating to the computation of expenses attributable to the Members under this Agreement. If a Member does not agree with the amount listed on the invoice, it must make full payment and provide a cover letter accompanying payment to the Authority specifying the amount in dispute and providing a detailed explanation of the basis for the dispute. The Authority shall advise the disputing Member of the Authority's determination within 30 business days.

5.6. Recovery of Project Agreement Costs: Each Project Agreement shall specify the requirements for recovery of costs, which shall be consistent with the requirements of Section 5.5.

5.7. Auditor: An auditor shall be chosen annually by, and serve at the pleasure of, the Board. The auditor shall make an annual audit of the accounts and records of the Authority. A report shall be filed as a public record with the Auditor of the County where the Authority is domiciled, consistent with Section 6505 of the Act, and with each agency that is a Member or an advisory member. Such report shall also be filed with the California Secretary of State or State Controller within twelve months of the end of the fiscal year.

5.8. Bonds: The Board shall, from time to time, designate the officers or other persons who have charge of, handle, or have access to any property of the Authority and shall require such officers or persons to file an official bond, at the Authority's expense, in an amount to be fixed by the Board.

5.9. Authority Members Limited Liability: As provided by Government Code Section 6508.1, the debts, liabilities, and obligations of the Authority shall be the debts, liabilities, and obligations of the Authority only, and not of the constituent Authority Members of the Authority.

VI. PROJECT AGREEMENTS

6.1. General: The Authority intends to carry out the purposes of this Agreement through projects that are consistent with the joint exercise of powers described herein. Funding and participation in any project undertaken by the Authority shall be governed by a Project Agreement. The Authority may undertake all or any portion of each project on its own or it may enter into agreements with the State of California, the United States, or any other public or private entity.

6.2. Parties to Agreement: Prior to undertaking a project, the Members and Non-Member Participating Parties electing to participate in the project shall enter into a Project Agreement. A Project Agreement may involve the Authority or one or more Members and any Non-Member Participating Parties. No Member shall be required to be involved in a Project Agreement.

6.3. Project Agreement: All assets, rights, benefits, and obligations attributable to the project shall be assets, rights, benefits, and obligations of those Members and Non-Member Participating Parties that have entered into the Project Agreement. Any debts, liabilities, obligations or indebtedness incurred by the Authority in regard to a particular project shall be the debts, liabilities, obligations, and indebtedness of the Members and Non-Member Participating Parties who have executed the respective Project Agreement and shall not be the debts, liabilities, obligations or indebtedness of the Members and Non-Member Participating Parties that have not executed the Project Agreement, nor of the Authority. If a project is undertaken by less than all the Members, the Members and Non-Member Participating Parties to a Project Agreement shall appoint a representative to a Project Agreement Committee for that project. The Project Agreement may include entities that are not Authority Members. The Bylaws may provide additional requirements regarding the implementation of each Project Agreement.

VII. TERMINATION, WITHDRAWAL, AND SUSPENSION

7.1. Termination:

7.1.1. Mutual Termination. This Agreement may be terminated by the mutual agreement of at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the total number of the Boards of the Authority Member Agencies in writing.

7.1.2. Termination of an Authority Member by the Authority. This Agreement may be terminated with respect to any Authority Member upon the affirmative vote of all Directors less one. Prior to any vote to terminate this Agreement with respect to an Authority Member, written notice of the proposed termination and the reason(s) for such termination shall be presented at a regular Board meeting with opportunity for discussion. The Authority Member subject to possible termination shall have the opportunity at the next regular Board meeting to respond to any reasons and allegations that may be cited as a basis for termination prior to a vote. If an Authority Member is terminated, that Authority Member will be responsible for its share of any costs incurred by the Authority up to the date of termination.

7.2. Member Withdrawal from Authority: Any Authority Member may withdraw from the Authority by giving at least 30 days written notice of its election to do so, which notice shall be given to the Authority and each Member to this Agreement; provided that such withdrawal does not in any way impair any contracts or obligations of the Authority then in effect. Prior to withdrawal or as soon as an accounting can be completed, the withdrawing Authority Member shall pay its share of General and Administrative Costs, described in Section 5.5; provided, however, the withdrawing member shall only be liable for expenses incurred through the date of withdrawal. The withdrawing Authority Member shall also be responsible for any claims, demands, damages, or liability arising from this Agreement through the date of withdrawal. With respect to a particular project, and subject to the terms of the applicable Project Agreement, the withdrawing Authority Member shall be responsible for its share of all costs, expenses, advances, contractual obligations, and other obligations, including bonds, notes or other indebtedness issued by the Authority while such withdrawing entity was a party to a project Agreement. The remaining parties to a Project Agreement shall have the option of discontinuing a project and/or acquiring the interests of the withdrawing party, as may be more particularly described in the Project Agreement. If the remaining Members to a Project Agreement under Article VI decide to terminate the Project Agreement, any remaining funds will be allocated pursuant to the terms of the agreement and the costs will be allocated to all parties as described in the Project Agreement, including the withdrawing party.

7.3. Membership Suspension: Should any Authority Member be deemed by the Board to not be in Good Standing as defined in the Bylaws, an affirmative vote of at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the total number of Directors can suspend the Authority Member's voting rights. Once the Authority Member is deemed by the Board to meet the requirements for being in Good Standing, the Authority Member can petition the Board of Directors to be have its voting privileges and, if applicable, any Board officer status restored by an affirmative vote of the Board of Directors consisting of at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the total number of Directors. During the time the Authority Member has not been in Good Standing, the Authority Member shall remain obligated to comply with all other requirements of this Agreement, the Bylaws and any Project Agreements the Authority Member executed.

7.4. Disposition of Assets Upon Termination: Upon termination of this Agreement, any surplus money or assets in the possession of the Authority for use under this Agreement, after payment of liabilities, costs, expenses and charges incurred under this Agreement, shall be returned to the then-existing Members in proportion to the contributions made by each. Unless otherwise agreed, all other property, works, rights and interests of the Authority shall be allocated to the then-existing Members in the same manner upon termination. Notwithstanding the foregoing, at the time of termination of this Agreement, upon a vote of the Board of Directors consisting of no less than a majority of the voting shares of all then existing members of the Board to sell the property, works, rights and interests of the Authority to a public utility, governmental agency, or other entity or entities for good and adequate consideration, the Authority shall have the power to consummate such a sale and the net proceeds from the sale shall be distributed in the same manner as set forth above.

VIII. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

8.1. Amendment of Agreement: This Agreement may be amended only by an affirmative vote of at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the Boards of the Authority Member Agencies; provided, however, this Agreement may not be amended to terminate the participation of an Authority Member without the affirmative vote of all Boards of the Authority Member Agencies less one . The Authority shall provide notice to all Members of amendments to this Agreement, including the effective date of such amendments.

8.2. Adoption and Amendment of Bylaws: The Bylaws may be adopted or amended only by an affirmative vote of at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the total number of Directors. The Authority shall provide notice to all Members of amendments to the Bylaws, which includes the effective date of such amendments.

8.3. Assignment: Except as otherwise expressed in this Agreement, the rights and duties of the Authority Members may not be assigned or delegated without the advance written consent of all the other Authority Members, and any attempt to assign or delegate such rights or duties in contravention of this section shall be null and void. This Agreement shall inure to the benefit of, and be binding upon, the successors and assigns of the Authority Members. This section does not prohibit an Authority Member from entering into an independent agreement with another agency, person or entity regarding the funding or financing of that Authority Member's contributions to the Authority, or the disposition of the proceeds which that Authority Member receives under this Agreement, so long as the independent agreement does not affect or purport to affect, the rights and duties of the Authority or the Authority Members under this Agreement.

8.4. Severability: If one or more clauses, sentences, paragraphs or provisions of this Agreement shall be held to be unlawful, invalid or unenforceable, it is hereby agreed by the Authority Members that the remainder of the Agreement shall not be affected thereby. Such clauses, sentences, paragraphs or provisions shall be deemed reformed so as to be lawful, valid, and enforced to the maximum extent possible.

8.5. Execution by Counterparts: This Agreement may be executed in any number of counterparts and upon execution by all Authority Members, each executed counterpart shall have the same force and effect as an original instrument and as if all Authority Members had signed the same instrument. Any signature page of this Agreement may be detached from any counterpart of this Agreement without impairing the legal effect of any signatures thereon, and may be attached to another counterpart of this Agreement identical in form hereto but have attached to it one or more signature pages.

8.6. Authority Members to be Served Notice: Any notice authorized to be given pursuant to this Agreement shall be validly given if served in writing either personally, by facsimile, by electronic mail (e-mail), by deposit in the United States mail, first class postage prepaid with return receipt requested, or by a recognized courier service. Notices given (i) personally or by courier service shall be conclusively deemed received at the time of delivery and receipt; (ii) by mail shall be conclusively deemed given 48 hours after the deposit thereof if the sender returns the

receipt; and (iii) by facsimile, upon receipt by sender of an acknowledgment or transmission report generated by the machine from which the facsimile was sent indicating that the facsimile was sent in its entirety and received at the recipient's facsimile number or email address. All Notices shall be sent to the addresses listed in Exhibit A to this Agreement:

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Authority Members hereto, pursuant to resolutions duly and regularly adopted by their respective governing bodies, have caused their names to be affixed by their proper and respective officers on the date shown below:

Dated: _____

COLUSA COUNTY WATER DISTRICT

By: _____

Dated: _____

COUNTY OF COLUSA

By: _____

Dated: _____

COUNTY OF GLENN

By: _____

Dated: _____

GLENN-COLUSA IRRIGATION
DISTRICT

By: _____

Dated: _____

MAXWELL IRRIGATION DISTRICT

By: _____

Dated: _____

ORLAND-ARTOIS WATER DISTRICT

By: _____

Dated: _____

Jointly, PLACER COUNTY WATER AGENCY
& CITY OF ROSEVILLE

By: _____

By: _____

Dated: _____

PROBERTA WATER DISTRICT

By: _____

Dated: _____

RECLAMATION DISTRICT 108

By: _____

Dated: _____

RECLAMATION DISTRICT 2035

By: _____

Dated: _____

TEHAMA-COLUSA CANAL AUTHORITY

By: _____

Dated: _____

WESTERN CANAL WATER DISTRICT

By: _____

Dated: _____

WESTSIDE WATER DISTRICT

By: _____

Exhibit A to the Sites Project Authority Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement:

Effective Date: _____

Colusa County Water District
General Manager
P.O. Box 337
Arbuckle, CA 95912

County of Colusa
Chair of the Board of Supervisors
547 Market Street, Suite 108
Colusa, CA 95932

County of Glenn
Chair of the Board of Supervisors
525 West Sycamore Street
Willows, CA 95988

Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District
General Manager
P.O. Box 150
Willows, CA 95988

Maxwell Irrigation District
General Manager
P.O. Box 217
Maxwell, CA 95955

Orland-Artois Water District
General Manager
P.O. Box 218
Orland, CA 95963

Placer County Water Agency
PO Box 6570
Auburn CA 95604

& City of Roseville
2005 Hilltop Circle
Roseville, CA 95747

Proberta Water District
P.O. Box 134
Proberta, CA 96078

Reclamation District 108
General Manager
P.O. Box 50
Grimes, CA 95950

Reclamation District 2035
General Manager
45332 County Road 25
Woodland, CA 95776

Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority
General Manager
P.O. Box 1025
Willows, CA 95988

Western Canal Water District
General Manager
PO Box 190
Richvale, CA 95974

Westside Water District General
Manager
5005 CA-20
Williams, CA 95987

11/21/16
AMENDED AND RESTATED BYLAWS
OF THE
SITES PROJECT AUTHORITY
FOR PHASE 1 OF THE SITES RESERVOIR PROJECT

Table of Contents:

1.	Relationship: Agreement and Bylaws	2
2.	Sites Project Authority's Mission, Vision & Values	3
3.	Definitions	4
4.	Board of Directors and Officers	6
5.	Project Agreement Committee Leadership and Administrative Process	8
6.	Common to Board of Directors and Project Agreement Committee Leadership Positions.....	11
7.	Membership Types	13
8.	Members & Non-Member Participating Parties - Common Requirements	16
9.	Committees	16
10.	The Authority's Powers and/or Authorities.....	18
11.	Delegations of Authority	18
12.	Material Change - Applicable for Phase 1	20
13.	Integration of Decisions - Authority Board & Project Agreement Committees	22
14.	Cost Management:	23

<u>Revision</u>	<u>Effective Date</u>	<u>Status or Authorizing Action</u>
1	Nov 21, 2016	Approved by Sites Project Authority Board for use.
0	Dec 21, 2015	Approved by Sites Project Authority Board for use.

1 Relationship: Agreement and Bylaws

1.1. Agreement: The Sites Project Authority Agreement (Agreement) is the chartering document that defines, among other things:

- The Authority's members and general limitations on membership in the Authority;
- The Authority's powers, with additional powers afforded the Authority specifically associated with both the Joint Exercise of Powers Act and laws applicable to Irrigation Districts;
- The mission, which is specific to the Sites Reservoir Project;
- The Board's officers and other key positions;
- Minimum meeting and voting requirements;
- The adoption or amendment of bylaws.

It is intended to be a living document that will evolve as the project progresses from the current level of planning (Phase 1) through construction and commissioning.

1.2. Bylaws: These Bylaws are to implement and provide further clarity for certain provisions of the Agreement and to provide procedures for administration of the Authority, including, among other things:

- Expands upon the types of parties, companies, and entities that can be non-Authority Members and participate at different 'levels'.
- Clarifies the Authority's role relative to Project Agreements and Authority's ability to delegate some of its authorities to project agreement committees and it expands upon policies in the Agreement that shall be used for the daily operations and management of the Authority and project agreement committees to complete the Authority's mission.
- Defines the Authority's mission.
- Expands upon roles and responsibilities of Board officers and project agreement committee lead positions.

- Expands upon the voting requirements for specific types of actions either the Board or a project agreement committee will make.

It is intended to guide the work of the Board and staff of both the Authority and project agreement committees and to serve as a living document, to be revised as the organizational needs evolve. Furthermore, from these Bylaws, procedures will be developed for Board approval and then use as an aid to managing the Sites Reservoir Project.

- 1.3. Conflicts between Agreement and Bylaws: Should one or more provisions of these Bylaws be in conflict with any portion of the Agreement, the Agreement shall take precedence.
- 1.4. Severability: If one or more clauses, sentences, paragraphs or provisions of these Bylaws be held to be unlawful, invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of the Agreement shall not be affected thereby. Such clauses, sentences, paragraphs or provisions shall be deemed reformed so as to be lawful, valid, and enforced to the maximum extent possible.
- 1.5. Amendments of Bylaws: As provided at Section 8.2 of the Agreement, these Bylaws may be amended only by an affirmative vote of at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the total number of Directors.

2 Sites Project Authority's Mission, Vision & Values

- 2.1. Mission: (Restatement). "[T]o be a proponent and facilitator to design and potentially acquire, construct, manage, govern, and operate Sites Reservoir and related facilities; to increase and develop water supplies; to improve the operation of the state's water system; and to provide a net improvement in ecosystem and water quality conditions in the Sacramento River system and the Delta."
- 2.2. Vision Statement: Fulfill state and federal mandates to provide a new supply of safe, reliable, affordable water. Sites Reservoir will augment water delivery reliability to agricultural and urban water users, while adding environmental flows that benefit the Delta and Sacramento Valley watershed ecosystems. Sites will enhance the state water system, providing flexible and resilient storage under future climate change conditions.
- 2.3. Values: Those involved with all activities of the Authority should:
 - a. Transact all business in an open and honest manner, except that communications shall not be disclosed when occurring in closed sessions of the Board of Directors or a committee, or are otherwise privileged and confidential, and certain documents may be exempt from disclosure under the Public Records Act;

- b. Communicate effectively;
- c. Build trust and confidence, both internally and externally to the Authority;
- d. Make decisions that are fiscally prudent;
- e. Utilize best-in-class processes and procedures, particularly in development of project controls for both management of risk and ensuring appropriate levels of quality.

3 Definitions

- 3.1. Board: The governing body of the Authority, composed of each Authority Member's delegate (or its respective alternate if the delegate is not present).
- 3.2. Material Change: Where the variance between a parameter of the Project Baseline and the forecast exceeds the Board-approved threshold, as described in Section 12 below.
- 3.3. Member is either an Authority Member, or other type of Member provided for at Section 7 below, and is either:
 - 3.3.1. A public agency that has either land use authorities or is a water agency that (a) is signatory to the Sites Project Authority Agreement (as amended) and (b) meets the requirements of the California Water Code §79759 (a) and (b), *or*
 - 3.3.2. A public agency that (a) is contributing to the financing of the Sites Reservoir Project and (b) meets the requirements of the California Water Code §79759 (b).
 - 3.3.3. Public agencies whose primary service area or boundaries are located *within* the Sacramento River watershed as defined in California Water Code §79759 (a) are designated as **Type A** while Members whose primary service area or boundaries are located *outside* of the Sacramento River watershed as defined in California Water Code §79759 (a) and meet the requirements of California Water Code §79759 (b) (i.e. not for-profit) are designated as **Type B**.
- 3.4. Non-Member Participating Party: A party, company, or entity that does not meet the requirements of a Member and is not a Member, yet is deemed by the Board able to participate by contract in advancing or supporting at least one element of the Sites Reservoir Project; such as, but not limited to, certain mutual water companies, investor owned utilities and the development of hydropower – both traditional and/or renewable pumped-storage.
- 3.5. Phase: Implementation of the Project has been divided into at least five (5) phases that coincide with major milestone processes relative to the Project's

schedule: (1) Through award of a Proposition 1 grant, (2) Certification of Environmental Impact Report and Statement, (3) completion of final design and pre-construction activities, (4) construction and commissioning, and (5) Project close-out, which includes repayment of debt and transfer of responsibilities to an operating entity.

For the Authority to accomplish its mission in an efficient and cost-effective manner, the start of a successor phase may overlap with the completion of the predecessor phase. Such overlap shall require Board (or project agreement committee if this authority has been delegated by the Board to the project agreement committee) approval, since it affects annual operating budgets and the respective Member's funding commitments.

- 3.6. Project Agreement: The requirements of the Agreement, as more fully described at Section 5 below, generally as follows:
- 3.6.1. Each Project Agreement is a contract between and among the Authority and some or all of the Authority's Members and may also include other types of Members (described at Section 7 below)(including, where deemed appropriate by the Board, Non-Member Participating Parties), who collectively will provide for the undertaking and sharing in the costs and benefits of activities authorized by the Board in connection with the development of either (a) capital works or facilities that may include the issuance of long-term debt or (b) expense related activities that support the Authority in completing its mission.
- 3.6.2. The formation, termination, or amendment of a Project Agreement is contingent upon the Board's approval.
- 3.6.3. Each Project Agreement shall specify the authorities delegated by the Authority to each Project Agreement's Committee, which may also include (1) identification of specific thresholds constituting a material change and/or (2) specific voting thresholds applicable to specific topic areas.
- 3.7. Project Agreement Committee: The decision-making body responsible for implementing a Project Agreement and compliance with the Project Agreement's terms and conditions.
- 3.8. Project Baseline: The Authority's proposed Sites Reservoir Project ("Project") from which proposed changes are compared against to determine if a material change (refer to Section 12) may result. It includes (a) the scope of work (i.e. proposed facilities and their operations and environmental mitigation measures and/or compliance obligations, (b) schedule and the sequencing of work and resources, (c) costs in terms of the approved operating budget, fiscal year and phase-level budget targets, and financing of both short-term and long-term debt, (d) quality of the physical assets as well as the operational reliability and performance, and (e) risk assignment and allocation of risks.

- 3.8.1. Phase 1 and 2: Until the Authority's proposed project is approved by the Board, the Authority will endeavor to estimate a 'mid-point' of the alternatives already developed and analyzed in the pre-administrative draft EIR/S that was prepared by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) with input from the United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR).
- 3.8.2. Phases 3 through 5: The Project as documented in the joint Environmental Impact Report and Statement (EIR/S) that has been certified by the Authority, will be permitted by the California Division of Safety of Dams (and potentially the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission), and from which permits for construction and operation will be obtained.
- 3.9. Cost Development Model: A cost management tool that uses (a) key Project parameters such as the estimated cost at completion; estimated water supply benefits in terms of annualized yield; and, if applicable, estimated potential power benefits associated with renewable energy generation and (b) estimates of financing cost, inflation and time value of money to calculate an estimated annualized cost/acre-ft. From these results, the funding commitment required by each Member will be developed. This tool will be used quarterly and throughout all of the Project's Phases as an aid for Members to determine their level of participation in the financing of the Project. As the Project evolves, (1) this tool will be updated to incorporate the current Project Baseline conditions and assumptions and (2) be used to analyze Material Changes relative to the results calculated for the Project Baseline to estimate the financial impacts (both positive and negative) to the Members.

A similar model may be developed to manage cost allocation for other types of project benefits, such as, but not limited to renewable power generation.

- 3.10 Re-balancing Process: A process used to transition from a predecessor phase to the successor phase affecting Members participation in terms of funding and financing of the Project as well as the level of benefits to be received from an operational Project. The process is described further in Section 14.

4 Board of Directors and Officers

In addition to the primary requirements, which are defined in the Agreement, the following additional requirements shall also apply:

- 4.1. Role of Board: To provide the overall policy direction and consider approval of activities and actions of the Authority, including approval of the following matters:
- For the Proposition 1, Chapter 8 grant, be the applicant and manage compliance with the terms and conditions of its award.

- Be the CEQA lead agency and work with USBR as the NEPA lead agency to effectively manage the environmental review process.
 - Hold title to the water rights issued by State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB).
 - Be the owner of record as it related to dam safety requirements and regulatory obligations.
 - Be the applicant for all applicable permits and manage compliance with the respective terms and conditions.
 - Review decisions at Project Agreement level to ensure they are in the best interest of the Sites Reservoir Project.
 - Acquire property, easements and rights-of-way.
- 4.2. Minimum Qualifications: Directors shall be a designated representative from their respective Authority Member who is in good standing as defined at Section 8.1. An Authority Member's designated alternate is not eligible to be candidate for an Officer position. Additional requirements for officers are provided under each position's roles and responsibilities. If an Officer is the designated representative of an Authority Member that is not in good standing and that Authority Member's voting rights have been suspended as provided at Section 7.3 of the Agreement, then that Officer shall no longer be eligible to serve as an Officer of the Authority and the Board shall make an appointment for the remaining duration of that office.
- 4.3. Officer Term Limits: Board officers shall serve a term that does not exceed one year in duration. A Board officer is not precluded from holding consecutive terms.
- 4.4. Election of Officers: Elections shall occur annually, at the regularly scheduled Board meeting in February, or if for any reason the election does not occur, then at the next meeting of the Authority. Absentee votes shall not be considered. For each position, the candidate receiving the majority vote from the Authority Members present shall be the successful candidate. Officers shall assume office upon their election and shall serve until their successor is elected.
- 4.5. Officer Vacancy: Should an officer position become vacant, the Board shall make an appointment for the remaining duration of the vacated position's term.
- 4.6. Treasurer's Roles and Responsibilities:
- Shall meet or exceed the requirements of Government Code Section 6505.5; the Authority to secure a bond for the position;
 - Either has or provides oversight to Authority staff who have a background in accounting, budgeting, or finance;

- Make recommendations to the Board on selection of the auditor and oversee the preparation of an annual audit;
- Ensure auditor's reports are filed as required by law:
 - (a) "as a public record with the Auditor of the County where the Authority is domiciled, consistent with Section 6505 of the Act";
 - (b) with each agency that is a Member or an advisory member;
 - (c) with the California Secretary of State or State Controller within twelve months of the end of the fiscal year; and
- Oversight of the annual budget preparation in accordance with Board direction and the Board's approval of the budget.
- A copy of the audit will be provided to each Member and Non Member Participating Party.

4.7. Secretary's Roles and Responsibilities:

- Oversight of board agendas, minutes, and board meeting's protocol; and
- Oversee Member (and their representatives) compliance with requirements of the Agreement and Bylaws.

4.8. Location: The Sites Project Authority's principle place of business and office and mailing addresses are:

Physical Address:

122 Old Highway 99 West
Maxwell, CA 95955

Mailing Address:

P.O. Box 517
Maxwell, CA 95955

4.9. Meeting Locations/Teleconference meetings:

- a. Most meetings of the Board and project agreement committees will be held at the principal office in Maxwell, however, since the Authority has members throughout the State, that is, in accordance with CA Water Code Section 79759(b) includes the Department of Water Resources (DWR) as an ex officio member of the Authority, and the Authority has Project Agreement Members throughout the State, to promote maximum participation of the Board, Project Agreement Members and the public, some meetings of the Board or project agreement committee may be held elsewhere in the State.
- b. For purposes of providing video or teleconferencing access for meetings of the Board or a project agreement committee, at least a quorum of the Board or the project agreement committee members shall participate from the Authority's principal office and within the combined

territory of the Authority Members or the project agreement committee members, as the case may be.

5 Project Agreement Committee Leadership and Administrative Process

- 5.1 Establishment of Project Agreement Committee: Each Project Agreement will include the establishment of a project agreement committee. The Project Agreement shall state the scope of work to be accomplished by the project agreement committee. The Project Agreement may also include delegations of authority necessary to accomplish the scope of work. The Project Agreement may also define thresholds for material change that if exceeded require approval of both the Board and the respective project agreement committee.
- 5.2 Appointment of Committee: Members and Non-Member Participating Parties of a Project Agreement in good standing shall appoint their respective representative to the Committee who is either an active member of the Member's board of directors or is a duly appointed senior-level staff have been delegated the authority from the Member to make decisions on the Member Agency's behalf.
- 5.3 Committee Leadership: At least two Authority Members are required to execute the Project Agreement and provide a representative to serve on each project agreement committee along with the Authority's General Manager. In preparing each Project Agreement, the decision-making structure will be defined by the Board; taking into account factors such as, but not limited to, the project's complexity, risk, cost, and entities requesting to become signatory to each Project Agreement. The Project Agreement shall, at a minimum, provide for appointment of a Committee Chair, whose responsibilities are similar to those of the Board Chair. Where the estimated scope of work exceeds \$200,000., the project agreement committee shall also appoint a Committee Treasurer whose responsibilities are similar to those of the Board Treasurer. The Committee Treasurer may be the Authority Treasurer, or if not, shall serve under the general supervision of the Authority Treasurer.
- 5.4 Leaders Term Limits: Project agreement committee leaders shall serve a term that does not exceed one year in duration. They are not precluded from holding consecutive terms.
- 5.5 Election of Committee Leaders: Elections shall occur annually, no later than the end of the third quarter of the year in which the term for the position expires. The election shall occur at a regularly scheduled project agreement committee meeting. Absentee votes shall not be considered. For each position, the candidate receiving the majority vote from the Committee members present shall be the successful candidate.

- 5.6 Committee Leader Vacancy: Should a Leader position become vacant, the project agreement committee shall make an appointment for the remaining duration of the vacated position's term.
- 5.7 Quorum and Voting of the Project Agreement Committee
- 5.7.1. A majority of the Committee members representing Members and Nonmember Participating Parties that have executed the Project Agreement shall constitute a quorum for a project agreement committee.
- 5.7.2. Routine Matters or Non-Material Change Items Before the Project Agreement Committee: Unless otherwise authorized by the Board and provided for Project Agreement, the Committee members representing both the Members and Non-Member Participating Parties that have executed the Project Agreement shall take action only upon an affirmative vote of a majority of the total number of Committee members and each Committee member shall have one vote.
- 5.7.3. Material Change Items Before the Project Agreement Committee: Unless otherwise authorized by the Board and provided for in the Project Agreement, and based on the thresholds established in these Bylaws regarding a Material Change (Section 12), the Committee members representing both the Members and Non-Member Participating Parties that have executed the Project Agreement shall take action only upon an affirmative vote of at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the total number of Committee members and each Committee member shall have one vote.
- 5.8 New Parties: In preparing each Project Agreement, the process to appoint new parties to the Project Agreement, including appointing a new member taking the place of a withdrawing or terminated Member, will be defined, taking into account factors such as, but not limited to, but not limited to, compliance with California Water Code § 79759.
- 5.9 Phase 1 Project Agreements: For Phase 1, the intent is to expeditiously develop a Project Agreement, and until such Project Agreement is executed, the Board shall direct the activities of Phase 1.
- 5.10 Member's Election to withdraw: Should a Member or Non-Member Participating Party of a Project Agreement elect to withdraw their participation in any executed Project Agreement, the Member shall submit their written intent and explanation for their decision to the project agreement committee Leader and Board Secretary. The notification shall also identify an effective date that does not precede the latest date received by either the project agreement committee Leader or the Board Secretary. A withdrawing Member or Non-Member Participating Party shall be responsible for costs and liabilities beyond the effective date of its withdrawal, as prescribed under the Project Agreement.
- 5.11. Termination of a non-Authority Member by the Authority. A Project Agreement may be terminated with respect to any non-Authority Member or Non Member

Participating Party upon an affirmative vote of the Board of Directors consisting of at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the total number of Directors. Prior to any vote to terminate this Agreement with respect to a non- Authority Member or Non Member Participating Party, written notice of the proposed termination and the reason(s) for such termination shall be presented at a regular Board meeting with opportunity for discussion. The non-Authority Member or Non Member Participating Party subject to possible termination shall have the opportunity at the next regular Board meeting to respond to any reasons and allegations that may be cited as a basis for termination prior to a vote. The terminated non-Authority Member or Non Member Participating Party shall be responsible for costs and liabilities beyond the date of termination, as may be prescribed under the Project Agreement.

- 5.12 Each Project Agreement involving agreements with third parties providing for the acquisition, construction, or management of the Project shall include provisions to provide for allocation of available sales and use tax revenues to the County of Colusa or County of Glenn to the greatest extent provided by law, depending on the situs of the work or activity.

6 Common to Board of Directors and Project Agreement Committee Leadership Positions

- 6.1. Conflict of Interest Code: Each Director of the Board and their delegated alternate and each Member's representative serving on a project agreement committee shall timely file Statements of Economic Interest as required by the Authority's Conflict of Interest Code.
- 6.2. Compensation: For at least Phase 1, no compensation shall be granted by the Authority to (a) any Director of the Board or a Member's delegated alternate or (b) any representative to a project agreement committee's. When travel has been pre-approved by either the Authority or project agreement committee's Leadership, respectively the representative is eligible to recover reasonable travel and related expenses.
- 6.3. Roles in Key Categories: The following chart summarizes various activities to be carried out or overseen by the Board and project agreement committees:

Category (& minimum frequency)	Authority Board	Project Agreement Committee Leadership
Implementation of the Sites Reservoir Project (ongoing).	Provide timely policy direction. Be the Project's strongest advocate.	Provide Authority with timely and accurate input.

Category (& minimum frequency)	Authority Board	Project Agreement Committee Leadership
Member's and staff's compliance with applicable chartering document (annually)	Compliance with Agreement & Bylaws	Compliance with Project Agreement
Approve operating budget and Phase-level target budgets (annually)	Authority's cost plus the roll-up of budget requests from each executed Project Agreement	Project Agreement
Insurance requirements, and financing plan on an annual basis (annually)	Maintain at Project level	
Organizational structure and assess the organizational effectiveness (annually).	Maintain at Project level Review Board and Committee performance Evaluate the effectiveness of policies and/or standards, Performance of the General Manager, Accountant, Chief Legal Counsel, and other key staff positions	Maintain at Project Agreement level. Provide Authority with timely and accurate input.
Maintain delegations of Authority for decision-making effectiveness (annually)	Maintain at Project level.	Maintain at Project Agreement level.
Risk assessment and risk management and quality assurance and quality control (periodic)	Maintain at Project level. Determine frequency for risk assessments and quality audits.	Provide Authority with timely and accurate input.
Compliance with significant regulatory requirements, governance matters, and litigation (annually)	Assess at Project level.	Provide Authority with timely and accurate input

7 Membership Types

7.1. General:

- 7.1.1. The Board retains its sole discretion to (a) offer membership to an agency, entity, party, or company ("requestor") who requests to participate in the Project, as further provided at Section 3.3 of the Agreement, and (b) to determine what if any membership type is applicable for the requestor. Should the Board elect to offer a membership type, the requestor shall then be required to (1) execute both an election to participate form and applicable agreements and (2) comply with the Agreement, Bylaws, and if applicable, Project Agreements.
- 7.1.2. All participating party's funding commitments must be based on the results of the Cost Development Model at the time the analysis is performed. The methodology used to create the Cost Development Model utilizes the time value of early financial contribution to the Authority. This model will be utilized quarterly and be used as the basis for estimating the cost for new Members and during the Re-balancing Process for all members, including those electing to change their level of participation.
- 7.1.3. A participating party's interests through the Authority and/or a Project Agreement cannot be assigned without written pre-approval by the Board.

- 7.2. Authority Member: A public agency that is signatory to the Agreement. They are required to be located within Sacramento River watershed that has either (1) land use authority or (2) is a duly recognized water agency, and complies with the joint powers authority ("JPA") membership requirements of California Water Code §79759 (a) & (b). Agencies that elected to participate and provide financial support to the Authority prior to October 30, 2015, may also be referred to as Founding Members.

Eligibility to join as an Authority Member, at the Board's sole discretion, as further provided at Section 3.3 of the Agreement, may be extended to a non-profit mutual water company that complies with the joint powers authority ("JPA") membership requirements of California Water Code §79759 (a) as it relates to being located within the Sacramento River watershed and California Water Code §79759 (b) as it relates to being a non-profit company.

Financial Contribution: Pro-rata cost share of either the Authority's cost and/or the pro-rata share of cost for each executed Project Agreement.

Attributes of an Authority Member:

- Eligible to be represented on the Board.
- Eligible to also be represented on a project agreement committee. An Authority Member's representative may be an officer on a project agreement committee.

- Eligible to provide in-kind (and/or other) services if pre-approved by the Board.

7.3. Project Agreement Members: Such members shall be either (1) a public agency that meets the requirements of California Water Code Section 79759(a) or (b), that has as its sole or a principal power the supplying of water (and/or power) to other entities or to retail water (and/or power) users which is a Type A Member or a Type B Member, or (2) a non-profit mutual water company that complies with the non-profit JPA membership requirements of California Water Code § 79759 (b). It must be willing to execute at least one Project Agreement.

Attributes of a Project Agreement Member:

- Eligible to be a member on either a project agreement committee. Can be an officer on the Committee.
- Eligible to provide in-kind (and/or other) services if pre-approved by the Board.

Such Project Agreement Members shall be within one of the following categories, depending on their affiliations with the Authority, and resulting financial contributions as follows:

7.3.1. Project Agreement Member Type I are Members which do not otherwise have a direct or indirect affiliation with the Authority, as compared to Types II and III described below.

Its financial contribution shall be for each Project Agreement executed such Member will contribute its pro-rata share of project costs. It receives benefits based on the time it joined, executing Project Agreements, and will be required to either pay an 'annexation' fee to offset the prior investment made by other Members, or have a reduced participation relative to prior Members.

7.3.2. Project Agreement Member Type II is an entity that is a member of another JPA (or equivalent group or collective), whereby the other JPA (or equivalent group or collective) is either an Authority or Project Agreement Member in good standing. [Example, members of TCCA] Regarding its financial contribution, since it provides its pro-rata cost share to the Authority through the other JPA (or equivalent group or collective), no additional funds are directly provided by such a Project Agreement Member II to the Authority.

7.3.3. Project Agreement Member Type III is an entity that has, via an independent contract, agreed to allow another agency, who is either an Authority Member or Project Agreement Member in good standing, to represent their interests on either the Authority's Board and/or a project agreement committee, respectively.

7.4. Associate Member: Either (1) a public agency that has as its sole or a principal power the supplying of water (and/or power) to other entities or to retail water (and/or power) users that also meets the joint powers authority membership

requirements of California Water Code § 79759 (a) & (b), but elects to accept an advisory role from the Authority or (2) a non-profit mutual water company that complies with the non-profit JPA membership requirements of California Water Code § 79759 (b), but elects to accept an advisory role from the Authority.

Financial Contribution: An annual contribution of \$5,000.

Attributes of an Associate Agreement Member:

- Eligible to become a member of the Consultation (advisory) Committee.
- Eligible to provide in-kind (and/or other) services if pre-approved by the Board.

7.5. Non-Member Participating Party: "An agency, entity or company, that does not meet the JPA membership requirements of California Water Code § 79759 (b) regarding for-profit corporations, including certain types of mutual water companies, and is not a Member of the Authority, but is deemed eligible by the Authority to participate by contract in certain elements of the Project." (Restatement from Agreement section 1.7).

Financial Contribution: For each Project Agreement executed, the pro-rata share of costs.

Attributes of Participating Party: Conditioned upon meeting certain eligibility requirements.

- An agency or company may be eligible to participate on a Project Agreement.
- A Mutual Water Company or private company may be eligible to participate on a Project Agreement.
- Allows a qualified energy developer to participate on a Project Agreement specifically executed to provide hydroelectric power including traditional and pumped-storage.

7.6. Ex Officio:

The California Department of Water Resources (DWR), which is required by law to be an ex officio member of a joint powers authority for the purposes of California Water Code § 79759 (b) shall be a non-voting member of the Authority and/or project agreement committee.

7.7. Cost Sharing Partner:

The United States Bureau of Reclamation may participate as a non-voting partner of the Authority and/or project agreement committee.

8 Members & Non-Member Participating Parties - Common Requirements

8.1. Good Standing: To actively participate in the respective decision-making authorities, each Member and Non-Member Participating Party is required to comply with the following conditions:

8.1.1. Compliance with the terms of the Agreement and these Bylaws as well as the policies and/or procedures the Board may adopt;

8.1.2. Compliance with any Project Agreements it has executed;

8.1.3. Providing timely payment of the Member's or Non-Member Participating Party's pro-rata share of costs;

Failure to remain in good standing may subject the Member or Non-Member Participating Party to disciplinary action that, at the discretion of the Board and/or applicable project agreement committee, may include suspension of voting rights as provided at Section 7.3 of the Agreement and/or removal from either the Authority and/or Project Agreement(s), respectively.

8.2. Change in Representation: Should a Member or Non-Member Participating Party elect to name a different person to represent them either on the Board and/or on any project agreement committee, the change shall be provided in writing to the Secretary. The written notification shall also include an effective date.

8.3. Conflict of Interest: The Authority has adopted and may from time to time amended its Conflict of Interest Code adopted pursuant to the Political Reform Act of 1974, California Government Code Section 87000, et seq., and regulations adopted by the Fair Political Practices Commission set forth in Title 2, California Code of Regulations. "Designated Positions" under said Conflict of Interest Code shall comply with such Code and Political Reform Act and other applicable laws.

9 Committees

9.1. Common: Each committee of the Authority shall have a chartering document approved by Board, which will include, among other things, quorum and voting requirements for conduct of the committee.

9.2. Board Committees:

9.2.1. Each committee of the Board shall be comprised of at least three (3) and no more than five (5) Authority Members.

9.2.2. Standing Board Committees: The Chair may elect to create standing committees as necessary to ensure successful completion of the Authority's mission.

9.2.3. Ad-Hoc Board Committees: The Chair may elect to create Ad-Hoc committees to address specific issues or area of concern to the Board.

9.3. Project Agreement Committees: The purpose is to manage each Project Agreement as provided for in Section VI of the Agreement and Section 5 of these Bylaws. The Project Agreement shall be the chartering document the project agreement committee shall use to perform the work consistent with the requirements of the Agreement and Bylaws.

9.4. Consultation Committees: The purpose of the Consultation Committees are to serve as an advisory committee in order to maximize transparency regarding the decision-making process and facilitate the exchange of information; provide opportunity for comment, input, and recommendations; and ensure meaningful discussions regarding the rationale for decisions and the outcomes that result. The Board shall initially establish three Consultation Committees, namely:

- Landowners and community representatives potentially affected by the Project;
- Business and labor organizations generally interested in pursuing the Project; and
- Environmental Interests (including non-governmental organizations)

The Board may from time to time reconstitute and/or provided for additional Consultation Committees.

9.4.1 The Board shall approve charter documents for the Consultation Committees which shall include, among other things, the scope of its activities and quorum and voting requirements for conduct of the Committees. The Board shall approve and may modify from time to time the composition of the Consultation Committees, based upon interest expressed by various interested entities.

9.4.2 The Consultation Committees will meet on a regular basis to exchange information and provide input concerning upcoming decisions expected to be made by the Authority. Consultation Committee members will not have a seat on the Board and will not vote on matters before the Authority, but will have an opportunity to inquire about relevant matters, be apprised by the Authority of issues of interest, and make recommendations concerning pending decisions.

9.4.3 A member of the Board or alternate shall participate in an ex officio capacity for each Consultation Committee and to provide access to information relevant to the committee's agenda items.

9.4.4 The Consultation Committees shall periodically provide reports to the Board on its activities.

10 The Authority's Powers and/or Authorities

- 10.1. Non-Delegated Authorities: While (a) Section VI of the Agreement includes the intent to use Project Agreements to accomplish the Authority's mission and (b) each Project Agreement shall specify the power delegated from the Authority, for Phase 1, the following powers shall remain with the Board unless these Bylaws are amended as provided for in the Agreement:
 - 10.1.1. Applicant for the Proposition 1, Chapter 8 grant funds.
 - 10.1.2. Lead agency with the SWRCB for the water rights application and/or assignment of an existing water right application or permit/license. Furthermore, the Authority will hold title to the water rights granted by the SWRCB.
 - 10.1.3. The Authority serving as Lead CEQA Agency for the Project.
 - 10.1.4. Acceptance of permit conditions, specifically those associated with NEPA/CEQA compliance to achieve less than significant classification, ESA/CESA compliance, Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, NHPA § 106/SHPO and compliance with the Clean Water Act.
 - 10.1.5. Responsibility for compliance with applicable dam safety requirements such as California Division of Safety of Dams and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.
 - 10.1.6. Engagement and outreach with tribal representatives, elected officials, the general public, and advocacy organizations (e.g. NGOs).
 - 10.1.7. Lead any efforts to (a) acquire land and rights-of-way and (b) obtain additional financial contributors.
 - 10.1.8. Determination of Material Changes affecting the annualized water supply and costs expected from development of the Sites Reservoir Project.
 - 10.1.9. Determination of Material Changes to the facilities associated with the reservoir that could result in either an increased schedule greater than one year and/or increase construction costs greater than 10%.
 - 10.1.10. Development of renewable power or pumped-storage beyond the pre-feasibility-level planned.
 - 10.1.11. Oversight of (a) employees and (b) consultant contracts.
 - 10.1.12. Overall cost management to ensure obligations or commitments remain within (a) each annually approved operating budget and (b) the phase 1 cost target.
 - 10.1.13. Establishing a decision-making threshold for specific topic areas likely to be addressed by the Project Agreement's Committee.

11 Delegations of Authority

- 11.1. To A Project Agreement Committee:

11.1.1. This section consolidates requirements of Section VI of the Agreement with additional clarifications.

11.1.2. Limited Liability: Each Project Agreement shall include the requirements of Agreement Sections 5.9 and 6.3.

11.2. To the General Manager. The following is delegated to the General Manager subject to oversight by the Board:

11.2.1. Outreach and Engagement:

- a. Serve as the primary advocate and voice of the Authority in all activities related to advancing surface water storage and enhanced water supply reliability in the Sacramento River watershed, and primarily Sites Reservoir.
- b. Advocate with local, state, and federal agencies as well as the regulatory and environmental sectors.
- c. Represent the Sites Project Authority to enhance the organization's profile as a leader in the storage debate.
- d. Conduct official correspondence on behalf of, and jointly with, the Board when appropriate.

11.2.2. Cost Management:

- a. Manage the Board-approved annual operating budget to ensure positive cash flow and track variances against both the phase-level budget target and total project cost, which includes an estimate of the finance cost.
- b. Obtain additional funding partners and investors in the Sites Reservoir Project.

11.2.3. Execute professional services contracts in accordance with the following:

- a. Board approved Master Services Agreements (MSAs) where the commercial terms but no scope or cost have been assigned.
- b. Task Orders for MSAs where the scope of work and cost has a value that does not exceed the line-item amount in the approved operating budget and is less than \$500,000.
- c. Other professional services agreements (i.e. commercial terms plus scopes of work and not-to-exceed cost) having a value that does not exceed the line-item amount in the approved operating budget and is less than \$100,000.

11.2.4. For expenditures that are not specific line items in the Board-approved annual operating budget, the General Manager is authorized to spend up to \$5,000, so

long as a positive cost variance to the Board-approved annual operating budget is forecast.

11.2.5. Administration: Annually, review and evaluate the performance of and report same to the Board:

- a. key staff positions;
- b. consultant contracts and their key personnel;
- c. The Managers' workgroup, which the General Manager shall chair.

12 Material Change - Applicable for Phase 1

12.1. These provisions shall apply both to decisions by the Board and project agreement committee(s).

12.2. As the Sites Reservoir Project progresses through each of the planned project phases, what constitutes a Material Change along with the associated thresholds for Material Change may require amendment to these Bylaws. For Phase 1, should a question arise regarding a change being deemed material, the Board shall make the final determination.

12.3. Decisions affecting the following topic areas constitute a Material Change applicable for Phase 1 as measured either qualitatively or quantitatively as a change from the Project Baseline:

12.3.1. An increase in the projected Phase 1 budget target greater than 5% of the approved Phase 1 budget target.

12.3.2. Any projected overrun to the approved total annual operating budget or transferring funds between line-items in the approved operating budget that is greater than \$50,000.

12.3.3. The eligibility of the Authority to receive grant funding from Proposition 1, chapter 8.

12.3.4. Water rights and/or annualized yield of the Sites Reservoir Project changing by more than 5% of the total annualized yield or changes the proposed split between water supply benefits and Proposition 1 defined public benefits by more than 5% from the Baseline Project.

12.3.5. An individual Member's or Non-Member Participating Party's election to reduce their commitment to either (a) fund the Authority and/or (b) for the Reservoir cost center, reduce its water commitment as measured in acre-feet by more than 25% that does not occur during the re-balancing process. Should such a change occur outside of the re-balancing process, the Board may elect to use the Dispute Resolution Process to resolve concerns or potential injury caused by such a change in participation. Provided, however, an individual

Member's or Non-Member Participating Party's election to withdraw from a Project Agreement in accordance with its terms shall not be subject to the Dispute Resolution Process.

During the re-balancing process, a Member's or Non-Member Participating Party's decision to change its position does not constitute a Material Change and the Dispute Resolution Process shall not apply.

- 12.3.6. Changes affecting the ability to obtain dam safety related permits in a timely and cost-effective manner.
- 12.3.7. Changes to the Project's scope that significantly changes the operations of existing conveyance assets owned and/or operated by Members and/or other entities relative to the Project Baseline.
- 12.3.8. Changes to the Project's scope that significantly changes the amount of power needed to operate and/or the amount of pumped-storage capability relative to the Project Baseline.
- 12.3.9. Changes causing the direct construction cost to increase or decrease more than 10% excluding inflation and escalation in material costs.
- 12.3.10. Changes causing the construction schedule to increase more than 6 months or require construction means and methods that may not comply or require extreme measures to comply with OSHA requirements.
- 12.3.11. Changes having the potential to shift significant risk from either (a) a Project Agreement to the Authority (or vice versa), (2) from one Project Agreement to another, and/or (3) from one participant to another. Absent defined thresholds, the Board has the discretion to determine, on a case by case basis, if a Material Change has occurred.
- 12.3.12. Causing the mitigation for construction and/or operations that changes the baseline estimated cost by more than 10%.
- 12.3.13. Affecting the acquisition cost or schedule of land, easements, or rights-of-way by more than 10% from the baseline estimate cost and/or increases the line-item schedule duration by more than 6 months.
- 12.3.14. Changes materially affecting the powers of the Authority, a Member, the State of California, the Federal Government, or a federally recognized Tribal organization.
- 12.3.15. Proposed amendments to the Agreement or these Bylaws that would materially affect the rights and/or duties of Member or Non-Member Participating Party under a Project Agreement.

13 Integration of Decisions - Authority Board & Project Agreement Committees

- 13.1. Material Change: Each Project Agreement will identify topic areas that constitute a Material Change and associated thresholds that are consistent with the Agreement and Bylaws and incorporate the Board's delegation of powers, if any, to the project agreement committee. Approval of actions to respond to a Material Change requires the approval of both the Board and the project agreement committee before the action can be implemented. If either decision-making entity does not approve the change, then the dispute resolution process will be invoked if timely requested as provided below.
- 13.2. Non-Material Changes: Approval of actions that are deemed by project agreement committee and the General Manager to not result in a Material Change do not require the approval of the Board before the action can be implemented.
- 13.3. Dispute Resolution Process: Early identification of items that may potentially result in a Material Change is essential. It is the responsibility of any project agreement committee Leaders and Members' or Non-Member Participating Party's representatives, regardless of membership type, to elevate a concern that they believe could result in a Material Change – either in the short-term (e.g. affecting an approved operating budget or schedule) or longer-term (e.g. affecting the current phase-level budget target or successor phase-level budget target or schedule). Concerns shall be brought directly to the General Manager's attention.
 - 13.3.1. The party that has identified a potential Material Change shall, within fifteen (15) days of the event, provide the General Manager with the basis for its concern along with a qualitative estimate of the severity (i.e. impact to the project) and consequence (i.e. probability of occurrence). The General Manager shall further investigate the merits of the concern and should the General Manager deem the item is likely result in a Material Change, to, at a minimum, notify the project agreement committee and Board with the assessment results and identify potential remedies. Should the party that has identified a potential Material Change disagree with the General Manager's assessment they should bring the matter up to either the Board or the applicable project agreement committee(s).
 - 13.3.2. Should the Board or applicable project agreement committee(s) agree that a Material Change is likely, a recommended strategy and course of action needed to minimize the risk shall be developed. Should the Board's officers and project agreement committee(s) Leadership not reach agreement on a preferred strategy and course of action, which could include a temporary suspension of some or all work until more information is known to reach agreement, each decision-making body can elect to take action via a vote of the eligible Members.

- 13.3.3. Within 15 calendar days of either the Board's or each of the applicable project agreement committee's having made their respective decision, should the respective decisions result in different solutions, the Board and project agreement committee Leads shall formally meet to resolve the differences.
- 13.3.4. Should the parties involved in taking action under section 13.3.3 fail to reach agreement, the disagreeing parties will submit the dispute to mediation. If the disputing parties cannot mutually agree upon a mediator, each will submit the names of two mediators and the mediator will be determined by lot. The disputing parties will share equally in the cost of the mediator and will bear their own costs of mediation.
- 13.3.5. Should mediation not result in a successful resolution of the dispute, the Project Agreement shall be terminated and the Authority's Board shall call a meeting to determine if the Agreement should similarly be terminated, amended, or if a new Project Agreement should be executed.

14 Cost Management:

14.1 General:

- 14.1.1. The Authority will utilize cost management, which includes both revenue and expenses, and best management practices for the purpose of efficient management and to facilitate accountability, transparency, and demonstrating the value being created.
- 14.1.2. The Authority will utilize the Cost Development Model. Its primary purposes are (1) to estimate the eventual debt repayment obligation on a cost/acre-ft. basis as the Sites Reservoir Project advances in response to potential Material Changes that may occur internally (i.e. Board decisions) and/or externally (i.e. future financial market conditions) and (2) to utilize the time value of investment in both the Authority and Project Agreements to insure that later joining Members and/or Non-Member Participating Parties are required to pay sums equivalent to that contributed by Members which joined earlier.

The Cost Development Model will be used (a) initially to establish the Project's target cost/acre-ft. to advance the Project from the current planning (i.e. start of Phase 1) through completion of Phase 5, (b) as an integral part of the decision-making process by both the Authority and/or applicable project agreement committee whenever a potential for a Material Change relative to the Project Baseline is identified, and (c) as part of the Re-balancing Process.

- 14.1.3. A Cost Center will be created for the Authority and each Project Agreement to create income statements showing both revenue and expenses at both a discrete activity level as well as enable a roll-up of both revenue and expenses

to the Project level. Each cost center will also have the ability to differentiate in-kind services from revenue and expenses.

- 14.1.4. Member's contributions need to accommodate direct funding, use of in-kind services, and the value of reputation/good will; noting that some of these contributions cannot be monetized.

14.2 Positive Cash Flow:

- 14.2.1. Each Project Agreement (cost center) shall maintain, at all times, a positive cash flow. Unless amended by a majority of member agencies providing financial contributions to a cost center, the positive cash flow will be established based on when approval to commit costs to a specific set of tasks or activities has occurred and not when costs are incurred (i.e. when a consultant task order is approved and not when invoices for the work are received).

For Phase 1, the Board approved, on October 19, 2015, the requirement to maintain at least a six-month reserve to fund the Authority's costs and to manage the effort to produce the grant proposal using a three-month rolling projection.

- 14.2.2. The Authority shall ensure that each cost center maintains a positive cash flow and there is an appropriate level of reserves for the Project's phase and commensurate with the level of risk and uncertainty. However, the Authority shall endeavor to establish the timing that payments are due from Members and Non-Member Participating Parties in a manner that minimizes the amount of funds in the Authority's account relative to the total incurred cost to date plus projected cost for the next three (3) months.
- 14.2.3. As agencies or entities are invited to become Members or Non-Member Participating Parties and elect to participate by providing financial contributions and/or the financing of applicable cost centers in exchange for the potential benefits, the Authority shall endeavor to re-adjust the funding commitments agreed to by the other Members and Non-Member Participating Parties for both the current annual operating budget as well as subsequent years' budget targets and the phase-level budget target. However, the Board retains the discretion to determine how much of the 'new' revenue should be used to timely fund work verses reduce the funding commitment of the existing Members and Non-Member Participating Parties. The Authority's goal is to complete each Phase in a cost effective manner.
- 14.2.4. The commitment to fund the day-to-day management and administration of the Authority takes precedence over any of the subordinate cost centers. Failure to fully fund the expense cost center used to fund the Authority can

result in work stoppages at the subordinate cost center (including, Project Agreements).

- 14.2.5. Prior to the start of each Phase of work, Members and Non-Member Participating Parties need to clearly communicate and commit to, their level of participation in the Project and provide their pro-rata share of costs in a timely manner; recognizing that such changes, especially reductions in participation, will likely shift the cost burden to other Members and Non-member Participating Parties, which therefore needs to be minimized.

14.3 Changing Participation Level:

- 14.3.1. Re-balancing Process: This process occurs only during the transition from the current Phase to the successor Phase, where Members and Non-Member Participating Parties may elect to formally change their respective position¹ in terms of the type of Membership and/or change the unit of measure (e.g. acre-ft.) being used to develop the pro-rata share of Phase-level costs to each participant in either Authority or in each Project Agreement. The successor Phase cannot start until the re-balancing process has been completed to allow all Members and Non-Member Participating Parties to execute both (a) an Election to participate in the Sites Reservoir Project form and (b) their respective Financial Commitment Agreement with the Authority for the successor Phase.
- 14.3.2. Outside of the Re-balancing Process, a Member and/or a Non-Member Participating Party cannot assign, sell, trade, or exchange all or a fraction of the potential benefits (e.g. acre-feet of water supply., megawatt-hours of power) they expect to receive through their participation in the Authority or through a Project Agreement to anyone who is not already a Member or Non-Member Participating Parties, unless approved in writing by both the Board and applicable project agreement committee. The Board (or project agreement committee if this authority has been delegated by the Board to the project agreement committee) shall only consider those transactions that do not shift a cost-burden or reduce benefits to another Member and/or Non-Member Participating Party and do not otherwise compromise the Authority's mission. Transactions that shift costs or reduce benefits to other Members or Non-Member Participating Parties who are not willing to accept this change can utilize the dispute resolution process to resolve the matter.
- 14.3.3. The annual budget process also allows a Member and/or a Non-Member Participating Party to reduce their position and/or the benefit units (e.g. acre-feet). This occurs during the period when the Board has approved the upcoming fiscal years' budget and Members approve their respective pro-rata

¹ The annual budget process also allows a Member or Non-Member Participating Party to change their membership position and/or change the unit of measure, which is described in Chapter 14.

share of funding. However, such change produces an unplanned iteration in allocating costs by shifting more costs onto other Members and Non-Member Participating Parties. An iteration could delay revenue to the Authority, which could adversely impact work in progress if it reduces the amount of reserves held by the Authority below Board approved thresholds. Such an impact could affect the Member's or Non-Member Participating Party's ability to remain in good standing.

- 14.4 Should the Board determine that potential hydroelectric power benefits - both traditional and/or pumped storage - result in a similar situation where there are multiple Members or Non-Member Participating Parties interested in acquiring benefits, the Board shall create an equivalent process whereby Members or Non-Member Participating Parties would have a first right of refusal before the benefit could be made available to a third party who has not been involved in the development of the Project.

14.5 Phase-level Cost Management:

- 14.5.1. Prior to the start of each Phase, Members and Participating Parties will be asked to define the level of participation and associated pro-rata share of the costs as managed at the Project Agreement and/or cost-center level. The start of each subsequent phase shall not occur until the Board (or project agreement committee if this power has been delegated by the Board to the project agreement committee) has approved that (a) there is sufficient level of participation and (b) sufficient commitment of funds (i.e. revenue).
- 14.5.2. For each phase, a work plan will be developed that identifies expected annual funding requirements for each fiscal year. As the Project's schedule changes, the work plan and estimated annual funding requirement will be updated for Board's (or applicable project agreement committee's) approval. Both the Phase-level and annual funding requirements shall be developed to the level of detail necessary to allow each Member or Non-Member Participating Party to understand their estimated pro-rata share of costs.
- 14.5.3. During each phase of work, the total Project's cost for the Reservoir (i.e. forecast to complete); which includes contingencies, escalation, and finance costs; shall be managed and tracked relative to the current Board-approved Baseline Project cost target. A Material Change shall require an update to the forecast to complete. These results shall also be reported on a cost/acre-ft. basis using the Cost Development Model and both values shall be provided in a timely manner to the Board and applicable project agreement committee for their respective action and direction to Staff.
- 14.5.4. The Board (or applicable project agreement committee if this authority has been delegated by the Board to a project agreement committee), may decide that other Project benefits, such as renewable power generation, should be managed and tracked using a similar process as defined under Section 14.3.3.

14.6 Budget Management within each Phase:

- 14.6.1. The phase-level work plan and resulting budget target shall be subdivided into annual budget targets that coincide with the Authority's fiscal year, such that the sum of the annual budget targets equals the Phase-level budget target. Both the annual budget target and phase-level budget target shall be provided to each Member and Non Member Participating Party on a periodic basis. The General Manager also shall notify each Member and Non Member Participating Party as soon as possible after a Material Change occurs to warrant an updated projection.
- 14.6.2. Each annual budget target, once approved by the Board (or project agreement committee if this power has been delegated by the Board to the project agreement committee) shall become the operating budget for the current fiscal year.
- 14.6.3. Based on the approved operating budget, invoices requesting payment will be submitted to each Member or Non Member Participating Party. The requirements shall be documented in a Financial Commitment Agreement that is executed between the Authority (or project agreement committee if this authority has been delegated by the Board to the project agreement committee) and each Member. Such Agreement shall itemize the funding requirements to each cost center and identify the date when such payments are due to the Authority. The Authority must receive payment within 60 days of the date listed on the invoice and delinquent sums shall bear interest at a rate per year equal to the Federal Funds 11th District cost of funds index on the first business day of then current year plus eight percent (8%).

14.7 In-Kind Services:

- 14.7.1. Phase 1: The California Water Commission has discretion to allow certain costs incurred by an applicant since passage of Proposition 1 in November 2014 through submittal of the application to be counted towards the total project cost that when combined with the projected public benefits will determine the amount of grant funds that can be awarded within the limitations of California Water Code Division 26.7. The Authority will track in-kind services for inclusion into the formula to be used to calculate the total amount of grant funds the Authority is eligible to receive. However, a Member will not receive monetary credit for in-kind services against their pro-rata share of Phase 1 funding.

For work performed prior to Dec 31, 2015, the Authority will work with each Authority Member to document the eligible types of work along with the associated hours and eligible cost. The cumulative Member's input will be included into the Authority's proposal to the California Water Commission.

For work performed effective January 1, 2016, discrete in-kind work activities shall be pre-approved by the Board with the Member being responsible to

track the effort and to provide the Authority with an estimate of the eligible hours and eligible costs. On a semi-annual basis, each Member will provide documentation to the Authority for all eligible in-kind costs incurred for inclusion into the Authority's proposal to the California Water Commission.

- 14.7.2. Future Phases: Pending Board approval, certain in-kind work activities may be counted as part of each Member's financial contribution towards meeting its funding commitments.

RESOLUTION NO. 17-21

APPROVING A COST SHARE AGREEMENT FOR SITES RESERVOIR PLANNING AND COORDINATION, BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND PLACER COUNTY WATER AGENCY, AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

WHEREAS, a Cost Share Agreement for Sites Reservoir Planning and Coordination, by and between the City of Roseville and Placer County Water Agency, has been reviewed by the City Council; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that said agreement is hereby approved and that the City Manager is authorized to execute it on behalf of the City of Roseville; and

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

COST SHARE AGREEMENT FOR SITES RESERVOIR PLANNING AND COORDINATION

This Cost Share Agreement for Sites Reservoir Planning and future water partnership projects ("Agreement") is entered into by and between the City of Roseville, a municipal corporation ("Roseville") and Placer County Water Agency, a public agency ("PCWA") and will take effect as of the date on which Roseville and PCWA have approved this Agreement. Roseville and PCWA may be referred to herein collectively as the "Parties" or each individually as a "Party."

RECITALS

A. Whereas, the State of California is in the midst of a multi-year drought that has severely strained the state and federal water systems; and

B. Whereas, Folsom Reservoir provides beneficial cold water in the American River and is relied upon by the Bureau of Reclamation as a first responder reservoir to send water to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta to repel salinity and meet water quality objectives; and

C. Whereas, Roseville and PCWA value the development of surface water storage infrastructure that provides for more water system reliability north of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta; and

D. Whereas, the proposed North of Delta Offstream Storage Project (or "Sites Reservoir Project") would add up to 1.8 million acre-feet of potential off-stream water supply storage to be operated for human consumptive uses, the production of food, and environmental benefits; and

E. Whereas, if the Sites Reservoir Project is built, it could be operated to provide flows to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta in place of excessive releases from Folsom Reservoir and the potential multiple benefits of Sites Reservoir Project could help with Roseville's and PCWA's water supply reliability; and

F. Whereas, the Parties' desire to: (1) support the construction and operation of the Sites Reservoir Project; (2) provide significant advocacy, communications and technical resources support to protect and advance the Parties water supply interests; and (3) utilize integrated and strategic tactics to support the development of the Sites Reservoir Project in a way that protects and advances the Parties interests (collectively the "Joint Effort"); and

G. Whereas, the Parties desire to set forth a process for sharing in the

costs of the Joint Effort, including engaging consultants to assist the parties, and to provide for participation of the Parties in the decision-making process related to the Joint Effort.

H. Whereas, Roseville and PCWA acknowledge that there are shared interests and a need to partner on other future projects that increase the mutual water supply reliability, protect the mutual water supply interests, and provide for a thriving region and economy.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual obligations set forth herein, the Parties hereby agree as follows:

AGREEMENT

1. Incorporation of Recitals. The foregoing recitals are hereby incorporated by reference.

2. Purpose of this Agreement. The purpose of this Agreement is to memorialize the Parties' coordinated funding and activities related to the Joint Effort and to allocate Funds to be expended in administering the Joint Effort.

3. Effective Date and Term. This Agreement shall be effective upon approval by the governing body of all Parties. Unless terminated earlier as provided in Section 11, this Agreement shall expire on December 31, 2026.

4. Definitions. When used in this Agreement, the following terms shall have the meanings set forth below:

- a. "Administrator" means a Party appointed by the other Parties from time to time in the manner set forth in this Agreement that is authorized to administer the Joint Effort activities, as set forth herein.
- b. "Budget" means the budget provided for in this Agreement.
- c. "Funds" means funds received by the Administrator from the Parties for use in the Joint Effort.
- d. "Party Representative" means the staff member (and/or alternates), designated from time to time by each Party, who is authorized to take actions under this Agreement to the extent permitted, until such time as the Party notifies the Administrator and the other Parties of a change in its Party

Representative.

5. Actions of the Party Representatives. Upon approval of this Agreement by the governing body of each Party, each Party shall appoint a staff member as a Party Representative. A Party Representative shall have authority to take action under this Agreement on behalf of the Party that he or she represents, consistent with agreed upon scope of activities and the Budget.

- a. Party Representatives may take action contemplated by this Agreement at a meeting, during a telephone conference call, through electronic correspondence or other means approved by the Party Representatives from time to time, in writing.
- b. All activities undertaken pursuant to this Agreement as part of the Joint Effort shall be agreed upon by all Parties through their Party Representative.
- c. Within 30 days of the effective date of this Agreement, the Party Representatives will develop a scope of proposed activities consistent with the Budget.

6. Appointment and Actions of the Administrator. The Parties hereby initially appoint PCWA to be the Administrator of this Agreement. The Parties may change the Administrator from time to time. The Administrator will be responsible for confirming and communicating to all Parties, in writing, the actions approved by the Parties from time to time. In carrying out its duties under this Agreement, the Administrator shall comply with the legal and regulatory requirements applicable to the Administrator (e.g., procurement procedures). The Administrator shall have the authority to take the following actions to the extent they are consistent with the approved Budget, the terms of this Agreement and the agreed upon scope of activities developed by the Party Representatives:

- a. To undertake or arrange for approved Joint Effort activities in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement;
- b. To apply for, receive and disburse Funds for use in the Joint Effort, or for other activities authorized by this Agreement;
- c. To accumulate Funds for the purposes herein mentioned, and to invest Funds subject to applicable law, provided such Funds are not presently needed to pay costs related to the authorized uses of such Funds under this Agreement;

- d. To make and enter into contracts reasonably necessary to carry out the purpose of this Agreement, consistent with the approved Budget and agreed upon scope of activities.

7. Amendment of Agreement. This Agreement may be amended only in writing upon approval by all of the Parties and their respective governing bodies.

8. Addition of Parties. Upon written approval by all of the Parties and their respective governing bodies, the Parties may approve the addition of a new Party to the Agreement and any terms or conditions related to the new Party's addition. The terms and conditions applicable to a joining Party shall be set forth in an amendment to this Agreement. The Administrating Agency shall be authorized to execute the amendment upon approval by all of the Parties.

9. Budget and Cost Share. The total Budget for the first year (Calendar Year 2017) of this Agreement shall not exceed \$250,000. The Parties intend that the costs shall be equally split (50%/50%) between PCWA and Roseville for the first year and all future Calendar Years, unless additional parties are added pursuant to Section 8. For the remainder of this Agreement, at least thirty days prior to the commencement of each Calendar Year, the Party Representatives will develop a proposed Budget for the upcoming Calendar Year, which shall designate each Party's annual contribution for that Calendar Year, for approval by the Parties. Upon approval of the Budget, the Administrator will be authorized to make expenditures on behalf of the Parties consistent with the approved scope of activities and Budget.

10. Funds. The Administrator shall be the depository and shall have custody of all Funds received pursuant to this Agreement, from whatever source, subject to the applicable provisions of any funding contract providing for a trustee or other fiscal agent. The Administrator shall have authority to disburse Funds received under this Agreement consistent with the terms of this Agreement and the approved activities, and shall report all receipts and disbursements to the Parties. The Administrator shall invoice the other party or parties to this agreement on a monthly basis for actual costs incurred as a result of decisions made by Party Representatives. Invoices shall be paid in a timely manner. Pursuant to Government Code section 6509.5, the Administrator will invest any moneys held for disbursement on behalf of the Parties in the same manner and on the same conditions as local agencies pursuant to Government Code section 53601.

11. Termination. The Parties may agree in writing to terminate this Agreement prior to the expiration date.

12. Disposition of Property Upon Expiration or Termination. Upon expiration or termination of this Agreement, any surplus Funds will be returned to the Parties in proportion to the contributions made by them except for any Funds obligated to pay for Joint Effort related expenses incurred prior to the date of termination.

13. Withdrawal of a Party. Any Party may withdraw from this Agreement effective upon thirty (30) day's written notice to all other Parties. The withdrawing Party and the Administrator, on behalf of the remaining Parties, shall execute an amendment to this Agreement memorializing the withdrawal. A withdrawing Party shall be responsible for its share of financial obligations incurred under this Agreement prior to the effective date of the withdrawal.

14. Notices. The time for providing any notices specified in this Agreement may be extended within the term of this Agreement with the consent of all of the Parties, confirmed in writing, without requiring an amendment to this Agreement. All notices and other communications required under this Agreement shall be in writing, and shall be deemed to have been duly given: (a) upon the date of service, if served personally on the Party to whom notice is to be given; (b) upon the date of service, if sent by electronic mail, and the Party to whom notice is to be given confirms receipt; or (c) on the third day after mailing, if mailed to the Party to whom notice is to be given by first-class mail, postage prepaid, and properly addressed to the designated representatives of the Party. Each Party shall promptly notify every other Party of approvals or any other actions taken by their respective governing boards concerning or related to this Agreement or the Project.

If to the City of Roseville:

City of Roseville
ATTN: City Manager
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

If to PCWA:

Placer County Water Agency
ATTN: General Manager
P.O. Box 6570
Auburn, CA 95604

15. Signatories' Authority. The signatories to this Agreement represent that they have authority to execute this Agreement and to bind the Party on whose behalf they execute this Agreement.

16. Counterparts of this Agreement. This Agreement may be signed in any number of counterparts by the Parties, each of which will be deemed to be an original, and all of which together will be deemed to be one and the same instrument. This Agreement, if executed in counterparts, will be valid and binding on a Party as if fully executed all in one copy.

17. No Third Party Beneficiary. The parties understand and agree that this Agreement creates rights and obligations solely between the Parties and is not intended to benefit any other Party. No provision of this Agreement shall in any way inure to the benefit of any third person so as to constitute any such third person as a third party beneficiary of this Agreement or any of its terms or conditions, or otherwise give rise to any cause of action in any person not a party hereto.

The foregoing is hereby agreed to by the Parties.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, the Parties have executed this Agreement as of the dates written below.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the City of Roseville, a municipal corporation, has authorized the execution of this Agreement by its City Manager and attested to by its City Clerk under the authority of Resolution No. _____, adopted by the Council of the City of Roseville on the ____ day of _____, 20__.

CITY OF ROSEVILLE, a
municipal corporation

BY: _____
ROB JENSEN
City Manager

ATTEST:

BY: _____
SONIA OROZCO
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

BY: _____
ROBERT R. SCHMITT
City Attorney

APPROVED AS TO SUBSTANCE:

BY: _____
RICHARD D. PLECKER
Director of Environmental Utilities

ORDINANCE NO. 5781

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE
AUTHORIZING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016-17
BUDGET AND DECLARING THIS ORDINANCE TO BE IMMEDIATELY
EFFECTIVE AS AN APPROPRIATION MEASURE

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. The City of Roseville Annual Budget, Fiscal Year 2016-17, is hereby amended by transferring appropriation to and from the activities indicated below:

Appropriate funds for the Sites Reservoir Joint Powers Authority Phase 1 project, per request of the Environmental Utilities Department, as listed on the attached Request for Budget Adjustment in the amount of \$70,000.00.

SECTION 2. This ordinance is hereby declared to be an appropriation measure, immediately effective pursuant to the provisions of Section 5.03 of the Charter.

SECTION 3. The City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to post a true copy of the foregoing ordinance in each of three (3) conspicuous locations in the City and she shall immediately after such posting enter in the ordinance book, under the record of the ordinance, a certificate under her hand stating the time and place of such publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville, this
_____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk



REQUEST FOR BUDGET ADJUSTMENT FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Instructions: Complete all necessary fields. Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory and required for processing. Obtain required approvals and process according to the procedure outlined in:
[A.R. 6.01 Budget Adjustment Policy & Procedure.](#)

For more detailed budget adjustment training information, including examples, please click on the following link:
[Miscellaneous Budget Training Information.](#)

REQUESTER*: Sean Bigley

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION*: Environmental Utilities/Administration

FISCAL YEAR/EFFECTIVE DATE*: FY17

PROPOSED COUNCIL DATE (if applicable): 01/18/2017

USE OF FUNDS*						
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL			JL		
	ORG KEY*	OBJECT*	FUND*	PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
70,000	08430	5101	480			Sites Reservoir JPA - Phase 1
\$ 70,000	TOTAL					

SOURCE OF FUNDS*						
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL			JL		
	ORG KEY	OBJECT	FUND*	PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
70,000			480			Sites Reservoir JPA - Phase 1
\$ 70,000	TOTAL					

FINANCE USE	Approved:				
	<i>Kathy Cullen</i>	<i>6/12/16</i>		<i>Marty Hall</i>	
	BUDGET MANAGER/DESIGNEE	DATE		Finance Director	Date

Justification for Budget Adjustment*:

This \$70,000 Budget Adjustment will fund Roseville's share of Phase 1 technical work on the Sites Reservoir Project through participation on the Sites Reservoir Joint Powers Authority. If the City Council approves the Fourth Amended and Restated Sites Project Authority Joint Exercise of Power Agreement, Roseville will reimburse PCWA for in kind work and direct payments to the Sites Reservoir Joint Powers Authority under a Cost-Share Agreement. Phase 1 is estimated to last through January 2018. This Budget Adjustment for \$70,000 is funded through the Water Operations Fund which derives its revenue from approved water utility rates.

Approved:		Approved:	
<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>12/12/16</i>		
REQUESTING DEPARTMENT HEAD / DESIGNEE	DATE	CITY MANAGER	DATE



REQUEST FOR BUDGET ADJUSTMENT

FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Instructions: Complete all necessary fields. Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory and required for processing. Obtain required approvals and process according to the procedure outlined in:

[A.R. 6.01 Budget Adjustment Policy & Procedure.](#)

For more detailed budget adjustment training information, including examples, please click on the following link:

[Miscellaneous Budget Training Information.](#)

REQUESTER*: Sean Bigley

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION*: Environmental Utilities/Administration

FISCAL YEAR/EFFECTIVE DATE*: FY17

PROPOSED COUNCIL DATE (if applicable): 01/18/2017

USE OF FUNDS*						
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL		FUND*	JL		
	ORG KEY*	OBJECT*		PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
70,000	08430	5101	480			Sites Reservoir JPA - Phase 1
\$ 70,000	TOTAL					

SOURCE OF FUNDS*						
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL		FUND*	JL		
	ORG KEY	OBJECT		PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
70,000			480			Sites Reservoir JPA - Phase 1
\$ 70,000	TOTAL					

FINANCE USE	Approved:					
	<i>Kathy Cullen</i>	12/12/16			<i>Walter Haul</i>	
	BUDGET MANAGER/DISEGNEE	DATE			Finance Director	DATE

Justification for Budget Adjustment*:

This \$70,000 Budget Adjustment will fund Roseville's share of Phase 1 technical work on the Sites Reservoir Project through participation on the Sites Reservoir Joint Powers Authority. If the City Council approves the Fourth Amended and Restated Sites Project Authority Joint Exercise of Power Agreement, Roseville will reimburse PCWA for in kind work and direct payments to the Sites Reservoir Joint Powers Authority under a Cost-Share Agreement. Phase 1 is estimated to last through January 2018. This Budget Adjustment for \$70,000 is funded through the Water Operations Fund which derives its revenue from approved water utility rates.

Approved:		Approved:	
<i>[Signature]</i>	12/12/16		
REQUESTING DEPARTMENT HEAD / DESIGNEE	DATE	CITY MANAGER	DATE



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8199

File #: 0709-03-01

Title:	HOUSING SUCCESSOR- 304 Washington Boulevard - Exclusive Right to Negotiate Agreement
Contact:	Danielle Foster 916-774-5446 dfoster@Roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 8.3.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff recommends that the City Council, acting as the Housing Successor, adopt the attached resolution approving the proposed Exclusive Right to Negotiate Agreement with Meta Housing Corporation for the affordable housing parcel located at 304 Washington Boulevard. This initial action does not result in any direct costs to the City, aside from the preparation of a title report that will be passed onto the project or otherwise covered by City housing funds.

BACKGROUND

The City, as the Redevelopment Agency, previously conducted a Request for Proposals in 2010 on this and the other city sites available for affordable housing development. USA Properties was the successful proposal at that time and worked on it until determining it infeasible years back. The new proposal before the City is from Meta Housing Corporation, which unlike previous proposals, incorporates the neighboring parcel at 134 Main Street. Meta's ownership interest in the neighboring parcel provides greater opportunity for the City's 1-acre affordable housing site at Washington Boulevard and Main Street, increasing its feasibility and competitiveness as an affordable housing project seeking state and federal subsidies. Redevelopment of the parcel at 134 Main Street would also contribute to the City's objectives for improving the historic district and removing blighted buildings downtown. The property at 134 Main Street houses the Roseville Hotel, which has been boarded up due to its insufficiencies with Building Code and seismic requirements. This building also has large amounts of vacant and underutilized space that could be improved and utilized in a new project.

Meta Housing is proposing that the City's site and the neighboring parcel at 134 Main Street be developed as a mixed-used multi-family affordable housing and commercial project, consisting of approximately seventy (70) to eighty (80) rental housing units (each a "Unit") affordable to low, very-low and extremely-low income households. The Units will include a mix of one, two, and three bedroom units and a minimum of 3,000 square feet of retail space, as envisioned in the attached preliminary site plan by Y&M Architects, dated 12.15.16. The Project would include permanent supportive housing units and on-site supportive services, with a focus on veterans and persons with physical disabilities. The project is also working to provide a significant portion of the

units as handicapped accessible or adaptable apartments, necessary for a disabled or elderly individual to age-in-place comfortably in their apartment.

If the proposed Exclusive Right to Negotiate Agreement is approved, staff will continue to work with Meta Housing on the scope of the project, potential funding sources, and the project's overall design to bring back in a Disposition and Development Agreement. In the meantime, Meta is finalizing its design proposal and submitting its full planning application to the City for review, in hopes of completing the process in time for pending state funding applications in 2017.

FISCAL IMPACT

There are no fiscal impacts to the City with this initial step, aside from a \$500 cost for the creation of an updated title report on the property for purposes of negotiation. This cost will either be passed on to the future project, or if things do not proceed, would be absorbed by city housing funds.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

This initial step will not result in the creation of jobs, but if the negotiations continue to an affordable housing project with commercial retail space in it, both construction and retail jobs will be created within its development.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not apply to activities that will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3)). Execution of this agreement does not include the potential for a significant environmental effect, and therefore is not subject to CEQA.

Respectfully Submitted,

Danielle Foster, Housing Manager

Chris Robles, Economic Development Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution No. 17-13

Exclusive Right to Negotiate Agreement - 304 Washington Blvd

Preliminary Site Plan - 304 Washington Boulevard

RESOLUTION NO. 17-13

APPROVING AN EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO NEGOTIATE AGREEMENT FOR
DEVELOPMENT OF A MIXED USE PROJECT AT 304 WASHINGTON BOULEVARD, BY
AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND META HOUSING CORPORATION,
AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE
CITY OF ROSEVILLE

WHEREAS, an exclusive right to negotiate agreement for development of a mixed use
project at 304 Washington Boulevard, by and between the City of Roseville and Meta Housing
Corporation has been reviewed by the City Council; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Roseville,
acting in its role as Housing Successor, that said agreement is hereby approved and that the City
Manager is authorized to execute it on behalf of the City of Roseville.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of
_____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

**EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO NEGOTIATE AGREEMENT
FOR DEVELOPMENT OF A MIXED USE PROJECT
AT 304 WASHINGTON BOULEVARD
(Washington and Main Apartment Project)**

THIS AGREEMENT ("Agreement") is entered into this ____ day of _____,
2017, by and between the City of Roseville, a municipal corporation ("CITY") and Meta
Housing Corporation, a California corporation ("DEVELOPER"); and

W I T N E S S E T H:

WHEREAS, DEVELOPER proposes to develop a mixed use project, which includes multi-family affordable housing and commercial project, consisting of approximately seventy (70) to eighty (80) rental housing units (each a "Unit") affordable to low, very-low and extremely-low income households; and

WHEREAS, the Units will include a mix of one (1), two (2), and three (3) bedroom units and a minimum of 3,000 square feet of retail space, as shown in the preliminary site plan by Y&M Architects dated December 15, 2016 ("Project"), which is attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein by this reference; and

WHEREAS, DEVELOPER proposes to develop, design, and construct the Project on parcels which DEVELOPER owns and/or has an option to purchase at 134 Main Street and on a parcel owned by CITY at 304 Washington Boulevard as described in Exhibit "B," attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference (collectively, "Project Site"); and

WHEREAS, CITY, acting in its capacity as Housing Successor to the former

Redevelopment Agency of the City of Roseville, finds development of the 304 Washington Boulevard parcel in conjunction with the 134 Main Street parcel to be highly beneficial to the Project Site's development and the overall public benefit; and

WHEREAS, CITY further finds that demolition of the existing dilapidated building at 134 Main Street and that property's redevelopment with CITY's site will improve public safety and provide an overall benefit to the Old Town Historic District; and

WHEREAS, based on these findings, CITY is negotiating with DEVELOPER for development of its site at 304 Washington Boulevard; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of this Agreement is to set forth a framework by which the parties intend to negotiate an agreement for the disposition and development of the Project and for likely public participation in its financing; and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the parties to:

- A. Negotiate the scope of the development and building program for the Project;
- B. Process the necessary design review for the Project;
- C. Negotiate business terms and conditions, including private financial and potential CITY or other potential public financial participation in the Project;
- D. Set forth provisions for review and approval of development plans and equity or financing commitments; and
- E. Negotiate and reach agreement on any necessary contracts, financial instruments, and related documents for development of the Project (collectively, "Disposition and Development Agreement or DDA").

NOW, THEREFORE, CITY and DEVELOPER agree as follows:

1. Exclusive Right to Negotiate. The parties hereby agree to diligently and in good faith negotiate and prepare a DDA, subject to the terms and conditions herein, for consideration by CITY and for execution between CITY and DEVELOPER with respect to the development of the Project. DEVELOPER and/or CITY shall not negotiate with any other person or entity regarding development of their respective parcels subject to this Agreement during the term of this Agreement. CITY and DEVELOPER shall generally cooperate with each other and supply such documents and information as may be reasonably requested by the other to facilitate the conduct of the negotiations. DEVELOPER acknowledges that CITY retains the authority to process applications for other similar projects, in locations other than the Project Site, in regards to planning and building entitlements within the City of Roseville during the term of this Agreement.

2. Project Feasibility and Negotiation Periods. This Agreement shall consist of two (2) phases, a "Feasibility Period" and a "Negotiation Period," as follows:

A. Feasibility Period. The Feasibility Period shall be for a period of thirty (30) business days commencing from the execution date. For the purposes of this Agreement, a "business day" shall refer to any day that the City Manager's Office is open to the public. The Feasibility Period may be extended upon written request by DEVELOPER for a reasonable period(s) subject to the approval of the City Manager of CITY, at his or her sole discretion. All references to the "City Manager" in this Agreement shall also refer to the City Manager's designee. During the Feasibility Period, DEVELOPER shall, at its cost, and to the City Manager's reasonable satisfaction, complete all of the following Project feasibility activities:

1) Preparation of a Project Site plan/study and conceptual design,

inclusive of 70-80 apartment units, commercial space and parking;

- 2) Develop a funding source matrix and requirements for securing all necessary funding;
- 3) Submit a design review application for the Project;
- 4) Provide an exterior design and elevation;
- 5) Provide documentation of DEVELOPER or its assignee's ability to finance the Project;
- 6) Provide a financial proforma for the Project;
- 7) Complete and submit the City of Roseville's Community Development Block Grant ("CDBG") Application found online at CITY's website;
- 8) Submit an appraisal of the CITY site at 304 Washington Boulevard for CITY review in the negotiation of the CITY-owned land and its value;
- 9) Submit a demolition plan for the existing building located at 134 Main Street; and
- 10) Submit such other reasonably related information or authorizations as may be required by the City Manager and/or Roseville City Attorney.

DEVELOPER shall submit all of the above information in writing to the City Manager prior to the expiration of the Feasibility Period. The City Manager shall, in consultation with the Roseville City Attorney, evaluate and determine (1) whether such information and any business terms are sufficiently complete, adequate and appropriate, and (2) whether DEVELOPER has demonstrated appropriate and sufficient private financing to allow the parties to proceed to the Negotiation Period. All information regarding DEVELOPER's business practice which may be provided to the City Manager shall remain confidential to the extent permissible by law

including, without limitation, the California Public Records Act. If the foregoing requirements have not been met by the end of the Feasibility Period, as determined by the City Manager, and the City Manager has provided DEVELOPER with a written deficiency letter, and the DEVELOPER has not requested an extension of the Feasibility Period, this Agreement may be deemed terminated at the sole discretion of the City Manager by written notice to DEVELOPER.

B. Negotiation Period. The Negotiation Period shall overlap with the Feasibility Period and be for a period of sixty (60) business days commencing from the execution date. The Negotiation Period may be extended upon written request by DEVELOPER for a reasonable period(s) subject to the approval of the City Manager, at his or her sole discretion. During the Negotiation Period, DEVELOPER shall complete all of the following negotiating activities:

- 1) Submit a Financing Plan which describes in complete and full detail the relative levels and sources of private and public financing, including proof of availability of private financing;
- 2) Submit such other reasonably related information or authorizations as may be required by the City Manager and/or Roseville City Attorney.

Upon submittal of the foregoing information by DEVELOPER in writing and to the satisfaction of the City Manager and the Roseville City Attorney prior to the expiration of the Negotiation Period, then the Negotiation Period may, if necessary, be extended at the sole discretion of the City Manager and/or the Roseville City Attorney, for a maximum of sixty (60) business days for CITY to:

- (i) Consider the terms and conditions of the DEVELOPER's complete Project proposal (all required submittals);

(ii) If necessary, conduct activities required for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, and

(iii) Commence and complete preparation of the DDA.

The Roseville City Attorney shall determine the types of contracts, financial instruments, and other documentation that will be required as a DDA. The Roseville City Attorney shall prepare the DDA, except where the Roseville City Attorney determines that DEVELOPER should prepare or submit any particular contractual, financial instruments, and other documentation.

The City Manager's and the Roseville City Attorney's satisfaction with the DDA may be signified by a written notice executed by the City Manager prior to the expiration of the Negotiation Period. If, at the end of the Negotiation Period, the City Manager determines that the DDA's terms and conditions cannot be negotiated to the satisfaction of CITY or the parties are otherwise at impasse, the City Manager may terminate this Agreement by written notice to DEVELOPER. DEVELOPER may terminate this Agreement at any time upon written notice to CITY.

3. Progress Reports and Technical Assistance. Upon reasonable notice, as from time to time may be requested by CITY, DEVELOPER agrees to make oral and written progress reports advising CITY on all matters and all studies being made by DEVELOPER. Should DEVELOPER fail to complete and submit to CITY any of the specific items listed in this section prior to the expiration of the Negotiation Period, the City Manager shall provide DEVELOPER with a written notice of such failure and at least fifteen (15) business days to cure such failure, and in the event DEVELOPER fails to cure such failure, may at his or her option immediately terminate this Agreement by written notice to DEVELOPER.

CITY will assist and cooperate by providing DEVELOPER with reasonable and appropriate technical information and assistance in fulfilling the DEVELOPER's obligations set forth in above Sections 2(A) and 2(B).

4. Execution of Disposition and Development Agreement (DDA). A DDA resulting from the negotiations pursuant to this Agreement shall become effective only after and if the DDA has been considered and approved by CITY at a public hearing called for such purpose. If a DDA is approved by CITY and is fully executed by CITY and DEVELOPER, the DDA shall thereafter govern the rights and obligations of the parties with respect to the development of the Project and this Agreement shall thereafter be null and void.

5. DEVELOPER's Development Support Team. DEVELOPER's development support team consists of:

- Aaron Mandel, Sr. Vice President, Meta Housing Corporation
- Ryan Yanagita, Vice President, Y&M Architects
- Ryan J. Beaton, Professional Engineer, kpff Engineering

Any change in DEVELOPER's development support team shall be reported in writing to CITY within fifteen (15) business days of such change and is subject to the approval of CITY.

6. No Reimbursement or Public Financial Commitment. For any activities under this Agreement DEVELOPER shall have no right to be reimbursed by CITY for any costs incurred by DEVELOPER. Upon termination of this Agreement neither party shall accrue any further rights or incur any further obligations or liability to the other under this Agreement. By execution of this Agreement, CITY is not committing itself or agreeing to undertake:

- A. Acquisition of land;
- B. Disposition of land to DEVELOPER;
- C. Pre-commitment or commitment of any public funds; or

D. Any other act or activities requiring the subsequent independent exercise of discretion by CITY or any department of it.

CITY reserves final discretion and approval as to the Project, DDA, the permits, environmental review, provision of public financing, if any, and all related matters in connection therewith. However, nothing in this Agreement shall limit the type or extent of obligations or commitments, including the commitments set forth above, which CITY may elect to include in the DDA. Similarly, DEVELOPER reserves discretion and approval as to the items listed in this paragraph and, further, the right to terminate this Agreement by immediate notice to CITY if CITY imposes terms and conditions as part of the Project permit and approval process which are unacceptable to DEVELOPER.

This Agreement does not constitute a disposition of property or exercise of control over property owned by CITY. Execution of this Agreement by CITY is merely an agreement to enter into a period of negotiations according to the terms of this Agreement, reserving final discretion and approval by CITY as to any DDA and all proceedings and decisions in connection therewith.

7. DEVELOPER's Representations and Warranties. DEVELOPER hereby represents and warrants that it has made full disclosure to CITY of its principals, officers, major stockholders, major partners, joint venturers, key managerial employees and other associates, and other material information relating to the Project concerning DEVELOPER and its associates. Any significant or material change in such management ownership or control of DEVELOPER or such information shall be reported to CITY and is subject to the approval of CITY prior to the execution of a DDA. Notwithstanding the foregoing, DEVELOPER reserves the right in its discretion to join and associate with other entities and joint ventures, partnerships

or otherwise for the purpose of developing the Project, provided that DEVELOPER retains management and control of such entities and remains fully responsible to CITY pursuant to this Agreement. All persons executing this Agreement on behalf of DEVELOPER represent and warrant that they are authorized to do so.

8. Agreement and Project Subject to Applicable Policies and laws. This Agreement and any development of the Project are subject to all applicable policies and laws, including but not limited to, the provisions of the Roseville General Plan, the Roseville Municipal Code and the Zoning Ordinance as they currently exist, or may hereafter be amended. The parties acknowledge that Project approval will be subject to the California Environmental Quality Act.

9. Commissions and Brokerage Fees. CITY shall not be liable for any real estate commission or brokerage fee which may arise from this Agreement. CITY represents that it has engaged no broker, agent or finder in connection with this transaction, and DEVELOPER agrees to hold CITY harmless from any broker, agent or finder retained by DEVELOPER.

10. Assignment. CITY enters into this Agreement solely because of the skills, characteristics, real property ownership, and abilities which are unique to DEVELOPER, and which CITY believes are necessary for the successful development of the Project. Therefore, the obligations of DEVELOPER pursuant to this Agreement may be assigned by DEVELOPER only upon prior written consent, subject to the City Manager's sole discretion. Any attempted assignment contrary to this section shall, at the option of the City Manager, immediately void and terminate this Agreement.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, DEVELOPER may assign this Agreement to a limited partnership in which DEVELOPER or its affiliate acts as the general partner, so long as DEVELOPER provides documentation, reasonably acceptable to CITY, that such affiliate is directly under the control of DEVELOPER, and such affiliate executes an assignment and assumption agreement in a form

reasonably acceptable to CITY.

11. Inspections. During the Negotiation Period, DEVELOPER shall conduct such inspections, tests, surveys, and other analyses ("Inspections") as DEVELOPER deems reasonably necessary to determine the feasibility of rehabilitating, leasing, and financing the Project and shall complete such Inspections as promptly as possible within the Negotiation Period. During the Negotiation Period, DEVELOPER or its consultants shall have the right to enter upon the Project Site to perform such Inspections and in connection therewith, DEVELOPER shall:

- 1) Give CITY seventy-two (72) hours' notice of intent to enter the Project Site and the purpose of the entry.
- 2) Repair and restore any damage it or its consultants may cause.
- 3) Deliver to CITY, within ten (10) business days of receipt thereof, a complete copy of any investigation, test, report or study that DEVELOPER conducts, or causes to be conducted, with respect to the Project Site. DEVELOPER makes no representation or warranty and shall have no liability to CITY as to the accuracy or reliability of any such materials.
- 4) Indemnify, defend and hold CITY and its directors, officers, employees and agents harmless from any and all claims, liabilities, damages, losses, expenses, costs and fees (including reasonable, attorneys' fees and costs) that may proximately arise out of DEVELOPER's entry upon the Project Site or the investigation(s) and test(s) DEVELOPER may conduct.
- 5) Prior to entry, cause CITY to be named as an additional insured on a Commercial General Liability insurance policy with limits not less than Two Million Dollars (\$2,000,000) each occurrence combined single limit for Bodily Injury and Property Damage,

including coverage from Contractual Liability, Personal Injury, Broadform Property Damage, Products and Completed Operations. The required insurance is to be provided under an occurrence form by an insurer authorized and licensed to provide such insurance in the State of California, and DEVELOPER shall maintain such coverage for not less than one (1) year after the expiration of the Negotiation Period.

12. Integrated Agreement. This is an integrated Agreement, and contains all of the terms, considerations, understandings and promises of the parties. It shall be read as a whole.

13. Attorney's Fees; Venue; Governing Law. If either party commences any legal action against the other party arising out of this Agreement or the performance hereof, the prevailing party in such action shall be entitled to recover its reasonable litigation expenses, including but not limited to, court costs, expert witness fees, discovery expenses, and attorney's fees. Any action arising out of this Agreement shall be brought in Placer County, California, regardless of where else venue may lie. This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of California.

14. Modification. This Agreement and each provision contained herein may be waived, amended, supplemented or eliminated only by mutual written agreement of the parties.

15. Severability. If any of the provisions contained in this Agreement are for any reason held invalid or unenforceable, such holding shall not affect the remaining provisions or the validity and enforceability of the Agreement as a whole.

16. Governing Agreement. In the event of any conflict between this Agreement and its Exhibits, the provisions of this Agreement shall govern. In the event of any conflict between any of the Exhibit, the provisions of the first in order of attachment shall govern.

17. Notice. Any notices to parties required by this Agreement shall be delivered or

mailed, U.S. first class postage prepaid, addressed as follows:

CITY OF ROSEVILLE

DEVELOPER

Chris Robles
Economic Development Director
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

Aaron Mandel
Meta Housing Corporation
1640 Sepulveda Blvd., Suite 42
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Either party may amend its address for notice by sending notice to the other party.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the City of Roseville, a municipal corporation, has authorized the execution of the Agreement in duplicate by its City Manager and attested to by its City Clerk under the authority of Resolution No. _____, adopted by the City of Roseville on the ____ day of _____, 2017, and DEVELOPER has caused this Agreement to be executed.

CITY OF ROSEVILLE,
a municipal corporation:

Meta Housing Corporation,
a California corporation:

BY: _____
ROB JENSEN
City Manager

BY: 
AARON MANDEL
Sr. Vice President

ATTEST:

and

BY: _____
SONIA OROZCO
City Clerk

BY: 
its: CFU

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

BY: _____
ROBERT R. SCHMITT
City Attorney

APPROVED AS TO SUBSTANCE:

BY: 
CHRIS ROBLES
Economic Development Director

EXHIBIT A Preliminary Site Plan from Y&M Architects, Dated 12/15/16




EXHIBIT B
Project Site

Legal Description and Preliminary Site Plan

Legal Description

Real property in the City of Roseville, County of Placer, State of California, described as follows:

PARCEL ONE:


LOTS 1 AND 2, BLOCK 3, AS SHOWN ON THAT CERTAIN MAP OF PLAT ENTITLED "AMENDED MAP OF MCRAES ADDITION OF THE TOWN (NOW CITY OF ROSEVILLE)" FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF PLACER COUNTY, AUGUST 21, 1906 IN BOOK A OF MAPS AT PAGE 38, PLACER COUNTY RECORDS.

PARCEL TWO:

A PORTION OF LOTS 3 AND 4 IN BLOCK 3, AS SHOWN ON THAT CERTAIN MAP OF PLAT ENTITLED "AMENDED MAP OF MCRAE'S ADDITIONS TO THE TOWN (NOW CITY) OF ROSEVILLE", FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF PLACER COUNTY, AUGUST 31, 1906 IN BOOK A OF MAPS AT PAGE 38, DESCRIBED AS:

BEGINNING AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 3; THENCE WESTERLY 85.49 FEET ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID LOT 3 AND 4 TO A POINT IN THE NORTH LINE OF SAID LOT 4 THAT IS DISTANT WESTERLY 35.49 FEET FROM THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 4; THENCE FROM A TANGENT THAT BEARS SOUTH 20° 17' 20" EAST ALONG A CURVE TO THE LEFT, WITH A RADIUS OF 420.50 FEET, THROUGH AN ANGLE OF 11° 20' A DISTANCE OF 83.98 FEET (THE CHORD OF SAID CURVE BEARS SOUTH 25° 58' 20" EAST 83.04 FEET TO A POINT IN THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 4 THAT IS DISTANT NORTHERLY 65.01 FEET FROM THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 4; THENCE CONTINUING ALONG SAID CURVE TO THE LEFT WITH A RADIUS OF 420.50 FEET, FROM A TANGENT THAT BEARS SOUTH 31° 37' 20" EAST THROUGH AN ANGLE OF 7° 03' 40" A DISTANCE OF 57.43 FEET; THE CHORD OF WHICH CURVE BEARS SOUTH 35° 11' 40" EAST 57.40 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 38° 46' EAST 37.83 FEET TO A POINT IN THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID LOT 3 THAT IS DISTANT WESTERLY 3.06 FEET FROM THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 3; THENCE EASTERLY 3.06 FEET ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID LOT 3 TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 3; THENCE NORTHERLY 140.00 FEET ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 3 TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

APN: 011-145-005-000



PROJECT SUMMARY:

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
3 STORY TYPE-V RESIDENTIAL APARTMENTS
OVER 1 STORY COMMERCIAL AND PARKING GARAGE

EXISTING ZONING:
GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION :
DOWNTOWN (DT-4)
PRIMARY ZONING:
OLD TOWN HISTORIC DISTRICT (HD/SA-DT)
PRIMARY LAND USE:
CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT (CBD)

SITE AREA :
50,907 SF OR 1.16 ACRES ,
(INCLUDES 8,421 SF PLACER ST.)

DENSITY:
AS DETERMINED BY THE FAR OR
32 UNITS/ACRE, WHICHEVER IS GREATER

FAR:
BUILDING AREA:
1ST FLOOR = 37,913 SF
GARAGE = 32,563 SF
RETAIL = 3,500 SF
LOBBY/OFFICE = 1,850 SF
2ND FLOOR: = 30,758 SF
3RD FLOOR: = 30,758 SF
4TH FLOOR: = 24,244 SF
TOTAL BUILDING AREA
EXCLUDING GARAGE = 91,110 SF
TOTAL SITE AREA = 50,907 SF

FAR PROVIDED - 1.79

UNIT SUMMARY:
28 - 1 BR UNITS @ 550 SF
26 - 2 BR UNITS @ 760 SF
23 - 3 BR UNITS @ 1,035 SF
77 UNITS TOTAL

OPEN SPACE REQUIREMENTS:
77 UNITS X 50 SF/UNIT = 3,700 SF

TOTAL OPEN AREA PROVIDED:
PODIUM COURTYARDS = ± 5,000 SF

COMMON AREAS:
COMMUNITY AREA = 2,000 SF



LOBBY AND SERVICE
PROVIDER OFFICES = 1,850 SF

PARKING REQUIRED:
RESIDENTIAL: (AB744)
.5 SPACE / UNIT = 39 SPACES
PROVIDED = 53 SPACES

COMMERCIAL:
1 SPACE / 500 SF
3,500 SF / 500 SF = 7 SPACES
PROVIDED = 23 SPACES

The above drawings, specifications, ideas, designs and arrangements represented thereby are and shall remain property of the Architect (YM Architects), and no part thereof shall be copied, divided, or used in connection with any other project other than the specific project for which they have been prepared and developed, without the written consent of the Architect (YM Architects). Visual contact with these drawings or specifications shall constitute conclusive evidence of acceptance of these restrictions. Written dimensions on these drawings shall have pre-over scaled dimensions. Contractors shall verify and be responsible for all dimensions and conditions on the job and this office must be notified of any variations from the dimensions and conditions shown by these drawings. Shop details must be submitted to this office for approval before proceeding with fabrication.

2016©



The above drawings, specifications, ideas, designs and arrangements represented thereby are and shall remain property of the Architect (YM Architects), and no part thereof shall be copied, divided, or altered or used in connection with any other project other than the specific project for which they have been prepared and developed, without the written consent of the Architect (YM Architects). Visual contact with these drawings or specifications shall constitute conclusive evidence of acceptance of these restrictions. Written dimensions on these drawings shall have pre-over scaled dimensions. Contractors shall verify and be responsible for all dimensions and conditions on the job, and this office must be notified of any variations from the dimensions and conditions shown by these drawings. Shop details must be submitted to this office for approval before proceeding with fabrication.

2016©



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8228
File #: 0600-01

Title: Department Head Salary Changes
Contact: Linda Hampton 916-774-5215 lhampton@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017
Item #: 9.1.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff recommends the approval of the Management salary schedules to reflect a 7.5% salary increase for Police Chief and a 7.5% salary increase for Electric Utility Director in recognition of services and to support retention. Staff also recommends the approval of an amended Management and Confidential Terms, Conditions and Understanding reflecting a one-time, non-PERSable 5% professional development pay for the Chief Financial Officer. In addition, it is recommended that City Council approve an amended and restated employment and personal services agreement for City Attorney to include a one-time, non-PERSable professional development payment of \$7,500. It is recommended that City Council take the following actions:

1. Adopt an ordinance to approve the attached Management A salary schedule (Appendix H) reflecting the salary increase for Police Chief (5410) and Electric Utility Director (2320) effective January 21, 2017; and,
2. Adopt an ordinance to approve the attached Management B salary schedule (Appendix H) reflecting the salary increase for Police Chief (B797) and Electric Utility Director (B753), effective January 21, 2017; and
3. Adopt a resolution to approve the attached amended Management Confidential Terms, Conditions and Understanding.
4. Adopt a resolution to approve the attached City Attorney amended and restated personal services agreement.

BACKGROUND

As part of the Municipal Code, the Human Resources Department is charged with maintaining the City's classification plan. Staff is continually evaluating organizational structure and staffing levels necessary to provide high service levels to the community within the constraints of the budget.

Executive Compensation has been reviewed this year in relation to succession planning efforts and retention of incumbents by reviewing the City's compensation in relation to the labor market. The City has determined that Police Chief, Electric Utility Director and Chief Financial Officer positions are recommended for compensation adjustments. The salary of the Police Chief is being increased by 7.5% and the Electric Utility Director by 7.5%. The Chief Financial Officer is recommended for a 5% one-time lump sum professional development payment.

The City has an existing employment contract with the City Attorney through February 21, 2019. The annual employment review process was recently completed by the City Council. The proposed employment contract amends the existing contract by providing a one-time, non-PERSable professional development payment of \$7,500 for the City Attorney.

FISCAL IMPACT

The proposed changes will result in an annual cost of \$54,850 and a fiscal impact of \$44,884. The Electric Utility Director fiscal impact of \$13,441 can be absorbed in the current Electric Department budget. The remaining \$31,443 impact will be funded through the General Fund Contingency Funds.

Position	Current Salary & Benefits	Proposed Salary & Benefits	Total Impact	FY16/17 Impact
Police Chief	\$343,043	\$368,772	\$ 25,728	\$11,875
Electric Utility Director	\$388,293	\$417,415	\$ 29,122	\$13,441
Chief Finance Officer				\$12,068
City Attorney				\$7,500

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

No new jobs will be created by this action.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Salary schedule and special pay changes are not considered a "project" as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (CEQA Guidelines 15378). Consequently no CEQA action is required.

Respectfully Submitted,

Linda Hampton, Human Resources Manager

Rob Jensen, City Manager



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:**Description**

Ordinance No. 5793

01/21/2017 Management Salary Schedule A Appendix H

Ordinance No. 5794

01/21/2017 Management Salary Schedule B Appendix H

Resolution No. 17-35

Terms, Conditions, and Understanding_Management and Confidential

Resolution No. 17-36

City Attorney Contract

ORDINANCE NO. 5793

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AMENDING
ORDINANCE NO. 5769, THE SALARY ORDINANCE FOR MANAGEMENT EMPLOYEES,
SALARY SCHEDULE-A, AS AMENDED BY APPENDIX "H" TO BE EFFECTIVE
JANUARY 21, 2017, AS AN URGENCY MEASURE

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. Title and Purpose.

Ordinance No. 5769, the Salary Ordinance for Management Employees, Salary Schedule A, is hereby amended as shown on Appendix "H" attached hereto.

SECTION 2. Salary Plan Effective Date.

This Ordinance shall be effective January 21, 2017 as an urgency measure.

SECTION 3. Urgency Ordinance.

This ordinance is hereby declared to be an urgency measure, immediately necessary for the public peace, health and safety and shall take effect January 21, 2017. A statement of urgency is as follows:

It is necessary to amend the Salary Ordinance to comply with recently approved changes for the orderly and necessary continuance of operations of the City.

SECTION 4. Posting.

The City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to post a true copy of the foregoing ordinance in each of three (3) conspicuous locations in the City and she shall immediately after such posting enter in the Ordinance Book under the record of the ordinance a certificate under her hand stating the time and place of said publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20____, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

ATTEST:

MAYOR

City Clerk

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
43	ACCOUNTING SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	41.0047	3280.37	7107.48	85289.75
		STEP B	43.0549	3444.39	7462.85	89554.23
		STEP C	45.2077	3616.61	7836.00	94031.94
		STEP D	47.4680	3797.44	8227.80	98733.54
		STEP E	49.8415	3987.32	8639.18	103670.22
		STEP F	52.3335	4186.68	9071.14	108853.73
		STEP G	54.9502	4396.02	9524.70	114296.42

45 ADMIN ANALYST I

STEP A	33.2609	2660.87	5765.22	69182.67
STEP B	34.9239	2793.91	6053.47	72641.71
STEP C	36.6700	2933.60	6356.13	76273.60
STEP D	38.5037	3080.29	6673.97	80087.69
STEP E	40.4288	3234.30	7007.65	84091.90
STEP F	42.4503	3396.02	7358.05	88296.62
STEP G	44.5728	3565.82	7725.95	92711.42

50 ADMIN ANALYST II

STEP A	36.5872	2926.97	6341.78	76101.37
STEP B	38.4165	3073.32	6658.86	79906.32
STEP C	40.3372	3226.97	6991.78	83901.37
STEP D	42.3541	3388.32	7341.37	88096.52
STEP E	44.4717	3557.73	7708.42	92501.13
STEP F	46.6954	3735.63	8093.86	97126.43
STEP G	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60

86 ALTERNATIVE TRANSP ANALYST I

STEP A	33.7583	2700.66	5851.43	70217.26
STEP B	35.4464	2835.71	6144.04	73728.51
STEP C	37.2187	2977.49	6451.24	77414.89
STEP D	39.0796	3126.36	6773.79	81285.56
STEP E	41.0335	3282.68	7112.47	85349.68
STEP F	43.0852	3446.81	7468.10	89617.21
STEP G	45.2396	3619.16	7841.53	94098.36

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - A**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
----------	-------	------	--------	-----------	---------	--------

88 ALTERNATIVE TRANSP ANALYST II

STEP A	36.5872	2926.97	6341.78	76101.37
STEP B	38.4165	3073.32	6658.86	79906.32
STEP C	40.3372	3226.97	6991.78	83901.37
STEP D	42.3541	3388.32	7341.37	88096.52
STEP E	44.4717	3557.73	7708.42	92501.13
STEP F	46.6954	3735.63	8093.86	97126.43
STEP G	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60

90 ALTERNATIVE TRANSP MGR

STEP A	48.1545	3852.36	8346.79	100161.46
STEP B	50.5623	4044.98	8764.13	105169.53
STEP C	53.0904	4247.23	9202.33	110428.01
STEP D	55.7449	4459.59	9662.45	115949.41
STEP E	58.5322	4682.57	10145.57	121746.88
STEP F	61.4588	4916.70	10652.85	127834.22
STEP G	64.5317	5162.54	11185.49	134225.94

245 ASST CITY ATTORNEY

STEP A	71.0229	5681.83	12310.64	147727.67
STEP B	74.5741	5965.92	12926.17	155114.05
STEP C	78.3028	6264.22	13572.48	162869.75
STEP D	82.2179	6577.43	14251.10	171013.24
STEP E	86.3288	6906.30	14963.66	179563.90
STEP F	90.6452	7251.62	15711.84	188542.10
STEP G	95.1775	7614.20	16497.43	197969.20

250 ASST CITY CLERK

STEP A	35.6195	2849.56	6174.05	74088.66
STEP B	37.4005	2992.04	6482.76	77793.09
STEP C	39.2706	3141.64	6806.90	81682.75
STEP D	41.2341	3298.73	7147.24	85766.88
STEP E	43.2958	3463.66	7504.60	90055.23
STEP F	45.4606	3636.85	7879.83	94557.99
STEP G	47.7336	3818.69	8273.82	99285.89

325 ASST CITY MANAGER

STEP A	74.0814	5926.51	12840.77	154089.31
STEP B	77.7854	6222.83	13482.80	161793.63
STEP C	81.6747	6533.97	14156.94	169883.37
STEP D	85.7585	6860.68	14864.80	178377.68
STEP E	90.0464	7203.71	15608.04	187296.51
STEP F	94.5487	7563.89	16388.44	196661.29
STEP G	99.2762	7942.09	17207.87	206494.49

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
8553 ASST ELEC UTIL DIR-RESOURCES						
		STEP A	77.7298	6218.38	13473.16	161677.98
		STEP B	81.6164	6529.31	14146.84	169762.11
		STEP C	85.6972	6855.77	14854.18	178250.17
		STEP D	89.9819	7198.55	15596.86	187162.35
		STEP E	94.4811	7558.48	16376.72	196520.68
		STEP F	99.2051	7936.40	17195.55	206346.60
		STEP G	104.1655	8333.24	18055.35	216664.24
395 ASST ELEC UTIL DIRECTOR						
		STEP A	70.9719	5677.75	12301.79	147621.55
		STEP B	74.5206	5961.64	12916.90	155002.84
		STEP C	78.2466	6259.72	13562.74	162752.92
		STEP D	82.1588	6572.70	14240.85	170890.30
		STEP E	86.2668	6901.34	14952.91	179434.94
		STEP F	90.5802	7246.41	15700.56	188406.81
		STEP G	95.1093	7608.74	16485.61	197827.34
411 ASST EU DIRECTOR						
		STEP A	62.1514	4972.11	10772.90	129274.91
		STEP B	65.2588	5220.70	11311.52	135738.30
		STEP C	68.5218	5481.74	11877.11	142525.34
		STEP D	71.9478	5755.82	12470.95	149651.42
		STEP E	75.5453	6043.62	13094.51	157134.22
		STEP F	79.3225	6345.80	13749.23	164990.80
		STEP G	83.2886	6663.08	14436.69	173240.28
480 ASST FIRE CHIEF						
		STEP A	61.2592	4900.73	10618.26	127419.13
		STEP B	64.3221	5145.76	11149.16	133789.96
		STEP C	67.5383	5403.06	11706.63	140479.66
		STEP D	70.9152	5673.21	12291.96	147503.61
		STEP E	74.4609	5956.87	12906.55	154878.67
		STEP F	78.1839	6254.71	13551.87	162622.51
		STEP G	82.0932	6567.45	14229.48	170753.85
484 ASST HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR						
		STEP A	53.1051	4248.40	9204.88	110458.60
		STEP B	55.7603	4460.82	9665.11	115981.42
		STEP C	58.5483	4683.86	10148.37	121780.46
		STEP D	61.4758	4918.06	10655.80	127869.66
		STEP E	64.5495	5163.96	11188.58	134262.96
		STEP F	67.7770	5422.16	11748.01	140976.16
		STEP G	71.1659	5693.27	12335.42	148025.07

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
510 ASST POLICE CHIEF						
		STEP A	67.3324	5386.59	11670.94	140051.31
		STEP B	70.6990	5655.92	12254.49	147053.87
		STEP C	74.2339	5938.71	12867.21	154406.56
		STEP D	77.9456	6235.65	13510.57	162126.89
		STEP E	81.8429	6547.43	14186.10	170233.24
		STEP F	85.9350	6874.80	14895.41	178744.90
		STEP G	90.2318	7218.54	15640.18	187682.14
920 BILLING SERVICES MANAGER						
		STEP A	44.7525	3580.20	7757.10	93085.15
		STEP B	46.9901	3759.21	8144.95	97739.41
		STEP C	49.3396	3947.17	8552.20	102626.38
		STEP D	51.8066	4144.53	8979.81	107757.70
		STEP E	54.3969	4351.75	9428.80	113145.59
		STEP F	57.1168	4569.34	9900.24	118802.86
		STEP G	59.9726	4797.81	10395.25	124743.01
1017 BLDG INSPECTION SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	40.3307	3226.45	6990.65	83887.85
		STEP B	42.3473	3387.78	7340.19	88082.38
		STEP C	44.4646	3557.16	7707.19	92486.36
		STEP D	46.6877	3735.01	8092.53	97110.41
		STEP E	49.0223	3921.78	8497.19	101966.38
		STEP F	51.4734	4117.87	8922.05	107064.67
		STEP G	54.0470	4323.76	9368.14	112417.76
1043 BLDG OFFICIAL						
		STEP A	50.1505	4012.04	8692.76	104313.09
		STEP B	52.6581	4212.64	9127.40	109528.75
		STEP C	55.2910	4423.28	9583.77	115005.18
		STEP D	58.0555	4644.44	10062.95	120755.44
		STEP E	60.9583	4876.66	10566.10	126793.22
		STEP F	64.0062	5120.50	11094.41	133132.88
		STEP G	67.2065	5376.52	11649.13	139789.52
910 BUDGET ANALYST I						
		STEP A	34.4334	2754.67	5968.45	71621.47
		STEP B	36.1549	2892.39	6266.84	75202.19
		STEP C	37.9628	3037.02	6580.21	78962.62
		STEP D	39.8610	3188.88	6909.24	82910.88
		STEP E	41.8541	3348.32	7254.71	87056.52
		STEP F	43.9466	3515.72	7617.41	91408.92
		STEP G	46.1440	3691.52	7998.29	95979.52

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
915 BUDGET ANALYST II						
		STEP A	37.3182	2985.45	6468.48	77621.85
		STEP B	39.1840	3134.72	6791.89	81502.72
		STEP C	41.1434	3291.47	7131.52	85578.27
		STEP D	43.2005	3456.04	7488.08	89857.04
		STEP E	45.3605	3628.84	7862.48	94349.84
		STEP F	47.6286	3810.28	8255.62	99067.48
		STEP G	50.0100	4000.80	8668.40	104020.80
930 BUDGET MANAGER						
		STEP A	44.7525	3580.20	7757.10	93085.15
		STEP B	46.9901	3759.21	8144.95	97739.41
		STEP C	49.3396	3947.17	8552.20	102626.38
		STEP D	51.8066	4144.53	8979.81	107757.70
		STEP E	54.3969	4351.75	9428.80	113145.59
		STEP F	57.1168	4569.34	9900.24	118802.86
		STEP G	59.9726	4797.81	10395.25	124743.01
1050 BUSINESS SVCS ADMINISTRATOR						
		STEP A	42.3780	3390.24	7345.52	88146.24
		STEP B	44.4970	3559.76	7712.81	92553.76
		STEP C	46.7217	3737.73	8098.42	97181.13
		STEP D	49.0581	3924.64	8503.40	102040.84
		STEP E	51.5108	4120.86	8928.53	107142.46
		STEP F	54.0864	4326.91	9374.97	112499.71
		STEP G	56.7907	4543.25	9843.72	118124.65
1125 CENTRAL SERVICES DIRECTOR						
		STEP A	60.9892	4879.13	10571.46	126857.53
		STEP B	64.0388	5123.10	11100.05	133200.70
		STEP C	67.2407	5379.25	11655.05	139860.65
		STEP D	70.6027	5648.21	12237.80	146853.61
		STEP E	74.1329	5930.63	12849.70	154196.43
		STEP F	77.8396	6227.16	13492.19	161906.36
		STEP G	81.7316	6538.52	14166.81	170001.72
1245 CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER						
		STEP A	86.5875	6927.00	15008.50	180102.00
		STEP B	90.9169	7273.35	15758.92	189107.15
		STEP C	95.4628	7637.02	16546.88	198562.62
		STEP D	100.2359	8018.87	17374.22	208490.67
		STEP E	105.2477	8419.81	18242.93	218915.21
		STEP F	110.5101	8840.80	19155.08	229861.00
		STEP G	116.0356	9282.84	20112.83	241354.04

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
1180 CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER						
		STEP A	60.9892	4879.13	10571.46	126857.53
		STEP B	64.0388	5123.10	11100.05	133200.70
		STEP C	67.2407	5379.25	11655.05	139860.65
		STEP D	70.6027	5648.21	12237.80	146853.61
		STEP E	74.1329	5930.63	12849.70	154196.43
		STEP F	77.8396	6227.16	13492.19	161906.36
		STEP G	81.7316	6538.52	14166.81	170001.72
1220 CITY CLERK						
		STEP A	55.5188	4441.50	9623.25	115479.10
		STEP B	58.2948	4663.58	10104.43	121253.18
		STEP C	61.2096	4896.76	10609.66	127315.96
		STEP D	64.2701	5141.60	11140.15	133681.80
		STEP E	67.4836	5398.68	11697.15	140365.88
		STEP F	70.8579	5668.63	12282.03	147384.43
		STEP G	74.4006	5952.04	12896.10	154753.24
1224 CITY LIBRARIAN						
		STEP A	50.0106	4000.84	8668.50	104022.04
		STEP B	52.5111	4200.88	9101.92	109223.08
		STEP C	55.1365	4410.92	9556.99	114683.92
		STEP D	57.8936	4631.48	10034.89	120418.68
		STEP E	60.7880	4863.04	10536.58	126439.04
		STEP F	63.8276	5106.20	11063.45	132761.40
		STEP G	67.0190	5361.52	11616.62	139399.52
1370 CONTROLLER						
		STEP A	46.1683	3693.46	8002.50	96030.06
		STEP B	48.4767	3878.13	8402.62	100831.53
		STEP C	50.9006	4072.04	8822.77	105873.24
		STEP D	53.4456	4275.64	9263.90	111166.84
		STEP E	56.1179	4489.43	9727.10	116725.23
		STEP F	58.9238	4713.90	10213.45	122561.50
		STEP G	61.8699	4949.59	10724.11	128689.39
1645 DEPT PUBLIC INFO OFFICER						
		STEP A	38.3214	3065.71	6642.37	79708.51
		STEP B	40.2376	3219.00	6974.51	83694.20
		STEP C	42.2491	3379.92	7323.17	87878.12
		STEP D	44.3617	3548.93	7689.36	92272.33
		STEP E	46.5799	3726.39	8073.84	96886.19
		STEP F	48.9088	3912.70	8477.52	101730.30
		STEP G	51.3546	4108.36	8901.46	106817.56

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
1655 DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY I						
		STEP A	51.0406	4083.25	8847.04	106164.47
		STEP B	53.5926	4287.41	9289.39	111472.69
		STEP C	56.2723	4501.78	9753.86	117046.33
		STEP D	59.0859	4726.87	10241.55	122898.65
		STEP E	62.0402	4963.21	10753.63	129043.58
		STEP F	65.1422	5211.38	11291.31	135495.76
		STEP G	68.3993	5471.94	11855.88	142270.54
1658 DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY II						
		STEP A	56.1446	4491.57	9731.74	116780.87
		STEP B	58.9519	4716.15	10218.33	122619.91
		STEP C	61.8995	4951.96	10729.24	128750.91
		STEP D	64.9944	5199.56	11265.70	135188.46
		STEP E	68.2442	5459.53	11828.99	141947.88
		STEP F	71.6564	5732.51	12420.44	149045.27
		STEP G	75.2392	6019.14	13041.46	156497.54
1659 DEPUTY CITY MANAGER						
		STEP A	55.5189	4441.51	9623.27	115479.31
		STEP B	58.2948	4663.58	10104.43	121253.18
		STEP C	61.2096	4896.76	10609.66	127315.96
		STEP D	64.2701	5141.60	11140.15	133681.80
		STEP E	67.4837	5398.69	11697.17	140366.09
		STEP F	70.8579	5668.63	12282.03	147384.43
		STEP G	74.4007	5952.05	12896.12	154753.45
1674 DEVELOPMENT ANALYST I						
		STEP A	33.2609	2660.87	5765.22	69182.67
		STEP B	34.9239	2793.91	6053.47	72641.71
		STEP C	36.6700	2933.60	6356.13	76273.60
		STEP D	38.5037	3080.29	6673.97	80087.69
		STEP E	40.4288	3234.30	7007.65	84091.90
		STEP F	42.4503	3396.02	7358.05	88296.62
		STEP G	44.5728	3565.82	7725.95	92711.42
1675 DEVELOPMENT ANALYST II						
		STEP A	36.5872	2926.97	6341.78	76101.37
		STEP B	38.4165	3073.32	6658.86	79906.32
		STEP C	40.3372	3226.97	6991.78	83901.37
		STEP D	42.3541	3388.32	7341.37	88096.52
		STEP E	44.4717	3557.73	7708.42	92501.13
		STEP F	46.6954	3735.63	8093.86	97126.43
		STEP G	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code Title Step Hourly Bi-weekly Monthly Annual

1676 DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR

STEP A	67.1903	5375.22	11646.31	139755.82
STEP B	70.5498	5643.98	12228.63	146743.58
STEP C	74.0772	5926.17	12840.04	154080.57
STEP D	77.7812	6222.49	13482.07	161784.89
STEP E	81.6702	6533.61	14156.16	169874.01
STEP F	85.7538	6860.30	14863.99	178367.90
STEP G	90.0416	7203.32	15607.21	187286.52

1695 DEVELOPMENT SERVICES MANAGER

STEP A	55.5189	4441.51	9623.27	115479.31
STEP B	58.2948	4663.58	10104.43	121253.18
STEP C	61.2096	4896.76	10609.66	127315.96
STEP D	64.2701	5141.60	11140.15	133681.80
STEP E	67.4837	5398.69	11697.17	140366.09
STEP F	70.8579	5668.63	12282.03	147384.43
STEP G	74.4007	5952.05	12896.12	154753.45

1710 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

STEP A	64.6607	5172.85	11207.85	134494.25
STEP B	67.8939	5431.51	11768.27	141219.31
STEP C	71.2886	5703.08	12356.69	148280.28
STEP D	74.8529	5988.23	12974.50	155694.03
STEP E	78.5957	6287.65	13623.25	163479.05
STEP F	82.5255	6602.04	14304.42	171653.04
STEP G	86.6518	6932.14	15019.64	180235.74

1712 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

STEP A	50.1075	4008.60	8685.30	104223.60
STEP B	52.6130	4209.04	9119.58	109435.04
STEP C	55.2436	4419.48	9575.55	114906.68
STEP D	58.0058	4640.46	10054.33	120652.06
STEP E	60.9060	4872.48	10557.04	126684.48
STEP F	63.9516	5116.12	11084.94	133019.32
STEP G	67.1490	5371.92	11639.16	139669.92

1310 ELECTRIC BUSINESS ANALYST I

STEP A	39.3071	3144.56	6813.23	81758.76
STEP B	41.2726	3301.80	7153.91	85847.00
STEP C	43.3361	3466.88	7511.59	90139.08
STEP D	45.5029	3640.23	7887.16	94646.03
STEP E	47.7780	3822.24	8281.52	99378.24
STEP F	50.1669	4013.35	8695.59	104347.15
STEP G	52.6752	4214.01	9130.36	109564.41

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - A**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
1312	ELECTRIC BUSINESS ANALYST II					
		STEP A	43.2416	3459.32	7495.21	89942.52
		STEP B	45.4038	3632.30	7869.99	94439.90
		STEP C	47.6740	3813.92	8263.49	99161.92
		STEP D	50.0576	4004.60	8676.65	104119.80
		STEP E	52.5605	4204.84	9110.48	109325.84
		STEP F	55.1886	4415.08	9566.02	114792.28
		STEP G	57.9480	4635.84	10044.32	120531.84
2335	ELECTRIC COMPLIANCE ANALYST					
		STEP A	45.0209	3601.67	7803.62	93643.47
		STEP B	47.2719	3781.75	8193.79	98325.55
		STEP C	49.6356	3970.84	8603.50	103242.04
		STEP D	52.1174	4169.39	9033.68	108404.19
		STEP E	54.7232	4377.85	9485.35	113824.25
		STEP F	57.4593	4596.74	9959.61	119515.34
		STEP G	60.3323	4826.58	10457.59	125491.18
6285	ELECTRIC CUSTOMER PROGRAMS SUPV					
		STEP A	54.7676	4381.40	9493.05	113916.60
		STEP B	57.5059	4600.47	9967.68	119612.27
		STEP C	60.3812	4830.49	10466.07	125592.89
		STEP D	63.4002	5072.01	10989.36	131872.41
		STEP E	66.5703	5325.62	11538.85	138466.22
		STEP F	69.8987	5591.89	12115.77	145389.29
		STEP G	73.3937	5871.49	12721.57	152658.89
2284	ELECTRIC ENGINEERING TECH SUPV					
		STEP A	47.8512	3828.09	8294.20	99530.49
		STEP B	50.2436	4019.48	8708.89	104506.68
		STEP C	52.7559	4220.47	9144.35	109732.27
		STEP D	55.3937	4431.49	9601.57	115218.89
		STEP E	58.1633	4653.06	10081.63	120979.66
		STEP F	61.0715	4885.72	10585.72	127028.72
		STEP G	64.1251	5130.00	11115.01	133380.20
2280	ELECTRIC LINE CONST SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	61.4415	4915.32	10649.86	127798.32
		STEP B	64.5137	5161.09	11182.37	134188.49
		STEP C	67.7392	5419.13	11741.46	140897.53
		STEP D	71.1263	5690.10	12328.55	147942.70
		STEP E	74.6826	5974.60	12944.98	155339.80
		STEP F	78.4168	6273.34	13592.24	163106.94
		STEP G	82.3374	6586.99	14271.81	171261.79

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
2338 ELECTRIC OPERATIONS MANAGER						
		STEP A	67.5845	5406.76	11714.64	140575.76
		STEP B	70.9637	5677.09	12300.37	147604.49
		STEP C	74.5119	5960.95	12915.39	154984.75
		STEP D	78.2374	6258.99	13561.14	162733.79
		STEP E	82.1493	6571.94	14239.21	170870.54
		STEP F	86.2569	6900.55	14951.19	179414.35
		STEP G	90.5697	7245.57	15698.74	188384.97
2346 ELECTRIC RATES & FINANCL ADMIN						
		STEP A	58.3337	4666.69	10111.17	121334.09
		STEP B	61.2503	4900.02	10616.71	127400.62
		STEP C	64.3128	5145.02	11147.55	133770.62
		STEP D	67.5284	5402.27	11704.92	140459.07
		STEP E	70.9049	5672.39	12290.18	147482.19
		STEP F	74.4500	5956.00	12904.66	154856.00
		STEP G	78.1726	6253.80	13549.91	162599.00
2348 ELECTRIC REGU COMPLNCE ADMNSTR						
		STEP A	67.5845	5406.76	11714.64	140575.76
		STEP B	70.9637	5677.09	12300.37	147604.49
		STEP C	74.5119	5960.95	12915.39	154984.75
		STEP D	78.2374	6258.99	13561.14	162733.79
		STEP E	82.1493	6571.94	14239.21	170870.54
		STEP F	86.2569	6900.55	14951.19	179414.35
		STEP G	90.5697	7245.57	15698.74	188384.97
2314 ELECTRIC RESOURCES ANALYST I						
		STEP A	47.9688	3837.50	8314.59	99775.10
		STEP B	50.3673	4029.38	8730.33	104763.98
		STEP C	52.8855	4230.84	9166.82	110001.84
		STEP D	55.5300	4442.40	9625.20	115502.40
		STEP E	58.3064	4664.51	10106.44	121277.31
		STEP F	61.2217	4897.73	10611.76	127341.13
		STEP G	64.2828	5142.62	11142.35	133708.22
2316 ELECTRIC RESOURCES ANALYST II						
		STEP A	52.7703	4221.62	9146.85	109762.22
		STEP B	55.4088	4432.70	9604.19	115250.30
		STEP C	58.1792	4654.33	10084.39	121012.73
		STEP D	61.0883	4887.06	10588.63	127063.66
		STEP E	64.1427	5131.41	11118.06	133416.81
		STEP F	67.3498	5387.98	11673.96	140087.58
		STEP G	70.7172	5657.37	12257.64	147091.77

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
2354 ELECTRIC RISK MGMT ADMNSTR						
		STEP A	64.1688	5133.50	11122.59	133471.10
		STEP B	67.3774	5390.19	11678.74	140144.99
		STEP C	70.7462	5659.69	12262.67	147152.09
		STEP D	74.2836	5942.68	12875.82	154509.88
		STEP E	77.9977	6239.81	13519.60	162235.21
		STEP F	81.8976	6551.80	14195.58	170347.00
		STEP G	85.9924	6879.39	14905.34	178864.19
2352 ELECTRIC SAFETY COORDINATOR						
		STEP A	36.5871	2926.96	6341.76	76101.16
		STEP B	38.4164	3073.31	6658.84	79906.11
		STEP C	40.3371	3226.96	6991.76	83901.16
		STEP D	42.3539	3388.31	7341.34	88096.11
		STEP E	44.4716	3557.72	7708.41	92500.92
		STEP F	46.6952	3735.61	8093.83	97126.01
		STEP G	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60
2319 ELECTRIC SUBSTATION SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	61.4415	4915.32	10649.86	127798.32
		STEP B	64.5137	5161.09	11182.37	134188.49
		STEP C	67.7392	5419.13	11741.46	140897.53
		STEP D	71.1263	5690.10	12328.55	147942.70
		STEP E	74.6826	5974.60	12944.98	155339.80
		STEP F	78.4168	6273.34	13592.24	163106.94
		STEP G	82.3374	6586.99	14271.81	171261.79
2358 ELECTRIC TECHNOLOGY SYST SUPV						
		STEP A	50.0104	4000.83	8668.46	104021.63
		STEP B	52.5110	4200.88	9101.90	109222.88
		STEP C	55.1365	4410.92	9556.99	114683.92
		STEP D	57.8934	4631.47	10034.85	120418.27
		STEP E	60.7880	4863.04	10536.58	126439.04
		STEP F	63.8273	5106.18	11063.39	132760.78
		STEP G	67.0187	5361.49	11616.57	139398.89
2320 ELECTRIC UTILITY DIRECTOR						
		STEP A	99.9138	7993.10	17318.39	207820.63
		STEP B	104.9095	8392.76	18184.31	218211.66
		STEP C	110.1549	8812.39	19093.52	229122.24
		STEP D	115.6627	9253.01	20048.20	240578.36
		STEP E	121.4458	9715.66	21050.61	252607.27
		STEP F	127.5181	10201.45	22103.14	265237.64
		STEP G	133.8940	10711.52	23208.29	278499.52

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code Title Step Hourly Bi-weekly Monthly Annual

2378 ELECTRONIC MAINT COORDINATOR

STEP A	39.2746	3141.96	6807.59	81691.16
STEP B	41.2384	3299.07	7147.98	85775.87
STEP C	43.3003	3464.02	7505.38	90064.62
STEP D	45.4653	3637.22	7880.65	94567.82
STEP E	47.7384	3819.07	8274.65	99295.87
STEP F	50.1254	4010.03	8688.40	104260.83
STEP G	52.6317	4210.53	9122.82	109473.93

2415 EMS QUAL ASSURANCE COORDINATOR

STEP A	45.1917	3615.33	7833.22	93998.73
STEP B	47.4512	3796.09	8224.87	98698.49
STEP C	49.8239	3985.91	8636.14	103633.71
STEP D	52.3152	4185.21	9067.96	108815.61
STEP E	54.9309	4394.47	9521.35	114256.27
STEP F	57.6775	4614.20	9997.43	119969.20
STEP G	60.5613	4844.90	10497.29	125967.50

2500 ENERGY SERVICES ACCOUNT REP I

STEP A	39.3599	3148.79	6822.38	81868.59
STEP B	41.3279	3306.23	7163.50	85962.03
STEP C	43.3942	3471.53	7521.66	90259.93
STEP D	45.5640	3645.12	7897.76	94773.12
STEP E	47.8421	3827.36	8292.63	99511.56
STEP F	50.2342	4018.73	8707.26	104487.13
STEP G	52.7459	4219.67	9142.62	109711.47

2501 ENERGY SERVICES ACCOUNT REP II

STEP A	43.2959	3463.67	7504.62	90055.47
STEP B	45.4605	3636.84	7879.82	94557.84
STEP C	47.7337	3818.69	8273.84	99286.09
STEP D	50.1204	4009.63	8687.53	104250.43
STEP E	52.6264	4210.11	9121.90	109462.91
STEP F	55.2577	4420.61	9578.00	114936.01
STEP G	58.0206	4641.64	10056.90	120682.84

1277 ENGINEERING MANAGER

STEP A	56.5013	4520.10	9793.55	117522.70
STEP B	59.3265	4746.12	10283.26	123399.12
STEP C	62.2925	4983.40	10797.36	129568.40
STEP D	65.4073	5232.58	11337.26	136047.18
STEP E	68.6775	5494.20	11904.10	142849.20
STEP F	72.1113	5768.90	12499.29	149991.50
STEP G	75.7169	6057.35	13124.26	157491.15

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
2540 ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR						
		STEP A	42.0752	3366.01	7293.03	87516.41
		STEP B	44.1791	3534.32	7657.71	91892.52
		STEP C	46.3881	3711.04	8040.60	96487.24
		STEP D	48.7074	3896.59	8442.61	101311.39
		STEP E	51.1428	4091.42	8864.75	106377.02
		STEP F	53.6998	4295.98	9307.96	111695.58
		STEP G	56.3849	4510.79	9773.38	117280.59
2541 ENVIRONMENTAL UTIL COMPL ADMIN						
		STEP A	42.0733	3365.86	7292.70	87512.46
		STEP B	44.1769	3534.15	7657.32	91887.95
		STEP C	46.3857	3710.85	8040.18	96482.25
		STEP D	48.7050	3896.40	8442.20	101306.40
		STEP E	51.1401	4091.20	8864.28	106371.40
		STEP F	53.6972	4295.77	9307.51	111690.17
		STEP G	56.3820	4510.56	9772.88	117274.56
1684 ENVIRONMENTAL UTIL DIRECTOR						
		STEP A	74.5054	5960.43	12914.26	154971.23
		STEP B	78.2306	6258.44	13559.97	162719.64
		STEP C	82.1421	6571.36	14237.96	170855.56
		STEP D	86.2493	6899.94	14949.87	179398.54
		STEP E	90.5617	7244.93	15697.36	188368.33
		STEP F	95.0898	7607.18	16482.23	197786.78
		STEP G	99.8443	7987.54	17306.34	207676.14
2565 EQUIPMENT MAINT SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	31.4681	2517.44	5454.47	65453.64
		STEP B	33.0415	2643.32	5727.19	68726.32
		STEP C	34.6936	2775.48	6013.55	72162.68
		STEP D	36.4283	2914.26	6314.23	75770.86
		STEP E	38.2497	3059.97	6629.94	79559.37
		STEP F	40.1622	3212.97	6961.44	83537.37
		STEP G	42.1703	3373.62	7309.51	87714.22
6520 ERP MANAGER						
		STEP A	48.3018	3864.14	8372.31	100467.74
		STEP B	50.7170	4057.36	8790.94	105491.36
		STEP C	53.2529	4260.23	9230.50	110766.03
		STEP D	55.9154	4473.23	9692.00	116304.03
		STEP E	58.7112	4696.89	10176.60	122119.29
		STEP F	61.6468	4931.74	10685.44	128225.34
		STEP G	64.7291	5178.32	11219.71	134636.52

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
2548 EU BUSINESS SVCS ADMINISTRATOR						
		STEP A	42.9160	3433.28	7438.77	89265.28
		STEP B	45.0618	3604.94	7810.71	93728.54
		STEP C	47.3149	3785.19	8201.24	98414.99
		STEP D	49.6806	3974.44	8611.30	103335.64
		STEP E	52.1646	4173.16	9041.86	108502.36
		STEP F	54.7729	4381.83	9493.96	113927.63
		STEP G	57.5115	4600.92	9968.66	119623.92
2546 EU RATE ANALYST I						
		STEP A	34.4334	2754.67	5968.45	71621.47
		STEP B	36.1550	2892.40	6266.86	75202.40
		STEP C	37.9628	3037.02	6580.21	78962.62
		STEP D	39.8609	3188.87	6909.22	82910.67
		STEP E	41.8540	3348.32	7254.69	87056.32
		STEP F	43.9467	3515.73	7617.42	91409.13
		STEP G	46.1440	3691.52	7998.29	95979.52
2547 EU RATE ANALYST II						
		STEP A	37.3182	2985.45	6468.48	77621.85
		STEP B	39.1841	3134.72	6791.91	81502.92
		STEP C	41.1434	3291.47	7131.52	85578.27
		STEP D	43.2005	3456.04	7488.08	89857.04
		STEP E	45.3605	3628.84	7862.48	94349.84
		STEP F	47.6286	3810.28	8255.62	99067.48
		STEP G	50.0100	4000.80	8668.40	104020.80
3395 FACILITIES MANAGER						
		STEP A	40.8297	3266.38	7077.15	84925.77
		STEP B	42.8712	3429.69	7431.00	89172.06
		STEP C	45.0147	3601.18	7802.56	93630.66
		STEP D	47.2655	3781.24	8192.68	98312.20
		STEP E	49.6288	3970.30	8602.32	103227.81
		STEP F	52.1102	4168.82	9032.43	108389.20
		STEP G	54.7157	4377.26	9484.05	113808.66
3301 FINANCE DIRECTOR						
		STEP A	67.0881	5367.04	11628.60	139543.24
		STEP B	70.4426	5635.40	12210.05	146520.60
		STEP C	73.9648	5917.18	12820.56	153846.78
		STEP D	77.6629	6213.03	13461.56	161538.83
		STEP E	81.5462	6523.69	14134.67	169616.09
		STEP F	85.6235	6849.88	14841.40	178096.88
		STEP G	89.9047	7192.37	15583.48	187001.77

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
2900 FINANCE MANAGER						
		STEP A	44.7525	3580.20	7757.10	93085.15
		STEP B	46.9901	3759.21	8144.95	97739.41
		STEP C	49.3396	3947.17	8552.20	102626.38
		STEP D	51.8066	4144.53	8979.81	107757.70
		STEP E	54.3969	4351.75	9428.80	113145.59
		STEP F	57.1168	4569.34	9900.24	118802.86
		STEP G	59.9726	4797.81	10395.25	124743.01
3310 FINANCE SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	36.3377	2907.01	6298.53	75582.41
		STEP B	38.1543	3052.34	6613.41	79360.94
		STEP C	40.0622	3204.97	6944.11	83329.37
		STEP D	42.0654	3365.23	7291.33	87496.03
		STEP E	44.1686	3533.48	7655.89	91870.68
		STEP F	46.3770	3710.16	8038.68	96464.16
		STEP G	48.6957	3895.65	8440.58	101287.05
3391 FIRE BATTALLION CHIEF (8HR)						
		STEP A	51.1945	4095.56	8873.71	106484.56
		STEP B	53.1586	4252.68	9214.15	110569.88
		STEP C	55.8162	4465.29	9674.80	116097.69
		STEP D	58.6075	4688.60	10158.63	121903.60
		STEP E	61.5376	4923.00	10666.51	127998.20
		STEP F	64.6146	5169.16	11199.86	134398.36
		STEP G	67.8453	5427.62	11759.85	141118.22
905 FIRE BATTALION CHIEF (24HR)						
		STEP A	36.1622	4050.16	8775.36	105304.32
		STEP B	37.9704	4252.68	9214.15	110569.80
		STEP C	39.8687	4465.29	9674.80	116097.65
		STEP D	41.8625	4688.60	10158.63	121903.60
		STEP E	43.9555	4923.01	10666.53	127998.41
		STEP F	46.1533	5169.16	11199.86	134398.40
		STEP G	48.4609	5427.62	11759.84	141118.14
3330 FIRE CHIEF						
		STEP A	72.7667	5821.33	12612.89	151354.73
		STEP B	76.4051	6112.40	13243.55	158922.60
		STEP C	80.2252	6418.01	13905.70	166868.41
		STEP D	84.2366	6738.92	14601.01	175212.12
		STEP E	88.4484	7075.87	15331.05	183972.67
		STEP F	92.8706	7429.64	16097.57	193170.84
		STEP G	97.5142	7801.13	16902.46	202829.53

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - A**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
3332 FIRE DIVISION CHIEF						
		STEP A	55.6902	4455.21	9652.96	115835.61
		STEP B	58.4747	4677.97	10135.61	121627.37
		STEP C	61.3984	4911.87	10642.38	127708.67
		STEP D	64.4683	5157.46	11174.50	134094.06
		STEP E	67.6918	5415.34	11733.24	140798.94
		STEP F	71.0764	5686.11	12319.90	147838.91
		STEP G	74.6301	5970.40	12935.88	155230.60
3392 FLEET MANAGER						
		STEP A	40.8297	3266.38	7077.15	84925.77
		STEP B	42.8712	3429.69	7431.00	89172.06
		STEP C	45.0147	3601.18	7802.56	93630.66
		STEP D	47.2655	3781.24	8192.68	98312.20
		STEP E	49.6288	3970.30	8602.32	103227.81
		STEP F	52.1102	4168.82	9032.43	108389.20
		STEP G	54.7157	4377.26	9484.05	113808.66
3451 GOVERNMENT RELATIONS ADMINISTR						
		STEP A	43.9043	3512.34	7610.07	91320.94
		STEP B	46.0995	3687.96	7990.58	95886.96
		STEP C	48.4044	3872.35	8390.09	100681.15
		STEP D	50.8248	4065.98	8809.63	105715.58
		STEP E	53.3660	4269.28	9250.10	111001.28
		STEP F	56.0343	4482.74	9712.61	116551.34
		STEP G	58.8358	4706.86	10198.20	122378.46
3589 HOUSING MANAGER						
		STEP A	43.4430	3475.44	7530.12	90361.44
		STEP B	45.6170	3649.36	7906.94	94883.36
		STEP C	47.8979	3831.83	8302.30	99627.63
		STEP D	50.2928	4023.42	8717.41	104609.02
		STEP E	52.8074	4224.59	9153.28	109839.39
		STEP F	55.4478	4435.82	9610.95	115331.42
		STEP G	58.2202	4657.61	10091.50	121098.01
3590 HOUSING SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	36.5872	2926.97	6341.78	76101.37
		STEP B	38.4165	3073.32	6658.86	79906.32
		STEP C	40.3372	3226.97	6991.78	83901.37
		STEP D	42.3541	3388.32	7341.37	88096.52
		STEP E	44.4717	3557.73	7708.42	92501.13
		STEP F	46.6954	3735.63	8093.86	97126.43
		STEP G	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
3594 HUMAN RESOURCES ANALYST I						
		STEP A	32.3413	2587.31	5605.83	67270.00
		STEP B	33.9584	2716.67	5886.13	70633.50
		STEP C	35.6563	2852.51	6180.43	74165.18
		STEP D	37.4392	2995.13	6489.45	77873.44
		STEP E	39.3111	3144.89	6813.93	81767.11
		STEP F	41.2767	3302.13	7154.62	85855.47
		STEP G	43.3405	3467.24	7512.35	90148.24
3596 HUMAN RESOURCES ANALYST II						
		STEP A	35.5826	2846.61	6167.65	74011.83
		STEP B	37.3617	2988.94	6476.03	77712.42
		STEP C	39.2298	3138.39	6799.84	81598.04
		STEP D	41.1913	3295.31	7139.83	85677.94
		STEP E	43.2509	3460.07	7496.82	89961.84
		STEP F	45.4134	3633.07	7871.66	94459.93
		STEP G	47.6841	3814.73	8265.24	99182.93
3598 HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR						
		STEP A	61.0708	4885.66	10585.60	127027.26
		STEP B	64.1243	5129.94	11114.87	133378.54
		STEP C	67.3305	5386.44	11670.62	140047.44
		STEP D	70.6971	5655.76	12254.16	147049.96
		STEP E	74.2321	5938.56	12866.89	154402.76
		STEP F	77.9437	6235.49	13510.24	162122.89
		STEP G	81.8408	6547.26	14185.73	170228.86
3599 HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGER						
		STEP A	41.6683	3333.46	7222.50	86670.06
		STEP B	43.7518	3500.14	7583.64	91003.74
		STEP C	45.9395	3675.16	7962.84	95554.16
		STEP D	48.2364	3858.91	8360.97	100331.71
		STEP E	50.6482	4051.85	8779.02	105348.25
		STEP F	53.1808	4254.46	9218.00	110616.06
		STEP G	55.8398	4467.18	9678.89	116146.78
3625 INFO SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR						
		STEP A	42.8581	3428.64	7428.73	89144.84
		STEP B	45.0010	3600.08	7800.17	93602.08
		STEP C	47.2510	3780.08	8190.17	98282.08
		STEP D	49.6135	3969.08	8599.67	103196.08
		STEP E	52.0942	4167.53	9029.66	108355.93
		STEP F	54.6989	4375.91	9481.14	113773.71
		STEP G	57.4339	4594.71	9955.20	119462.51

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
3740 INTERPRETIVE SRVCS SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	34.8445	2787.56	6039.71	72476.56
		STEP B	36.5866	2926.92	6341.67	76100.12
		STEP C	38.4161	3073.28	6658.79	79905.48
		STEP D	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
		STEP E	42.3537	3388.29	7341.30	88095.69
		STEP F	44.4713	3557.70	7708.35	92500.30
		STEP G	46.6949	3735.59	8093.78	97125.39
3601 IT DIVISION MANAGER						
		STEP A	48.3018	3864.14	8372.31	100467.74
		STEP B	50.7170	4057.36	8790.94	105491.36
		STEP C	53.2529	4260.23	9230.50	110766.03
		STEP D	55.9154	4473.23	9692.00	116304.03
		STEP E	58.7112	4696.89	10176.60	122119.29
		STEP F	61.6468	4931.74	10685.44	128225.34
		STEP G	64.7291	5178.32	11219.71	134636.52
3602 IT PROGRAM MANAGER						
		STEP A	43.9092	3512.73	7610.92	91331.13
		STEP B	46.1046	3688.36	7991.46	95897.56
		STEP C	48.4098	3872.78	8391.03	100692.38
		STEP D	50.8304	4066.43	8810.60	105727.23
		STEP E	53.3719	4269.75	9251.12	111013.55
		STEP F	56.0403	4483.22	9713.65	116563.82
		STEP G	58.8424	4707.39	10199.34	122392.19
3810 KEY ACCOUNTS REPRESENTATIVE						
		STEP A	47.6233	3809.86	8254.70	99056.46
		STEP B	50.0044	4000.35	8667.42	104009.15
		STEP C	52.5047	4200.37	9100.81	109209.77
		STEP D	55.1299	4410.39	9555.84	114670.19
		STEP E	57.8863	4630.90	10033.62	120403.50
		STEP F	60.7806	4862.44	10535.30	126423.64
		STEP G	63.8196	5105.56	11062.06	132744.76
4246 LIBRARY SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	32.1157	2569.25	5566.72	66800.65
		STEP B	33.7218	2697.74	5845.11	70141.34
		STEP C	35.4077	2832.61	6137.33	73648.01
		STEP D	37.1782	2974.25	6444.22	77330.65
		STEP E	39.0370	3122.96	6766.41	81196.96
		STEP F	40.9889	3279.11	7104.74	85256.91
		STEP G	43.0383	3443.06	7459.97	89519.66

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
4449 MANAGEMENT ANALYST						
		STEP A	38.4165	3073.32	6658.86	79906.32
		STEP B	40.3372	3226.97	6991.78	83901.37
		STEP C	42.3541	3388.32	7341.37	88096.52
		STEP D	44.4717	3557.73	7708.42	92501.13
		STEP E	46.6954	3735.63	8093.86	97126.43
		STEP F	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60
		STEP G	51.4815	4118.52	8923.46	107081.52
4509 MAPPING SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	36.5871	2926.96	6341.76	76101.16
		STEP B	38.4164	3073.31	6658.84	79906.11
		STEP C	40.3371	3226.96	6991.76	83901.16
		STEP D	42.3539	3388.31	7341.34	88096.11
		STEP E	44.4716	3557.72	7708.41	92500.92
		STEP F	46.6952	3735.61	8093.83	97126.01
		STEP G	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60
4960 OPEN SPACE SUPERINTENDENT						
		STEP A	40.3361	3226.88	6991.59	83899.08
		STEP B	42.3530	3388.24	7341.18	88094.24
		STEP C	44.4707	3557.65	7708.25	92499.05
		STEP D	46.6942	3735.53	8093.66	97123.93
		STEP E	49.0292	3922.33	8498.39	101980.73
		STEP F	51.4803	4118.42	8923.25	107079.02
		STEP G	54.0543	4324.34	9369.41	112432.94
5020 PARK DEVELOPMENT ANALYST I						
		STEP A	33.2609	2660.87	5765.22	69182.67
		STEP B	34.9239	2793.91	6053.47	72641.71
		STEP C	36.6700	2933.60	6356.13	76273.60
		STEP D	38.5037	3080.29	6673.97	80087.69
		STEP E	40.4288	3234.30	7007.65	84091.90
		STEP F	42.4503	3396.02	7358.05	88296.62
		STEP G	44.5728	3565.82	7725.95	92711.42
5022 PARK DEVELOPMENT ANALYST II						
		STEP A	36.5872	2926.97	6341.78	76101.37
		STEP B	38.4165	3073.32	6658.86	79906.32
		STEP C	40.3372	3226.97	6991.78	83901.37
		STEP D	42.3541	3388.32	7341.37	88096.52
		STEP E	44.4717	3557.73	7708.42	92501.13
		STEP F	46.6954	3735.63	8093.86	97126.43
		STEP G	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
5024 PARK PLANNING & DEVELOPMT SUPT						
		STEP A	40.3363	3226.90	6991.62	83899.50
		STEP B	42.3531	3388.24	7341.20	88094.44
		STEP C	44.4708	3557.66	7708.27	92499.26
		STEP D	46.6942	3735.53	8093.66	97123.93
		STEP E	49.0293	3922.34	8498.41	101980.94
		STEP F	51.4805	4118.44	8923.28	107079.44
		STEP G	54.0543	4324.34	9369.41	112432.94
5090 PARKS SUPERINTENDENT						
		STEP A	40.3363	3226.90	6991.62	83899.50
		STEP B	42.3531	3388.24	7341.20	88094.44
		STEP C	44.4708	3557.66	7708.27	92499.26
		STEP D	46.6942	3735.53	8093.66	97123.93
		STEP E	49.0293	3922.34	8498.41	101980.94
		STEP F	51.4805	4118.44	8923.28	107079.44
		STEP G	54.0543	4324.34	9369.41	112432.94
5069 PARKS SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	34.8445	2787.56	6039.71	72476.56
		STEP B	36.5867	2926.93	6341.69	76100.33
		STEP C	38.4162	3073.29	6658.80	79905.69
		STEP D	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
		STEP E	42.3537	3388.29	7341.30	88095.69
		STEP F	44.4713	3557.70	7708.35	92500.30
		STEP G	46.6949	3735.59	8093.78	97125.39
5082 PARKS, REC & LIBRARIES DIRECTOR						
		STEP A	66.0802	5286.41	11453.90	137446.81
		STEP B	69.3842	5550.73	12026.59	144319.13
		STEP C	72.8533	5828.26	12627.90	151534.86
		STEP D	76.4960	6119.68	13259.30	159111.68
		STEP E	80.3208	6425.66	13922.27	167067.26
		STEP F	84.3370	6746.96	14618.41	175420.96
		STEP G	88.5538	7084.30	15349.32	184191.90
5010 PARKS, REC & LIBRARY BUS ADMSTR						
		STEP A	40.2452	3219.61	6975.83	83710.01
		STEP B	42.2576	3380.60	7324.65	87895.80
		STEP C	44.3703	3549.62	7690.85	92290.22
		STEP D	46.5888	3727.10	8075.39	96904.70
		STEP E	48.9184	3913.47	8479.18	101750.27
		STEP F	51.3641	4109.12	8903.11	106837.32
		STEP G	53.9324	4314.59	9348.28	112179.39

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
5309 PLANNING MANAGER						
		STEP A	55.5189	4441.51	9623.27	115479.31
		STEP B	58.2948	4663.58	10104.43	121253.18
		STEP C	61.2096	4896.76	10609.66	127315.96
		STEP D	64.2701	5141.60	11140.15	133681.80
		STEP E	67.4837	5398.69	11697.17	140366.09
		STEP F	70.8579	5668.63	12282.03	147384.43
		STEP G	74.4007	5952.05	12896.12	154753.45
5400 POLICE CAPTAIN						
		STEP A	58.5500	4684.00	10148.67	121784.00
		STEP B	61.4775	4918.20	10656.10	127873.20
		STEP C	64.5514	5164.11	11188.91	134266.86
		STEP D	67.7789	5422.32	11748.35	140980.20
		STEP E	71.1679	5693.43	12335.77	148029.21
		STEP F	74.7263	5978.10	12952.56	155430.67
		STEP G	78.4626	6277.01	13600.18	163202.21
5410 POLICE CHIEF						
		STEP A	83.8045	6704.36	14526.11	174313.29
		STEP B	87.9947	7039.58	15252.41	183028.95
		STEP C	92.3944	7391.55	16015.03	192180.40
		STEP D	97.0141	7761.13	16815.79	201789.42
		STEP E	101.8649	8149.19	17656.57	211878.89
		STEP F	106.9581	8556.65	18539.40	222472.84
		STEP G	112.3060	8984.48	19466.37	233596.48
5420 POLICE LIEUTENANT						
		STEP A	53.1477	4251.82	9212.27	110547.21
		STEP B	55.8051	4464.41	9672.88	116074.58
		STEP C	58.5953	4687.63	10156.53	121878.30
		STEP D	61.5251	4922.01	10664.35	127972.22
		STEP E	64.6014	5168.11	11197.57	134370.83
		STEP F	67.8314	5426.51	11757.45	141089.37
		STEP G	71.2230	5697.84	12345.32	148143.84
5489 POLICE SERVICES ADMINISTRATOR						
		STEP A	41.4691	3317.52	7187.97	86255.72
		STEP B	43.5427	3483.41	7547.40	90568.81
		STEP C	45.7198	3657.58	7924.76	95097.18
		STEP D	48.0058	3840.46	8321.00	99852.06
		STEP E	50.4061	4032.48	8737.05	104844.68
		STEP F	52.9264	4234.11	9173.90	110086.91
		STEP G	55.5728	4445.82	9632.61	115591.42

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
5485 POLICE SOCIAL SVCS ADMINSTR						
		STEP A	43.9043	3512.34	7610.07	91320.94
		STEP B	46.0995	3687.96	7990.58	95886.96
		STEP C	48.4044	3872.35	8390.09	100681.15
		STEP D	50.8248	4065.98	8809.63	105715.58
		STEP E	53.3660	4269.28	9250.10	111001.28
		STEP F	56.0343	4482.74	9712.61	116551.34
		STEP G	58.8358	4706.86	10198.20	122378.46
5505 POWER ENGINEERING MANAGER						
		STEP A	67.5845	5406.76	11714.64	140575.76
		STEP B	70.9637	5677.09	12300.37	147604.49
		STEP C	74.5119	5960.95	12915.39	154984.75
		STEP D	78.2374	6258.99	13561.14	162733.79
		STEP E	82.1493	6571.94	14239.21	170870.54
		STEP F	86.2569	6900.55	14951.19	179414.35
		STEP G	90.5697	7245.57	15698.74	188384.97
5600 POWER GENERATION SUPERTINDENT						
		STEP A	62.0272	4962.17	10751.38	129016.57
		STEP B	65.1286	5210.28	11288.95	135467.48
		STEP C	68.3849	5470.79	11853.38	142240.59
		STEP D	71.8041	5744.32	12446.04	149352.52
		STEP E	75.3944	6031.55	13068.36	156820.35
		STEP F	79.1642	6333.13	13721.79	164661.53
		STEP G	83.1225	6649.80	14407.90	172894.80
5530 POWER PLANT OPS & MAINT SUPV						
		STEP A	59.0692	4725.53	10238.66	122863.93
		STEP B	62.0227	4961.81	10750.60	129007.21
		STEP C	65.1239	5209.91	11288.14	135457.71
		STEP D	68.3800	5470.40	11852.53	142230.40
		STEP E	71.7990	5743.92	12445.16	149341.92
		STEP F	75.3889	6031.11	13067.40	156808.91
		STEP G	79.1584	6332.67	13720.78	164649.47
5535 POWER SUPPLY & PORTFOLIO ADMST						
		STEP A	64.1688	5133.50	11122.59	133471.10
		STEP B	67.3774	5390.19	11678.74	140144.99
		STEP C	70.7462	5659.69	12262.67	147152.09
		STEP D	74.2836	5942.68	12875.82	154509.88
		STEP E	77.9977	6239.81	13519.60	162235.21
		STEP F	81.8976	6551.80	14195.58	170347.00
		STEP G	85.9924	6879.39	14905.34	178864.19

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
5519 PREVENTATIVE MAINT SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	42.7162	3417.29	7404.14	88849.69
		STEP B	44.8518	3588.14	7774.31	93291.74
		STEP C	47.0943	3767.54	8163.01	97956.14
		STEP D	49.4492	3955.93	8571.19	102854.33
		STEP E	51.9218	4153.74	8999.77	107997.34
		STEP F	54.5179	4361.43	9449.76	113397.23
		STEP G	57.2435	4579.48	9922.20	119066.48
5514 PRINCIPAL ENGINEER						
		STEP A	50.2219	4017.75	8705.12	104461.55
		STEP B	52.7328	4218.62	9140.35	109684.22
		STEP C	55.3696	4429.56	9597.39	115168.76
		STEP D	58.1381	4651.04	10077.27	120927.24
		STEP E	61.0451	4883.60	10581.15	126973.80
		STEP F	64.0975	5127.80	11110.23	133322.80
		STEP G	67.3020	5384.16	11665.68	139988.16
5513 PRINCIPAL PLANNER						
		STEP A	46.3792	3710.33	8039.06	96468.73
		STEP B	48.6982	3895.85	8441.02	101292.25
		STEP C	51.1330	4090.64	8863.05	106356.64
		STEP D	53.6897	4295.17	9306.21	111674.57
		STEP E	56.3742	4509.93	9771.52	117258.33
		STEP F	59.1928	4735.42	10260.08	123121.02
		STEP G	62.1526	4972.20	10773.11	129277.40
5615 PUB AFFAIRS&COMMUNICAT ADMNSTR						
		STEP A	43.9043	3512.34	7610.07	91320.94
		STEP B	46.0995	3687.96	7990.58	95886.96
		STEP C	48.4044	3872.35	8390.09	100681.15
		STEP D	50.8248	4065.98	8809.63	105715.58
		STEP E	53.3660	4269.28	9250.10	111001.28
		STEP F	56.0343	4482.74	9712.61	116551.34
		STEP G	58.8358	4706.86	10198.20	122378.46
5610 PUBLIC AFFAIRS&COMMNCT DIRCTOR						
		STEP A	55.5188	4441.50	9623.25	115479.10
		STEP B	58.2948	4663.58	10104.43	121253.18
		STEP C	61.2096	4896.76	10609.66	127315.96
		STEP D	64.2701	5141.60	11140.15	133681.80
		STEP E	67.4836	5398.68	11697.15	140365.88
		STEP F	70.8579	5668.63	12282.03	147384.43
		STEP G	74.4006	5952.04	12896.10	154753.24

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - A**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
5565	PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER					
		STEP A	40.2377	3219.01	6974.53	83694.31
		STEP B	42.2495	3379.96	7323.25	87879.03
		STEP C	44.3620	3548.96	7689.42	92272.98
		STEP D	46.5801	3726.41	8073.89	96886.63
		STEP E	48.9091	3912.73	8477.58	101730.96
		STEP F	51.3546	4108.37	8901.46	106817.51
		STEP G	53.9223	4313.78	9346.53	112158.38

5635 PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR

STEP A	60.9892	4879.13	10571.46	126857.53
STEP B	64.0388	5123.10	11100.05	133200.70
STEP C	67.2407	5379.25	11655.05	139860.65
STEP D	70.6027	5648.21	12237.80	146853.61
STEP E	74.1329	5930.63	12849.70	154196.43
STEP F	77.8396	6227.16	13492.19	161906.36
STEP G	81.7316	6538.52	14166.81	170001.72

5652 PURCHASING & WAREHOUSE MANAGER

STEP A	41.1306	3290.45	7129.30	85551.59
STEP B	43.1871	3454.97	7485.76	89829.17
STEP C	45.3465	3627.72	7860.05	94320.63
STEP D	47.6138	3809.10	8253.05	99036.66
STEP E	49.9945	3999.56	8665.71	103988.49
STEP F	52.4942	4199.54	9098.99	109187.92
STEP G	55.1189	4409.51	9553.94	114647.31

6125 RECREATION MANAGER

STEP A	46.0837	3686.69	7987.84	95854.09
STEP B	48.3880	3871.04	8387.25	100647.04
STEP C	50.8072	4064.57	8806.58	105678.97
STEP D	53.3476	4267.80	9246.91	110963.00
STEP E	56.0151	4481.20	9709.28	116511.40
STEP F	58.8160	4705.28	10194.77	122337.28
STEP G	61.7566	4940.52	10704.47	128453.72

6145 RECREATION SUPERINTENDENT

STEP A	40.3363	3226.90	6991.62	83899.50
STEP B	42.3531	3388.24	7341.20	88094.44
STEP C	44.4708	3557.66	7708.27	92499.26
STEP D	46.6942	3735.53	8093.66	97123.93
STEP E	49.0293	3922.34	8498.41	101980.94
STEP F	51.4805	4118.44	8923.28	107079.44
STEP G	54.0543	4324.34	9369.41	112432.94

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
6147 RECREATION SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	34.8445	2787.56	6039.71	72476.56
		STEP B	36.5867	2926.93	6341.69	76100.33
		STEP C	38.4162	3073.29	6658.80	79905.69
		STEP D	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
		STEP E	42.3537	3388.29	7341.30	88095.69
		STEP F	44.4713	3557.70	7708.35	92500.30
		STEP G	46.6949	3735.59	8093.78	97125.39
6244 REFUSE & STORMWATER MANAGER						
		STEP A	56.5013	4520.10	9793.55	117522.70
		STEP B	59.3265	4746.12	10283.26	123399.12
		STEP C	62.2925	4983.40	10797.36	129568.40
		STEP D	65.4073	5232.58	11337.26	136047.18
		STEP E	68.6775	5494.20	11904.10	142849.20
		STEP F	72.1113	5768.90	12499.29	149991.50
		STEP G	75.7169	6057.35	13124.26	157491.15
6231 REFUSE SUPERINTENDENT						
		STEP A	40.0712	3205.69	6945.67	83348.09
		STEP B	42.0747	3365.97	7292.94	87515.37
		STEP C	44.1783	3534.26	7657.57	91890.86
		STEP D	46.3875	3711.00	8040.50	96486.00
		STEP E	48.7067	3896.53	8442.49	101309.93
		STEP F	51.1420	4091.36	8864.61	106375.36
		STEP G	53.6991	4295.92	9307.84	111694.12
6235 REFUSE SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	33.7592	2700.73	5851.59	70219.13
		STEP B	35.4472	2835.77	6144.18	73730.17
		STEP C	37.2197	2977.57	6451.41	77416.97
		STEP D	39.0799	3126.39	6773.84	81286.19
		STEP E	41.0339	3282.71	7112.54	85350.51
		STEP F	43.0854	3446.83	7468.13	89617.63
		STEP G	45.2399	3619.19	7841.58	94098.99
6242 REFUSE UTILITY MANAGER						
		STEP A	50.8512	4068.09	8814.20	105770.49
		STEP B	53.3936	4271.48	9254.89	111058.68
		STEP C	56.0634	4485.07	9717.65	116611.87
		STEP D	58.8664	4709.31	10203.50	122442.11
		STEP E	61.8098	4944.78	10713.69	128564.38
		STEP F	64.9004	5192.03	11249.40	134992.83
		STEP G	68.1453	5451.62	11811.85	141742.22

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
6450 RISK MANAGER						
		STEP A	50.2260	4018.08	8705.85	104470.16
		STEP B	52.7373	4218.99	9141.14	109693.66
		STEP C	55.3742	4429.94	9598.20	115178.35
		STEP D	58.1429	4651.43	10078.11	120937.26
		STEP E	61.0501	4884.00	10582.01	126984.13
		STEP F	64.1026	5128.21	11111.11	133333.33
		STEP G	67.3077	5384.62	11666.67	140000.00
6500 SAFETY COORDINATOR						
		STEP A	36.5871	2926.96	6341.76	76101.16
		STEP B	38.4164	3073.31	6658.84	79906.11
		STEP C	40.3371	3226.96	6991.76	83901.16
		STEP D	42.3539	3388.31	7341.34	88096.11
		STEP E	44.4716	3557.72	7708.41	92500.92
		STEP F	46.6952	3735.61	8093.83	97126.01
		STEP G	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60
7130 SR BUSINESS SYSTEMS ANALYST						
		STEP A	34.7663	2781.30	6026.15	72313.90
		STEP B	36.5046	2920.36	6327.46	75929.56
		STEP C	38.3298	3066.38	6643.83	79725.98
		STEP D	40.2463	3219.70	6976.02	83712.30
		STEP E	42.2586	3380.68	7324.82	87897.88
		STEP F	44.3716	3549.72	7691.07	92292.92
		STEP G	46.5900	3727.20	8075.60	96907.20
7145 SR DATABASE ANALYST						
		STEP A	38.1818	3054.54	6618.17	79418.14
		STEP B	40.0910	3207.28	6949.10	83389.28
		STEP C	42.0955	3367.64	7296.55	87558.64
		STEP D	44.2002	3536.01	7661.36	91936.41
		STEP E	46.4103	3712.82	8044.45	96533.42
		STEP F	48.7307	3898.45	8446.65	101359.85
		STEP G	51.1673	4093.38	8869.00	106427.98
7123 SR DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY						
		STEP A	61.7590	4940.72	10704.90	128458.77
		STEP B	64.8470	5187.76	11240.14	134881.71
		STEP C	68.0893	5447.15	11802.15	141625.80
		STEP D	71.4938	5719.50	12392.26	148707.09
		STEP E	75.0685	6005.48	13011.87	156142.44
		STEP F	78.8219	6305.75	13662.46	163949.56
		STEP G	82.7630	6621.04	14345.59	172147.04

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
7128 SR ELECTRIC BUSINESS ANALYST						
		STEP A	47.5668	3805.34	8244.91	98938.94
		STEP B	49.9452	3995.61	8657.16	103886.01
		STEP C	52.4425	4195.40	9090.03	109080.40
		STEP D	55.0646	4405.16	9544.53	114534.36
		STEP E	57.8179	4625.43	10021.76	120261.23
		STEP F	60.7088	4856.70	10522.85	126274.30
		STEP G	63.7442	5099.53	11048.99	132587.93
7163 SR ENERGY SERVICES ACCOUNT REP						
		STEP A	47.6233	3809.86	8254.70	99056.46
		STEP B	50.0044	4000.35	8667.42	104009.15
		STEP C	52.5047	4200.37	9100.81	109209.77
		STEP D	55.1299	4410.39	9555.84	114670.19
		STEP E	57.8863	4630.90	10033.62	120403.50
		STEP F	60.7806	4862.44	10535.30	126423.64
		STEP G	63.8196	5105.56	11062.06	132744.76
7142 SR ENGINEER						
		STEP A	42.7247	3417.97	7405.61	88867.37
		STEP B	44.8610	3588.88	7775.90	93310.88
		STEP C	47.1040	3768.32	8164.69	97976.32
		STEP D	49.4593	3956.74	8572.94	102875.34
		STEP E	51.9321	4154.56	9001.56	108018.76
		STEP F	54.5288	4362.30	9451.65	113419.90
		STEP G	57.2552	4580.41	9924.23	119090.81
7150 SR HUMAN RESOURCES ANALYST						
		STEP A	38.4165	3073.32	6658.86	79906.32
		STEP B	40.3372	3226.97	6991.78	83901.37
		STEP C	42.3541	3388.32	7341.37	88096.52
		STEP D	44.4717	3557.73	7708.42	92501.13
		STEP E	46.6954	3735.63	8093.86	97126.43
		STEP F	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60
		STEP G	51.4815	4118.52	8923.46	107081.52
7194 SR IT ANALYST						
		STEP A	34.8115	2784.92	6033.99	72407.92
		STEP B	36.5520	2924.16	6335.68	76028.16
		STEP C	38.3796	3070.36	6652.46	79829.56
		STEP D	40.2987	3223.89	6985.10	83821.29
		STEP E	42.3135	3385.08	7334.34	88012.08
		STEP F	44.4293	3554.34	7701.07	92412.94
		STEP G	46.6506	3732.04	8086.10	97033.24

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
7180 SR PLANNER						
		STEP A	40.3307	3226.45	6990.65	83887.85
		STEP B	42.3473	3387.78	7340.19	88082.38
		STEP C	44.4646	3557.16	7707.19	92486.36
		STEP D	46.6877	3735.01	8092.53	97110.41
		STEP E	49.0223	3921.78	8497.19	101966.38
		STEP F	51.4734	4117.87	8922.05	107064.67
		STEP G	54.0470	4323.76	9368.14	112417.76
7151 SR POWER ENGINEER						
		STEP A	59.8134	4785.07	10367.65	124411.87
		STEP B	62.8043	5024.34	10886.07	130632.94
		STEP C	65.9443	5275.54	11430.34	137164.14
		STEP D	69.2416	5539.32	12001.87	144022.52
		STEP E	72.7036	5816.28	12601.95	151223.48
		STEP F	76.3389	6107.11	13232.07	158784.91
		STEP G	80.1558	6412.46	13893.67	166724.06
5555 SR POWER PLANT ENGINEER						
		STEP A	59.8134	4785.07	10367.65	124411.87
		STEP B	62.8043	5024.34	10886.07	130632.94
		STEP C	65.9443	5275.54	11430.34	137164.14
		STEP D	69.2416	5539.32	12001.87	144022.52
		STEP E	72.7036	5816.28	12601.95	151223.48
		STEP F	76.3389	6107.11	13232.07	158784.91
		STEP G	80.1558	6412.46	13893.67	166724.06
7520 STREET MAINT SUPERINTENDENT						
		STEP A	42.7162	3417.29	7404.14	88849.69
		STEP B	44.8518	3588.14	7774.31	93291.74
		STEP C	47.0943	3767.54	8163.01	97956.14
		STEP D	49.4492	3955.93	8571.19	102854.33
		STEP E	51.9218	4153.74	8999.77	107997.34
		STEP F	54.5179	4361.43	9449.76	113397.23
		STEP G	57.2435	4579.48	9922.20	119066.48
7522 STREET MAINT SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	32.5766	2606.12	5646.60	67759.24
		STEP B	34.2054	2736.43	5928.93	71147.20
		STEP C	35.9157	2873.25	6225.38	74704.56
		STEP D	37.7114	3016.91	6536.65	78439.78
		STEP E	39.5970	3167.76	6863.48	82361.77
		STEP F	41.5769	3326.15	7206.66	86479.86
		STEP G	43.6557	3492.46	7566.99	90803.86

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
8762 URBAN FORESTER						
		STEP A	34.8445	2787.56	6039.71	72476.56
		STEP B	36.5866	2926.92	6341.67	76100.12
		STEP C	38.4161	3073.28	6658.79	79905.48
		STEP D	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
		STEP E	42.3537	3388.29	7341.30	88095.69
		STEP F	44.4713	3557.70	7708.35	92500.30
		STEP G	46.6949	3735.59	8093.78	97125.39
9047 WATER CONSERVATION ADMINSTR						
		STEP A	38.4381	3075.04	6662.60	79951.24
		STEP B	40.3601	3228.80	6995.75	83949.00
		STEP C	42.3780	3390.24	7345.52	88146.24
		STEP D	44.4970	3559.76	7712.81	92553.76
		STEP E	46.7218	3737.74	8098.44	97181.34
		STEP F	49.0582	3924.65	8503.42	102041.05
		STEP G	51.5109	4120.87	8928.55	107142.67
9084 WATER DISTRIBUTION SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	34.8445	2787.56	6039.71	72476.56
		STEP B	36.5867	2926.93	6341.69	76100.33
		STEP C	38.4162	3073.29	6658.80	79905.69
		STEP D	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
		STEP E	42.3537	3388.29	7341.30	88095.69
		STEP F	44.4713	3557.70	7708.35	92500.30
		STEP G	46.6949	3735.59	8093.78	97125.39
9085 WATER DISTRIBUTION SUPT						
		STEP A	42.0794	3366.35	7293.76	87525.15
		STEP B	44.8448	3587.58	7773.09	93277.18
		STEP C	47.0871	3766.96	8161.76	97941.16
		STEP D	49.4415	3955.32	8569.86	102838.32
		STEP E	51.9135	4153.08	8998.34	107980.08
		STEP F	54.5093	4360.74	9448.27	113379.34
		STEP G	57.2346	4578.76	9920.66	119047.96
9101 WATER QUALITY LAB SUPERVISOR						
		STEP A	36.5854	2926.83	6341.46	76097.63
		STEP B	38.4146	3073.16	6658.53	79902.36
		STEP C	40.3354	3226.83	6991.46	83897.63
		STEP D	42.3521	3388.16	7341.03	88092.36
		STEP E	44.4698	3557.58	7708.09	92497.18
		STEP F	46.6932	3735.45	8093.48	97121.85
		STEP G	49.0277	3922.21	8498.13	101977.61

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
9175 WATER TRMT PLT CHIEF OPERATOR						
		STEP A	41.8116	3344.92	7247.34	86968.12
		STEP B	43.9023	3512.18	7609.73	91316.78
		STEP C	46.0973	3687.78	7990.19	95882.38
		STEP D	48.4023	3872.18	8389.73	100676.78
		STEP E	50.8222	4065.77	8809.18	105710.17
		STEP F	53.3634	4269.07	9249.65	110995.87
		STEP G	56.0315	4482.52	9712.12	116545.52
9244 WATER UTILITY MANAGER						
		STEP A	56.5013	4520.10	9793.55	117522.70
		STEP B	59.3265	4746.12	10283.26	123399.12
		STEP C	62.2925	4983.40	10797.36	129568.40
		STEP D	65.4073	5232.58	11337.26	136047.18
		STEP E	68.6775	5494.20	11904.10	142849.20
		STEP F	72.1113	5768.90	12499.29	149991.50
		STEP G	75.7169	6057.35	13124.26	157491.15
8980 WSTWTR COLLECTION SUPT						
		STEP A	42.7094	3416.75	7402.96	88835.55
		STEP B	44.8448	3587.58	7773.09	93277.18
		STEP C	47.0871	3766.96	8161.76	97941.16
		STEP D	49.4415	3955.32	8569.86	102838.32
		STEP E	51.9135	4153.08	8998.34	107980.08
		STEP F	54.5093	4360.74	9448.27	113379.34
		STEP G	57.2346	4578.76	9920.66	119047.96
8978 WSTWTR COLLECTION SUPV						
		STEP A	34.8446	2787.56	6039.73	72476.76
		STEP B	36.5867	2926.93	6341.69	76100.33
		STEP C	38.4162	3073.29	6658.80	79905.69
		STEP D	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
		STEP E	42.3538	3388.30	7341.32	88095.90
		STEP F	44.4713	3557.70	7708.35	92500.30
		STEP G	46.6949	3735.59	8093.78	97125.39
9040 WSTWTR TRMT PLT CHIEF OPERATOR						
		STEP A	45.9928	3679.42	7972.08	95665.02
		STEP B	48.2926	3863.40	8370.71	100448.60
		STEP C	50.7070	4056.56	8789.21	105470.56
		STEP D	53.2425	4259.40	9228.70	110744.40
		STEP E	55.9044	4472.35	9690.09	116281.15
		STEP F	58.6998	4695.98	10174.63	122095.58
		STEP G	61.6346	4930.76	10683.33	128199.96

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
SALARY SCHEDULE - A

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMT MANAGEMENT-A

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
9045	WSTWTR UTILITY MANAGER					
		STEP A	56.5013	4520.10	9793.55	117522.70
		STEP B	59.3265	4746.12	10283.26	123399.12
		STEP C	62.2925	4983.40	10797.36	129568.40
		STEP D	65.4073	5232.58	11337.26	136047.18
		STEP E	68.6775	5494.20	11904.10	142849.20
		STEP F	72.1113	5768.90	12499.29	149991.50
		STEP G	75.7169	6057.35	13124.26	157491.15

ORDINANCE NO. 5794

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AMENDING
ORDINANCE NO. 5769, THE SALARY ORDINANCE FOR MANAGEMENT EMPLOYEES,
SALARY SCHEDULE-B, AS AMENDED BY APPENDIX "H" TO BE EFFECTIVE
JANUARY 21, 2017, AS AN URGENCY MEASURE

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. Title and Purpose.

Ordinance No. 5769, the Salary Ordinance for Management Employees, Salary Schedule B, is hereby amended as shown on Appendix "H" attached hereto.

SECTION 2. Salary Plan Effective Date.

This Ordinance shall be effective January 21, 2017 as an urgency measure.

SECTION 3. Urgency Ordinance.

This ordinance is hereby declared to be an urgency measure, immediately necessary for the public peace, health and safety and shall take effect January 21, 2017. A statement of urgency is as follows:

It is necessary to amend the Salary Ordinance to comply with recently approved changes for the orderly and necessary continuance of operations of the City.

SECTION 4. Posting.

The City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to post a true copy of the foregoing ordinance in each of three (3) conspicuous locations in the City and she shall immediately after such posting enter in the Ordinance Book under the record of the ordinance a certificate under her hand stating the time and place of said publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20____, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

ATTEST:

MAYOR

City Clerk

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B701	ACCOUNTING SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	41.0047	3280.37	7107.48	85289.75
		STEP B	42.0169	3361.35	7282.93	87395.12
		STEP C	43.0545	3444.36	7462.79	89553.43
		STEP D	44.1178	3529.42	7647.09	91765.04
		STEP E	45.2073	3616.59	7835.94	94031.27
		STEP F	46.3238	3705.90	8029.46	96353.46
		STEP G	47.4678	3797.42	8227.75	98733.01
		STEP H	48.6401	3891.20	8430.94	101171.32
		STEP I	49.8413	3987.30	8639.15	103669.84
		STEP J	51.0722	4085.77	8852.51	106230.08
		STEP K	52.3334	4186.67	9071.13	108853.53
		STEP L	53.6259	4290.07	9295.15	111541.78
		STEP M	54.9502	4396.02	9524.70	114296.42

B702 ADMIN ANALYST I

	STEP A	33.2609	2660.87	5765.22	69182.67
	STEP B	34.0820	2726.56	5907.54	70890.56
	STEP C	34.9236	2793.88	6053.42	72641.08
	STEP D	35.7861	2862.88	6202.92	74435.08
	STEP E	36.6699	2933.59	6356.11	76273.39
	STEP F	37.5755	3006.04	6513.08	78157.04
	STEP G	38.5035	3080.28	6673.94	80087.28
	STEP H	39.4543	3156.34	6838.74	82064.94
	STEP I	40.4287	3234.29	7007.64	84091.69
	STEP J	41.4271	3314.16	7180.69	86168.36
	STEP K	42.4502	3396.01	7358.03	88296.41
	STEP L	43.4986	3479.88	7539.75	90477.08
	STEP M	44.5728	3565.82	7725.95	92711.42

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGBB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B703	ADMIN ANALYST II					
		STEP A	36.5872	2926.97	6341.78	76101.37
		STEP B	37.4902	2999.21	6498.30	77979.61
		STEP C	38.4160	3073.28	6658.77	79905.28
		STEP D	39.3647	3149.17	6823.21	81878.57
		STEP E	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
		STEP F	41.3331	3306.64	7164.40	85972.84
		STEP G	42.3538	3388.30	7341.32	88095.90
		STEP H	43.3998	3471.98	7522.63	90271.58
		STEP I	44.4716	3557.72	7708.41	92500.92
		STEP J	45.5699	3645.59	7898.78	94785.39
		STEP K	46.6952	3735.61	8093.83	97126.01
		STEP L	47.8484	3827.87	8293.72	99524.67
		STEP M	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60

B704 ALTERNATIVE TRANSP ANALYST I

	STEP A	33.7583	2700.66	5851.43	70217.26
	STEP B	34.5918	2767.34	5995.91	71950.94
	STEP C	35.4461	2835.68	6143.99	73727.88
	STEP D	36.3215	2905.72	6295.72	75548.72
	STEP E	37.2185	2977.48	6451.20	77414.48
	STEP F	38.1376	3051.00	6610.51	79326.20
	STEP G	39.0795	3126.36	6773.78	81285.36
	STEP H	40.0446	3203.56	6941.06	83292.76
	STEP I	41.0335	3282.68	7112.47	85349.68
	STEP J	42.0469	3363.75	7288.12	87457.55
	STEP K	43.0853	3446.82	7468.11	89617.42
	STEP L	44.1493	3531.94	7652.54	91830.54
	STEP M	45.2396	3619.16	7841.53	94098.36

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B705	ALTERNATIVE TRANSP ANALYST II					
		STEP A	36.5872	2926.97	6341.78	76101.37
		STEP B	37.4902	2999.21	6498.30	77979.61
		STEP C	38.4160	3073.28	6658.77	79905.28
		STEP D	39.3647	3149.17	6823.21	81878.57
		STEP E	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
		STEP F	41.3331	3306.64	7164.40	85972.84
		STEP G	42.3538	3388.30	7341.32	88095.90
		STEP H	43.3998	3471.98	7522.63	90271.58
		STEP I	44.4716	3557.72	7708.41	92500.92
		STEP J	45.5699	3645.59	7898.78	94785.39
		STEP K	46.6952	3735.61	8093.83	97126.01
		STEP L	47.8484	3827.87	8293.72	99524.67
		STEP M	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60

B706 ALTERNATIVE TRANSP MGR

	STEP A	48.1545	3852.36	8346.79	100161.46
	STEP B	49.3432	3947.46	8552.83	102633.94
	STEP C	50.5618	4044.95	8764.05	105168.59
	STEP D	51.8105	4144.84	8980.49	107765.83
	STEP E	53.0900	4247.20	9202.27	110427.21
	STEP F	54.4011	4352.09	9429.53	113154.32
	STEP G	55.7446	4459.57	9662.40	115948.78
	STEP H	57.1213	4569.70	9901.02	118812.25
	STEP I	58.5319	4682.56	10145.54	121746.44
	STEP J	59.9774	4798.20	10396.09	124753.09
	STEP K	61.4587	4916.69	10652.83	127833.99
	STEP L	62.9764	5038.11	10915.92	130990.98
	STEP M	64.5317	5162.54	11185.49	134225.94

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B711	ASST CITY ATTORNEY					
		STEP A	71.0229	5681.83	12310.64	147727.67
		STEP B	72.7761	5822.09	12614.53	151374.31
		STEP C	74.5734	5965.87	12926.05	155112.65
		STEP D	76.4151	6113.20	13245.28	158943.31
		STEP E	78.3022	6264.18	13572.38	162868.58
		STEP F	80.2360	6418.88	13907.56	166890.78
		STEP G	82.2175	6577.40	14251.03	171012.31
		STEP H	84.2479	6739.83	14602.97	175235.63
		STEP I	86.3285	6906.28	14963.60	179563.25
		STEP J	88.4605	7076.84	15333.15	183997.75
		STEP K	90.6451	7251.61	15711.81	188541.76
		STEP L	92.8836	7430.69	16099.83	193197.98
		STEP M	95.1775	7614.20	16497.43	197969.20

B712 ASST CITY CLERK

STEP A	35.6195	2849.56	6174.05	74088.66
STEP B	36.4988	2919.91	6326.46	75917.53
STEP C	37.4002	2992.02	6482.70	77792.39
STEP D	38.3238	3065.91	6642.80	79713.55
STEP E	39.2703	3141.62	6806.85	81682.16
STEP F	40.2401	3219.21	6974.95	83699.38
STEP G	41.2339	3298.71	7147.20	85766.42
STEP H	42.2522	3380.17	7323.71	87884.51
STEP I	43.2956	3463.65	7504.58	90054.90
STEP J	44.3649	3549.19	7689.91	92278.90
STEP K	45.4605	3636.84	7879.82	94557.82
STEP L	46.5832	3726.65	8074.42	96893.02
STEP M	47.7336	3818.69	8273.82	99285.89

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGBB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B707	ASST CITY MANAGER					
		STEP A	74.0814	5926.51	12840.77	154089.31
		STEP B	75.9101	6072.80	13157.75	157893.00
		STEP C	77.7848	6222.78	13482.69	161792.38
		STEP D	79.7058	6376.46	13815.67	165788.06
		STEP E	81.6742	6533.93	14156.86	169882.33
		STEP F	83.6912	6695.29	14506.47	174077.69
		STEP G	85.7581	6860.64	14864.73	178376.84
		STEP H	87.8759	7030.07	15231.82	182781.87
		STEP I	90.0461	7203.68	15607.99	187295.88
		STEP J	92.2699	7381.59	15993.44	191921.39
		STEP K	94.5486	7563.88	16388.42	196661.08
		STEP L	96.8836	7750.68	16793.15	201517.88
		STEP M	99.2762	7942.09	17207.87	206494.49

B940 ASST ELEC UTIL DIR-RESOURCES

	STEP A	77.7298	6218.38	13473.16	161677.98
	STEP B	79.6487	6371.89	13805.77	165669.29
	STEP C	81.6157	6529.25	14146.72	169760.65
	STEP D	83.6312	6690.49	14496.07	173952.89
	STEP E	85.6966	6855.72	14854.07	178248.92
	STEP F	87.8130	7025.04	15220.92	182651.04
	STEP G	89.9816	7198.52	15596.81	187161.72
	STEP H	92.2038	7376.30	15981.99	191783.90
	STEP I	94.4808	7558.46	16376.67	196520.06
	STEP J	96.8141	7745.12	16781.11	201373.32
	STEP K	99.2051	7936.40	17195.55	206346.60
	STEP L	101.6550	8132.40	17620.20	211442.40
	STEP M	104.1655	8333.24	18055.35	216664.24

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B708	ASST ELEC UTIL DIRECTOR					
		STEP A	70.9719	5677.75	12301.79	147621.55
		STEP B	72.7240	5817.92	12605.49	151265.92
		STEP C	74.5200	5961.60	12916.80	155001.60
		STEP D	76.3603	6108.82	13235.78	158829.42
		STEP E	78.2461	6259.68	13562.65	162751.88
		STEP F	80.1785	6414.28	13897.60	166771.28
		STEP G	82.1585	6572.68	14240.80	170889.68
		STEP H	84.1875	6735.00	14592.50	175110.00
		STEP I	86.2666	6901.32	14952.87	179434.52
		STEP J	88.3971	7071.76	15322.16	183865.96
		STEP K	90.5801	7246.40	15700.55	188406.60
		STEP L	92.8171	7425.36	16088.29	193059.56
		STEP M	95.1093	7608.74	16485.61	197827.34

B709 ASST EU DIRECTOR

	STEP A	62.1514	4972.11	10772.90	129274.91
	STEP B	63.6854	5094.83	11038.80	132465.63
	STEP C	65.2582	5220.65	11311.42	135737.05
	STEP D	66.8698	5349.58	11590.76	139089.18
	STEP E	68.5212	5481.69	11877.00	142524.09
	STEP F	70.2134	5617.07	12170.32	146043.87
	STEP G	71.9474	5755.79	12470.88	149650.59
	STEP H	73.7242	5897.93	12778.86	153346.33
	STEP I	75.5449	6043.59	13094.44	157133.39
	STEP J	77.4106	6192.84	13417.83	161014.04
	STEP K	79.3223	6345.78	13749.19	164990.38
	STEP L	81.2813	6502.50	14088.75	169065.10
	STEP M	83.2886	6663.08	14436.69	173240.28

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B713	ASST FIRE CHIEF					
		STEP A	61.2592	4900.73	10618.26	127419.13
		STEP B	62.7714	5021.71	10880.37	130564.51
		STEP C	64.3216	5145.72	11149.07	133788.92
		STEP D	65.9101	5272.80	11424.41	137093.00
		STEP E	67.5378	5403.02	11706.55	140478.62
		STEP F	69.2057	5536.45	11995.65	143947.85
		STEP G	70.9148	5673.18	12291.89	147502.78
		STEP H	72.6661	5813.28	12595.45	151145.48
		STEP I	74.4607	5956.85	12906.52	154878.25
		STEP J	76.2996	6103.96	13225.26	158703.16
		STEP K	78.1839	6254.71	13551.87	162622.51
		STEP L	80.1147	6409.17	13886.54	166638.57
		STEP M	82.0932	6567.45	14229.48	170753.85

B845 ASST HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR

	STEP A	53.1051	4248.40	9204.88	110458.60
	STEP B	54.4160	4353.28	9432.10	113185.28
	STEP C	55.7598	4460.78	9665.03	115980.38
	STEP D	57.1369	4570.95	9903.72	118844.75
	STEP E	58.5479	4683.83	10148.30	121779.63
	STEP F	59.9938	4799.50	10398.92	124787.10
	STEP G	61.4754	4918.03	10655.73	127868.83
	STEP H	62.9936	5039.48	10918.89	131026.68
	STEP I	64.5493	5163.94	11188.54	134262.54
	STEP J	66.1434	5291.47	11464.85	137578.27
	STEP K	67.7769	5422.15	11748.00	140975.95
	STEP L	69.4507	5556.05	12038.12	144457.45
	STEP M	71.1659	5693.27	12335.42	148025.07

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B710	ASST POLICE CHIEF					
		STEP A	67.3324	5386.59	11670.94	140051.31
		STEP B	68.9945	5519.56	11959.04	143508.46
		STEP C	70.6983	5655.87	12254.38	147052.55
		STEP D	72.4443	5795.54	12557.01	150684.16
		STEP E	74.2334	5938.67	12867.12	154405.45
		STEP F	76.0667	6085.33	13184.89	158218.65
		STEP G	77.9452	6235.62	13510.50	162126.02
		STEP H	79.8701	6389.61	13844.16	166129.88
		STEP I	81.8426	6547.41	14186.05	170232.62
		STEP J	83.8638	6709.10	14536.39	174436.69
		STEP K	85.9349	6874.79	14895.38	178744.58
		STEP L	88.0571	7044.57	15263.24	183158.85
		STEP M	90.2318	7218.54	15640.18	187682.14

B714 BILLING SERVICES MANAGER

	STEP A	44.7525	3580.20	7757.10	93085.15
	STEP B	45.8572	3668.58	7948.58	95382.95
	STEP C	46.9897	3759.17	8144.88	97738.53
	STEP D	48.1501	3852.01	8346.02	100152.28
	STEP E	49.3393	3947.14	8552.14	102625.64
	STEP F	50.5577	4044.62	8763.34	105160.08
	STEP G	51.8063	4144.50	8979.76	107757.12
	STEP H	53.0857	4246.86	9201.52	110418.29
	STEP I	54.3967	4351.74	9428.76	113145.18
	STEP J	55.7401	4459.21	9661.62	115939.41
	STEP K	57.1167	4569.33	9900.22	118802.65
	STEP L	58.5272	4682.18	10144.72	121736.60
	STEP M	59.9726	4797.81	10395.25	124743.01

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B715	BLDG INSPECTION SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	40.3307	3226.45	6990.65	83887.85
		STEP B	41.3263	3306.10	7163.22	85958.70
		STEP C	42.3469	3387.75	7340.12	88081.55
		STEP D	43.3927	3471.41	7521.40	90256.81
		STEP E	44.4643	3557.14	7707.14	92485.74
		STEP F	45.5624	3644.99	7897.48	94769.79
		STEP G	46.6876	3735.00	8092.51	97110.20
		STEP H	47.8406	3827.24	8292.37	99508.44
		STEP I	49.0220	3921.76	8497.14	101965.76
		STEP J	50.2327	4018.61	8707.00	104484.01
		STEP K	51.4732	4117.85	8922.02	107064.25
		STEP L	52.7444	4219.55	9142.36	109708.35
		STEP M	54.0470	4323.76	9368.14	112417.76

B717 BLDG OFFICIAL

STEP A	50.1505	4012.04	8692.76	104313.09
STEP B	51.3885	4111.08	8907.34	106888.05
STEP C	52.6576	4212.61	9127.31	109527.76
STEP D	53.9580	4316.64	9352.72	112232.66
STEP E	55.2906	4423.24	9583.70	115004.35
STEP F	56.6560	4532.48	9820.38	117844.50
STEP G	58.0552	4644.42	10062.90	120754.79
STEP H	59.4889	4759.11	10311.41	123736.95
STEP I	60.9581	4876.64	10566.06	126792.76
STEP J	62.4635	4997.08	10827.00	129924.03
STEP K	64.0061	5120.49	11094.39	133132.64
STEP L	65.5868	5246.94	11368.37	136420.48
STEP M	67.2065	5376.52	11649.13	139789.52

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B718	BUDGET ANALYST I					
		STEP A	34.4334	2754.67	5968.45	71621.47
		STEP B	35.2833	2822.66	6115.77	73389.26
		STEP C	36.1547	2892.37	6266.81	75201.77
		STEP D	37.0476	2963.80	6421.58	77059.00
		STEP E	37.9625	3037.00	6580.16	78962.00
		STEP F	38.9000	3112.00	6742.66	80912.00
		STEP G	39.8607	3188.85	6909.18	82910.25
		STEP H	40.8451	3267.60	7079.81	84957.80
		STEP I	41.8538	3348.30	7254.65	87055.90
		STEP J	42.8874	3430.99	7433.81	89205.79
		STEP K	43.9466	3515.72	7617.41	91408.92
		STEP L	45.0319	3602.55	7805.52	93666.35
		STEP M	46.1440	3691.52	7998.29	95979.52

B719 BUDGET ANALYST II

	STEP A	37.3182	2985.45	6468.48	77621.85
	STEP B	38.2394	3059.15	6628.16	79537.95
	STEP C	39.1838	3134.70	6791.85	81502.30
	STEP D	40.1515	3212.12	6959.59	83515.12
	STEP E	41.1431	3291.44	7131.47	85577.64
	STEP F	42.1591	3372.72	7307.57	87690.92
	STEP G	43.2003	3456.02	7488.05	89856.62
	STEP H	44.2672	3541.37	7672.98	92075.77
	STEP I	45.3604	3628.83	7862.46	94349.63
	STEP J	46.4806	3718.44	8056.63	96679.64
	STEP K	47.6285	3810.28	8255.60	99067.28
	STEP L	48.8047	3904.37	8459.48	101513.77
	STEP M	50.0100	4000.80	8668.40	104020.80

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B720	BUDGET MANAGER					
		STEP A	44.7525	3580.20	7757.10	93085.15
		STEP B	45.8572	3668.58	7948.58	95382.95
		STEP C	46.9897	3759.17	8144.88	97738.53
		STEP D	48.1501	3852.01	8346.02	100152.28
		STEP E	49.3393	3947.14	8552.14	102625.64
		STEP F	50.5577	4044.62	8763.34	105160.08
		STEP G	51.8063	4144.50	8979.76	107757.12
		STEP H	53.0857	4246.86	9201.52	110418.29
		STEP I	54.3967	4351.74	9428.76	113145.18
		STEP J	55.7401	4459.21	9661.62	115939.41
		STEP K	57.1167	4569.33	9900.22	118802.65
		STEP L	58.5272	4682.18	10144.72	121736.60
		STEP M	59.9726	4797.81	10395.25	124743.01

B721 BUSINESS SVCS ADMINISTRATOR

	STEP A	42.3780	3390.24	7345.52	88146.24
	STEP B	43.4242	3473.93	7526.86	90322.33
	STEP C	44.4966	3559.72	7712.74	92552.92
	STEP D	45.5955	3647.64	7903.22	94838.64
	STEP E	46.7215	3737.72	8098.39	97180.72
	STEP F	47.8753	3830.02	8298.38	99580.62
	STEP G	49.0577	3924.61	8503.33	102040.01
	STEP H	50.2692	4021.53	8713.32	104559.93
	STEP I	51.5107	4120.85	8928.52	107142.25
	STEP J	52.7828	4222.62	9149.01	109788.22
	STEP K	54.0863	4326.90	9374.95	112499.50
	STEP L	55.4220	4433.76	9606.48	115277.76
	STEP M	56.7907	4543.25	9843.72	118124.65

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B722	CENTRAL SERVICES DIRECTOR					
		STEP A	60.9892	4879.13	10571.46	126857.53
		STEP B	62.4949	4999.59	10832.44	129989.39
		STEP C	64.0383	5123.06	11099.97	133199.66
		STEP D	65.6198	5249.58	11374.09	136489.18
		STEP E	67.2403	5379.22	11654.98	139859.82
		STEP F	68.9009	5512.07	11942.82	143313.87
		STEP G	70.6024	5648.19	12237.74	146852.99
		STEP H	72.3460	5787.68	12539.97	150479.68
		STEP I	74.1327	5930.61	12849.66	154196.01
		STEP J	75.9635	6077.08	13167.00	158004.08
		STEP K	77.8395	6227.16	13492.18	161906.16
		STEP L	79.7618	6380.94	13825.37	165904.54
		STEP M	81.7316	6538.52	14166.81	170001.72

B723 CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

STEP A	86.5875	6927.00	15008.50	180102.00
STEP B	88.7250	7098.00	15379.00	184548.00
STEP C	90.9161	7273.28	15758.79	189105.48
STEP D	93.1614	7452.91	16147.97	193775.71
STEP E	95.4621	7636.96	16546.76	198561.16
STEP F	97.8196	7825.56	16955.39	203464.76
STEP G	100.2354	8018.83	17374.13	208489.63
STEP H	102.7108	8216.86	17803.20	213638.46
STEP I	105.2473	8419.78	18242.86	218914.38
STEP J	107.8465	8627.72	18693.39	224320.72
STEP K	110.5099	8840.79	19155.04	229860.59
STEP L	113.2390	9059.12	19628.09	235537.12
STEP M	116.0356	9282.84	20112.83	241354.04

CITY OF ROSEVILLE

SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B724	CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER					
		STEP A	60.9892	4879.13	10571.46	126857.53
		STEP B	62.4949	4999.59	10832.44	129989.39
		STEP C	64.0383	5123.06	11099.97	133199.66
		STEP D	65.6198	5249.58	11374.09	136489.18
		STEP E	67.2403	5379.22	11654.98	139859.82
		STEP F	68.9009	5512.07	11942.82	143313.87
		STEP G	70.6024	5648.19	12237.74	146852.99
		STEP H	72.3460	5787.68	12539.97	150479.68
		STEP I	74.1327	5930.61	12849.66	154196.01
		STEP J	75.9635	6077.08	13167.00	158004.08
		STEP K	77.8395	6227.16	13492.18	161906.16
		STEP L	79.7618	6380.94	13825.37	165904.54
		STEP M	81.7316	6538.52	14166.81	170001.72

B725 CITY CLERK

	STEP A	49.4890	3959.12	8578.09	102937.12
	STEP B	50.7112	4056.89	8789.94	105479.29
	STEP C	51.9636	4157.08	9007.02	108084.28
	STEP D	53.2468	4259.74	9229.44	110753.34
	STEP E	54.5618	4364.94	9457.37	113488.54
	STEP F	55.9093	4472.74	9690.94	116291.34
	STEP G	57.2900	4583.20	9930.26	119163.20
	STEP H	58.7049	4696.39	10175.51	122106.19
	STEP I	60.1546	4812.36	10426.79	125121.56
	STEP J	61.6402	4931.21	10684.30	128211.61
	STEP K	63.1625	5053.00	10948.16	131378.00
	STEP L	64.7223	5177.78	11218.53	134622.38
	STEP M	66.3207	5305.65	11495.58	137947.05

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B726	CITY LIBRARIAN					
		STEP A	43.4443	3475.54	7530.34	90364.14
		STEP B	44.5172	3561.37	7716.31	92595.77
		STEP C	45.6166	3649.32	7906.87	94882.52
		STEP D	46.7432	3739.45	8102.15	97225.85
		STEP E	47.8976	3831.80	8302.25	99627.00
		STEP F	49.0804	3926.43	8507.26	102087.23
		STEP G	50.2925	4023.40	8717.36	104608.40
		STEP H	51.5345	4122.76	8932.64	107191.76
		STEP I	52.8072	4224.57	9153.24	109838.97
		STEP J	54.1114	4328.91	9379.30	112551.71
		STEP K	55.4477	4435.81	9610.93	115331.21
		STEP L	56.8170	4545.36	9848.28	118179.36
		STEP M	58.2202	4657.61	10091.50	121098.01

B852 CONTROLLER

	STEP A	46.1683	3693.46	8002.50	96030.06
	STEP B	47.3080	3784.64	8200.05	98400.64
	STEP C	48.4763	3878.10	8402.55	100830.70
	STEP D	49.6734	3973.87	8610.05	103320.67
	STEP E	50.9002	4072.01	8822.70	105872.41
	STEP F	52.1572	4172.57	9040.58	108486.97
	STEP G	53.4453	4275.62	9263.85	111166.22
	STEP H	54.7652	4381.21	9492.63	113911.61
	STEP I	56.1177	4489.41	9727.06	116724.81
	STEP J	57.5035	4600.28	9967.27	119607.28
	STEP K	58.9236	4713.88	10213.42	122561.08
	STEP L	60.3788	4830.30	10465.65	125587.90
	STEP M	61.8699	4949.59	10724.11	128689.39

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B728	DEPT PUBLIC INFO OFFICER					
		STEP A	38.3214	3065.71	6642.37	79708.51
		STEP B	39.2676	3141.40	6806.38	81676.60
		STEP C	40.2373	3218.98	6974.46	83693.58
		STEP D	41.2310	3298.48	7146.70	85760.48
		STEP E	42.2493	3379.94	7323.21	87878.54
		STEP F	43.2926	3463.40	7504.05	90048.60
		STEP G	44.3618	3548.94	7689.37	92272.54
		STEP H	45.4574	3636.59	7879.28	94551.39
		STEP I	46.5800	3726.40	8073.86	96886.40
		STEP J	47.7303	3818.42	8273.25	99279.02
		STEP K	48.9091	3912.72	8477.57	101730.92
		STEP L	50.1169	4009.35	8686.92	104243.15
		STEP M	51.3546	4108.36	8901.46	106817.56

B729 DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY I

	STEP A	51.0406	4083.25	8847.04	106164.47
	STEP B	52.3005	4184.04	9065.43	108785.13
	STEP C	53.5922	4287.37	9289.31	111471.69
	STEP D	54.9157	4393.25	9518.72	114224.59
	STEP E	56.2719	4501.75	9753.79	117045.48
	STEP F	57.6616	4612.92	9994.67	119936.04
	STEP G	59.0856	4726.85	10241.50	122897.98
	STEP H	60.5447	4843.58	10494.42	125933.07
	STEP I	62.0400	4963.20	10753.59	129043.11
	STEP J	63.5721	5085.77	11019.16	132229.96
	STEP K	65.1421	5211.37	11291.29	135495.51
	STEP L	66.7508	5340.07	11570.14	138841.71
	STEP M	68.3993	5471.94	11855.88	142270.54

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B730	DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY II					
		STEP A	56.1446	4491.57	9731.74	116780.87
		STEP B	57.5306	4602.45	9971.97	119663.60
		STEP C	58.9514	4716.11	10218.23	122618.81
		STEP D	60.4072	4832.58	10470.58	125647.00
		STEP E	61.8990	4951.92	10729.17	128749.98
		STEP F	63.4277	5074.22	10994.13	131929.59
		STEP G	64.9941	5199.53	11265.64	135187.72
		STEP H	66.5992	5327.94	11543.86	138526.32
		STEP I	68.2439	5459.51	11828.95	141947.37
		STEP J	69.9293	5594.34	12121.07	145452.90
		STEP K	71.6563	5732.50	12420.42	149045.00
		STEP L	73.4259	5874.07	12727.15	152725.82
		STEP M	75.2392	6019.14	13041.46	156497.54

B731 DEPUTY CITY MANAGER

	STEP A	55.5189	4441.51	9623.27	115479.31
	STEP B	56.8894	4551.15	9860.82	118329.95
	STEP C	58.2944	4663.55	10104.36	121252.35
	STEP D	59.7340	4778.72	10353.89	124246.72
	STEP E	61.2092	4896.73	10609.59	127315.13
	STEP F	62.7208	5017.66	10871.60	130459.26
	STEP G	64.2698	5141.58	11140.09	133681.18
	STEP H	65.8570	5268.56	11415.21	136982.56
	STEP I	67.4834	5398.67	11697.12	140365.47
	STEP J	69.1500	5532.00	11986.00	143832.00
	STEP K	70.8577	5668.61	12282.00	147384.01
	STEP L	72.6076	5808.60	12585.31	151023.80
	STEP M	74.4007	5952.05	12896.12	154753.45

CITY OF ROSEVILLE

SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B732	DEVELOPMENT ANALYST I					
		STEP A	33.2609	2660.87	5765.22	69182.67
		STEP B	34.0820	2726.56	5907.54	70890.56
		STEP C	34.9236	2793.88	6053.42	72641.08
		STEP D	35.7861	2862.88	6202.92	74435.08
		STEP E	36.6699	2933.59	6356.11	76273.39
		STEP F	37.5755	3006.04	6513.08	78157.04
		STEP G	38.5035	3080.28	6673.94	80087.28
		STEP H	39.4543	3156.34	6838.74	82064.94
		STEP I	40.4287	3234.29	7007.64	84091.69
		STEP J	41.4271	3314.16	7180.69	86168.36
		STEP K	42.4502	3396.01	7358.03	88296.41
		STEP L	43.4986	3479.88	7539.75	90477.08
		STEP M	44.5728	3565.82	7725.95	92711.42

B733 DEVELOPMENT ANALYST II

	STEP A	36.5872	2926.97	6341.78	76101.37
	STEP B	37.4902	2999.21	6498.30	77979.61
	STEP C	38.4160	3073.28	6658.77	79905.28
	STEP D	39.3647	3149.17	6823.21	81878.57
	STEP E	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
	STEP F	41.3331	3306.64	7164.40	85972.84
	STEP G	42.3538	3388.30	7341.32	88095.90
	STEP H	43.3998	3471.98	7522.63	90271.58
	STEP I	44.4716	3557.72	7708.41	92500.92
	STEP J	45.5699	3645.59	7898.78	94785.39
	STEP K	46.6952	3735.61	8093.83	97126.01
	STEP L	47.8484	3827.87	8293.72	99524.67
	STEP M	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B734	DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR					
		STEP A	67.1903	5375.22	11646.31	139755.82
		STEP B	68.8490	5507.92	11933.82	143205.92
		STEP C	70.5493	5643.94	12228.54	146742.54
		STEP D	72.2916	5783.32	12530.54	150366.52
		STEP E	74.0769	5926.15	12840.00	154079.95
		STEP F	75.9063	6072.50	13157.09	157885.10
		STEP G	77.7809	6222.47	13482.02	161784.27
		STEP H	79.7018	6376.14	13814.97	165779.74
		STEP I	81.6701	6533.60	14156.15	169873.80
		STEP J	83.6870	6694.96	14505.74	174068.96
		STEP K	85.7538	6860.30	14863.99	178367.90
		STEP L	87.8715	7029.72	15231.06	182772.72
		STEP M	90.0416	7203.32	15607.21	187286.52

B735 DEVELOPMENT SERVICES MANAGER

	STEP A	55.5189	4441.51	9623.27	115479.31
	STEP B	56.8894	4551.15	9860.82	118329.95
	STEP C	58.2944	4663.55	10104.36	121252.35
	STEP D	59.7340	4778.72	10353.89	124246.72
	STEP E	61.2092	4896.73	10609.59	127315.13
	STEP F	62.7208	5017.66	10871.60	130459.26
	STEP G	64.2698	5141.58	11140.09	133681.18
	STEP H	65.8570	5268.56	11415.21	136982.56
	STEP I	67.4834	5398.67	11697.12	140365.47
	STEP J	69.1500	5532.00	11986.00	143832.00
	STEP K	70.8577	5668.61	12282.00	147384.01
	STEP L	72.6076	5808.60	12585.31	151023.80
	STEP M	74.4007	5952.05	12896.12	154753.45

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B736	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR					
		STEP A	64.6607	5172.85	11207.85	134494.25
		STEP B	66.2571	5300.56	11484.56	137814.76
		STEP C	67.8933	5431.46	11768.17	141218.06
		STEP D	69.5700	5565.60	12058.80	144705.60
		STEP E	71.2881	5703.04	12356.60	148279.24
		STEP F	73.0487	5843.89	12661.77	151941.29
		STEP G	74.8527	5988.21	12974.46	155693.61
		STEP H	76.7012	6136.09	13294.87	159538.49
		STEP I	78.5955	6287.64	13623.22	163478.64
		STEP J	80.5364	6442.91	13959.64	167515.71
		STEP K	82.5254	6602.03	14304.40	171652.83
		STEP L	84.5634	6765.07	14657.65	175891.87
		STEP M	86.6518	6932.14	15019.64	180235.74

B737 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

STEP A	43.4443	3475.54	7530.34	90364.14
STEP B	44.5172	3561.37	7716.31	92595.77
STEP C	45.6166	3649.32	7906.87	94882.52
STEP D	46.7432	3739.45	8102.15	97225.85
STEP E	47.8976	3831.80	8302.25	99627.00
STEP F	49.0804	3926.43	8507.26	102087.23
STEP G	50.2925	4023.40	8717.36	104608.40
STEP H	51.5345	4122.76	8932.64	107191.76
STEP I	52.8072	4224.57	9153.24	109838.97
STEP J	54.1114	4328.91	9379.30	112551.71
STEP K	55.4477	4435.81	9610.93	115331.21
STEP L	56.8170	4545.36	9848.28	118179.36
STEP M	58.2202	4657.61	10091.50	121098.01

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B738	ELECTRIC BUSINESS ANALYST I					
	STEP A		39.3071	3144.56	6813.23	81758.76
	STEP B		40.2773	3222.18	6981.39	83776.78
	STEP C		41.2720	3301.76	7153.81	85845.76
	STEP D		42.2913	3383.30	7330.49	87965.90
	STEP E		43.3357	3466.85	7511.52	90138.25
	STEP F		44.4059	3552.47	7697.02	92364.27
	STEP G		45.5026	3640.20	7887.11	94645.40
	STEP H		46.6263	3730.10	8081.89	96982.70
	STEP I		47.7778	3822.22	8281.48	99377.82
	STEP J		48.9577	3916.61	8486.00	101832.01
	STEP K		50.1668	4013.34	8695.57	104346.94
	STEP L		51.4057	4112.45	8910.32	106923.85
	STEP M		52.6752	4214.01	9130.36	109564.41

B739 ELECTRIC BUSINESS ANALYST II

STEP A	43.2416	3459.32	7495.21	89942.52
STEP B	44.3091	3544.72	7680.24	92162.92
STEP C	45.4034	3632.27	7869.92	94439.07
STEP D	46.5246	3721.96	8064.26	96771.16
STEP E	47.6736	3813.88	8263.42	99161.08
STEP F	48.8510	3908.08	8467.50	101610.08
STEP G	50.0574	4004.59	8676.61	104119.39
STEP H	51.2936	4103.48	8890.89	106690.68
STEP I	52.5604	4204.83	9110.46	109325.63
STEP J	53.8584	4308.67	9335.45	112025.47
STEP K	55.1885	4415.08	9566.00	114792.08
STEP L	56.5514	4524.11	9802.24	117626.91
STEP M	57.9480	4635.84	10044.32	120531.84

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B740	ELECTRIC COMPLIANCE ANALYST					
		STEP A	45.0209	3601.67	7803.62	93643.47
		STEP B	46.1322	3690.57	7996.24	95954.97
		STEP C	47.2715	3781.72	8193.72	98324.72
		STEP D	48.4389	3875.11	8396.07	100752.91
		STEP E	49.6352	3970.81	8603.43	103241.21
		STEP F	50.8610	4068.88	8815.90	105790.88
		STEP G	52.1170	4169.36	9033.61	108403.36
		STEP H	53.4041	4272.32	9256.71	111080.52
		STEP I	54.7230	4377.84	9485.32	113823.84
		STEP J	56.0744	4485.95	9719.56	116634.75
		STEP K	57.4592	4596.73	9959.59	119515.13
		STEP L	58.8782	4710.25	10205.55	122466.65
		STEP M	60.3323	4826.58	10457.59	125491.18

B741 ELECTRIC ENGINEERING TECH SUPV

	STEP A	47.8512	3828.09	8294.20	99530.49
	STEP B	49.0323	3922.58	8498.93	101987.18
	STEP C	50.2432	4019.45	8708.82	104505.85
	STEP D	51.4840	4118.72	8923.89	107086.72
	STEP E	52.7555	4220.44	9144.28	109731.44
	STEP F	54.0583	4324.66	9370.10	112441.26
	STEP G	55.3934	4431.47	9601.52	115218.27
	STEP H	56.7614	4540.91	9838.64	118063.71
	STEP I	58.1631	4653.04	10081.60	120979.24
	STEP J	59.5995	4767.96	10330.58	123966.96
	STEP K	61.0714	4885.71	10585.70	127028.51
	STEP L	62.5796	5006.36	10847.13	130165.56
	STEP M	64.1251	5130.00	11115.01	133380.20

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B742	ELECTRIC LINE CONST SUPERVISOR					
	STEP A	61.4415	4915.32	10649.86	127798.32	
	STEP B	62.9581	5036.64	10912.73	130952.84	
	STEP C	64.5129	5161.03	11182.23	134186.83	
	STEP D	66.1061	5288.48	11458.39	137500.68	
	STEP E	67.7387	5419.09	11741.37	140896.49	
	STEP F	69.4116	5552.92	12031.34	144376.12	
	STEP G	71.1258	5690.06	12328.47	147941.66	
	STEP H	72.8823	5830.58	12632.93	151595.18	
	STEP I	74.6822	5974.57	12944.91	155338.97	
	STEP J	76.5265	6122.12	13264.59	159175.12	
	STEP K	78.4164	6273.31	13592.17	163106.11	
	STEP L	80.3530	6428.24	13927.85	167134.24	
	STEP M	82.3374	6586.99	14271.81	171261.79	
B941	ELECTRIC CUSTOMER PROGRAMS SUPV					
	STEP A	54.7676	4381.40	9493.05	113916.60	
	STEP B	56.1194	4489.55	9727.36	116728.35	
	STEP C	57.5054	4600.43	9967.60	119611.23	
	STEP D	58.9255	4714.04	10213.75	122565.04	
	STEP E	60.3807	4830.45	10465.98	125591.85	
	STEP F	61.8719	4949.75	10724.46	128693.55	
	STEP G	63.3999	5071.99	10989.31	131871.79	
	STEP H	64.9656	5197.24	11260.70	135128.44	
	STEP I	66.5700	5325.60	11538.80	138465.60	
	STEP J	68.2140	5457.12	11823.76	141885.12	
	STEP K	69.8986	5591.88	12115.75	145389.08	
	STEP L	71.6249	5729.99	12414.98	148979.79	
	STEP M	73.3937	5871.49	12721.57	152658.89	
B743	ELECTRIC OPERATIONS MANAGER					
	STEP A	67.5845	5406.76	11714.64	140575.76	
	STEP B	69.2528	5540.22	12003.81	144045.82	
	STEP C	70.9631	5677.04	12300.27	147603.24	
	STEP D	72.7156	5817.24	12604.03	151248.44	
	STEP E	74.5114	5960.91	12915.30	154983.71	
	STEP F	76.3515	6108.12	13234.26	158811.12	
	STEP G	78.2371	6258.96	13561.09	162733.16	

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
		STEP H	80.1692	6413.53	13895.99	166751.93
		STEP I	82.1491	6571.92	14239.17	170870.12
		STEP J	84.1778	6734.22	14590.81	175089.82
		STEP K	86.2567	6900.53	14951.16	179413.93
		STEP L	88.3869	7070.95	15320.39	183844.75
		STEP M	90.5697	7245.57	15698.74	188384.97

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B744	ELECTRIC RATES & FINANCL ADMIN					
		STEP A	58.3337	4666.69	10111.17	121334.09
		STEP B	59.7736	4781.88	10360.75	124329.08
		STEP C	61.2497	4899.97	10616.61	127399.37
		STEP D	62.7623	5020.98	10878.79	130545.58
		STEP E	64.3123	5144.98	11147.46	133769.58
		STEP F	65.9006	5272.04	11422.77	137073.24
		STEP G	67.5281	5402.24	11704.87	140458.44
		STEP H	69.1957	5535.65	11993.92	143927.05
		STEP I	70.9046	5672.36	12290.13	147481.56
		STEP J	72.6557	5812.45	12593.65	151123.85
		STEP K	74.4500	5956.00	12904.66	154856.00
		STEP L	76.2886	6103.08	13223.35	158680.28
		STEP M	78.1726	6253.80	13549.91	162599.00

B745 ELECTRIC REGU COMPLNCE ADMNSTR

STEP A	67.5845	5406.76	11714.64	140575.76
STEP B	69.2528	5540.22	12003.81	144045.82
STEP C	70.9631	5677.04	12300.27	147603.24
STEP D	72.7156	5817.24	12604.03	151248.44
STEP E	74.5114	5960.91	12915.30	154983.71
STEP F	76.3515	6108.12	13234.26	158811.12
STEP G	78.2371	6258.96	13561.09	162733.16
STEP H	80.1692	6413.53	13895.99	166751.93
STEP I	82.1491	6571.92	14239.17	170870.12
STEP J	84.1778	6734.22	14590.81	175089.82
STEP K	85.2567	6820.53	14777.82	177333.93
STEP L	88.3869	7070.95	15320.39	183844.75
STEP M	90.5697	7245.57	15698.74	188384.97

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B746	ELECTRIC RESOURCES ANALYST I					
	STEP A		47.9688	3837.50	8314.59	99775.10
	STEP B		49.1529	3932.23	8519.83	102238.03
	STEP C		50.3668	4029.34	8730.24	104762.94
	STEP D		51.6107	4128.85	8945.85	107350.25
	STEP E		52.8852	4230.81	9166.76	110001.21
	STEP F		54.1913	4335.30	9393.15	112717.90
	STEP G		55.5296	4442.36	9625.13	115501.56
	STEP H		56.9010	4552.08	9862.84	118354.08
	STEP I		58.3062	4664.49	10106.40	121276.89
	STEP J		59.7461	4779.68	10355.99	124271.88
	STEP K		61.2216	4897.72	10611.74	127340.92
	STEP L		62.7335	5018.68	10873.80	130485.68
	STEP M		64.2828	5142.62	11142.35	133708.22

B747 ELECTRIC RESOURCES ANALYST II

STEP A	52.7703	4221.62	9146.85	109762.22
STEP B	54.0729	4325.83	9372.63	112471.63
STEP C	55.4083	4432.66	9604.10	115249.26
STEP D	56.7766	4542.12	9841.27	118095.32
STEP E	58.1788	4654.30	10084.32	121011.90
STEP F	59.6156	4769.24	10333.37	124000.44
STEP G	61.0878	4887.02	10588.55	127062.62
STEP H	62.5965	5007.72	10850.06	130200.72
STEP I	64.1424	5131.39	11118.01	133416.19
STEP J	65.7264	5258.11	11392.57	136710.91
STEP K	67.3496	5387.96	11673.93	140087.16
STEP L	69.0129	5521.03	11962.23	143546.83
STEP M	70.7172	5657.37	12257.64	147091.77

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGBM MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B749	ELECTRIC RISK MGMT ADMNSTR					
		STEP A	64.1688	5133.50	11122.59	133471.10
		STEP B	65.7529	5260.23	11397.16	136766.03
		STEP C	67.3767	5390.13	11678.62	140143.53
		STEP D	69.0406	5523.24	11967.03	143604.44
		STEP E	70.7457	5659.65	12262.58	147151.05
		STEP F	72.4928	5799.42	12565.41	150785.02
		STEP G	74.2831	5942.64	12875.73	154508.84
		STEP H	76.1176	6089.40	13193.71	158324.60
		STEP I	77.9974	6239.79	13519.54	162234.59
		STEP J	79.9236	6393.88	13853.42	166241.08
		STEP K	81.8974	6551.79	14195.54	170346.59
		STEP L	83.9199	6713.59	14546.11	174553.39
		STEP M	85.9924	6879.39	14905.34	178864.19

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B750	ELECTRIC SAFETY COORDINATOR					
		STEP A	36.5871	2926.96	6341.76	76101.16
		STEP B	37.4902	2999.21	6498.30	77979.61
		STEP C	38.4160	3073.28	6658.77	79905.28
		STEP D	39.3647	3149.17	6823.21	81878.57
		STEP E	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
		STEP F	41.3331	3306.64	7164.40	85972.84
		STEP G	42.3538	3388.30	7341.32	88095.90
		STEP H	43.3998	3471.98	7522.63	90271.58
		STEP I	44.4716	3557.72	7708.41	92500.92
		STEP J	45.5699	3645.59	7898.78	94785.39
		STEP K	46.6952	3735.61	8093.83	97126.01
		STEP L	47.8484	3827.87	8293.72	99524.67
		STEP M	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60

B751 ELECTRIC SUBSTATION SUPERVISOR

STEP A	61.4415	4915.32	10649.86	127798.32
STEP B	62.9581	5036.64	10912.73	130952.84
STEP C	64.5129	5161.03	11182.23	134186.83
STEP D	66.1061	5288.48	11458.39	137500.68
STEP E	67.7387	5419.09	11741.37	140896.49
STEP F	69.4116	5552.92	12031.34	144376.12
STEP G	71.1258	5690.06	12328.47	147941.66
STEP H	72.8823	5830.58	12632.93	151595.18
STEP I	74.6822	5974.57	12944.91	155338.97
STEP J	76.5265	6122.12	13264.59	159175.12
STEP K	78.4164	6273.31	13592.17	163106.11
STEP L	80.3530	6428.24	13927.85	167134.24
STEP M	82.3374	6586.99	14271.81	171261.79

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B752	ELECTRIC TECHNOLOGY SYST SUPV					
		STEP A	50.0104	4000.83	8668.46	104021.63
		STEP B	51.2449	4099.59	8882.44	106589.39
		STEP C	52.5104	4200.83	9101.80	109221.63
		STEP D	53.8072	4304.57	9326.58	111918.97
		STEP E	55.1361	4410.88	9556.92	114683.08
		STEP F	56.4977	4519.81	9792.93	117515.21
		STEP G	57.8930	4631.44	10034.78	120417.44
		STEP H	59.3227	4745.81	10282.60	123391.21
		STEP I	60.7877	4863.01	10536.53	126438.41
		STEP J	62.2889	4983.11	10796.74	129560.91
		STEP K	63.8272	5106.17	11063.38	132760.57
		STEP L	65.4035	5232.28	11336.60	136039.28
		STEP M	67.0187	5361.49	11616.57	139398.89

B753 ELECTRIC UTILITY DIRECTOR

Step A	99.9138	7993.10	17318.39	207820.63
Step B	102.3801	8190.41	17745.89	212950.67
Step C	104.9085	8392.68	18184.14	218209.69
Step D	107.4993	8599.95	18633.22	223598.60
Step E	110.1541	8812.33	19093.38	229120.59
Step F	112.8745	9029.96	19564.91	234778.95
Step G	115.6620	9252.96	20048.09	240577.06
Step H	118.5184	9481.47	20543.20	246518.35
Step I	121.4454	9715.63	21050.53	252606.36
Step J	124.4446	9955.57	21570.39	258844.73
Step K	127.5179	10201.43	22103.10	265237.16
Step L	130.6670	10453.36	22648.95	271787.46
Step M	133.8940	10711.52	23208.29	278499.52

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGBB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B754	ELECTRONIC MAINT COORDINATOR					
		STEP A	35.2965	2823.72	6118.06	73416.72
		STEP B	36.1682	2893.45	6269.15	75229.85
		STEP C	37.0614	2964.91	6423.97	77087.71
		STEP D	37.9766	3038.12	6582.61	78991.32
		STEP E	38.9145	3113.16	6745.18	80942.16
		STEP F	39.8755	3190.04	6911.75	82941.04
		STEP G	40.8603	3268.82	7082.45	84989.42
		STEP H	41.8694	3349.55	7257.36	87088.35
		STEP I	42.9034	3432.27	7436.58	89239.07
		STEP J	43.9629	3517.03	7620.23	91442.83
		STEP K	45.0486	3603.88	7808.42	93701.08
		STEP L	46.1612	3692.89	8001.27	96015.29
		STEP M	47.3012	3784.09	8198.87	98386.49

B755 EMS QUAL ASSURANCE COORDINATOR

STEP A	45.1917	3615.33	7833.22	93998.73
STEP B	46.3073	3704.58	8026.59	96319.18
STEP C	47.4509	3796.07	8224.82	98697.87
STEP D	48.6228	3889.82	8427.95	101135.42
STEP E	49.8236	3985.88	8636.09	103633.08
STEP F	51.0540	4084.32	8849.36	106192.32
STEP G	52.3148	4185.18	9067.89	108814.78
STEP H	53.6068	4288.54	9291.84	111502.14
STEP I	54.9307	4394.45	9521.32	114255.85
STEP J	56.2873	4502.98	9756.46	117077.58
STEP K	57.6773	4614.18	9997.39	119968.78
STEP L	59.1017	4728.13	10244.29	122931.53
STEP M	60.5613	4844.90	10497.29	125967.50

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B939	ENERGY SERVICES ACCOUNT REP I					
		STEP A	39.3599	3148.79	6822.38	81868.59
		STEP B	40.3314	3226.51	6990.77	83889.31
		STEP C	41.3274	3306.19	7163.41	85960.99
		STEP D	42.3480	3387.84	7340.32	88083.84
		STEP E	43.3939	3471.51	7521.60	90259.31
		STEP F	44.4655	3557.24	7707.35	92488.24
		STEP G	45.5636	3645.08	7897.69	94772.28
		STEP H	46.6889	3735.11	8092.74	97112.91
		STEP I	47.8419	3827.35	8292.59	99511.15
		STEP J	49.0234	3921.87	8497.38	101968.67
		STEP K	50.2341	4018.72	8707.24	104486.92
		STEP L	51.4747	4117.97	8922.28	107067.37
		STEP M	52.7459	4219.67	9142.62	109711.47

B756 ENERGY SERVICES ACCOUNT REP II

	STEP A	43.2959	3463.67	7504.62	90055.47
	STEP B	44.3646	3549.16	7689.86	92278.36
	STEP C	45.4602	3636.81	7879.76	94557.21
	STEP D	46.5829	3726.63	8074.36	96892.43
	STEP E	47.7333	3818.66	8273.77	99285.26
	STEP F	48.9122	3912.97	8478.11	101737.37
	STEP G	50.1201	4009.60	8687.48	104249.80
	STEP H	51.3579	4108.63	8902.03	106824.43
	STEP I	52.6262	4210.09	9121.87	109462.49
	STEP J	53.9259	4314.07	9347.15	112165.87
	STEP K	55.2576	4420.60	9577.98	114935.80
	STEP L	56.6223	4529.78	9814.53	117774.38
	STEP M	58.0206	4641.64	10056.90	120682.84

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B757	ENGINEERING MANAGER					
		STEP A	56.5013	4520.10	9793.55	117522.70
		STEP B	57.8958	4631.66	10035.27	120423.26
		STEP C	59.3256	4746.04	10283.10	123397.24
		STEP D	60.7907	4863.25	10537.05	126444.65
		STEP E	62.2920	4983.36	10797.28	129567.36
		STEP F	63.8304	5106.43	11063.93	132767.23
		STEP G	65.4068	5232.54	11337.17	136046.14
		STEP H	67.0220	5361.76	11617.14	139405.76
		STEP I	68.6772	5494.17	11904.04	142848.57
		STEP J	70.3733	5629.86	12198.03	146376.46
		STEP K	72.1112	5768.89	12499.27	149991.29
		STEP L	73.8921	5911.36	12807.96	153695.56
		STEP M	75.7169	6057.35	13124.26	157491.15

B758 ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR

	STEP A	42.0752	3366.01	7293.03	87516.41
	STEP B	43.1139	3449.11	7473.07	89676.91
	STEP C	44.1786	3534.28	7657.62	91891.48
	STEP D	45.2697	3621.57	7846.74	94160.97
	STEP E	46.3877	3711.01	8040.53	96486.41
	STEP F	47.5333	3802.66	8239.10	98869.26
	STEP G	48.7071	3896.56	8442.56	101310.76
	STEP H	49.9100	3992.80	8651.06	103812.80
	STEP I	51.1426	4091.40	8864.71	106376.60
	STEP J	52.4056	4192.44	9083.63	109003.64
	STEP K	53.6998	4295.98	9307.96	111695.58
	STEP L	55.0260	4402.08	9537.84	114454.08
	STEP M	56.3849	4510.79	9773.38	117280.59

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGBB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B761	ENVIRONMENTAL UTIL COMPL ADMIN					
		STEP A	42.0733	3365.86	7292.70	87512.46
		STEP B	43.1117	3448.93	7472.69	89672.33
		STEP C	44.1764	3534.11	7657.24	91886.91
		STEP D	45.2674	3621.39	7846.34	94156.19
		STEP E	46.3853	3710.82	8040.11	96481.42
		STEP F	47.5308	3802.46	8238.67	98864.06
		STEP G	48.7046	3896.36	8442.13	101305.56
		STEP H	49.9074	3992.59	8650.61	103807.39
		STEP I	51.1400	4091.20	8864.26	106371.20
		STEP J	52.4029	4192.23	9083.16	108998.03
		STEP K	53.6970	4295.76	9307.48	111689.76
		STEP L	55.0231	4401.84	9537.33	114448.04
		STEP M	56.3820	4510.56	9772.88	117274.56

B759 ENVIRONMENTAL UTIL DIRECTOR

STEP A	74.5054	5960.43	12914.26	154971.23
STEP B	76.3445	6107.56	13233.04	158796.56
STEP C	78.2299	6258.39	13559.84	162718.19
STEP D	80.1619	6412.95	13894.72	166736.75
STEP E	82.1416	6571.32	14237.87	170854.52
STEP F	84.1701	6733.60	14589.48	175073.80
STEP G	86.2488	6899.90	14949.79	179397.50
STEP H	88.3788	7070.30	15318.99	183827.90
STEP I	90.5614	7244.91	15697.30	188367.71
STEP J	92.7979	7423.83	16084.96	193019.63
STEP K	95.0896	7607.16	16482.19	197786.36
STEP L	97.4380	7795.04	16889.25	202671.04
STEP M	99.8443	7987.54	17306.34	207676.14

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B760	EQUIPMENT MAINT SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	31.4681	2517.44	5454.47	65453.64
		STEP B	32.2449	2579.59	5589.11	67069.39
		STEP C	33.0412	2643.29	5727.14	68725.69
		STEP D	33.8572	2708.57	5868.58	70422.97
		STEP E	34.6934	2775.47	6013.52	72162.27
		STEP F	35.5501	2844.00	6162.01	73944.20
		STEP G	36.4281	2914.24	6314.20	75770.44
		STEP H	37.3277	2986.21	6470.13	77641.61
		STEP I	38.2496	3059.96	6629.93	79559.16
		STEP J	39.1942	3135.53	6793.66	81523.93
		STEP K	40.1621	3212.96	6961.43	83537.16
		STEP L	41.1540	3292.32	7133.36	85600.32
		STEP M	42.1703	3373.62	7309.51	87714.22

B851 ERP MANAGER

	STEP A	48.3018	3864.14	8372.31	100467.74
	STEP B	49.4942	3959.53	8578.99	102947.93
	STEP C	50.7165	4057.32	8790.86	105490.32
	STEP D	51.9690	4157.52	9007.96	108095.52
	STEP E	53.2524	4260.19	9230.41	110764.99
	STEP F	54.5675	4365.40	9458.36	113500.40
	STEP G	55.9151	4473.20	9691.95	116303.40
	STEP H	57.2960	4583.68	9931.30	119175.68
	STEP I	58.7110	4696.88	10176.57	122118.88
	STEP J	60.1609	4812.87	10427.88	125134.67
	STEP K	61.6467	4931.73	10685.42	128225.13
	STEP L	63.1691	5053.52	10949.31	131391.72
	STEP M	64.7291	5178.32	11219.71	134636.52

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B847	EU BUSINESS SVCS ADMINISTRATOR					
		STEP A	42.9160	3433.28	7438.77	89265.28
		STEP B	43.9753	3518.02	7622.38	91468.62
		STEP C	45.0614	3604.91	7810.64	93727.71
		STEP D	46.1742	3693.93	8003.52	96042.33
		STEP E	47.3145	3785.16	8201.18	98414.16
		STEP F	48.4830	3878.64	8403.72	100844.64
		STEP G	49.6803	3974.42	8611.25	103335.02
		STEP H	50.9072	4072.57	8823.91	105886.97
		STEP I	52.1644	4173.15	9041.82	108501.95
		STEP J	53.4527	4276.21	9265.13	111181.61
		STEP K	54.7728	4381.82	9493.95	113927.42
		STEP L	56.1254	4490.03	9728.40	116740.83
		STEP M	57.5115	4600.92	9968.66	119623.92

B848 EU RATE ANALYST I

STEP A	34.4334	2754.67	5968.45	71621.47
STEP B	35.2833	2822.66	6115.77	73389.26
STEP C	36.1547	2892.37	6266.81	75201.77
STEP D	37.0476	2963.80	6421.58	77059.00
STEP E	37.9625	3037.00	6580.16	78962.00
STEP F	38.9000	3112.00	6742.66	80912.00
STEP G	39.8607	3188.85	6909.18	82910.25
STEP H	40.8451	3267.60	7079.81	84957.80
STEP I	41.8538	3348.30	7254.65	87055.90
STEP J	42.8874	3430.99	7433.81	89205.79
STEP K	43.9466	3515.72	7617.41	91408.92
STEP L	45.0319	3602.55	7805.52	93666.35
STEP M	46.1440	3691.52	7998.29	95979.52

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B849	EU RATE ANALYST II					
		STEP A	37.3182	2985.45	6468.48	77621.85
		STEP B	38.2394	3059.15	6628.16	79537.95
		STEP C	39.1838	3134.70	6791.85	81502.30
		STEP D	40.1515	3212.12	6959.59	83515.12
		STEP E	41.1431	3291.44	7131.47	85577.64
		STEP F	42.1591	3372.72	7307.57	87690.92
		STEP G	43.2003	3456.02	7488.05	89856.62
		STEP H	44.2672	3541.37	7672.98	92075.77
		STEP I	45.3604	3628.83	7862.46	94349.63
		STEP J	46.4806	3718.44	8056.63	96679.64
		STEP K	47.6285	3810.28	8255.60	99067.28
		STEP L	48.8047	3904.37	8459.48	101513.77
		STEP M	50.0100	4000.80	8668.40	104020.80

B762 FACILITIES MANAGER

	STEP A	40.8297	3266.38	7077.15	84925.77
	STEP B	41.8376	3347.01	7251.85	87022.16
	STEP C	42.8708	3429.66	7430.94	89171.26
	STEP D	43.9295	3514.36	7614.45	91373.43
	STEP E	45.0144	3601.15	7802.50	93629.99
	STEP F	46.1261	3690.09	7995.19	95942.27
	STEP G	47.2652	3781.22	8192.64	98311.66
	STEP H	48.4325	3874.60	8394.96	100739.57
	STEP I	49.6286	3970.29	8602.29	103227.43
	STEP J	50.8542	4068.34	8814.73	105776.74
	STEP K	52.1101	4168.81	9032.42	108389.00
	STEP L	53.3970	4271.76	9255.48	111065.78
	STEP M	54.7157	4377.26	9484.05	113808.66

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B763	FINANCE DIRECTOR					
		STEP A	67.0881	5367.04	11628.60	139543.24
		STEP B	68.7443	5499.54	11915.67	142988.14
		STEP C	70.4421	5635.36	12209.96	146519.56
		STEP D	72.1817	5774.53	12511.49	150137.93
		STEP E	73.9643	5917.14	12820.47	153845.74
		STEP F	75.7909	6063.27	13137.08	157645.07
		STEP G	77.6626	6213.00	13461.51	161538.20
		STEP H	79.5806	6366.44	13793.97	165527.64
		STEP I	81.5459	6523.67	14134.62	169615.47
		STEP J	83.5598	6684.78	14483.69	173804.38
		STEP K	85.6234	6849.87	14841.38	178096.67
		STEP L	87.7379	7019.03	15207.90	182494.83
		STEP M	89.9047	7192.37	15583.48	187001.77

B764 FINANCE MANAGER

STEP A	44.7525	3580.20	7757.10	93085.15
STEP B	45.8572	3668.58	7948.58	95382.95
STEP C	46.9897	3759.17	8144.88	97738.53
STEP D	48.1501	3852.01	8346.02	100152.28
STEP E	49.3393	3947.14	8552.14	102625.64
STEP F	50.5577	4044.62	8763.34	105160.08
STEP G	51.8063	4144.50	8979.76	107757.12
STEP H	53.0857	4246.86	9201.52	110418.29
STEP I	54.3967	4351.74	9428.76	113145.18
STEP J	55.7401	4459.21	9661.62	115939.41
STEP K	57.1167	4569.33	9900.22	118802.65
STEP L	58.5272	4682.18	10144.72	121736.60
STEP M	59.9726	4797.81	10395.25	124743.01

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B765	FINANCE SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	36.3377	2907.01	6298.53	75582.41
		STEP B	37.2345	2978.76	6453.98	77447.76
		STEP C	38.1540	3052.32	6613.36	79360.32
		STEP D	39.0963	3127.70	6776.69	81320.30
		STEP E	40.0618	3204.94	6944.04	83328.54
		STEP F	41.0511	3284.08	7115.52	85386.28
		STEP G	42.0649	3365.19	7291.24	87494.99
		STEP H	43.1038	3448.30	7471.32	89655.90
		STEP I	44.1683	3533.46	7655.83	91870.06
		STEP J	45.2591	3620.72	7844.91	94138.92
		STEP K	46.3768	3710.14	8038.64	96463.74
		STEP L	47.5221	3801.76	8237.16	98845.96
		STEP M	48.6957	3895.65	8440.58	101287.05

B766 FIRE BATTALLION CHIEF (8HR)

STEP A	51.1945	4095.56	8873.71	106484.56
STEP B	51.8769	4150.15	8992.00	107903.95
STEP C	53.1581	4252.64	9214.07	110568.84
STEP D	54.4709	4357.67	9441.62	113299.47
STEP E	55.8161	4465.28	9674.79	116097.48
STEP F	57.1945	4575.56	9913.71	118964.56
STEP G	58.6070	4688.56	10158.54	121902.56
STEP H	60.0544	4804.35	10409.42	124913.15
STEP I	61.5375	4923.00	10666.50	127998.00
STEP J	63.0572	5044.57	10929.91	131158.97
STEP K	64.6145	5169.16	11199.84	134398.16
STEP L	66.2102	5296.81	11476.43	137717.21
STEP M	67.8453	5427.62	11759.85	141118.22

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B767	FIRE BATTALION CHIEF (24HR)					
		STEP A	36.1622	4050.16	8775.36	105304.32
		STEP B	37.0549	4150.14	8991.98	107903.86
		STEP C	37.9700	4252.64	9214.05	110568.64
		STEP D	38.9077	4357.66	9441.60	113299.22
		STEP E	39.8686	4465.28	9674.78	116097.36
		STEP F	40.8532	4575.55	9913.70	118964.51
		STEP G	41.8621	4688.55	10158.53	121902.43
		STEP H	42.8959	4804.34	10409.40	124912.86
		STEP I	43.9553	4922.99	10666.48	127997.83
		STEP J	45.0408	5044.56	10929.90	131158.80
		STEP K	46.1532	5169.15	11199.84	134398.11
		STEP L	47.2930	5296.81	11476.43	137717.21
		STEP M	48.4609	5427.62	11759.84	141118.14

B768 FIRE CHIEF

	STEP A	72.7667	5821.33	12612.89	151354.73
	STEP B	74.5628	5965.02	12924.21	155090.62
	STEP C	76.4042	6112.33	13243.39	158920.73
	STEP D	78.2911	6263.28	13570.45	162845.48
	STEP E	80.2246	6417.96	13905.59	166867.16
	STEP F	82.2058	6576.46	14249.00	170988.06
	STEP G	84.2360	6738.88	14600.90	175210.88
	STEP H	86.3163	6905.30	14961.49	179537.90
	STEP I	88.4479	7075.83	15330.96	183971.63
	STEP J	90.6322	7250.57	15709.58	188514.97
	STEP K	92.8705	7429.64	16097.55	193170.64
	STEP L	95.1640	7613.12	16495.09	197941.12
	STEP M	97.5142	7801.13	16902.46	202829.53

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B769	FIRE DIVISION CHIEF					
		STEP A	55.6902	4455.21	9652.96	115835.61
		STEP B	57.0648	4565.18	9891.23	118694.78
		STEP C	58.4741	4677.92	10135.51	121626.12
		STEP D	59.9182	4793.45	10385.82	124629.85
		STEP E	61.3979	4911.83	10642.30	127707.63
		STEP F	62.9142	5033.13	10905.12	130861.53
		STEP G	64.4679	5157.43	11174.43	134093.23
		STEP H	66.0600	5284.80	11450.40	137404.80
		STEP I	67.6915	5415.32	11733.19	140798.32
		STEP J	69.3632	5549.05	12022.95	144275.45
		STEP K	71.0762	5686.09	12319.87	147838.49
		STEP L	72.8315	5826.52	12624.12	151489.52
		STEP M	74.6301	5970.40	12935.88	155230.60

B770 FLEET MANAGER

	STEP A	40.8297	3266.38	7077.15	84925.77
	STEP B	41.8376	3347.01	7251.85	87022.16
	STEP C	42.8708	3429.66	7430.94	89171.26
	STEP D	43.9295	3514.36	7614.45	91373.43
	STEP E	45.0144	3601.15	7802.50	93629.99
	STEP F	46.1261	3690.09	7995.19	95942.27
	STEP G	47.2652	3781.22	8192.64	98311.66
	STEP H	48.4325	3874.60	8394.96	100739.57
	STEP I	49.6286	3970.29	8602.29	103227.43
	STEP J	50.8542	4068.34	8814.73	105776.74
	STEP K	52.1101	4168.81	9032.42	108389.00
	STEP L	53.3970	4271.76	9255.48	111065.78
	STEP M	54.7157	4377.26	9484.05	113808.66

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B771	GOVERNMENT RELATIONS ADMINISTR					
		STEP A	43.9043	3512.34	7610.07	91320.94
		STEP B	44.9880	3599.04	7797.92	93575.04
		STEP C	46.0990	3687.92	7990.49	95885.92
		STEP D	47.2374	3778.99	8187.81	98253.79
		STEP E	48.4040	3872.32	8390.02	100680.32
		STEP F	49.5994	3967.95	8597.22	103166.75
		STEP G	50.8243	4065.94	8809.54	105714.54
		STEP H	52.0795	4166.36	9027.11	108325.36
		STEP I	53.3656	4269.24	9250.03	111000.44
		STEP J	54.6835	4374.68	9478.47	113741.68
		STEP K	56.0340	4482.72	9712.56	116550.72
		STEP L	57.4178	4593.42	9952.41	119429.02
		STEP M	58.8358	4706.86	10198.20	122378.46

B844 HOUSING MANAGER

STEP A	43.4430	3475.44	7530.12	90361.44
STEP B	44.5172	3561.37	7716.31	92595.77
STEP C	45.6166	3649.32	7906.87	94882.52
STEP D	46.7432	3739.45	8102.15	97225.85
STEP E	47.8976	3831.80	8302.25	99627.00
STEP F	49.0804	3926.43	8507.26	102087.23
STEP G	50.2925	4023.40	8717.36	104608.40
STEP H	51.5345	4122.76	8932.64	107191.76
STEP I	52.8072	4224.57	9153.24	109838.97
STEP J	54.1114	4328.91	9379.30	112551.71
STEP K	55.4477	4435.81	9610.93	115331.21
STEP L	56.8170	4545.36	9848.28	118179.36
STEP M	58.2202	4657.61	10091.50	121098.01

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B772	HOUSING SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	36.5872	2926.97	6341.78	76101.37
		STEP B	37.4902	2999.21	6498.30	77979.61
		STEP C	38.4160	3073.28	6658.77	79905.28
		STEP D	39.3647	3149.17	6823.21	81878.57
		STEP E	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
		STEP F	41.3331	3306.64	7164.40	85972.84
		STEP G	42.3538	3388.30	7341.32	88095.90
		STEP H	43.3998	3471.98	7522.63	90271.58
		STEP I	44.4716	3557.72	7708.41	92500.92
		STEP J	45.5699	3645.59	7898.78	94785.39
		STEP K	46.6952	3735.61	8093.83	97126.01
		STEP L	47.8484	3827.87	8293.72	99524.67
		STEP M	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60

B773 HUMAN RESOURCES ANALYST I

STEP A	32.3413	2587.31	5605.83	67270.00
STEP B	33.1397	2651.18	5744.21	68930.56
STEP C	33.9581	2716.65	5886.07	70632.87
STEP D	34.7967	2783.74	6031.43	72377.22
STEP E	35.6561	2852.49	6180.39	74164.65
STEP F	36.5366	2922.93	6333.02	75996.22
STEP G	37.4390	2995.12	6489.42	77873.02
STEP H	38.3635	3069.08	6649.68	79796.17
STEP I	39.3110	3144.88	6813.90	81766.82
STEP J	40.2818	3222.54	6982.18	83786.13
STEP K	41.2766	3302.13	7154.61	85855.31
STEP L	42.2960	3383.68	7331.30	87975.59
STEP M	43.3405	3467.24	7512.35	90148.24

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B774	HUMAN RESOURCES ANALYST II					
		STEP A	35.5826	2846.61	6167.65	74011.83
		STEP B	36.4610	2916.88	6319.90	75838.80
		STEP C	37.3614	2988.91	6475.98	77711.72
		STEP D	38.2841	3062.73	6635.91	79630.89
		STEP E	39.2295	3138.36	6799.79	81597.45
		STEP F	40.1984	3215.87	6967.72	83612.58
		STEP G	41.1911	3295.29	7139.79	85677.48
		STEP H	42.2084	3376.67	7316.11	87793.37
		STEP I	43.2507	3460.06	7496.79	89961.52
		STEP J	44.3188	3545.51	7681.93	92183.20
		STEP K	45.4133	3633.07	7871.65	94459.76
		STEP L	46.5349	3722.79	8066.04	96792.54
		STEP M	47.6841	3814.73	8265.24	99182.93

B775 HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR

STEP A	61.0708	4885.66	10585.60	127027.26
STEP B	62.5784	5006.27	10846.92	130163.07
STEP C	64.1238	5129.90	11114.79	133377.50
STEP D	65.7074	5256.59	11389.28	136671.39
STEP E	67.3301	5386.40	11670.55	140046.60
STEP F	68.9929	5519.43	11958.76	143505.23
STEP G	70.6968	5655.74	12254.11	147049.34
STEP H	72.4427	5795.41	12556.73	150680.81
STEP I	74.2318	5938.54	12866.84	154402.14
STEP J	76.0650	6085.20	13184.60	158215.20
STEP K	77.9435	6235.48	13510.20	162122.48
STEP L	79.8684	6389.47	13843.85	166126.27
STEP M	81.8408	6547.26	14185.73	170228.86

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B776	HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGER					
		STEP A	41.6683	3333.46	7222.50	86670.06
		STEP B	42.6971	3415.76	7400.83	88809.96
		STEP C	43.7516	3500.12	7583.61	91003.32
		STEP D	44.8320	3586.56	7770.88	93250.56
		STEP E	45.9392	3675.13	7962.79	95553.53
		STEP F	47.0737	3765.89	8159.44	97913.29
		STEP G	48.2363	3858.90	8360.95	100331.50
		STEP H	49.4275	3954.20	8567.43	102809.20
		STEP I	50.6482	4051.85	8779.02	105348.25
		STEP J	51.8990	4151.92	8995.82	107949.92
		STEP K	53.1807	4254.45	9217.98	110615.85
		STEP L	54.4940	4359.52	9445.62	113347.52
		STEP M	55.8398	4467.18	9678.89	116146.78

B777 INFO SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR

STEP A	42.8581	3428.64	7428.73	89144.84
STEP B	43.9160	3513.28	7612.10	91345.28
STEP C	45.0006	3600.04	7800.10	93601.24
STEP D	46.1119	3688.95	7992.72	95912.75
STEP E	47.2507	3780.05	8190.12	98281.45
STEP F	48.4176	3873.40	8392.38	100708.60
STEP G	49.6133	3969.06	8599.63	103195.66
STEP H	50.8385	4067.08	8812.00	105744.08
STEP I	52.0941	4167.52	9029.64	108355.72
STEP J	53.3806	4270.44	9252.63	111031.64
STEP K	54.6989	4375.91	9481.14	113773.71
STEP L	56.0497	4483.97	9715.28	116583.37
STEP M	57.4339	4594.71	9955.20	119462.51

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B778	INTERPRETIVE SRVCS SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	31.2307	2498.45	5413.32	64959.85
		STEP B	32.0020	2560.16	5547.01	66564.16
		STEP C	32.7923	2623.38	5684.00	68207.98
		STEP D	33.6022	2688.17	5824.38	69892.57
		STEP E	34.4320	2754.56	5968.21	71618.56
		STEP F	35.2823	2822.58	6115.59	73387.18
		STEP G	36.1537	2892.29	6266.64	75199.69
		STEP H	37.0465	2963.72	6421.39	77056.72
		STEP I	37.9614	3036.91	6579.97	78959.71
		STEP J	38.8989	3111.91	6742.47	80909.71
		STEP K	39.8596	3188.76	6909.00	82907.96
		STEP L	40.8439	3267.51	7079.60	84955.31
		STEP M	41.8526	3348.20	7254.45	87053.40

B779 IT DIVISION MANAGER

	STEP A	44.7165	3577.32	7750.86	93010.32
	STEP B	45.8208	3665.66	7942.27	95307.26
	STEP C	46.9524	3756.19	8138.41	97660.99
	STEP D	48.1119	3848.95	8339.39	100072.75
	STEP E	49.3001	3944.00	8545.35	102544.20
	STEP F	50.5176	4041.40	8756.38	105076.60
	STEP G	51.7652	4141.21	8972.63	107671.61
	STEP H	53.0436	4243.48	9194.22	110330.68
	STEP I	54.3535	4348.28	9421.27	113055.28
	STEP J	55.6958	4455.66	9653.93	115847.26
	STEP K	57.0713	4565.70	9892.35	118708.30
	STEP L	58.4807	4678.45	10136.65	121639.85
	STEP M	59.9250	4794.00	10387.00	124644.00

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B781	IT PROGRAM MANAGER					
		STEP A	40.6545	3252.36	7046.78	84561.36
		STEP B	41.6585	3332.68	7220.80	86649.68
		STEP C	42.6873	3414.98	7399.13	88789.58
		STEP D	43.7415	3499.32	7581.86	90982.32
		STEP E	44.8217	3585.73	7769.09	93229.13
		STEP F	45.9286	3674.28	7960.95	95531.48
		STEP G	47.0629	3765.03	8157.56	97890.83
		STEP H	48.2252	3858.01	8359.03	100308.41
		STEP I	49.4161	3953.28	8565.45	102785.48
		STEP J	50.6365	4050.92	8776.99	105323.92
		STEP K	51.8870	4150.96	8993.74	107924.96
		STEP L	53.1684	4253.47	9215.85	110590.27
		STEP M	54.4815	4358.52	9443.46	113321.52

B782 KEY ACCOUNTS REPRESENTATIVE

STEP A	47.6233	3809.86	8254.70	99056.46
STEP B	48.7987	3903.89	8458.44	101501.29
STEP C	50.0039	4000.31	8667.34	104008.11
STEP D	51.2388	4099.10	8881.39	106576.70
STEP E	52.5042	4200.33	9100.72	109208.73
STEP F	53.8008	4304.06	9325.47	111905.66
STEP G	55.1295	4410.36	9555.78	114669.36
STEP H	56.4909	4519.27	9791.75	117501.07
STEP I	57.8860	4630.88	10033.57	120402.88
STEP J	59.3156	4745.24	10281.37	123376.44
STEP K	60.7805	4862.44	10535.28	126423.44
STEP L	62.2815	4982.52	10795.46	129545.52
STEP M	63.8196	5105.56	11062.06	132744.76

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B783	LIBRARY SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	32.1157	2569.25	5566.72	66800.65
		STEP B	32.9086	2632.68	5704.15	68449.88
		STEP C	33.7213	2697.70	5845.02	70140.30
		STEP D	34.5541	2764.32	5989.37	71872.52
		STEP E	35.4075	2832.60	6137.30	73647.60
		STEP F	36.2819	2902.55	6288.86	75466.35
		STEP G	37.1779	2974.23	6444.16	77330.03
		STEP H	38.0960	3047.68	6603.30	79239.68
		STEP I	39.0369	3122.95	6766.39	81196.75
		STEP J	40.0009	3200.07	6933.48	83201.87
		STEP K	40.9888	3279.10	7104.72	85256.70
		STEP L	42.0010	3360.08	7280.17	87362.08
		STEP M	43.0383	3443.06	7459.97	89519.66

B784 MANAGEMENT ANALYST

STEP A	38.4165	3073.32	6658.86	79906.32
STEP B	39.3646	3149.16	6823.19	81878.36
STEP C	40.3367	3226.93	6991.69	83900.33
STEP D	41.3329	3306.63	7164.36	85972.43
STEP E	42.3537	3388.29	7341.30	88095.69
STEP F	43.3996	3471.96	7522.59	90271.16
STEP G	44.4714	3557.71	7708.37	92500.51
STEP H	45.5697	3645.57	7898.74	94784.97
STEP I	46.6951	3735.60	8093.81	97125.80
STEP J	47.8483	3827.86	8293.70	99524.46
STEP K	49.0299	3922.39	8498.51	101982.19
STEP L	50.2408	4019.26	8708.40	104500.86
STEP M	51.4815	4118.52	8923.46	107081.52

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B785	MAPPING SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	36.5871	2926.96	6341.76	76101.16
		STEP B	37.4902	2999.21	6498.30	77979.61
		STEP C	38.4160	3073.28	6658.77	79905.28
		STEP D	39.3647	3149.17	6823.21	81878.57
		STEP E	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
		STEP F	41.3331	3306.64	7164.40	85972.84
		STEP G	42.3538	3388.30	7341.32	88095.90
		STEP H	43.3998	3471.98	7522.63	90271.58
		STEP I	44.4716	3557.72	7708.41	92500.92
		STEP J	45.5699	3645.59	7898.78	94785.39
		STEP K	46.6952	3735.61	8093.83	97126.01
		STEP L	47.8484	3827.87	8293.72	99524.67
		STEP M	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B787	OPEN SPACE SUPERINTENDENT					
		STEP A	37.0282	2962.25	6418.22	77018.65
		STEP B	37.9426	3035.40	6576.71	78920.60
		STEP C	38.8797	3110.37	6739.14	80869.77
		STEP D	39.8398	3187.18	6905.56	82866.78
		STEP E	40.8237	3265.89	7076.10	84913.29
		STEP F	41.8319	3346.55	7250.86	87010.35
		STEP G	42.8650	3429.20	7429.93	89159.20
		STEP H	43.9236	3513.88	7613.42	91361.08
		STEP I	45.0083	3600.66	7801.43	93617.26
		STEP J	46.1198	3689.58	7994.09	95929.18
		STEP K	47.2588	3780.70	8191.52	98298.30
		STEP L	48.4259	3874.07	8393.82	100725.87
		STEP M	49.6218	3969.74	8601.11	103213.34

B788 PARK DEVELOPMENT ANALYST I

	STEP A	33.2609	2660.87	5765.22	69182.67
	STEP B	34.0820	2726.56	5907.54	70890.56
	STEP C	34.9236	2793.88	6053.42	72641.08
	STEP D	35.7861	2862.88	6202.92	74435.08
	STEP E	36.6699	2933.59	6356.11	76273.39
	STEP F	37.5755	3006.04	6513.08	78157.04
	STEP G	38.5035	3080.28	6673.94	80087.28
	STEP H	39.4543	3156.34	6838.74	82064.94
	STEP I	40.4287	3234.29	7007.64	84091.69
	STEP J	41.4271	3314.16	7180.69	86168.36
	STEP K	42.4502	3396.01	7358.03	88296.41
	STEP L	43.4986	3479.88	7539.75	90477.08
	STEP M	44.5728	3565.82	7725.95	92711.42

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B789	PARK DEVELOPMENT ANALYST II					
		STEP A	36.5872	2926.97	6341.78	76101.37
		STEP B	37.4902	2999.21	6498.30	77979.61
		STEP C	38.4160	3073.28	6658.77	79905.28
		STEP D	39.3647	3149.17	6823.21	81878.57
		STEP E	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
		STEP F	41.3331	3306.64	7164.40	85972.84
		STEP G	42.3538	3388.30	7341.32	88095.90
		STEP H	43.3998	3471.98	7522.63	90271.58
		STEP I	44.4716	3557.72	7708.41	92500.92
		STEP J	45.5699	3645.59	7898.78	94785.39
		STEP K	46.6952	3735.61	8093.83	97126.01
		STEP L	47.8484	3827.87	8293.72	99524.67
		STEP M	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60
B790	PARK PLANNING & DEVELOPMT SUPT					
		STEP A	37.0282	2962.25	6418.22	77018.65
		STEP B	37.9426	3035.40	6576.71	78920.60
		STEP C	38.8797	3110.37	6739.14	80869.77
		STEP D	39.8398	3187.18	6905.56	82866.78
		STEP E	40.8237	3265.89	7076.10	84913.29
		STEP F	41.8319	3346.55	7250.86	87010.35
		STEP G	42.8650	3429.20	7429.93	89159.20
		STEP H	43.9236	3513.88	7613.42	91361.08
		STEP I	45.0083	3600.66	7801.43	93617.26
		STEP J	46.1198	3689.58	7994.09	95929.18
		STEP K	47.2588	3780.70	8191.52	98298.30
		STEP L	48.4259	3874.07	8393.82	100725.87
		STEP M	49.6218	3969.74	8601.11	103213.34

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B791	PARKS SUPERINTENDENT					
		STEP A	37.0282	2962.25	6418.22	77018.65
		STEP B	37.9426	3035.40	6576.71	78920.60
		STEP C	38.8797	3110.37	6739.14	80869.77
		STEP D	39.8398	3187.18	6905.56	82866.78
		STEP E	40.8237	3265.89	7076.10	84913.29
		STEP F	41.8319	3346.55	7250.86	87010.35
		STEP G	42.8650	3429.20	7429.93	89159.20
		STEP H	43.9236	3513.88	7613.42	91361.08
		STEP I	45.0083	3600.66	7801.43	93617.26
		STEP J	46.1198	3689.58	7994.09	95929.18
		STEP K	47.2588	3780.70	8191.52	98298.30
		STEP L	48.4259	3874.07	8393.82	100725.87
		STEP M	49.6218	3969.74	8601.11	103213.34

B792 PARKS SUPERVISOR

STEP A	29.9659	2397.27	5194.08	62329.07
STEP B	30.7059	2456.47	5322.35	63868.27
STEP C	31.4642	2517.13	5453.79	65445.53
STEP D	32.2413	2579.30	5588.49	67061.90
STEP E	33.0375	2643.00	5726.50	68718.00
STEP F	33.8534	2708.27	5867.92	70415.07
STEP G	34.6895	2775.16	6012.84	72154.16
STEP H	35.5461	2843.68	6161.32	73935.88
STEP I	36.4240	2913.92	6313.49	75761.92
STEP J	37.3235	2985.88	6469.40	77632.88
STEP K	38.2453	3059.62	6629.18	79550.22
STEP L	39.1898	3135.18	6792.89	81514.78
STEP M	40.1576	3212.60	6960.65	83527.80

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B794	PARKS,REC & LIBRARIES DIRECTOR					
		STEP A	66.0802	5286.41	11453.90	137446.81
		STEP B	67.7114	5416.91	11736.64	140839.71
		STEP C	69.3836	5550.68	12026.49	144317.88
		STEP D	71.0971	5687.76	12323.49	147881.96
		STEP E	72.8529	5828.23	12627.83	151534.03
		STEP F	74.6521	5972.16	12939.69	155276.36
		STEP G	76.4957	6119.65	13259.25	159111.05
		STEP H	78.3848	6270.78	13586.69	163040.38
		STEP I	80.3206	6425.64	13922.23	167066.84
		STEP J	82.3042	6584.33	14266.06	171192.73
		STEP K	84.3368	6746.94	14618.37	175420.54
		STEP L	86.4196	6913.56	14979.39	179752.76
		STEP M	88.5538	7084.30	15349.32	184191.90

B793 PARKS,REC & LIBRARY BUS ADMSTR

STEP A	37.0442	2963.53	6420.99	77051.93
STEP B	37.9591	3036.72	6579.57	78954.92
STEP C	38.8965	3111.72	6742.06	80904.72
STEP D	39.8571	3188.56	6908.56	82902.76
STEP E	40.8414	3267.31	7079.17	84950.11
STEP F	41.8500	3348.00	7254.00	87048.00
STEP G	42.8836	3430.68	7433.15	89197.88
STEP H	43.9426	3515.40	7616.71	91400.60
STEP I	45.0278	3602.22	7804.81	93657.82
STEP J	46.1398	3691.18	7997.56	95970.78
STEP K	47.2793	3782.34	8195.07	98340.94
STEP L	48.4469	3875.75	8397.46	100769.55
STEP M	49.6433	3971.46	8604.83	103258.06

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B795	PLANNING MANAGER					
		STEP A	55.5189	4441.51	9623.27	115479.31
		STEP B	56.8894	4551.15	9860.82	118329.95
		STEP C	58.2944	4663.55	10104.36	121252.35
		STEP D	59.7340	4778.72	10353.89	124246.72
		STEP E	61.2092	4896.73	10609.59	127315.13
		STEP F	62.7208	5017.66	10871.60	130459.26
		STEP G	64.2698	5141.58	11140.09	133681.18
		STEP H	65.8570	5268.56	11415.21	136982.56
		STEP I	67.4834	5398.67	11697.12	140365.47
		STEP J	69.1500	5532.00	11986.00	143832.00
		STEP K	70.8577	5668.61	12282.00	147384.01
		STEP L	72.6076	5808.60	12585.31	151023.80
		STEP M	74.4007	5952.05	12896.12	154753.45

B796 POLICE CAPTAIN

STEP A	58.5500	4684.00	10148.67	121784.00
STEP B	59.9953	4799.62	10399.19	124790.23
STEP C	61.4769	4918.16	10656.00	127872.05
STEP D	62.9952	5039.61	10919.16	131029.98
STEP E	64.5509	5164.07	11188.82	134265.89
STEP F	66.1451	5291.60	11465.14	137581.72
STEP G	67.7786	5422.29	11748.29	140979.44
STEP H	69.4524	5556.19	12038.42	144461.07
STEP I	71.1676	5693.41	12335.72	148028.68
STEP J	72.9252	5834.02	12640.37	151684.40
STEP K	74.7262	5978.09	12952.53	155430.39
STEP L	76.5716	6125.73	13272.41	159268.90
STEP M	78.4626	6277.01	13600.18	163202.21

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B797	POLICE CHIEF					
		STEP A	83.8045	6704.36	14526.11	174313.29
		STEP B	85.8732	6869.85	14884.68	178616.20
		STEP C	87.9939	7039.51	15252.28	183027.31
		STEP D	90.1670	7213.36	15628.95	187547.35
		STEP E	92.3938	7391.50	16014.92	192179.02
		STEP F	94.6755	7574.04	16410.42	196925.07
		STEP G	97.0136	7761.09	16815.69	201788.33
		STEP H	99.4095	7952.76	17230.97	206771.70
		STEP I	101.8645	8149.16	17656.51	211878.13
		STEP J	104.3801	8350.41	18092.56	217110.67
		STEP K	106.9579	8556.63	18539.37	222472.44
		STEP L	109.5993	8767.95	18997.22	227966.62
		STEP M	112.3060	8984.48	19466.37	233596.48

B798 POLICE LIEUTENANT

STEP A	53.1477	4251.82	9212.27	110547.21
STEP B	54.4596	4356.77	9439.67	113276.06
STEP C	55.8046	4464.37	9672.79	116073.53
STEP D	57.1827	4574.62	9911.67	118940.08
STEP E	58.5949	4687.59	10156.45	121877.43
STEP F	60.0420	4803.36	10407.28	124887.31
STEP G	61.5248	4921.98	10664.29	127971.53
STEP H	63.0442	5043.54	10927.66	131131.91
STEP I	64.6011	5168.09	11197.53	134370.35
STEP J	66.1965	5295.72	11474.06	137688.76
STEP K	67.8313	5426.50	11757.43	141089.12
STEP L	69.5065	5560.52	12047.79	144573.45
STEP M	71.2230	5697.84	12345.32	148143.84

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B799	POLICE SERVICES ADMINISTRATOR					
		STEP A	41.4691	3317.52	7187.97	86255.72
		STEP B	42.4929	3399.43	7365.43	88385.23
		STEP C	43.5424	3483.39	7547.34	90568.19
		STEP D	44.6177	3569.41	7733.73	92804.81
		STEP E	45.7196	3657.56	7924.73	95096.76
		STEP F	46.8486	3747.88	8120.42	97445.08
		STEP G	48.0056	3840.44	8320.97	99851.64
		STEP H	49.1912	3935.29	8526.47	102317.69
		STEP I	50.4060	4032.48	8737.04	104844.48
		STEP J	51.6508	4132.06	8952.80	107433.66
		STEP K	52.9264	4234.11	9173.90	110086.91
		STEP L	54.2335	4338.68	9400.47	112805.68
		STEP M	55.5728	4445.82	9632.61	115591.42

B800 POLICE SOCIAL SVCS ADMINSTR

	STEP A	43.9043	3512.34	7610.07	91320.94
	STEP B	44.9880	3599.04	7797.92	93575.04
	STEP C	46.0990	3687.92	7990.49	95885.92
	STEP D	47.2374	3778.99	8187.81	98253.79
	STEP E	48.4040	3872.32	8390.02	100680.32
	STEP F	49.5994	3967.95	8597.22	103166.75
	STEP G	50.8243	4065.94	8809.54	105714.54
	STEP H	52.0795	4166.36	9027.11	108325.36
	STEP I	53.3656	4269.24	9250.03	111000.44
	STEP J	54.6835	4374.68	9478.47	113741.68
	STEP K	56.0340	4482.72	9712.56	116550.72
	STEP L	57.4178	4593.42	9952.41	119429.02
	STEP M	58.8358	4706.86	10198.20	122378.46

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B801	POWER ENGINEERING MANAGER					
		STEP A	67.5845	5406.76	11714.64	140575.76
		STEP B	69.2528	5540.22	12003.81	144045.82
		STEP C	70.9631	5677.04	12300.27	147603.24
		STEP D	72.7156	5817.24	12604.03	151248.44
		STEP E	74.5114	5960.91	12915.30	154983.71
		STEP F	76.3515	6108.12	13234.26	158811.12
		STEP G	78.2371	6258.96	13561.09	162733.16
		STEP H	80.1692	6413.53	13895.99	166751.93
		STEP I	82.1491	6571.92	14239.17	170870.12
		STEP J	84.1778	6734.22	14590.81	175089.82
		STEP K	86.2567	6900.53	14951.16	179413.93
		STEP L	88.3869	7070.95	15320.39	183844.75
		STEP M	90.5697	7245.57	15698.74	188384.97

B802 POWER GENERATION SUPERTINDENT

	STEP A	62.0272	4962.17	10751.38	129016.57
	STEP B	63.5584	5084.67	11016.78	132201.47
	STEP C	65.1281	5210.24	11288.87	135466.44
	STEP D	66.7365	5338.92	11567.66	138811.92
	STEP E	68.3846	5470.76	11853.33	142239.96
	STEP F	70.0734	5605.87	12146.05	145752.67
	STEP G	71.8040	5744.32	12446.02	149352.32
	STEP H	73.5772	5886.17	12753.38	153040.57
	STEP I	75.3943	6031.54	13068.34	156820.14
	STEP J	77.2562	6180.49	13391.07	160692.89
	STEP K	79.1641	6333.12	13721.77	164661.32
	STEP L	81.1192	6489.53	14060.66	168727.93
	STEP M	83.1225	6649.80	14407.90	172894.80

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B803	POWER PLANT OPS & MAINT SUPV					
		STEP A	59.0692	4725.53	10238.66	122863.93
		STEP B	60.5273	4842.18	10491.39	125896.78
		STEP C	62.0221	4961.76	10750.49	129005.96
		STEP D	63.5538	5084.30	11015.99	132191.90
		STEP E	65.1233	5209.86	11288.03	135456.46
		STEP F	66.7316	5338.52	11566.81	138801.72
		STEP G	68.3796	5470.36	11852.46	142229.56
		STEP H	70.0683	5605.46	12145.17	145742.06
		STEP I	71.7987	5743.89	12445.10	149341.29
		STEP J	73.5719	5885.75	12752.46	153029.55
		STEP K	75.3888	6031.10	13067.39	156808.70
		STEP L	77.2506	6180.04	13390.10	160681.24
		STEP M	79.1584	6332.67	13720.78	164649.47

B804 POWER SUPPLY & PORTFOLIO ADMST

	STEP A	64.1688	5133.50	11122.59	133471.10
	STEP B	65.7529	5260.23	11397.16	136766.03
	STEP C	67.3767	5390.13	11678.62	140143.53
	STEP D	69.0406	5523.24	11967.03	143604.44
	STEP E	70.7457	5659.65	12262.58	147151.05
	STEP F	72.4928	5799.42	12565.41	150785.02
	STEP G	74.2831	5942.64	12875.73	154508.84
	STEP H	76.1176	6089.40	13193.71	158324.60
	STEP I	77.9974	6239.79	13519.54	162234.59
	STEP J	79.9236	6393.88	13853.42	166241.08
	STEP K	81.8974	6551.79	14195.54	170346.59
	STEP L	83.9199	6713.59	14546.11	174553.39
	STEP M	85.9924	6879.39	14905.34	178864.19

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B805	PREVENTATIVE MAINT SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	42.7162	3417.29	7404.14	88849.69
		STEP B	43.7704	3501.63	7586.86	91042.43
		STEP C	44.8514	3588.11	7774.24	93290.91
		STEP D	45.9590	3676.72	7966.22	95594.72
		STEP E	47.0940	3767.52	8162.96	97955.52
		STEP F	48.2571	3860.56	8364.56	100374.76
		STEP G	49.4488	3955.90	8571.12	102853.50
		STEP H	50.6700	4053.60	8782.80	105393.60
		STEP I	51.9214	4153.71	8999.70	107996.51
		STEP J	53.2036	4256.28	9221.95	110663.48
		STEP K	54.5175	4361.40	9449.70	113396.40
		STEP L	55.8639	4469.11	9683.07	116196.91
		STEP M	57.2435	4579.48	9922.20	119066.48

B806 PRINCIPAL ENGINEER

	STEP A	50.2219	4017.75	8705.12	104461.55
	STEP B	51.4615	4116.92	8919.99	107039.92
	STEP C	52.7324	4218.59	9140.28	109683.39
	STEP D	54.0347	4322.77	9366.01	112392.17
	STEP E	55.3691	4429.52	9597.31	115167.72
	STEP F	56.7365	4538.92	9834.32	118011.92
	STEP G	58.1377	4651.01	10077.20	120926.41
	STEP H	59.5735	4765.88	10326.07	123912.88
	STEP I	61.0447	4883.57	10581.08	126972.97
	STEP J	62.5522	5004.17	10842.38	130108.57
	STEP K	64.0970	5127.76	11110.14	133321.76
	STEP L	65.6800	5254.40	11384.53	136614.40
	STEP M	67.3020	5384.16	11665.68	139988.16

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B807	PRINCIPAL PLANNER					
		STEP A	46.3792	3710.33	8039.06	96468.73
		STEP B	47.5241	3801.92	8237.51	98850.12
		STEP C	48.6977	3895.81	8440.93	101291.21
		STEP D	49.9004	3992.03	8649.40	103792.83
		STEP E	51.1327	4090.61	8863.00	106356.01
		STEP F	52.3955	4191.64	9081.88	108982.64
		STEP G	53.6895	4295.16	9306.18	111674.16
		STEP H	55.0154	4401.23	9536.00	114432.03
		STEP I	56.3740	4509.92	9771.49	117257.92
		STEP J	57.7663	4621.30	10012.82	120153.90
		STEP K	59.1928	4735.42	10260.08	123121.02
		STEP L	60.6547	4852.37	10513.48	126161.77
		STEP M	62.1526	4972.20	10773.11	129277.40

B808 PUB AFFAIRS&COMMUNICAT ADMNSTR

	STEP A	43.9043	3512.34	7610.07	91320.94
	STEP B	44.9880	3599.04	7797.92	93575.04
	STEP C	46.0990	3687.92	7990.49	95885.92
	STEP D	47.2374	3778.99	8187.81	98253.79
	STEP E	48.4040	3872.32	8390.02	100680.32
	STEP F	49.5994	3967.95	8597.22	103166.75
	STEP G	50.8243	4065.94	8809.54	105714.54
	STEP H	52.0795	4166.36	9027.11	108325.36
	STEP I	53.3656	4269.24	9250.03	111000.44
	STEP J	54.6835	4374.68	9478.47	113741.68
	STEP K	56.0340	4482.72	9712.56	116550.72
	STEP L	57.4178	4593.42	9952.41	119429.02
	STEP M	58.8358	4706.86	10198.20	122378.46

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B809	PUBLIC AFFAIRS&COMMNCT DIRECTOR					
		STEP A	55.5188	4441.50	9623.25	115479.10
		STEP B	56.8894	4551.15	9860.82	118329.95
		STEP C	58.2943	4663.54	10104.34	121252.14
		STEP D	59.7339	4778.71	10353.87	124246.51
		STEP E	61.2091	4896.72	10609.57	127314.92
		STEP F	62.7207	5017.65	10871.58	130459.05
		STEP G	64.2697	5141.57	11140.08	133680.97
		STEP H	65.8569	5268.55	11415.19	136982.35
		STEP I	67.4833	5398.66	11697.10	140365.26
		STEP J	69.1499	5531.99	11985.98	143831.79
		STEP K	70.8576	5668.60	12281.98	147383.80
		STEP L	72.6075	5808.60	12585.30	151023.60
		STEP M	74.4006	5952.04	12896.10	154753.24

B810 PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER

STEP A	40.2377	3219.01	6974.53	83694.31
STEP B	41.2309	3298.47	7146.69	85760.30
STEP C	42.2492	3379.93	7323.19	87878.24
STEP D	43.2925	3463.40	7504.04	90048.48
STEP E	44.3617	3548.94	7689.36	92272.31
STEP F	45.4572	3636.58	7879.26	94551.07
STEP G	46.5799	3726.39	8073.84	96886.11
STEP H	47.7302	3818.42	8273.23	99278.80
STEP I	48.9089	3912.72	8477.55	101730.59
STEP J	50.1168	4009.34	8686.91	104242.93
STEP K	51.3545	4108.36	8901.44	106817.32
STEP L	52.6227	4209.82	9121.27	109455.28
STEP M	53.9223	4313.78	9346.53	112158.38

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B811	PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR					
		STEP A	60.9892	4879.13	10571.46	126857.53
		STEP B	62.4949	4999.59	10832.44	129989.39
		STEP C	64.0383	5123.06	11099.97	133199.66
		STEP D	65.6198	5249.58	11374.09	136489.18
		STEP E	67.2403	5379.22	11654.98	139859.82
		STEP F	68.9009	5512.07	11942.82	143313.87
		STEP G	70.6024	5648.19	12237.74	146852.99
		STEP H	72.3460	5787.68	12539.97	150479.68
		STEP I	74.1327	5930.61	12849.66	154196.01
		STEP J	75.9635	6077.08	13167.00	158004.08
		STEP K	77.8395	6227.16	13492.18	161906.16
		STEP L	79.7618	6380.94	13825.37	165904.54
		STEP M	81.7316	6538.52	14166.81	170001.72

B812 PURCHASING & WAREHOUSE MANAGER

STEP A	41.1306	3290.45	7129.30	85551.59
STEP B	42.1459	3371.67	7305.29	87663.42
STEP C	43.1867	3454.94	7485.70	89828.36
STEP D	44.2533	3540.26	7670.56	92046.76
STEP E	45.3461	3627.69	7860.00	94319.95
STEP F	46.4660	3717.28	8054.11	96649.27
STEP G	47.6135	3809.08	8253.01	99036.12
STEP H	48.7894	3903.15	8456.83	101481.92
STEP I	49.9943	3999.54	8665.68	103988.12
STEP J	51.2289	4098.32	8879.68	106556.21
STEP K	52.4941	4199.53	9098.98	109187.72
STEP L	53.7905	4303.24	9323.68	111884.22
STEP M	55.1189	4409.51	9553.94	114647.31

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B813	RECREATION MANAGER					
		STEP A	41.2998	3303.98	7158.63	85903.58
		STEP B	42.3197	3385.57	7335.41	88024.97
		STEP C	43.3649	3469.19	7516.58	90198.99
		STEP D	44.4358	3554.86	7702.20	92426.46
		STEP E	45.5332	3642.65	7892.42	94709.05
		STEP F	46.6577	3732.61	8087.33	97048.01
		STEP G	47.8099	3824.79	8287.04	99444.59
		STEP H	48.9907	3919.25	8491.72	101900.65
		STEP I	50.2005	4016.04	8701.42	104417.04
		STEP J	51.4403	4115.22	8916.31	106995.82
		STEP K	52.7106	4216.84	9136.50	109638.04
		STEP L	54.0124	4320.99	9362.14	112345.79
		STEP M	55.3463	4427.70	9593.35	115120.30

B814 RECREATION SUPERINTENDENT

STEP A	35.8423	2867.38	6212.66	74551.98
STEP B	36.7275	2938.20	6366.10	76393.20
STEP C	37.6345	3010.76	6523.31	78279.76
STEP D	38.5639	3085.11	6684.40	80212.91
STEP E	39.5163	3161.30	6849.49	82193.90
STEP F	40.4922	3239.37	7018.64	84223.77
STEP G	41.4922	3319.37	7191.98	86303.77
STEP H	42.5169	3401.35	7369.59	88435.15
STEP I	43.5669	3485.35	7551.59	90619.15
STEP J	44.6428	3571.42	7738.08	92857.02
STEP K	45.7453	3659.62	7929.18	95150.22
STEP L	46.8750	3750.00	8125.00	97500.00
STEP M	48.0326	3842.60	8325.65	99907.80

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B815	RECREATION SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	31.2307	2498.45	5413.32	64959.85
		STEP B	32.0020	2560.16	5547.01	66564.16
		STEP C	32.7923	2623.38	5684.00	68207.98
		STEP D	33.6022	2688.17	5824.38	69892.57
		STEP E	34.4320	2754.56	5968.21	71618.56
		STEP F	35.2823	2822.58	6115.59	73387.18
		STEP G	36.1537	2892.29	6266.64	75199.69
		STEP H	37.0465	2963.72	6421.39	77056.72
		STEP I	37.9614	3036.91	6579.97	78959.71
		STEP J	38.8989	3111.91	6742.47	80909.71
		STEP K	39.8596	3188.76	6909.00	82907.96
		STEP L	40.8439	3267.51	7079.60	84955.31
		STEP M	41.8526	3348.20	7254.45	87053.40

B846 REFUSE & STORMWATER MANAGER

STEP A	56.5013	4520.10	9793.55	117522.70
STEP B	57.8958	4631.66	10035.27	120423.26
STEP C	59.3256	4746.04	10283.10	123397.24
STEP D	60.7907	4863.25	10537.05	126444.65
STEP E	62.2920	4983.36	10797.28	129567.36
STEP F	63.8304	5106.43	11063.93	132767.23
STEP G	65.4068	5232.54	11337.17	136046.14
STEP H	67.0220	5361.76	11617.14	139405.76
STEP I	68.6772	5494.17	11904.04	142848.57
STEP J	70.3733	5629.86	12198.03	146376.46
STEP K	72.1112	5768.89	12499.27	149991.29
STEP L	73.8921	5911.36	12807.96	153695.56
STEP M	75.7169	6057.35	13124.26	157491.15

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B816	REFUSE SUPERINTENDENT					
		STEP A	40.0712	3205.69	6945.67	83348.09
		STEP B	41.0602	3284.81	7117.10	85405.21
		STEP C	42.0743	3365.94	7292.87	87514.54
		STEP D	43.1133	3449.06	7472.97	89675.66
		STEP E	44.1781	3534.24	7657.53	91890.44
		STEP F	45.2691	3621.52	7846.64	94159.72
		STEP G	46.3871	3710.96	8040.43	96485.16
		STEP H	47.5326	3802.60	8238.98	98867.80
		STEP I	48.7065	3896.52	8442.46	101309.52
		STEP J	49.9093	3992.74	8650.94	103811.34
		STEP K	51.1419	4091.35	8864.59	106375.15
		STEP L	52.4049	4192.39	9083.51	109002.19
		STEP M	53.6991	4295.92	9307.84	111694.12

B817 REFUSE SUPERVISOR

STEP A	33.7592	2700.73	5851.59	70219.13
STEP B	34.5920	2767.36	5995.94	71951.36
STEP C	35.4463	2835.70	6144.02	73728.30
STEP D	36.3217	2905.73	6295.76	75549.13
STEP E	37.2187	2977.49	6451.24	77414.89
STEP F	38.1379	3051.03	6610.56	79326.83
STEP G	39.0797	3126.37	6773.81	81285.77
STEP H	40.0448	3203.58	6941.09	83293.18
STEP I	41.0338	3282.70	7112.52	85350.30
STEP J	42.0471	3363.76	7288.16	87457.96
STEP K	43.0855	3446.84	7468.15	89617.84
STEP L	44.1496	3531.96	7652.59	91831.16
STEP M	45.2399	3619.19	7841.58	94098.99

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B818	REFUSE UTILITY MANAGER					
		STEP A	50.8512	4068.09	8814.20	105770.49
		STEP B	52.1063	4168.50	9031.75	108381.10
		STEP C	53.3931	4271.44	9254.80	111057.64
		STEP D	54.7117	4376.93	9483.36	113800.33
		STEP E	56.0629	4485.03	9717.56	116610.83
		STEP F	57.4474	4595.79	9957.54	119490.59
		STEP G	58.8662	4709.29	10203.47	122441.69
		STEP H	60.3199	4825.59	10455.44	125465.39
		STEP I	61.8096	4944.76	10713.66	128563.96
		STEP J	63.3360	5066.88	10978.24	131738.88
		STEP K	64.9002	5192.01	11249.36	134992.41
		STEP L	66.5029	5320.23	11527.16	138326.03
		STEP M	68.1453	5451.62	11811.85	141742.22

B819 RISK MANAGER

Step A	50.2260	4018.08	8705.85	104470.16
Step B	51.4659	4117.27	8920.75	107048.99
Step C	52.7369	4218.95	9141.06	109692.67
Step D	54.0393	4323.14	9366.80	112401.65
Step E	55.3738	4429.90	9598.13	115177.52
Step F	56.7413	4539.31	9835.16	118021.94
Step G	58.1426	4651.41	10078.05	120936.61
Step H	59.5785	4766.28	10326.94	123923.26
Step I	61.0498	4883.99	10581.97	126983.67
Step J	62.5575	5004.60	10843.30	130119.66
Step K	64.1024	5128.20	11111.09	133333.09
Step L	65.6855	5254.84	11385.49	136625.89
Step M	67.3077	5384.62	11666.67	140000.00

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B820	SAFETY COORDINATOR					
		STEP A	36.5871	2926.96	6341.76	76101.16
		STEP B	37.4902	2999.21	6498.30	77979.61
		STEP C	38.4160	3073.28	6658.77	79905.28
		STEP D	39.3647	3149.17	6823.21	81878.57
		STEP E	40.3369	3226.95	6991.72	83900.75
		STEP F	41.3331	3306.64	7164.40	85972.84
		STEP G	42.3538	3388.30	7341.32	88095.90
		STEP H	43.3998	3471.98	7522.63	90271.58
		STEP I	44.4716	3557.72	7708.41	92500.92
		STEP J	45.5699	3645.59	7898.78	94785.39
		STEP K	46.6952	3735.61	8093.83	97126.01
		STEP L	47.8484	3827.87	8293.72	99524.67
		STEP M	49.0301	3922.40	8498.55	101982.60

B821 SR BUSINESS SYSTEMS ANALYST

	STEP A	34.7663	2781.30	6026.15	72313.90
	STEP B	35.6244	2849.95	6174.89	74098.75
	STEP C	36.5042	2920.33	6327.39	75928.73
	STEP D	37.4057	2992.45	6483.65	77803.85
	STEP E	38.3294	3066.35	6643.76	79725.15
	STEP F	39.2760	3142.08	6807.84	81694.08
	STEP G	40.2460	3219.68	6975.97	83711.68
	STEP H	41.2399	3299.19	7148.24	85778.99
	STEP I	42.2584	3380.67	7324.78	87897.47
	STEP J	43.3020	3464.16	7505.68	90068.16
	STEP K	44.3713	3549.70	7691.02	92292.30
	STEP L	45.4671	3637.36	7880.96	94571.56
	STEP M	46.5900	3727.20	8075.60	96907.20

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B822	SR DATABASE ANALYST					
		STEP A	35.3507	2828.05	6127.45	73529.45
		STEP B	36.2237	2897.89	6278.77	75345.29
		STEP C	37.1183	2969.46	6433.83	77206.06
		STEP D	38.0350	3042.80	6592.73	79112.80
		STEP E	38.9743	3117.94	6755.54	81066.54
		STEP F	39.9368	3194.94	6922.37	83068.54
		STEP G	40.9231	3273.84	7093.33	85120.04
		STEP H	41.9337	3354.69	7268.50	87222.09
		STEP I	42.9693	3437.54	7448.01	89376.14
		STEP J	44.0305	3522.44	7631.95	91583.44
		STEP K	45.1179	3609.43	7820.43	93845.23
		STEP L	46.2321	3698.56	8013.56	96162.76
		STEP M	47.3738	3789.90	8211.45	98537.50

B823 SR DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

STEP A	61.7590	4940.72	10704.90	128458.77
STEP B	63.2835	5062.68	10969.15	131629.77
STEP C	64.8464	5187.71	11240.04	134880.49
STEP D	66.4478	5315.83	11517.63	138211.50
STEP E	68.0888	5447.11	11802.06	141624.77
STEP F	69.7704	5581.63	12093.53	145122.34
STEP G	71.4934	5719.47	12392.19	148706.28
STEP H	73.2590	5860.72	12698.23	152378.73
STEP I	75.0682	6005.46	13011.82	156141.88
STEP J	76.9221	6153.77	13333.16	159997.96
STEP K	78.8218	6305.74	13662.44	163949.27
STEP L	80.7683	6461.47	13999.85	167998.16
STEP M	82.7630	6621.04	14345.59	172147.04

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B824	SR ELECTRIC BUSINESS ANALYST					
		STEP A	47.5668	3805.34	8244.91	98938.94
		STEP B	48.7411	3899.28	8448.45	101381.48
		STEP C	49.9448	3995.58	8657.09	103885.18
		STEP D	51.1782	4094.25	8870.88	106450.65
		STEP E	52.4421	4195.36	9089.96	109079.56
		STEP F	53.7372	4298.97	9314.44	111773.37
		STEP G	55.0643	4405.14	9544.47	114533.74
		STEP H	56.4242	4513.93	9780.19	117362.33
		STEP I	57.8177	4625.41	10021.73	120260.81
		STEP J	59.2455	4739.64	10269.22	123230.64
		STEP K	60.7087	4856.69	10522.84	126274.09
		STEP L	62.2079	4976.63	10782.70	129392.43
		STEP M	63.7442	5099.53	11048.99	132587.93

B825 SR ENERGY SERVICES ACCOUNT REP

STEP A	47.6233	3809.86	8254.70	99056.46
STEP B	48.7987	3903.89	8458.44	101501.29
STEP C	50.0039	4000.31	8667.34	104008.11
STEP D	51.2388	4099.10	8881.39	106576.70
STEP E	52.5042	4200.33	9100.72	109208.73
STEP F	53.8008	4304.06	9325.47	111905.66
STEP G	55.1295	4410.36	9555.78	114669.36
STEP H	56.4909	4519.27	9791.75	117501.07
STEP I	57.8860	4630.88	10033.57	120402.88
STEP J	59.3156	4745.24	10281.37	123376.44
STEP K	60.7805	4862.44	10535.28	126423.44
STEP L	62.2815	4982.52	10795.46	129545.52
STEP M	63.8196	5105.56	11062.06	132744.76

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B826	SR ENGINEER					
		STEP A	42.7247	3417.97	7405.61	88867.37
		STEP B	43.7794	3502.35	7588.42	91061.15
		STEP C	44.8605	3588.84	7775.82	93309.84
		STEP D	45.9684	3677.47	7967.85	95614.27
		STEP E	47.1037	3768.29	8164.64	97975.69
		STEP F	48.2669	3861.35	8366.26	100395.15
		STEP G	49.4589	3956.71	8572.87	102874.51
		STEP H	50.6804	4054.43	8784.60	105415.23
		STEP I	51.9320	4154.56	9001.54	108018.56
		STEP J	53.2145	4257.16	9223.84	110686.16
		STEP K	54.5287	4362.29	9451.64	113419.69
		STEP L	55.8753	4470.02	9685.05	116220.62
		STEP M	57.2552	4580.41	9924.23	119090.81

B827 SR HUMAN RESOURCES ANALYST

STEP A	38.4165	3073.32	6658.86	79906.32
STEP B	39.3646	3149.16	6823.19	81878.36
STEP C	40.3367	3226.93	6991.69	83900.33
STEP D	41.3329	3306.63	7164.36	85972.43
STEP E	42.3537	3388.29	7341.30	88095.69
STEP F	43.3996	3471.96	7522.59	90271.16
STEP G	44.4714	3557.71	7708.37	92500.51
STEP H	45.5697	3645.57	7898.74	94784.97
STEP I	46.6951	3735.60	8093.81	97125.80
STEP J	47.8483	3827.86	8293.70	99524.46
STEP K	49.0299	3922.39	8498.51	101982.19
STEP L	50.2408	4019.26	8708.40	104500.86
STEP M	51.4815	4118.52	8923.46	107081.52

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B828	SR IT ANALYST					
		STEP A	34.8115	2784.92	6033.99	72407.92
		STEP B	35.6707	2853.65	6182.92	74195.05
		STEP C	36.5516	2924.12	6335.61	76027.32
		STEP D	37.4543	2996.34	6492.07	77904.94
		STEP E	38.3793	3070.34	6652.41	79828.94
		STEP F	39.3271	3146.16	6816.69	81800.36
		STEP G	40.2983	3223.86	6985.03	83820.46
		STEP H	41.2935	3303.48	7157.54	85890.48
		STEP I	42.3133	3385.06	7334.30	88011.66
		STEP J	43.3583	3468.66	7515.43	90185.26
		STEP K	44.4291	3554.32	7701.04	92412.52
		STEP L	45.5263	3642.10	7891.22	94694.70
		STEP M	46.6506	3732.04	8086.10	97033.24

B829 SR PLANNER

STEP A	40.3307	3226.45	6990.65	83887.85
STEP B	41.3263	3306.10	7163.22	85958.70
STEP C	42.3469	3387.75	7340.12	88081.55
STEP D	43.3927	3471.41	7521.40	90256.81
STEP E	44.4643	3557.14	7707.14	92485.74
STEP F	45.5624	3644.99	7897.48	94769.79
STEP G	46.6876	3735.00	8092.51	97110.20
STEP H	47.8406	3827.24	8292.37	99508.44
STEP I	49.0220	3921.76	8497.14	101965.76
STEP J	50.2327	4018.61	8707.00	104484.01
STEP K	51.4732	4117.85	8922.02	107064.25
STEP L	52.7444	4219.55	9142.36	109708.35
STEP M	54.0470	4323.76	9368.14	112417.76

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B830	SR POWER ENGINEER					
		STEP A	59.8134	4785.07	10367.65	124411.87
		STEP B	61.2900	4903.20	10623.60	127483.20
		STEP C	62.8036	5024.28	10885.95	130631.48
		STEP D	64.3546	5148.36	11154.79	133857.56
		STEP E	65.9439	5275.51	11430.27	137163.31
		STEP F	67.5725	5405.80	11712.56	140550.80
		STEP G	69.2412	5539.29	12001.80	144021.69
		STEP H	70.9512	5676.09	12298.20	147578.49
		STEP I	72.7034	5816.27	12601.92	151223.07
		STEP J	74.4989	5959.91	12913.14	154957.71
		STEP K	76.3387	6107.09	13232.04	158784.49
		STEP L	78.2240	6257.92	13558.82	162705.92
		STEP M	80.1558	6412.46	13893.67	166724.06

B831 SR POWER PLANT ENGINEER

STEP A	59.8134	4785.07	10367.65	124411.87
STEP B	61.2900	4903.20	10623.60	127483.20
STEP C	62.8036	5024.28	10885.95	130631.48
STEP D	64.3546	5148.36	11154.79	133857.56
STEP E	65.9439	5275.51	11430.27	137163.31
STEP F	67.5725	5405.80	11712.56	140550.80
STEP G	69.2412	5539.29	12001.80	144021.69
STEP H	70.9512	5676.09	12298.20	147578.49
STEP I	72.7034	5816.27	12601.92	151223.07
STEP J	74.4989	5959.91	12913.14	154957.71
STEP K	76.3387	6107.09	13232.04	158784.49
STEP L	78.2240	6257.92	13558.82	162705.92
STEP M	80.1558	6412.46	13893.67	166724.06

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B833	STREET MAINT SUPERINTENDENT					
		STEP A	42.7162	3417.29	7404.14	88849.69
		STEP B	43.7704	3501.63	7586.86	91042.43
		STEP C	44.8514	3588.11	7774.24	93290.91
		STEP D	45.9590	3676.72	7966.22	95594.72
		STEP E	47.0940	3767.52	8162.96	97955.52
		STEP F	48.2571	3860.56	8364.56	100374.76
		STEP G	49.4488	3955.90	8571.12	102853.50
		STEP H	50.6700	4053.60	8782.80	105393.60
		STEP I	51.9214	4153.71	8999.70	107996.51
		STEP J	53.2036	4256.28	9221.95	110663.48
		STEP K	54.5175	4361.40	9449.70	113396.40
		STEP L	55.8639	4469.11	9683.07	116196.91
		STEP M	57.2435	4579.48	9922.20	119066.48

B832 STREET MAINT SUPERVISOR

STEP A	32.5766	2606.12	5646.60	67759.24
STEP B	33.3807	2670.46	5785.99	69431.87
STEP C	34.2051	2736.41	5928.88	71146.56
STEP D	35.0498	2803.98	6075.30	72903.59
STEP E	35.9154	2873.23	6225.33	74704.02
STEP F	36.8024	2944.19	6379.08	76548.91
STEP G	37.7112	3016.90	6536.61	78439.36
STEP H	38.6425	3091.40	6698.04	80376.50
STEP I	39.5969	3167.75	6863.46	82361.48
STEP J	40.5747	3245.98	7032.96	84395.48
STEP K	41.5768	3326.14	7206.64	86479.71
STEP L	42.6036	3408.28	7384.62	88615.41
STEP M	43.6557	3492.46	7566.99	90803.86

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B834	URBAN FORESTER					
		STEP A	34.8445	2787.56	6039.71	72476.56
		STEP B	35.7046	2856.36	6188.79	74265.56
		STEP C	36.5863	2926.90	6341.62	76099.50
		STEP D	37.4899	2999.19	6498.24	77978.99
		STEP E	38.4157	3073.25	6658.72	79904.65
		STEP F	39.3644	3149.15	6823.16	81877.95
		STEP G	40.3366	3226.92	6991.67	83900.12
		STEP H	41.3327	3306.61	7164.33	85972.01
		STEP I	42.3535	3388.28	7341.27	88095.28
		STEP J	43.3995	3471.96	7522.58	90270.96
		STEP K	44.4713	3557.70	7708.35	92500.30
		STEP L	45.5695	3645.56	7898.71	94784.56
		STEP M	46.6949	3735.59	8093.78	97125.39

B835 WATER CONSERVATION ADMINSTR

STEP A	38.4381	3075.04	6662.60	79951.24
STEP B	39.3871	3150.96	6827.09	81925.16
STEP C	40.3598	3228.78	6995.69	83948.38
STEP D	41.3565	3308.52	7168.46	86021.52
STEP E	42.3778	3390.22	7345.48	88145.82
STEP F	43.4244	3473.95	7526.89	90322.75
STEP G	44.4968	3559.74	7712.77	92553.34
STEP H	45.5957	3647.65	7903.25	94839.05
STEP I	46.7217	3737.73	8098.42	97181.13
STEP J	47.8756	3830.04	8298.43	99581.24
STEP K	49.0579	3924.63	8503.36	102040.43
STEP L	50.2694	4021.55	8713.36	104560.35
STEP M	51.5109	4120.87	8928.55	107142.67

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B836	WATER DISTRIBUTION SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	34.8445	2787.56	6039.71	72476.56
		STEP B	35.7046	2856.36	6188.79	74265.56
		STEP C	36.5863	2926.90	6341.62	76099.50
		STEP D	37.4899	2999.19	6498.24	77978.99
		STEP E	38.4157	3073.25	6658.72	79904.65
		STEP F	39.3644	3149.15	6823.16	81877.95
		STEP G	40.3366	3226.92	6991.67	83900.12
		STEP H	41.3327	3306.61	7164.33	85972.01
		STEP I	42.3535	3388.28	7341.27	88095.28
		STEP J	43.3995	3471.96	7522.58	90270.96
		STEP K	44.4713	3557.70	7708.35	92500.30
		STEP L	45.5695	3645.56	7898.71	94784.56
		STEP M	46.6949	3735.59	8093.78	97125.39

B850 WATER DISTRIBUTION SUPT

	STEP A	42.0794	3366.35	7293.76	87525.15
	STEP B	43.7636	3501.08	7585.69	91028.28
	STEP C	44.8444	3587.55	7773.02	93276.35
	STEP D	45.9519	3676.15	7965.00	95579.95
	STEP E	47.0867	3766.93	8161.69	97940.33
	STEP F	48.2495	3859.96	8363.24	100358.96
	STEP G	49.4411	3955.28	8569.79	102837.48
	STEP H	50.6621	4052.96	8781.43	105377.16
	STEP I	51.9133	4153.06	8998.30	107979.66
	STEP J	53.1953	4255.62	9220.51	110646.22
	STEP K	54.5090	4360.72	9448.22	113378.72
	STEP L	55.8552	4468.41	9681.56	116178.81
	STEP M	57.2346	4578.76	9920.66	119047.96

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B837	WATER QUALITY LAB SUPERVISOR					
		STEP A	36.5854	2926.83	6341.46	76097.63
		STEP B	37.4883	2999.06	6497.97	77975.66
		STEP C	38.4141	3073.12	6658.44	79901.32
		STEP D	39.3628	3149.02	6822.88	81874.62
		STEP E	40.3349	3226.79	6991.38	83896.59
		STEP F	41.3310	3306.48	7164.04	85968.48
		STEP G	42.3517	3388.13	7340.96	88091.53
		STEP H	43.3977	3471.81	7522.26	90267.21
		STEP I	44.4694	3557.55	7708.02	92496.35
		STEP J	45.5676	3645.40	7898.38	94780.60
		STEP K	46.6930	3735.44	8093.45	97121.44
		STEP L	47.8461	3827.68	8293.32	99519.88
		STEP M	49.0277	3922.21	8498.13	101977.61
B838	WATER TRMT PLT CHIEF OPERATOR					
		STEP A	41.8116	3344.92	7247.34	86968.12
		STEP B	42.8437	3427.49	7426.24	89114.89
		STEP C	43.9018	3512.14	7609.64	91315.74
		STEP D	44.9859	3598.87	7797.55	93570.67
		STEP E	46.0969	3687.75	7990.12	95881.55
		STEP F	47.2353	3778.82	8187.45	98249.42
		STEP G	48.4019	3872.15	8389.66	100675.95
		STEP H	49.5972	3967.77	8596.84	103162.17
		STEP I	50.8220	4065.76	8809.14	105709.76
		STEP J	52.0771	4166.16	9026.69	108320.36
		STEP K	53.3632	4269.05	9249.62	110995.45
		STEP L	54.6811	4374.48	9478.05	113736.68
		STEP M	56.0315	4482.52	9712.12	116545.52

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B839	WATER UTILITY MANAGER					
		STEP A	56.5013	4520.10	9793.55	117522.70
		STEP B	57.8958	4631.66	10035.27	120423.26
		STEP C	59.3256	4746.04	10283.10	123397.24
		STEP D	60.7907	4863.25	10537.05	126444.65
		STEP E	62.2920	4983.36	10797.28	129567.36
		STEP F	63.8304	5106.43	11063.93	132767.23
		STEP G	65.4068	5232.54	11337.17	136046.14
		STEP H	67.0220	5361.76	11617.14	139405.76
		STEP I	68.6772	5494.17	11904.04	142848.57
		STEP J	70.3733	5629.86	12198.03	146376.46
		STEP K	72.1112	5768.89	12499.27	149991.29
		STEP L	73.8921	5911.36	12807.96	153695.56
		STEP M	75.7169	6057.35	13124.26	157491.15

B840 WSTWTR COLLECTION SUPT

STEP A	42.7094	3416.75	7402.96	88835.55
STEP B	43.7636	3501.08	7585.69	91028.28
STEP C	44.8444	3587.55	7773.02	93276.35
STEP D	45.9519	3676.15	7965.00	95579.95
STEP E	47.0867	3766.93	8161.69	97940.33
STEP F	48.2496	3859.96	8363.26	100359.16
STEP G	49.4411	3955.28	8569.79	102837.48
STEP H	50.6621	4052.96	8781.43	105377.16
STEP I	51.9133	4153.06	8998.30	107979.66
STEP J	53.1953	4255.62	9220.51	110646.22
STEP K	54.5090	4360.72	9448.22	113378.72
STEP L	55.8552	4468.41	9681.56	116178.81
STEP M	57.2346	4578.76	9920.66	119047.96

CITY OF ROSEVILLE SALARY SCHEDULE - B

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGMB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B841	WSTWTR COLLECTION SUPV					
		STEP A	34.8446	2787.56	6039.73	72476.76
		STEP B	35.7046	2856.36	6188.79	74265.56
		STEP C	36.5863	2926.90	6341.62	76099.50
		STEP D	37.4899	2999.19	6498.24	77978.99
		STEP E	38.4157	3073.25	6658.72	79904.65
		STEP F	39.3644	3149.15	6823.16	81877.95
		STEP G	40.3366	3226.92	6991.67	83900.12
		STEP H	41.3327	3306.61	7164.33	85972.01
		STEP I	42.3535	3388.28	7341.27	88095.28
		STEP J	43.3995	3471.96	7522.58	90270.96
		STEP K	44.4713	3557.70	7708.35	92500.30
		STEP L	45.5695	3645.56	7898.71	94784.56
		STEP M	46.6949	3735.59	8093.78	97125.39

B842 WSTWTR TRMT PLT CHIEF OPERATOR

STEP A	45.9928	3679.42	7972.08	95665.02
STEP B	47.1280	3770.24	8168.85	98026.24
STEP C	48.2919	3863.35	8370.59	100447.15
STEP D	49.4845	3958.76	8577.31	102927.76
STEP E	50.7066	4056.52	8789.14	105469.72
STEP F	51.9588	4156.70	9006.19	108074.30
STEP G	53.2420	4259.36	9228.61	110743.36
STEP H	54.5569	4364.55	9456.52	113478.35
STEP I	55.9042	4472.33	9690.06	116280.73
STEP J	57.2848	4582.78	9929.36	119152.38
STEP K	58.6995	4695.96	10174.58	122094.96
STEP L	60.1492	4811.93	10425.86	125110.33
STEP M	61.6346	4930.76	10683.33	128199.96

CITY OF ROSEVILLE **SALARY SCHEDULE - B**

Effective Date: 01/21/2017

MGBB MANAGEMENT-B

Job Code	Title	Step	Hourly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Annual
B843	WSTWTR UTILITY MANAGER					
		STEP A	56.5013	4520.10	9793.55	117522.70
		STEP B	57.8958	4631.66	10035.27	120423.26
		STEP C	59.3256	4746.04	10283.10	123397.24
		STEP D	60.7907	4863.25	10537.05	126444.65
		STEP E	62.2920	4983.36	10797.28	129567.36
		STEP F	63.8304	5106.43	11063.93	132767.23
		STEP G	65.4068	5232.54	11337.17	136046.14
		STEP H	67.0220	5361.76	11617.14	139405.76
		STEP I	68.6772	5494.17	11904.04	142848.57
		STEP J	70.3733	5629.86	12198.03	146376.46
		STEP K	72.1112	5768.89	12499.27	149991.29
		STEP L	73.8921	5911.36	12807.96	153695.56
		STEP M	75.7169	6057.35	13124.26	157491.15

RESOLUTION NO. 17-35

APPROVING THE AMENDED MEMORANDUM OF TERMS, CONDITIONS AND
UNDERSTANDINGS REGARDING MANAGEMENT AND CONFIDENTIAL EMPLOYEES

WHEREAS, an amended memorandum of terms, conditions and understandings
regarding Management and Confidential Employees has been reviewed by the City Council;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that
said amended memorandum is hereby approved.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of
_____, 20____, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

Terms, Conditions, and Understandings

Management and Confidential Employees



Term of January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2018



Table of Contents

SUMMARY OF CONFIDENTIAL DESIGNATION	1
DEFINITION	1
CRITERIA	1
ARTICLE I. SALARIES	2
ARTICLE II. SALARY UPON PROMOTION	6
ARTICLE III. DEFERRED COMPENSATION	6
ARTICLE IV. WORKING OUT OF CLASS	6
ARTICLE V. PUBLIC EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM	7
ARTICLE VI. HEALTH AND WELFARE PROGRAM	9
ARTICLE VII. RETIREE HEALTH BENEFITS	10
ARTICLE VIII. LONG TERM DISABILITY PLAN	12
ARTICLE IX. LIFE INSURANCE	12
ARTICLE XI. SERVICE TERM/PERFORMANCE BONUS	12
ARTICLE XII. VACATION LEAVE	14
ARTICLE XIII. MANAGEMENT LEAVE PLAN	14
ARTICLE XIV. PERSONAL LEAVE TIME	15
ARTICLE XV. HOLIDAY PAYOFF FOR PUBLIC SAFETY MANAGERS	16
ARTICLE XVI. SICK LEAVE INCENTIVE PROGRAM	16
ARTICLE XVII. CATASTROPHIC LEAVE	17
ARTICLE XVIII. ADDITIONAL APPLICATION	17
ARTICLE XIX. UNIFORM ALLOWANCE	17
ARTICLE XX. EDUCATIONAL REIMBURSEMENT	17
ARTICLE XXI. ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE POLICY	18
ARTICLE XXII. DEPARTMENT HEAD CONTRACTS AND SEPARATION INCENTIVE PLAN AND ADMINISTRATIVE SETTLEMENTS	18
ARTICLE XXIII. RELOCATION ASSISTANCE	18
ARTICLE XXVI. NO SMOKING POLICY	18

TERMS, CONDITIONS AND UNDERSTANDINGS OF COMPENSATION AND EMPLOYMENT FOR MANAGEMENT/CONFIDENTIAL EMPLOYEES

The City Council of the City of Roseville hereby establishes the following salary, benefits and other provisions related to the employment of the City's Management/Confidential employees during the period of January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2018

SUMMARY OF CONFIDENTIAL DESIGNATION

The confidential designation of selected positions protects the confidentiality of the City's bargaining process and strategy, both in general contract negotiations and in day-to-day interaction with employee unions and associations. The employees who occupy positions designated as confidential serve as essential support members to the management team and their confidentiality is assured by their exclusion from any organized bargaining unit.

DEFINITION

The term "confidential employee" identifies those employees who are regularly required to assist City managers responsible for developing and implementing City policies within the area of labor relations. A confidential employee is an employee who normally participates or assists in writing and/or preparing policies affecting employees' wages, hours, and working conditions; or an employee who regularly has advance knowledge of decisions which affect labor relations; or who processes information relating to the city's confidential labor relations matters.

CRITERIA

The following factors are used (in their totality) to determine those positions to be designated as confidential:

- A. The duties assigned to these positions include responsibility for providing clerical and/or technical support to managers who regularly participate in labor negotiations as a chief negotiator or team member; processing paperwork relating to labor negotiations, notes, research, management proposals, contract costing, strategies and plans, strike contingency plans, salary surveys, and problems within departments which are addressed during negotiations.
- B. Responsibility for processing paperwork relating to the disposition of union/association grievances, Skelly hearings, letters of reprimand, counseling memos, employee background checks, and other documents including those relating to all other forms of employee discipline.
- C. All non-management employees in the following departments are deemed to be confidential employees:
 - 1. City Attorney
 - 2. City Manager
 - 3. Human Resources
 - 4. Finance – Payroll only
 - 5. Administrative Assistants to all Department Heads

ARTICLE I. SALARIES

- A. Effective the first full pay period after January 1, 2016 the City shall provide a two percent (2%) general salary increase for all employees designated as Management/Confidential.
- B. Effective the first full pay period after January 1, 2018, the City shall provide a two percent (2%) general salary increase for all employees designated as Management/Confidential.
- C. Labor Market Adjustments – Effective the first full pay period in January 2016, the following salary increases shall be implemented for employees in the classifications listed below:

		January 2016	January 2017	January 2018
Job Code	Class Title	Market Adj	Market Adj	Market Adj
0041	Accounting Manager	1.78%	1.78%	1.78%
0043	Accounting Supervisor	1.15%	1.15%	1.15%
0090	Alternative Transportation Manager	3.33%	3.33%	3.33%
0245	Assistant City Attorney	3.33%	3.33%	3.33%
0250	Assistant City Clerk	0.41%	0.41%	0.41%
0395	Assistant Electric Utility Director	1.66%		
8553	Assistant Electric Utility Director-Resources & Planning	11.34%		
0510	Assistant Police Chief	2.32%	1.00%	1.00%
0920	Billing Services Manager	1.78%	1.78%	1.78%
0930	Budget Manager	1.78%	1.78%	1.78%
1043	Building Official	0.68%	0.68%	0.68%
1245	Chief Information Officer	0.69%		
1655	Deputy City Attorney I	3.33%	3.33%	3.33%
1658	Deputy City Attorney II	3.33%	3.33%	3.33%
1676	Development Services Director	1.68%		
1710	Economic Development Director	6.02%		
1310	Electric Business Analyst I	11.42%		
1312	Electric Business Analyst II	11.43%		
2335	Electric Compliance Analyst	9.36%		
2284	Electric Engineering Tech Supervisor	5.51%		
2280	Electric Line Construction Supervisor	15.00%		
2338	Electric Operations Manager	11.33%		
2346	Electric Rates and Financial Administrator	6.25%		
2348	Electric Regulatory Compliance Administrator	11.33%		
2314	Electric Resources Analyst I	13.24%		
2316	Electric Resources Analyst II	13.25%		
6280	Electric Retail Services Supervisor	4.31%		
2354	Electric Risk Management Administrator	6.25%		

2319	Electric Substation Supervisor	15.00%		
2358	Electric Technology Systems Supervisor	11.08%		
2320	Electric Utility Director	11.34%		
2500	Energy Services Account Representative I	4.31%		
2501	Energy Services Account Representative II	4.31%		
3395	Facilities Manager	0.61%	0.61%	0.61%
3301	Finance Director	10.00%		
2900	Finance Manager	1.78%	1.78%	1.78%
3330	Fire Chief	1.43%		
3392	Fleet Manager	0.61%	0.61%	0.61%
3594	Human Resources Analyst I	0.28%	0.28%	0.28%
3596	Human Resources Analyst II	0.29%	0.29%	0.29%
3598	Human Resources Director	10.00%		
3810	Key Account Representative	4.30%		
5400	Police Captain	2.32%	1.00%	1.00%
5410	Police Chief	4.32%		
5420	Police Lieutenant	2.32%	1.00%	1.00%
5505	Power Engineering Manager	11.33%		
5600	Power Generation Superintendent	2.29%		
5530	Power Plant Operations & Maintenance Supervisor	15.00%		
5535	Power Supply and Portfolio Administrator	6.25%		
5652	Purchasing & Warehouse Manager	0.98%	0.98%	0.98%
6450	Risk Manager	10.00%		
7123	Senior Deputy City Attorney	3.33%	3.33%	3.33%
7128	Senior Electric Business Analyst	11.43%		
7163	Senior Energy Services Account Representative	4.30%		
7194	Senior Information Technology Analyst	0.13%		
7151	Senior Power Engineer	11.34%		
5555	Senior Power Plant Engineer	11.34%		
7522	Street Maintenance Supervisor	0.17%		
9040	Wastewater Treatment Plant Chief Operator	10.00%		

D. Salary Schedule B – All Employees Hired On/After the first full pay period in January of 2016

Effective the first full pay period in January 2016, for any current classification in the bargaining unit where the total compensation was 5% or more above the median total compensation for benchmarked classifications in the surveyed jurisdictions, the new top step for all such classifications in the new salary schedule B will be reduced as listed below. All other classification's top step in the new salary schedule B will remain unchanged.

Confidential B Schedule Reductions

Job Code	Class Title	Reduction
B101	Executive Assistant to the City Manager	-8.95%
B111	Payroll Clerk I	-7.48%
B112	Payroll Clerk II	-7.49%
B113	Payroll Technician I	-7.04%
B114	Payroll Technician II	-7.04%
B116	Senior Payroll Technician	-7.03%

Management B Schedule Reductions

Job Code	Class Title	Reduction
B725	City Clerk	-10.86%
B726	City Librarian	-13.13%
B737	Economic Development Manager	-11.70%
B754	Electronic Maintenance Coordinator	-10.13%
B779	Information Technology Division Manager	-7.42%
B781	Information Technology Program Manager	-7.41%
B778	Interpretive Services Supervisor	-10.37%
B786	Meter Services Supervisor	-24.63%
B787	Open Space Superintendent	-8.20%
B790	Park Planning and Development Superintendent	-8.20%
B791	Parks Superintendent	-8.20%
B792	Parks Supervisor	-14.00%
B793	Parks, Recreation & Libraries Business Administrator	-7.95%
B813	Recreation Manager	-10.38%
B814	Recreation Superintendent	-11.14%
B815	Recreation Supervisor	-10.37%
B822	Senior Database Analyst	-7.41%

Annual Merit Step Increases

1. Effective the first full pay period in January 2016, all employees hired before January 1, 2016 will remain on the current salary schedule (A) for all listed classifications in the bargaining unit. All such employees will continue on this salary schedule when promoted or transferred to other classifications.

2. Effective the first full pay period in January 2016, the City will create a second salary schedule (B) which will apply to new hires for all listed classifications in the bargaining unit. The salary steps for the new salary schedule will be approximately 2.5% apart for each classification in the unit. For purposes of this provision, any employee who was initially hired before January 1, 2016 that had a break in City service and was rehired after January 1, 2016 will be deemed a newly hired employee under this provision.

- E. Bilingual Pay - employees certified by the Human Resources Department as Spanish speaking will be paid \$100.00 per month (\$46.15 bi-weekly). At the discretion of the Department Head and upon certification by the Human Resources Department, employees may be compensated \$100.00 per month for other languages used during the course of employment. However, \$100 per month bilingual pay is the maximum amount an employee may receive no matter how many languages he/she is certified to speak.
- F. A five percent (5%) differential will continue to be paid to management employees in engineering classifications (except Wastewater Utility Manager and Water Utility Manager who had their PE pay converted to salary in 2000) who possess a California Professional Engineer Certificate (PE) but whose position does not require such possession.
- G. Fire Battalion Chiefs will earn time and one-half overtime when covering a shift assignment.
- H. The Assistant Fire Chief, Fire Division Chiefs and Fire Battalion Chiefs (8 hour shift only) when acting in the capacity of the Battalion Chief (24 hour), will be paid at the Battalion Chief (24 hour) time and one-half rate.
- I. The Assistant Fire Chief, Fire Division Chiefs and Battalion Chiefs will receive the following certification pay:
 - a. Five percent (5%) of base pay bi-weekly for HazMat Technician or Specialist certification. HazMat certification must be maintained by attending the necessary trainings and proving competency through annual testing.
 - b. Two percent (2%) of base pay bi-weekly for possessing the requisite certificates for departmental rescue certification (possessing RS1, RS2, Confined Space Rescue, and Trench rescue certification). Rescue certification must be maintained by attending the necessary trainings and proving competency through annual testing.
- J. Police Lieutenants required to spend time as a peace officer or watch commander will be compensated at time-and-one-half rate for time spent in excess of their normal shift. The overtime rate is for SWAT, mandatory shift scheduling and additional watch commander shifts based on operational need where the employee is not serving in his/her regular management role.
- K. Reopener Provision:

The City may reopen the terms and conditions if any of the following occurs:

1. General Fund revenue declines, or is projected to decline, by two percent (2%) or more in one year or one percent (1%) per year over two (2) years. The contract can be reopened only after: (a) closing out the previous fiscal year, (b) receiving County property tax projections for the current fiscal year, and (c) the Finance Department revising revenue projections for the current fiscal year based on (a) and (b).
2. General Fund expenses increase by two percent (2%) or more, with no offsetting increase in revenue, based on unfunded mandates of the State of California or an agency of the State.
3. The Roseville electorate, by local ballot initiative, approves a limitation to the salaries of Roseville management employees.

The City shall identify Management/Confidential's proportionate share of any revenue shortfall.

In the event other revenues increase and exceed the amount of any lost revenue, the City will not exercise the reopener clause; however, any future increase in revenues must clearly offset general fund expenditures.

ARTICLE II. SALARY UPON PROMOTION

Any regular employee who is promoted to a position in a class with a higher salary range shall be placed in the step in the new salary range which represents at least a ten percent (10%) increase over the employee's current step. In the event that the new range does not have a step that is at least ten percent (10%) higher than the employee's current range, the employee shall be assigned to the highest step in the range. A promoted employee is assigned a new salary anniversary date effective on the date of the promotion.

ARTICLE III. DEFERRED COMPENSATION

The City shall maintain a program of deferred compensation for eligible employees. It is understood that the City is solely responsible for selection of the Deferred Compensation plan and plan administrator(s).

Effective the first full pay period in January of 2016, the City agrees to contribute one percent (1%) of the base salary into the city sponsored 457 deferred compensation plan for employees who have completed five (5) continuous years of regular employment with the City of Roseville.

Effective the first full pay period in January of 2017, the City agrees to contribute an additional one percent (1%) for a total of two percent (2%) of the base wages into the city sponsored deferred compensation plan for employees who have completed five (5) continuous years of regular employment with the City of Roseville.

Effective the first full pay period in January 2018, the City agrees to contribute an additional one percent (1%) for a total of three percent (3%) of the base wages into the city sponsored deferred compensation plan for employees who have completed five (5) continuous years of regular employment with the City of Roseville.

ARTICLE IV. WORKING OUT OF CLASS

Pursuant to Roseville Municipal Code Section 3.07.080, no employee shall be required to perform duties which are not closely related both in kind of work and in level of responsibility to duties formerly assigned to positions in the class, except on a short-term, temporary or emergency basis. However, if a supervisor assigns an employee to work out of class for four (4) hours or more, or one-half (1/2) shift or more, the employee shall be paid out of class pay equal to ten percent (10%) or top step of the higher class where there is not ten percent (10%) differential between the two classes.

Temporary Acting Pay

An employee temporarily assigned in writing to an acting position in a classification with a higher salary range shall be compensated for the duration of the acting assignment by the payment of ten percent (10%) of the regular salary the employee received prior to the acting assignment, or the salary provided for in Step A of the higher classification, whichever is greater, but not to exceed top step of the higher classification for all time worked and any leave time paid. The higher classified position must be temporarily vacant due to a long-term absence of the incumbent or pending the filling of a vacant position. The temporary acting pay assignment shall be for a minimum of two full-time pay periods and limited to one year. Authorization for a temporary acting assignment must be given by the employee's supervisor and requires advance approval of the Department Head, Human Resources Director and City Manager.

This section does not apply to regular employees whose positions are designated to act in the absence of the department, division or section head.

ARTICLE V. PUBLIC EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM

A. The City provides and maintain membership in the California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS) for the benefit of eligible employees based on the following CalPERS definitions and contract provisions:

1. New Member means:

- i. A unit member who becomes a member of a public retirement system for the first time on or after January 1, 2013 and who was not a member of any other public retirement system prior to that date;
- ii. A unit member who becomes a member of a public retirement system for the first time on or after January 1, 2013 and who was a member of another public retirement system prior to that date, but who was not subject to reciprocity under Gov. Code §7522.02(c) and related CalPERS reciprocity requirements; or
- iii. A unit member who was an active member in a public retirement system with another employer and who, after a break in service of more than six (6) months, returns to active membership in CalPERS with the City.

2. Classic Member means: a unit member who entered into membership with a qualifying public retirement system on or before December 31, 2012 who does not meet the definition of "New Member" under Government Code §7522.04(f) and related CalPERS membership requirements. Status as a classic member shall be determined by CalPERS.

B. Retirement Benefits:

Safety Members

1. Retirement Plan for Employees Hired On or Before December 31, 2012, and Classic Members as Defined by CalPERS:

Employees hired on or before December 31, 2012 shall receive the 3% at 50 retirement benefit. For purposes of determining a retirement benefit, final compensation for employees covered by Section B.1. shall mean the single highest year of compensation earnable.

Each employee covered by Section B.1. shall pay through payroll deduction, 100% of the required bargaining unit member contribution, which is nine percent (9%). As permitted by CalPERS, the City agrees to report the amount paid by the employee as part of the employer's contribution and to report the same amount as EPMC and compensation earnable.

2. Retirement Plan for Employees Hired On or After January 1, 2013, Who Are Not Classic Members.

Employees hired on or after January 1, 2013 who are new members, as defined by CalPERS, shall receive the 2.7% at 57 benefit.

For purposes of determining a retirement benefit, final compensation for unit members covered by Section B.2. shall mean the highest annual average pensionable compensation earned during thirty-six (36) consecutive months of service.

As required by Government Code §7522.30, unit members covered by Section B.2. shall pay, through payroll deduction, fifty percent (50%) of the total normal cost of their retirement plan as determined annually by CalPERS.

3. In addition to the benefits listed above, the City contracts for the following optional benefits for employees covered by Section B(1) and B(2):
 - Post Retirement Survivor Allowance
 - Optional Settlement 2W
 - 1959 Survivor Benefit Level 4
 - Special Death Benefit
 - Credit for Unused Sickleave
 - Two-percent (2%) Retirement COLA
4. Employee contributions shall be made in accordance with Section 414(h)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code wherein payment to CalPERS is made pretax, to the extent permitted by Internal Revenue Code, 26 USC Section 414(h)(2).

Miscellaneous Members

5. This Section B, including subsections, shall apply to bargaining unit members hired on or before December 31, 2012. In addition, this Section B shall apply to bargaining unit members hired on or after January 1, 2013, who are qualified for pension reciprocity as stated in Government Code Section 7522.02(c) and related CalPERS reciprocity requirements (Classic Member):

The "2.7% @ 55" retirement program will be available to bargaining unit members covered by Section B(5).

For the purposes of determining a retirement benefit, final compensation for bargaining unit members covered by Section B(5) shall mean the highest twelve (12) consecutive month period as specified in Government Code Section 20042.

Bargaining unit members covered by Section B(5) shall continue to pay, through payroll deduction, 8.0% of compensation earnable contribution to CalPERS. 6.197% shall be contributed toward the City's pension costs, and 1.803% shall be contributed toward the employees' pension contribution. The City shall pay 6.197% of compensation earnable as EPMC (Employer Paid Member Contribution) and shall report the same percent (value) of compensation earnable as special compensation pursuant to Government Code Section 20636(c) (4).

6. This Section B, including subsections, shall apply to bargaining unit members who were hired on or after January 1, 2013, and who do not qualify for pension reciprocity as stated in Government Code Section 7522.02(c) (PEPRA Members).

The "2% @ 62" retirement program will be available to bargaining unit members covered by Section B(6).

Effective January 1, 2013, for the purposes of determining a retirement benefit, final compensation for bargaining unit members covered by Section B(6) shall mean the highest annual average pensionable compensation earned during thirty-six (36) consecutive months of service.

As required by Government Code Section 7522.04(g), effective January 1, 2013, bargaining unit members covered by Section B(6) shall pay, through payroll deduction, fifty percent (50%) of normal costs as determined by CalPERS.

7. Unit members covered by Section B(5) and B(6) continue to be eligible for the following options included in the City's contract with CalPERS:
 - Government Code Section 20965 (Conversion of unused sick leave balance to service credit)
 - Government Code Section 21573 (Third Level of 1959 Survivor Benefits)
 - Government Code Section 21548 (Pre-Retirement Option 2W Death Benefit)
 - Two percent (2%) Retirement COLA
8. Employee contributions shall be made in accordance with Section 414(h)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code wherein payment to CalPERS is made pretax, to the extent permitted by Internal Revenue Code, 26 USC Section 414(h)(2).

ARTICLE VI. HEALTH AND WELFARE PROGRAM

A. Eligibility

Any regular employee working fifty percent (50%) or more of a full-time schedule shall be eligible to enroll in any health and welfare benefit provided by this Article. Regular part-time employees who are hired into a position funded as regular part-time after January 1, 2004, or current employees who laterally transfer or promote into a regular part-time allocated position will receive a pro-rated amount toward their health and welfare contribution based on actual hours worked. The contribution amount will be based on the percentage of full-time the employee works. For example, employees working twenty (20) hours per week will receive fifty percent (50%) of the full-time contribution; employees working thirty (30) hours per week will receive seventy-five percent (75%) of the full-time contribution, etc.

B. Medical Insurance Benefits

The City agrees to contract with the California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS) for the purpose of providing employees and their eligible dependents with medical insurance benefits. Effective the first of the month following City Council approval of this resolution or as soon as administratively possible, the City's maximum monthly contribution for each eligible active employee shall be equal to the minimum employer contribution required under the Public Employees' Medical and Hospital Care Act (PEMHCA).

C. Cafeteria Plan

1. The City agrees to maintain a Cafeteria Plan, pursuant to Section 125 of the Internal Revenue Code and any related regulations, for the purpose of providing employees with access to various health and welfare benefits. Benefits available through the Cafeteria Plan include medical insurance, dental insurance, vision insurance and long term disability (LTD).

2. Effective December 1, 2016, the City agrees to provide a Cafeteria Plan Allowance to all employees eligible to participate in City sponsored health and welfare benefits under Section A of this Article of up to \$1,296 monthly (less the direct PEMHCA payment provided in paragraph B) for the term of the agreement.

3. Effective December 1, 2017, , the City agrees to provide a Cafeteria Plan Allowance to all employees eligible to participate in City sponsored health and welfare benefits under Section A of this Article of up to \$1,321 monthly (less the direct PEMHCA payment provided in paragraph B) for the term of the agreement.

4. Effective December 1, 2018,, the City agrees to provide a Cafeteria Plan Allowance to all employees eligible to participate in City sponsored health and welfare benefits under Section A of this Article of up to \$ 1,347 monthly (less the direct PEMHCA payment provided in paragraph B) for the term of the agreement.

6. The City agrees to provide a flex plan credit of up to \$168.00 per month to be used by active employees for any benefit covered under the Cafeteria Plan.
7. Employees who elect not to participate in any of the medical, dental, vision and LTD insurance benefits sponsored by the City and who provide proof of other medical coverage will not receive any Cafeteria Plan Allowance under Section C(2) or Flex Plan Credit under Section C(3) of this Article. Instead, employees who opt out of these City sponsored benefits will receive \$150 per month.
8. Any Cafeteria Plan Allowance provided for under Section C(2) of this Article can only be used by an employee to offset the cost of participation in City sponsored medical, dental, vision and LTD, insurance benefits for the employee and any eligible dependents.
- D. The City agrees to continue its existing Section 125 plan. The City reserves the right to select the provider or self-administer this program and to set limits for medical reimbursement accounts.
- E. The City agrees to provide a dental benefit. The City agrees to provide a dental benefit to include two (2) preventative cleanings per year. Other details of the City's dental benefit are described in the evidence of coverage document. The City reserves the right to select any dental carrier. Open enrollment will be as described in the evidence of coverage document.
- F. From time to time, the City will change benefit providers due to administrative, service, economic or other reasons. Due to carrier policies and procedures and Department of Insurance requirements, there can be no guarantee that one policy will exactly mirror the preceding one. The City desires to provide a consistent benefit, and insofar as is possible, benefits and language will be matched.
- G. Management and Confidential employees may utilize the Employee Assistance Program. Each employee and each dependent is eligible for a maximum of six (6) City paid counseling sessions.
- H. The City agrees to continue its existing vision program and reserves the right to select an insurance provider or choose to self-insure this benefit.

ARTICLE VII. RETIREE HEALTH BENEFITS

- A. **Medical Insurance Benefits**
The City agrees to contract with the California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS) for the purpose of providing employees and their eligible dependents with medical insurance benefits. Effective the first of the month following City Council approval of this resolution or as soon as administratively possible, the City's maximum monthly medical contribution for each eligible retiree shall be equal to the minimum employer contribution required for active employees under the Public Employees' Medical and Hospital Care Act (PEMHCA).
- The parties' agreement to move from the CalPERS equal contribution method to the PEMHCA minimum employer contribution method does not modify retiree health benefits for employees in Tiers I and II pursuant to Article VI B and C below. Employees who are currently in Tier 1 who promote into a management position covered, herein, shall maintain Tier 1 benefits until retirement or a break in service. Employees who leave City employment and return to City employment shall not be covered by Tier 1 or Tier 2 retiree health benefits.
- B. **For Employees Hired Prior to January 1, 2004 (Tier 1)**
Employees hired prior to January 1, 2004 that qualify for post-retirement health benefits shall qualify for such benefits based on rules in effect prior to January 1, 2004, i.e. an employee that

retires from the City of Roseville and is eligible for CalPERS service retirement shall receive a City contribution towards their post-retirement medical insurance benefit at the same level as full-time regular employees covered by this agreement.

- C. For Employees Hired on or after January 1, 2004 and Prior to January 1, 2014 (Tier 2)
For employees hired on or after January 1, 2004 and prior to January 1, 2014, to be eligible to receive post-retirement health benefits, an employee must complete at least five (5) years of CalPERS-credited service with the City of Roseville. Employees who retire from the City of Roseville after meeting the service requirement stated above and who have at least ten (10) years of CalPERS-credited service will receive a City contribution towards their post-retirement health benefits as follows:

Total Credited Years of Service	% of City Contribution
10	50 %
11	55
12	60
13	65
14	70
15	75
16	80
17	85
18	90
19	95
20 +	100

Employees who have PERS-credited service through other public agencies must complete at least five (5) years of service with the City of Roseville and retire from the City of Roseville to be eligible for post-retirement health benefits. However, once an employee has completed five (5) years of service with the City of Roseville, their eligibility for post-retirement health benefits will include all years of PERS-credited service.

The vesting requirements for post-retirement health benefits will become effective January 1, 2004. Employees hired on or after January 1, 2004 shall be subject to the above post-retirement vesting schedule for health benefits.

- D. For Employees Hired on or After January 1, 2014 (Tier 3)

1. Employees hired on or after January 1, 2014 shall have no vested right in any post-employment medical benefits provided by the City of Roseville. Instead, upon hire, those employees shall contribute one percent (1%) of their base salary each pay period to a City sponsored Retirement Health Savings (RHS) account and shall contribute an additional one percent (1%) per pay period per year annually, up to a maximum of five percent (5%) per pay period annually thereafter, to be used to fund the employee's medical costs upon retirement from the City.
2. After five (5) years of continuous service with the City of Roseville, and beginning on the first pay period of the sixth year of service, the City shall contribute a flat dollar amount equal to \$100 per month to be deposited to the employee's RHS account up until the employee's retirement date or separation from the City. After accruing ten (10) cumulative years of service with the City and pursuant to the vesting schedule in Section C of this Article, employees may draw from the City contribution to this account upon retirement.

3. Employees who terminate City service for reasons other than retirement prior to twenty (20) years of cumulative service with the City will forfeit any City contributions.

4. Employees must retire from the City of Roseville and be enrolled in the City of Roseville's health plan in order to utilize City contributions to the employee's RHS accounts. After ten (10) years of cumulative service with the City of Roseville, City contributions to the employee's RHS account may be used for all covered medical expenses pursuant to Section 213 of the IRS Code.

ARTICLE VIII. LONG TERM DISABILITY PLAN

- A. The City agrees to maintain a long term disability (LTD) program consisting of a sixty (60) calendar day qualifying period; whereupon an eligible employee shall be entitled to receive sixty percent (60%) of his/her gross monthly salary in accordance with the LTD Plan. Other details of the City's LTD plan are described in the plan booklet.
- B. After five (5) years as a regular employee, the City agrees to pay one hundred percent (100%) of the premium for the LTD plan.
- C. A program of voluntary group Supplemental LTD is available to those employees assigned to the classifications in Management Appendix "A", CCAP Appendix "A", and Confidential Appendix "A". The City reserves the right to select the insurance provider. The employee accepts sole responsibility for payment of any and all costs under this program. All premiums will be collected via payroll deduction.

ARTICLE IX. LIFE INSURANCE

The City agrees to continue to provide a City paid life insurance program for eligible employees as covered in the plan document. The City reserves the right to select the life insurance benefit provider. The program will provide a policy equivalent to twice the annual salary in effect as of July 1 of each year.

ARTICLE XI. SERVICE TERM/PERFORMANCE BONUS

- A. **SERVICE TERM BONUS**
In recognition of the substantial contribution to the community made by Confidential employees as a result of the length of their City service, the City shall annually award, not compounded, each applicable employee a service term bonus as indicated below.

1. The City agrees to provide Confidential employees the following service term bonus:

SERVICE TERM	BONUS AMOUNT
Beginning of the 10th year	2.5% of base salary

2. The City agrees to continue to provide Assistant Fire Chief, Fire Division Chief and Fire Battalion Chief the following service term bonus:

SERVICE TERM	BONUS AMOUNT
Beginning of 10th year to completion of 14th year	2.5% of base salary
Beginning of 15th year to completion of 19th year	5.0% of base salary
Beginning of 20th year and	7.5% of base salary

every year thereafter

3. The City agrees to provide Police Lieutenants and Captains the following service term bonus:

SERVICE TERM	BONUS AMOUNT
Beginning of 10th year to completion of 14th year	2.5% of base salary
Beginning of 15th year to completion of 19th year and every year thereafter	5.0% of base salary

Such service term bonus shall be included in each eligible employee's bi-weekly payroll.

- B. Employees hired on or after January 1, 2016, who receive a satisfactory or above annual performance review shall be eligible for an annual lump sum performance bonus as follows:

1. The City agrees to provide Confidential employees the following service term bonus:

SERVICE TERM	BONUS AMOUNT
Beginning of the 10th year	2.5% of base salary

2. The City agrees to continue to provide Assistant Fire Chief, Fire Division Chief and Fire Battalion Chief the following service term bonus:

SERVICE TERM	BONUS AMOUNT
Beginning of 10th year to completion of 14th year	2.5% of base salary
Beginning of 15th year to completion of 19th year	5.0% of base salary
Beginning of 20th year and every year thereafter	7.5% of base salary

3. The City agrees to provide Police Lieutenants and Police Captains the following service term bonus:

SERVICE TERM	BONUS AMOUNT
Beginning of 10th year to completion of 14th year	2.5% of base salary
Beginning of 15th year to completion of 19th year and every year thereafter	5.0% of base salary

The annual lump sum performance bonus shall be paid with the first full pay check in January each year based upon the base salary paid during the first full pay period in the previous November of each year.

ARTICLE XII. VACATION LEAVE

- A. Vacation provisions shall be governed pursuant to Roseville Municipal Code Section 3.12.060 with the exceptions noted in Subsection B.
- B. Except as noted below, each full-time classified public safety Fire Department employee shall accrue vacation leave with pay as follows:

Service Category	Bi-weekly Accrual	Days/Year Equivalent	Maximum Hours
New employee to completion of 4th year	3.693 hr	12 days (96 hours)	192
Start of 5th yr to completion of 9th year	4.62 hr	15 days (120 hours)	240
Start of 10th yr to completion of 14th yr	5.23 hr	17 days (135 hours)	272
Start of 15th yr to completion of 19th yr	5.8 hr	19 days (152 hours)	304
Start of 20th yr and succeeding years	6.46 hr	21 days (168 hours)	336

Each full-time management employee in the Fire Department working a twenty-four (24) hour shift shall accrue vacation leave with pay as follows:

Service Category	Bi-weekly Accrual	Days/Year Equivalent	Maximum Hours
New employee to completion of 4 th year	5.538 hr	6 shifts (144 hours)	288
Start of 5 th yr to completion of 9 th year	7.385 hr	8 shifts (192 hours)	384
Start of 10 th yr to completion of 14 th yr	8.308 hr	9 shifts (216 hours)	432
Start of 15 th yr to completion of 19 th yr	9.231 hr	10 shifts (240 hours)	480
Start of 20 th yr and succeeding years	10.15 hr	11 shifts (264 hours)	528

- C. All employees in the unit who are on probation may use vacation leave with prior approval from their supervisor.

ARTICLE XIII. MANAGEMENT LEAVE PLAN

Each calendar year management employees will be eligible to receive up to one hundred (100) hours of management leave. The actual number of hours allocated to each employee will be determined based on:

- A. The employee's accomplishments, efforts and performance as determined by the department head and the City Manager. The City Manager has the discretion to determine the number of management leave hours for new hires.

- B. By December 1st (for the subsequent year) each department will submit to the Human Resources Director their recommendation (and any supporting justification) for the amount of management leave to be allocated to each employee. The City Manager will have final approval of all management leave allocations.

Employees will be issued hours on January 1st each year and will not be allowed to carry unused hours beyond the end of the current calendar year. Employees may receive a lump sum payoff of up to fifty (50) hours. Department Heads may receive a lump sum payoff off of up to 100 hours. Employees may make an early payoff request any time after July 1 of each year. Employee may not be compensated for more hours than earned (based on an annual pro-ration) at the time of the payoff request. If an employee does not make an early request then the payoff of up to fifty (50) hours will be made on the pay period that includes December 31st.

A department head may recommend a revised allocation if an employee's work schedule or job duties change during the year. Any payoff of management leave will be based on the revised allocation. Upon separation from City service, an employee's allocation shall be deemed revised, prorated to correspond to the portion of the calendar year prior to separation, and net payoff of management leave shall be adjusted accordingly.

ARTICLE XIV. PERSONAL LEAVE TIME

Each full-time employee in the confidential unit shall be provided a bank of forty (40) hours of Personal Leave Time (PLT) on the first pay period of each calendar year. Part-time employees shall receive a pro-rated bank.

Use of PLT time shall be subject to the following:

- A. PLT may be used by employees for time off on an hour for hour basis until the employee has exhausted the bank.
1. Use of PLT shall be subject to the operating needs of the City. The City may deny an employee time off on PLT if such release time will adversely impact the operating or staffing needs of a City department.
- B. PLT shall have cash value and may be cashed out by the employee on an hour-for-hour basis at the employee's regular straight-time hourly rate of pay. Employees may cash out unused PLT in any regular pay period pursuant to procedures established by the City Human Resources Department.
- C. Any PLT time remaining in an employee's PLT bank on the last pay period of the calendar year shall not roll over into the next calendar year. Such PLT time shall be cashed out by the City on an hour-for-hour basis at the employee's regular straight-time hourly rate of pay.
- D. Employees who terminate employment with the City or leave the bargaining unit shall be cashed out at the rate of 0.76923 hours per week up to the balance of the employee's PLT bank. If an employee terminates and has taken more PLT in advance than 0.76923 hours per week, the City shall deduct an equivalent amount of pay for the excess PLT. Any time cashed out will be paid on an hour-for-hour basis at the employee's regular straight-time hourly rate of pay. Part-time employees will receive a pro-rated cash out of their PLT bank.
- E. Any employee hired after the first of the year shall be granted a prorated amount at 0.76923 hours per week for the remainder of the calendar year. For example, if an employee is hired on July 1, the employee shall be granted twenty (20) hours of PLT.

ARTICLE XV. HOLIDAY PAYOFF FOR PUBLIC SAFETY MANAGERS

- A. Police Lieutenants assigned to patrol will be issued one hundred and ten (110) holiday hours annually.
- B. At any time after July 1st, police managers may submit a request for a one-time lump sum of up to forty (40) hours of holiday pay prior to taking time off at straight salary.
- C. Battalion Chiefs (24 hour) will be issued one hundred and forty-four (144) hours of holiday time annually. In lieu of holiday time off, Battalion Chiefs may elect to receive straight salary for up to six (6) shifts of earned and unused holiday credit prior to the end of each January. All holiday time to be converted to pay shall be in one-half (1/2) shift increments.

ARTICLE XVI. SICK LEAVE INCENTIVE PROGRAM (refer to Section 3.12.070 of the Personnel Rules)

The payment of unused sick leave is authorized by the City as a means of rewarding employees who have made conscientious efforts to maximize their attendance on the job.

Upon retirement, permanent employees shall be entitled to the payment for accrued sick leave as follows:

A.

Non-24 Hour Shift Number of Sick			24 Hour Shift Number of Sick			Percent of Compensation Given
Leave Hours Accumulated			Leave Hours Accumulated			
Max			Max			
1200	To	1600	1800	to	2400	70%
956	To	1199.99	1434	to	1799.99	60%
764	To	955.99	1146	to	1433.99	50%
572	To	763.99	858	to	1145.99	40%
380	To	571.99	570	to	857.99	30%
188	To	379.99	282	to	569.99	20%
0	To	187.99	0	to	281.99	0%

OR

- B. Upon retirement, for employees hired or promoted to a management position prior to January 1, 2016 with a minimum of one hundred and fifty (150) days (1200 hours) of sick leave may "run out" their balance up to a maximum of six (6) months. During this "run out" period, the employee will remain on City payroll and will receive all health and welfare contributions as if they were actually working. Employee will not earn any additional vacation, sick, holiday, administrative or any other form of leave, nor will they receive salary or step increases. Employee will not receive auto allowance, performance pay or City paid deferred compensation contributions while on "run down." Finally, employee will not receive any long term disability or life insurance benefits while running down their sick leave.
- C. Any remaining sick leave balances after choice of either "A" or "B" can be converted to CalPERS service credit.

ARTICLE XVII. CATASTROPHIC LEAVE

Employees may voluntarily donate accrued vacation, PLT, management leave, floating holiday, and/or compensatory time off (CTO) for credit to another regular employee covered by this agreement who suffers a non-industrial related catastrophic illness or injury. Such donations shall be made in accordance with the following:

- A. The recipient employee must be off work for a minimum of thirty (30) consecutive days and must have exhausted all accrued leave (vacation, holiday, sick leave, compensatory time, etc.) prior to receiving donated leave.
- B. A donor employee may voluntarily donate up to a maximum of forty (40) hours of vacation, PLT, management leave, floating holiday, and/or compensatory time in any calendar year. All donations are irrevocable. Donations shall be made in four (4) hour increments. All unused hours shall remain with the recipient employee.
- C. A maximum of sixty (60) days can be donated to any one regular employee in any one calendar year.
- D. A recipient employee shall be eligible for health benefits while on catastrophic leave with donated time for a maximum of sixty (60) days; however a recipient employee shall not accrue vacation or sick leave during this period.
- E. An employee donating accrued leave or an employee receiving donated leave shall waive all tax liability of the City through the establishment of the catastrophic sick leave program.

ARTICLE XVIII. ADDITIONAL APPLICATION

In addition to the specific application of the above terms, conditions and understanding of compensation of employment, the provisions of Articles I, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, X, XI, XIV, XV, XVIII, XIX and XXII shall apply to the City Manager and the City Attorney.

ARTICLE XIX. UNIFORM ALLOWANCE

- A. Police management will be provided uniforms in accordance with department procedures. Police Lieutenants who are assigned to investigations for a period of one year or more who have not served in that assignment for at least two (2) years are eligible to receive a one-time clothing reimbursement of \$400 to offset increased clothing costs associated with the assignment. Such clothing will be cleaned at the City's expense.
- B. The City will continue to provide uniforms, clean and replace uniforms for fire management personnel.

ARTICLE XX. EDUCATIONAL REIMBURSEMENT

Employees may be reimbursed for the tuition and fees connected with approved job related educational courses recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education not to exceed the California State University full-time tuition rate per year. The cost of books is not covered in this agreement. The employee will submit the request for reimbursement to the Human Resources Department.

The request must be made before the class has been completed. The Human Resources Department will make the final decision to accept or reject the request. No payment will be made until the final proof of passing grade is submitted to Human Resources. The City has established an annual educational reimbursement fund of \$6,000 to be administered by the Human Resources Department. Once the fund balance is depleted, no further reimbursements will be approved.

ARTICLE XXI. ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE POLICY

The Alcohol and Drug Abuse Policy will continue to be enforced. All employees will be required to immediately notify the City in writing of any criminal drug or alcohol related conviction.

ARTICLE XXII. DEPARTMENT HEAD CONTRACTS AND SEPARATION INCENTIVE PLAN AND ADMINISTRATIVE SETTLEMENTS

- A. The City agrees to grant the City Manager the authority to enter into employment contracts with department head staff. One of the provisions of the contract will be to provide up to six (6) months' severance pay for department heads whose contracts are not renewed.
- B. The City agrees to grant the City Manager the authorization to create a separation incentive plan using a 401 tax qualified plan and for the City Manager to serve as the Plan Administrator
- C. The City Manager is authorized to approve administrative settlements through separation of service agreements with up to 2 weeks compensation for each year of service credit, up to a maximum of 26 weeks.
- C.D. The City Manager is authorized to approve a 5% professional development pay for the Chief Financial Officer.

ARTICLE XXIII. RELOCATION ASSISTANCE

The City agrees to grant the City Manager the authority to provide up to \$15,000 in relocation assistance for positions the manager deems appropriate.

ARTICLE XXVI. NO SMOKING POLICY

Sworn employees hired after January 1, 2004 must be tobacco free and cannot use tobacco products on or off duty.

RESOLUTION NO. 17-36

APPROVING A SECOND AMENDED AND RESTATED EMPLOYMENT AND PERSONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND ROBERT R. SCHMITT, AND AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

WHEREAS, a Second Amended and Restated Employment and Personal Services Agreement regarding the position of City Attorney, between the City of Roseville and Robert R. Schmitt, has been reviewed by the City Council; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that said second amended agreement is hereby approved and that the Mayor is authorized to execute it on behalf of the City of Roseville.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

SECOND AMENDED AND RESTATED EMPLOYMENT AND
PERSONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE
AND ROBERT R. SCHMITT

THIS SECOND AMENDED AND RESTATED AGREEMENT (hereinafter, "Agreement") is made and entered into as of this _____ day of _____, 2017, by and between the City of Roseville, a municipal corporation (hereinafter "City") and Robert R. Schmitt, an individual (hereinafter referred to as "Attorney").

RECITALS:

WHEREAS, City requires the services of a full time, experienced city attorney; and

WHEREAS, Attorney is qualified, by training and experience, to render such services, and has agreed to so perform pursuant to this Agreement, and

WHEREAS, City and Attorney entered into the Employment And Personal Services Agreement Between The City Of Roseville and Robert R. Schmitt, dated February 21, 2015 ("Original Agreement"), and amended and restated on May 18, 2016 ("First Amended And Restated Employment And Personal Services Agreement Between The City Of Roseville And Robert R. Schmitt" or alternatively, "First Amended And Restated Agreement"); and

WHEREAS, City and Attorney desire to amend and restate the First Amended And Restated Agreement as set forth herein;

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises set forth herein, City and Attorney agree as follows:

1. Duties. Attorney shall diligently and faithfully perform the duties of City Attorney of the City of Roseville, as such duties are set forth in City's Charter, Ordinances, Resolutions, Rules and Regulations and applicable laws of the State of California. Such duties may be modified from time to time upon such terms as are mutually agreeable to City and Attorney.

2. Exclusive Employment. Attorney shall not accept employment as an attorney at law from or on behalf of any other person, firm, corporation or entity during the term of this Agreement. The foregoing shall not be construed to prevent Attorney from performing volunteer community service, or *pro bono* services, provided that Attorney shall, prior to performing any such services, disclose such anticipated services to the City Council of City and obtain its approval, and provided further that such outside services shall not create nor tend to create a disqualifying conflict of interest as defined by the California Political Reform Act of 1974, as amended, nor shall such services impair Attorney's ability to fully perform his duties for City hereunder.

3. Term, Termination and Severance Pay. The term of this Agreement commenced on February 21, 2015, and shall continue for four (4) years and shall expire on February 21, 2019, unless this provision is amended by the parties or this Agreement is terminated as provided hereunder.

3.1. The City Council shall have the right to terminate this Agreement at any time and without cause by a majority vote of such Council. In the event that this Agreement is terminated by City without cause, City shall then pay Attorney the cash equivalent of six (6) months aggregate salary in addition to all of those benefits which at that time have already accrued to and vested in Attorney, in consideration of the obligation to devote his services solely to the City during the term of this Agreement; provided, however, that in no event shall the termination payment exceed the salary for the number of months remaining on the unexpired term of this Agreement.

City and Attorney expressly agree that no additional benefits shall accrue to Attorney from and after the date of termination, and that Attorney shall not be eligible to receive any payment for accrued sick leave except to the extent allowed at retirement pursuant to the

Roseville Municipal Code and any applicable compensation and benefit resolution. However, Attorney shall be allowed to convert accrued sick leave to PERS service credit to the extent permitted by PERS regulations and City's agreement with PERS.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, any cash payment related to termination of this Agreement that Attorney receives shall be fully reimbursed to City if Attorney is convicted of a crime involving an abuse of office or position. For purposes of this Agreement, "abuse of office or position" shall be as defined in Section 53243.4 of the California Government Code, as amended. Additionally, if the City provides funds for a legal criminal defense or paid leave pending an investigation, the Attorney must fully reimburse the City for any funds the City provided for a legal criminal defense or for any paid leave pending an investigation, if Attorney is convicted of a crime involving an abuse of his office or position in accordance with Government Code Sections 53243 and 53243.1.

3.2. As an alternative to the cash payment set forth above, City shall have the right to elect to terminate this Agreement by giving Attorney six (6) months written notice of termination, in which case, the date of termination shall occur at the expiration of the six (6) months notice period, and Attorney shall continue to accrue and receive benefits pursuant to this Agreement, the Roseville Municipal Code and any applicable compensation and benefits resolution until such date of termination.

3.3. Notwithstanding the foregoing, City may terminate this Agreement for cause, without obligation to make any cash payment whatsoever (with the exception of accrued and vested salary and benefits) to Attorney, upon a determination made by a majority vote of the City Council that the Attorney has adversely affected the City or the reputation of the City or the Office of City Attorney, by misfeasance, malfeasance, nonfeasance, incapacity, or an act of moral turpitude. The determination of the City Council shall be binding and not subject to further appeal.

3.4. Attorney may terminate this Agreement by submitting a written resignation to City, which resignation shall provide for a minimum notice period of ninety (90) days. With the exception of accrued and vested salary and benefits, the Attorney shall not receive any cash payout or severance upon his resignation.

4. Review, Evaluation and Goal Setting. City shall meet annually with Attorney to review and evaluate his performance and to set goals. City shall utilize such reviews to recognize Attorney's performance, to identify areas for modification or improvement, and to provide direction and a reasonable time period for any desired improvement.

5. Salary. City shall pay Attorney, for services rendered hereunder, a salary of TWO HUNDRED FORTY THOUSAND, SEVEN HUNDRED TWENTY AND 06/100 DOLLARS (\$240,720.06) per year. Future adjustment to such salary shall be governed by City's Charter, Ordinances, Resolutions, Rules, Regulations and practices then in effect. City may review and consider extending or denying to Attorney any salary increase granted to the entire Management Group as provided by the then current Management/Confidential Terms, Conditions and Understandings document. In the event that City declines to take action to review and act on any such increase prior to or within thirty (30) days after its effective date for the Management Group, the increase shall be deemed approved for and shall apply to Attorney. City shall not reduce Attorney's salary or benefits unless (a) in accordance with a citywide reduction of employees' salaries; or (b) following a written performance evaluation with an "unsatisfactory" rating that provides Attorney with direction and a six-month time period for improvement before such reduction would be instituted.

6. Benefits. Except as expressly provided herein, City shall provide benefits to Attorney at least equivalent to those provided for management employees in the then-current

Terms and Conditions for Management/Confidential Employees document as adopted by the City Council. City shall also, during the term of this Agreement, provide all of the following:

6.1. Contribute to Attorney's deferred compensation accounts established pursuant to sections 457 and 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code (or any successor programs established by statute or City Council action) an additional amount equal to three percent (3%) of base salary per year, effective on the pay period beginning May 28, 2016. This shall be the total amount of deferred compensation contributions provided to Attorney by City and may be modified only by written amendment to this Agreement.

6.2. Provide to Attorney one hundred (100) hours paid administrative leave per calendar year. Administrative leave not taken within the calendar year within which it is issued will be forfeited, notwithstanding any provisions of the Roseville Municipal Code or any compensation and benefits resolution which would otherwise allow payoff of a portion of such leave.

6.3. Reimburse Attorney for City-related business expenses, subject to such Rules, Regulations and Policies as the City may establish or amend from time to time.

6.4 Provide to Attorney upon execution of this Agreement a one-time sum of \$7,500.00 as a Professional Development Incentive.

7. Professional Development. City shall also budget and pay for Attorney's membership in the State Bar of California, together with professional dues and subscriptions as necessary for professional growth and development, and shall budget and pay Attorney's travel and subsistence expenses to enable Attorney to participate in selected professional development programs.

8. Amendment. This Agreement may be amended from time to time by mutual consent of Attorney and City, provided that no such amendment shall be effective or of any

force or effect unless expressed in a writing duly authorized and executed by both City and Attorney.

9. Entire Agreement. This Agreement sets forth the entire agreement between City and Attorney. No promises or representations have been made or relied upon by either party hereto, except as expressly set forth herein.

10. Negotiation and Representation. City and Attorney agree and acknowledge that the provisions of this Agreement have been arrived at through negotiation and that each party has had a full and fair opportunity to revise the provisions of this Agreement and to have such provisions reviewed by legal counsel, and that both parties agree that they either have had the provisions of this Agreement reviewed by legal counsel or have voluntarily chosen not to do so. Attorney and City expressly acknowledge that he was not representing the City of Roseville regarding the terms of or the making of this Agreement and was not acting as the City Attorney in the negotiation and making of this Agreement. The City was advised by Special Counsel Timothy L. Davis in the making of this Agreement. The parties agree that any ambiguities in construing or interpreting this Agreement shall not be resolved against any party by reason of that party's role in drafting this Agreement. The titles of the various sections are merely informational and shall not be construed as a substantive portion of this Agreement. This Agreement may be executed in several counterparts, each of which shall be an original of the same Agreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, City and Attorney have executed this Agreement in Roseville, California, as of the date first above written.

CITY OF ROSEVILLE

ATTORNEY

By: _____
SUSAN ROHAN
Mayor

By: 
ROBERT R. SCHMITT

ATTEST:

By: _____
SONIA OROZCO
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

By: 
TIMOTHY L. DAVIS
Special Counsel

APPROVED:

By: _____
JAY PANZICA
Chief Financial Officer



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8213

File #: 1000 & 0201-01

Title: Real Estate Brokerage Services - Professional Services Agreement and Budget Adjustment

Contact: Wayne Wiley 916-774-5283 wwiley@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 9.2.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff recommends that the City Council take the following actions:

A. Adopt an Ordinance approving a Budget Adjustment allocating \$10,500 from the Building Improvement Fund; and

B. Adopt a Resolution approving the Professional Services Agreement with CB Richard Ellis, Inc. for real estate asset services and authorize the City Manager to execute said agreement.

BACKGROUND

The City of Roseville currently owns approximately 4,856 acres of real property made up of over 1,020 separate parcels. These properties range in size and consist of a variety of uses including easements, open space, park land, golf courses, parking lots, vacant parcels and buildings. In 2011, in an effort to better manage these properties, the City solicited proposals from real estate brokerage firms to represent the City in real estate transactions and to develop a strategic plan for property management. Accordingly, on March 20, 2012, the City Council awarded a Professional Services Agreement (PSA) to CB Richard Ellis, Inc. (CBRE) for real estate services, which has since expired.

Consistent with previous efforts, staff has recently identified 21 underutilized properties that are viable candidates to be sold, leased, or dedicated based on their current use, location, and/or configuration. Staff has categorized these properties to better identify a potential property management strategy, and these sites (as identified in Exhibit B) consist of properties that are currently not being utilized for governmental purposes, and are potential surplus properties that are not included in current or long term city plans, and/or are properties that may have commercial value.

Due to the working history and knowledge CBRE has of City owned properties, staff recommends establishing a PSA with the commercial brokerage to develop Broker Opinions of Value (BOV) to

assist in developing strategies and recommendations that are in alignment with Council's goals. In addition, this agreement will include provisions for the leasing of 6,405 square feet of retail/commercial space located at 316 Vernon Street.

To perform this work, CBRE will charge \$500 per BOV, for a maximum charge of \$10,500. In addition, CBRE will represent the City on the lease or sale of these properties, with associated fees based on a percentage of the gross lease value or gross sales price, respectively. The proposed fee structure, as outlined in Exhibit A, is commission based and consistent with the industry standard. However, the specific terms of each lease, including that of 316 Vernon Street, would come back before Council for review and approval. Based on the cost of preparing the BOV, staff is also requesting a Budget Adjustment in the amount of \$10,500 from the Building Improvement Fund to cover the fees for these services.

FISCAL IMPACT

A Budget Adjustment of \$10,500 from the Building Improvement Fund is proposed to cover CBRE's cost of service to establish 21 BOVs. The remaining scope of work outlined in CBRE's proposal is commission based and the associated fees will be paid out of the proceeds of future real estate transactions. In addition, with the establishment and implementation of a property management strategy, the City may be relieved of potential liabilities and/or costs associated with maintaining properties that do not generate income or provide a public benefit.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

With the establishment of the BOV and the implementation of the strategy, underutilized City properties may be sold and subsequently development by a private party, resulting in the payment of City fees, construction activity, jobs and other associated development benefits.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

A Budget Adjustment and Professional Services Agreement are not considered a "project" as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15061 (b)(3). Consequently, no CEQA action is required.

Respectfully Submitted,

Wayne Wiley, Associate Planner

Chris Robles, Economic Development Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Resolution No. 17-24

Exhibit B - Professional Service Agreement

Ordinance No. 5785

Exhibit A - Budget Adjustment

RESOLUTION NO. 17-24

APPROVING A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND CBRE, INC., AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

WHEREAS, a professional services agreement regarding brokerage services, by and between the City of Roseville and CBRE, Inc., has been reviewed by the City Council; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that said agreement is hereby approved and that the City Manager is authorized to execute it on behalf of the City of Roseville.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT

Project: Brokerage Services

THIS AGREEMENT is made and entered into this ____ day of _____, 20____,
by and between the City of Roseville, a municipal corporation ("CITY"), and CBRE, Inc., a
Delaware corporation ("CONSULTANT"); and

W I T N E S S E T H:

WHEREAS, CITY desires professional services consisting of brokerage services; and

WHEREAS, CONSULTANT has prepared a proposal dated November 11, 2016, which
describes the scope of work to be performed by CONSULTANT, the budget for the work, and
the schedule for performance of the work; and

WHEREAS, CONSULTANT is qualified and experienced to provide such professional
services.

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties agree as follows:

1. Services. CONSULTANT shall perform, at the direction of CITY, the scope of
services as described in EXHIBIT "A" (excluding asset services), attached hereto and
incorporated herein by this reference.
2. Compensation. For its services provided hereunder related to providing Broker
Opinions of Value, CONSULTANT shall be compensated five hundred dollars (\$500) per

Broker Opinion of Value as described in EXHIBIT "A." Total compensation for these services shall not exceed ten thousand, five hundred dollars (\$10,500).

For services related to Broker Opinions of Value, CONSULTANT shall submit one monthly invoice for its services. Such invoices shall be delineated by task, the person performing the services, and the hourly rate, which shall be stated in time increments of not greater than one tenth (1/10) hours. CITY shall pay invoices within thirty (30) days after receipt, if the services specified in the invoice have been satisfactorily completed.

For its services provided hereunder related to leasing or selling any of the properties identified in EXHIBIT "A" plus leasing 316 Vernon Street, compensation shall be as follows. For dispositions of real property by sale, CONSULTANT's fee shall not exceed six percent (6%) of the gross sales price. In the event of lease of any of the properties identified in EXHIBIT "A" and/or the 6,405 square feet of retail/commercial space located at 316 Vernon Street, CONSULTANT shall be paid a market-rate commission from lease proceeds generated as a result of such lease. CONSULTANT's market-rate commission for representation of CITY as landlord shall not exceed five percent (5%) of the gross lease value. If someone other than CONSULTANT's listing team represents the lessee, CONSULTANT's listing team's fee shall not exceed two and one-half percent (2.5%) and the tenant's representative fee shall not exceed five percent (5%) for a total amount not to exceed seven and one-half percent (7.5%) of the gross lease value.

3. Indemnification. To the fullest extent allowed by law, CONSULTANT shall defend, indemnify, and save and hold harmless CITY, its officers, agents, employees and volunteers from any claims, suits or actions of every name, kind and description brought forth, or on account of, injuries to or death of any person (including but not limited to workers and the

public), or damage to property, resulting from or arising out of CONSULTANT's willful misconduct or negligent act or omission while engaged in the performance of obligations or exercise of rights created by this Agreement, except those matters arising from CITY's sole negligence or willful misconduct. The parties intend that this provision shall be broadly construed.

CONSULTANT's responsibility for such defense and indemnity obligations shall survive the termination or completion of this Agreement for the full period of time allowed by law. The defense and indemnity obligations of this Agreement are undertaken in addition to, and shall not in any way be limited by, the insurance obligations contained in this Agreement.

4. Insurance. CONSULTANT agrees to continuously maintain, in full force and effect, the following minimum policies of insurance during the term of this Agreement.

<u>COVERAGE</u>	<u>LIMITS OF LIABILITY</u>
Workers' Compensation	Statutory
Commercial General Liability	\$1,000,000 each occurrence \$2,000,000 aggregate Personal Injury: \$1,000,000 each occurrence \$2,000,000 aggregate
Automobile Liability	\$1,000,000 combined single limit
Professional Liability (errors and omissions)	\$1,000,000 per claim \$2,000,000 aggregate

a. Form. CONSULTANT shall submit a certificate evidencing such coverage for the period covered by this Agreement in a form reasonably satisfactory to Risk Management and the City Attorney, prior to undertaking any work hereunder. Any insurance written on a claims made basis is subject to the reasonable approval of Risk Management and the

City Attorney.

b. Additional Insureds. CONSULTANT shall also provide a separate endorsement form or section of the policy showing CITY, its officers, agents, employees and volunteers as additional insureds for each type of coverage, except for Workers' Compensation and Professional Liability. Such insurance shall specifically cover the insurable contractual liability of CONSULTANT. The additional insured coverage under the CONSULTANT's policy shall be primary and noncontributory to the extent of losses attributable to CONSULTANT's negligence, as evidenced by a separate endorsement or section of the policy, and shall not seek contribution from CITY's insurance or self-insurance. In addition, the additional insured coverage shall be at least as broad as the Insurance Services Office ("ISO") CG 2010 0413 and CG 2037 0413 Endorsement.

c. Cancellation/Modification. CONSULTANT shall provide thirty (30) days written notice to CITY prior to cancellation or modification of any insurance required by this Agreement.

d. Umbrella/Excess Insurance. The limits of insurance required in this Agreement may be satisfied by a combination of primary and excess insurance. Any excess insurance shall contain or be endorsed to contain a provision that such coverage shall also apply on a primary and noncontributory basis for the benefit of CITY (if agreed to in a written contract) before CITY's own insurance shall be called upon to protect it as a named insured.

e. Subcontractors. CONSULTANT agrees to include in its contracts with all subcontractors the same requirements and provisions of this Agreement, including the indemnity and insurance requirements, to the extent they apply to the scope of the subcontractor's work.

Furthermore, CONSULTANT shall require its subcontractors to agree to be bound to CONSULTANT and CITY in the same manner and to the same extent as CONSULTANT is bound to CITY under this Agreement. Additionally, CONSULTANT shall obligate its subcontractors to comply with these same provisions with respect to any tertiary subcontractor, regardless of tier. A copy of CITY's indemnity and insurance provisions will be furnished to the subcontractor or tertiary subcontractor upon request.

f. Waiver of Subrogation. CONSULTANT hereby agrees to waive subrogation which any insurer of CONSULTANT may acquire from CONSULTANT by virtue of the payment of any loss under a Workers Compensation, Commercial General Liability or Automobile Liability policy. All Workers Compensation, Commercial General Liability and Automobile Liability policies shall be endorsed with a waiver of subrogation in favor of CITY, its officers, agents, employees and volunteers for all work performed by CONSULTANT, its employees, agents and subcontractors.

g. Liability/Remedies. Insurance coverage in the minimum amounts set forth herein shall not be construed to relieve CONSULTANT of liability in excess of such coverage, nor shall it preclude CITY from taking such other actions as are available to it under any other provisions of this Agreement or law.

5. Records. CONSULTANT and its subcontractors shall maintain all files and records relating to the services performed hereunder during the term of this Agreement and for a period of not less than one (1) year after the date of termination or expiration. Provided, however, that in the event of litigation or settlement of claims arising from the performance of this Agreement, CONSULTANT and its subcontractors shall maintain all files and records until such litigation, appeals or claims are resolved. Duly authorized representatives of CITY shall

have right of access during normal business hours and after reasonable notice to CONSULTANT's and subcontractors' files and records relating to the services performed hereunder, and may review and copy the files and records at appropriate stages during performance of the services and during the one (1) year period following termination or expiration of this Agreement. CONSULTANT shall include this provisions in its contracts with all subcontractors.

6. Time is of the Essence. Time is of the essence of this Agreement.

7. Compliance with Laws. CONSULTANT shall comply with all federal, state and local laws, ordinances and policies as may be applicable to the performance of services under this Agreement.

8. Ability to Perform. CONSULTANT agrees and represents that it has the time, ability and professional expertise to perform the services required under this Agreement.

9. Governing Agreement. In the event of any conflict between this Agreement and its EXHIBITS, the provisions of this Agreement shall govern. In the event of any conflict between any of the EXHIBITS, the provisions of the first in order of attachment shall govern.

10. Assignment. CONSULTANT is employed to perform unique personal services. CONSULTANT shall not assign this Agreement without the prior written consent of CITY. CONSULTANT shall not employ or otherwise incur any obligation to pay other specialists or experts for services in connection with this Agreement, without prior written consent of CITY.

11. Independent Contractor. CONSULTANT shall act as an independent contractor, and covenants and agrees that it will conduct itself consistent with such status, that it will neither hold itself out as, nor claim to be, an officer or employee of CITY by reason of this Agreement.

12. Representations and Warranties. CONSULTANT warrants that it has not employed or retained any company or person, other than a bona fide employee working for CONSULTANT, to solicit or secure this Agreement, and that it has not paid or agreed to pay any company or person, other than a bona fide employee, any fee, commission, percentage, brokerage fee, gift or any other consideration, contingent upon or resulting from the award or making of this Agreement. For breach or violation of this warranty, CITY shall have the right to terminate as void this Agreement, without liability, or, in its discretion, to deduct from the Agreement price or consideration, or otherwise recover, the full amount of such fee, commission, percentage, brokerage fee, gift or contingent fee.

13. Successors in Interest. This Agreement shall be binding upon the heirs, successors, executors, administrators and assigns of the respective parties hereto.

14. Copyright, Ownership and Use of Materials. All tangible material, excluding CONSULTANT's pre-existing intellectual property such as trademarks, service marks, and templates ("Material") created or delivered pursuant to this Agreement is considered a work made for hire under the Copyright Act. To the extent such Material does not qualify as a work made for hire, CONSULTANT hereby assigns to CITY all right, title, and interest, including but not limited to all copyrights, in all Material created by CONSULTANT in its performance under this Agreement. Material constitutes the scope of work outlined in Exhibit A and attached hereto, and all written and other tangible expressions, including but not limited to, drawings (including computer aided drawings), papers, documents, reports, surveys, renderings, exhibits, sketches, maps, models, prints, paintings or photographs, in any and all media or formats in which such materials have been created or are maintained. All Material furnished by CONSULTANT is, and shall remain, the property of CITY.

CONSULTANT shall execute any documents necessary to effectuate such assignment. In the event that CONSULTANT uses, employs, designates, or retains any person or entity who is not an employee of CONSULTANT, to perform any work required of it pursuant to this Agreement, CONSULTANT shall require said person or entity to execute an agreement containing the preceding paragraph.

15. Termination of Agreement. The City may terminate this Agreement without cause by giving CONSULTANT ten (10) days advance written notice from the City Manager. CONSULTANT may terminate this Agreement without cause by giving CITY thirty (30) days advance written notice. In the event of termination through no fault of CONSULTANT, CITY shall compensate CONSULTANT for services performed as of the date of termination, upon the release to CITY of all Material hereunder, in any and all media or formats in which such materials have been created or are maintained. CITY retains the right to receive and use any MATERIAL, notwithstanding any termination or any dispute regarding the amount to be paid.

16. Attorney's Fees; Venue; Governing Law. If either party commences any legal action against the other party arising out of this Agreement or the performance hereof, the prevailing party in such action shall be entitled to recover its reasonable litigation expenses, including but not limited to, court costs, expert witness fees, discovery expenses, and attorney's fees. Any action arising out of this Agreement shall be brought in Placer County, California, regardless of where else venue may lie. This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of California.

17. Modification. This Agreement and each provision contained herein may be waived, amended, supplemented or eliminated only by mutual written agreement of the parties.

18. Severability. If any of the provisions contained in this Agreement are for any reason held invalid or unenforceable, such holding shall not affect the remaining provisions or the validity and enforceability of the Agreement as a whole.

19. Notices. Any notices to parties required by this Agreement shall be delivered personally or mailed, U.S. first class postage prepaid, addressed as follows:

CITY OF ROSEVILLE

Chris Robles
Economic Development Director
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

CONSULTANT

Tony Burnett, Sales Director
CBRE – Advisory & Transaction Services
500 Capitol Mall, Suite 2400
Sacramento, CA 95814

Either party may amend its address for notice by giving notice to the other party in writing.

20. Integrated Agreement. This is an integrated agreement and contains all of the terms, considerations, understanding and promises of the parties. It shall be read as a whole.

[SIGNATURES ON FOLLOWING PAGE]

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the City of Roseville, a municipal corporation, has authorized the execution of this Agreement in duplicate by its City Manager and attested to by its City Clerk under the authority of Resolution No. _____, adopted by the Council of the City of Roseville on the ____ day of _____, 20____, and CONSULTANT has caused this Agreement to be executed.

CITY OF ROSEVILLE, a
municipal corporation

CBRE, INC., a
Delaware corporation

BY: _____
ROB JENSEN
City Manager

BY: 
its: Sr. Managing Director
and

ATTEST:

BY: _____
its: _____

BY: _____
SONIA OROZCO
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

BY: _____
ROBERT R. SCHMITT
City Attorney

APPROVED AS TO SUBSTANCE:

BY: 
CHRIS ROBLES
Economic Development Director

**ASSISTANT SECRETARY'S CERTIFICATE
AND
INCUMBENCY CERTIFICATE
OF
CBRE, INC.**

December 21, 2016

The undersigned hereby certifies, in her capacity as an Assistant Secretary and not in her individual capacity of CBRE, Inc., a Delaware corporation (the "Company") that:

1. Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a true and complete copy of the Restated Certificate of Incorporation of the Company certified by the Secretary of State of the State of Delaware on December 5, 2014, which is in full force and effect on the date hereof.
2. Attached hereto as Exhibit B is a true, correct and complete copy of the resolutions adopted by the board of directors of the Company on November 3, 2005, which resolutions have not been modified, rescinded or amended since their adoption and execution and remain in full force and effect on the date hereof.
3. David O. Brennan is a Senior Managing Director of the Company and presently holds such title. In such capacity, Mr. Brennan is authorized to sign on behalf of the Company all agreements to which the Company is or will be a party (such as commission, listing, representation, services, management or co-brokerage agreements) and all transactional documents drafted, prepared, revised or signed by a real estate licensee for which a real estate license is required, as permitted or required by the laws, rules and regulations of the jurisdiction in which the office is located, subject to receipt of any prior approvals required under the internal policies of the Company.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned has executed this certificate as of the date first written above.

By: Marie Ly
Name: Marie Ly
Title: Assistant Secretary

Exhibit A

Restated Certificate of Incorporation of the Company
certified on December 5, 2014
(attached)

Delaware

PAGE 1

The First State

I, JEFFREY W. BULLOCK, SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THE ATTACHED ARE TRUE AND CORRECT COPIES OF ALL DOCUMENTS FILED FROM AND INCLUDING THE RESTATED CERTIFICATE OR A MERGER WITH A RESTATED CERTIFICATE ATTACHED OF "CBRE, INC." AS RECEIVED AND FILED IN THIS OFFICE.

THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS HAVE BEEN CERTIFIED:

RESTATED CERTIFICATE, FILED THE FIRST DAY OF JULY, A.D. 2014, AT 10:09 O'CLOCK P.M.

CERTIFICATE OF CORRECTION, FILED THE THIRD DAY OF NOVEMBER, A.D. 2014, AT 7:03 O'CLOCK P.M.



0777218 8100X

141495956

You may verify this certificate online
at corp.delaware.gov/authver.shtml


Jeffrey W. Bullock, Secretary of State
AUTHENTICATION: 1928997

DATE: 12-05-14

**RESTATED CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION
OF
CBRE, INC.**

CBRE, Inc., a corporation organized and existing under the General Corporation Law of the State of Delaware (the "Corporation"), DOES HEREBY CERTIFY:

FIRST: The original name under which the Corporation was incorporated in the State of Delaware is Coldwell Banker Management Corporation.

SECOND: The original Certificate of Incorporation of the Corporation was filed with the Secretary of State of the State of Delaware on December 15, 1971.

THIRD: The Restated Certificate of Incorporation of the Corporation in the form attached hereto as Exhibit A has been duly adopted in accordance with the provisions of Section 245 of the General Corporation Law of the State of Delaware by the directors of the Corporation.

FOURTH: The Restated Certificate of Incorporation only restates and integrates and does not further amend the provisions of the Corporation's Certificate of Incorporation as heretofore amended or supplemented, and there is no discrepancy between those provisions and the provisions of this Restated Certificate of Incorporation.

(Signature page follows.)

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Corporation has caused this Certificate to be signed
this 30th day of June, 2014.

CBRE, INC.

By: Stephen Ball
Stephen Ballas
Senior Vice President

EXHIBIT A

**RESTATED CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION
OF
CBRE, INC.**

FIRST: The name of the corporation is CBRE, Inc.

SECOND: The address of its registered office in the State of Delaware is 1209 Orange Street, in the City of Wilmington, County of New Castle, Delaware 19801. The name of its registered agent at such address is The Corporation Trust Company.

THIRD: The nature of the business or purposes to be conducted or promoted is to engage in any lawful act or activity for which a corporation may be organized under the Delaware General Corporation Law as the same exists or may hereafter be amended.

FOURTH: The total number of shares of capital stock which the corporation shall have authority to issue is One Thousand (1,000) shares of common stock, \$0.01 par value per share.

FIFTH: A director of the corporation shall not be liable to the corporation or its stockholders for monetary damages for breach of fiduciary duty as a director, except to the extent such exemption from liability or limitation thereof is not permitted under the Delaware General Corporation Law as the same exists or may hereafter be amended. Any repeal or modification of the foregoing sentence shall not adversely affect any right or protection of a director of the corporation existing hereunder with respect to any act or omission occurring prior to such repeal or modification.

SIXTH:

A. The corporation shall indemnify and hold harmless, to the fullest extent permitted by applicable law as it presently exists or may hereafter be amended, any person who was or is made or is threatened to be made a party or is otherwise involved in any action, suit or proceeding, whether civil, criminal, administrative or investigative (a "Proceeding") by reason of the fact that he, or a person for whom he is the legal representative, is or was a director or officer of the corporation or is or was serving at the request of the corporation as a director, officer, employee or agent of another corporation or of a partnership, joint venture, trust, enterprise or nonprofit entity, including service with respect to employee benefit plans (an "Indemnitee"), against all liability and loss suffered and expenses (including attorneys' fees) reasonably incurred by such person. The corporation shall not be required to indemnify and hold harmless a person in connection with a Proceeding (or part thereof) initiated by such person unless the Proceeding (or the part thereof initiated by such person) was authorized by the Board of Directors.

B. The right to indemnification conferred by this Article SIXTH shall be presumed to have been relied upon the Indemnitee and shall be enforceable as a contract right. The

corporation may enter into contracts to provide individual Indemnitees with specific rights of indemnification to the fullest extent permitted by applicable law and may create trust funds, grant security interests, obtain letters of credit or use other means to ensure the payment of such amounts as may be necessary to effect the rights provided in this Article SIXTH or in any such contract.

C. Except for any Proceeding described in the last sentence of Section A of Article SIXTH, upon making a request for indemnification, the Indemnatee shall be presumed to be entitled to indemnification under this Article SIXTH and the corporation shall have the burden of proof to overcome that presumption in reaching any contrary determination. Such indemnification shall include the right to receive payment in advance of any reasonable expenses incurred by the Indemnatee in connection with any Proceeding (other than a Proceeding described in the last sentence of Section A of Article SIXTH) consistent with the provisions of applicable law.

D. Any repeal or modification of the foregoing provisions of this Article SIXTH shall not adversely affect any right or protection of any Indemnatee existing at the time of such repeal or modification.

SEVENTH: The Board of Directors is authorized to adopt, amend or repeal the by-laws of the corporation, without any action on the part of the stockholders, solely by the affirmative vote of at least a majority of the directors of the corporation then in office.

STATE OF DELAWARE
CERTIFICATE OF CORRECTION

CBRE, Inc., a corporation organized and existing under the General Corporation Law of the State of Delaware, DOES HEREBY CERTIFY:

1. The name of the corporation is CBRE, Inc.

2. That a Certificate of Restated Certificate of Incorporation of CBRE, Inc. was filed by the Secretary of State of Delaware on July 1, 2014 and that said Certificate requires correction as permitted by Section 103 of the General Corporation Law of the State of Delaware.

3. The inaccuracy or defect of said Certificate is:

The word "by" is missing between the words "upon" and "the Indemnitee" in Article SIXTH. B.

4. Article SIXTH. B. of the Certificate is corrected to read as follows:


SIXTH:

B. The right to indemnification conferred by this Article SIXTH shall be presumed to have been relied upon by the Indemnitee and shall be enforceable as a contract right. The corporation may enter into contracts to provide individual Indemnitees with specific rights of indemnification to the fullest extent permitted by applicable law and may create trust funds, grant security interests, obtain letters of credit or use other means to ensure the payment of such amounts as may be necessary to effect the rights provided in this Article SIXTH or in any such contract.

(Signature page follows.)

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the corporation has caused this Certificate of Correction to be signed this 3rd day of November, 2014.

CBRE, INC.

By: 

Stephen Ballas
Senior Vice President

Exhibit B

Managing Director and Designee authority resolutions
adopted on November 3, 2005
(attached)

**ACTION BY UNANIMOUS WRITTEN CONSENT
OF
THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OF
CB RICHARD ELLIS, INC.**


November 3, 2005

The undersigned, being the members of the Board of Directors of CB Richard Ellis, Inc., a Delaware corporation (the "Company"), acting pursuant to the Bylaws of the Company and the Delaware General Corporation Law, hereby adopt the following resolution with the same force and effect as if it has been unanimously adopted at a duly convened meeting of the Board of Directors of the Company:


RESOLVED, that all Managing Directors and their designees are hereby authorized to execute all agreements to which the Company is or will be a party (such as commission, listing, representation, services, management or co-brokerage agreements) and all transactional documents drafted, prepared, revised or signed by a real estate licensee for any transaction for which a real estate license is required, as permitted or required by the laws, rules and regulations of the jurisdiction in which the office is located, subject to receipt of any prior approvals required under the internal policies of the Company.



Brett White



Kenneth J. Kay



Laurence H. Midler

EXHIBIT "A"



A Proposal to City of Roseville



For Brokerage and Property Management Services

November 2016

Presented by:

Tony Burnett
Sales Director

Gavin Farnam
Managing Director

CBRE

On behalf of the entire CBRE team, we are proud to present this proposal to provide brokerage and property management services to the City of Roseville. CBRE offers comprehensive services that generate measurable results, positive tenant relationships and support the responsible stewardship of public real estate. Our goal is to provide the City of Roseville with access to the best personnel and resources to assist them in making real estate decisions that create value for the City's constituents, staff and operations.

CITY OF ROSEVILLE PORTFOLIO OBJECTIVES

Our number one objective is to meet the needs of the City of Roseville and continue to enhance the value and functionality of your real estate portfolio. We understand that your goals for CBRE include:

- Analyze select assets and provide opinions on their highest and best use as well as market value;
- As directed, provide leasing and sales brokerage support to maximize value for the City;
- Focus on improving the performance of real property assets in a first class manner;
- Look for efficiencies and improve maintenance operations;
- Provide exceptional tenant relations as the agent for the Owner, and;
- Act as the main point of contact for all tenants, contractors and vendors, with on-site management staffing.

CBRE offers owners of assets with comprehensive, quantifiable, value-added services through our strong local platform.

CBRE ADVANTAGES

By leveraging our experience, CBRE can offer the City of Roseville portfolio the following advantages:

Local Market Expertise

The Sacramento office has been serving clients in the Metro area since 1960, becoming a dominant player in the Sacramento commercial real estate market. As industry leaders in acquisitions and dispositions; property management; office, industrial and retail leasing; and project management, CBRE has earned a reputation as a respected leader in the local business community through the ability to track trends and build solid, lasting relationships. Whether facilitating the acquisition of a new building or strategically planning and negotiating complex lease agreements, our employees offer the most integrated array of portfolio services.

In Sacramento and Placer County, we manage more than 14 million square feet (MSF) of properties and provide fully integrated leasing services at many of these same assets. Independent of management, we also provide leasing services to another 15 MSF of well-positioned real estate, giving CBRE a comprehensive presence in the market and a keen awareness of opportunities that will contribute to our clients' success.

Public Sector Specialization

Cities and other public entities have unique commercial real estate requirements and face different challenges than the private sector. CBRE's extensive experience representing municipalities allows us to deploy strategies that are specifically aligned to public sector needs, including: making fiscally responsible,

logical recommendations that support public interests; ensuring transparent communication occurs early and often; building community consensus and educating stakeholders; and delivering creative, yet proven, solutions that offer flexibility and options. We are committed to providing the best real estate information and solutions to our clients.

In Sacramento and Placer County, we manage more than 17 MSF of properties and provide fully integrated strategies at many of these same assets.

OUR PROJECT TEAM

CBRE has 41 brokerage professionals and 45 property management professionals throughout the greater Sacramento market. Each team member's approach is strategic rather than merely transactional. That is, our people can assess a client's deep and specific needs on a long-term scale—consistently delivering value results and surpassing expectations.

The performance of the City of Roseville Portfolio will be optimized through a team of experienced and dedicated CBRE professionals. Each brings a unique background fit to satisfy the unique property's special requirements and exceed your expectations.

Our integrated team is structured in a manner that streamlines communications, applies ample resources to the property, and has effective oversight in place to ensure accountability.

In a business as richly diverse as commercial real estate, true success requires a team of people with different, but complementary backgrounds, skill sets, personalities, perspectives and approaches—all pulling together in a collegial, cohesive manner. The communication and synergy among CBRE's professionals is unsurpassed.

ASSET SERVICES

Gavin Farnam, Director of Asset Services. Mr. Farnam is the ideal candidate to oversee the management team at the City of Roseville Portfolio and has more than 13 years of property management experience, including leading the repositioning of Westfield's key assets in Northern California. His participation will provide an added layer of property-level oversight and ensure that the City of Roseville Portfolio receives the time, attention and resources it deserves.

Bobbie Brown, General Manager. Ms. Brown currently manages 1.8 million square feet in Placer County and Sacramento. Her responsibilities include budgeting, forecasting and improving the overall net income of her properties. Ms. Brown has over 20 years of property management experience and maintains excellent relationships with her clients and city officials. She will play a key role in working with the on-site management team we put in place for the City of Roseville Portfolio.

Christy Cabrera, Real Estate Manager. During Ms. Cabrera's 13 year career, she has managed 1.2 million square feet throughout Northern California. Her experience covers all aspects of property management, administration, operations and working for REIT owner developers.

BROKERAGE

Tony Burnett, Sales Director. Mr. Burnett manages sales and leasing activity for CBRE's professionals in Greater Sacramento, Central Valley and Northern Nevada. Mr. Burnett has particular expertise in serving the needs of public entities – including the Cities of Roseville, Sacramento, Rocklin, Reno, Stockton and Fresno – to provide strategic guidance on property valuation, portfolio organization, and disposition of

surplus properties. He will be responsible for ensuring that the City's needs are communicated to the project team.

Peter Nixon, Senior Vice President, Land Services. With over 25 years of commercial real estate experience in land valuation and sales, Mr. Nixon has negotiated residential, commercial, industrial, and multifamily land sales ranging from small urban in-fill properties to large ranches. Over the course of his career, he has completed over 250 transactions, totaling more than 55,000 acres.

Kevin Larscheid and Scott Rush, Executive Vice President and First Vice President, Office Services. Mr. Larscheid and Mr. Rush have 50 years of collective experience serving the Roseville market, specializing in the sale and leasing of office properties. They are the most experienced highly regarded brokers in their specialty and will be responsible for the analysis and transaction of select buildings within the City's portfolio.

Rick Martinez, Senior Vice President, Retail Services. Mr. Martinez has been a perennial top performer in the region for retail property sales and leasing. With 27 years of commercial real estate experience, he will use his vast network and knowledge to identify quality opportunities to lease the City's retail space.

OUR SERVICES

Portfolio Repositioning

The Project Team's goal is to work as the City's advocate in repositioning its real estate portfolio. Our project team has performed real estate transactions—including ground leases, tenant leases, public-private partnerships, and other real estate transactions—on behalf of dozens of public and private entities throughout the country. We are well prepared to sell and purchase buildings on the City's behalf. If we come across a scenario where it makes sense for the City to engage in leasing activity, we are prepared to represent it in those pursuits as well. We outline a few such scenarios below.

For Leased assets:

- Rental rates, escalations, expenses or additional charges that are out of line with current market rates
- Lease terms or provisions that fall outside of standard market practices or are otherwise detrimental to the best interests of the City
- Tenants in the market for whom certain locations and building attributes represent premium value, e.g., high traffic counts, proximity to complimentary services, above-standard parking
- Highest revenue-generating opportunities for lease renegotiation and termination

For Owned assets:

- Operating costs, deferred maintenance and additional building management expenses that unnecessarily increase occupancy costs
- Agency staff forecasts, working relationships, and adjacency requirements to determine space needs and the feasibility of co-location or consolidation strategies
- Inefficient space configuration and building layout
- Highest and Best Use analyses to determine re-use and re-purpose potential

Disposition Strategy

The Project Team will identify and prioritize disposition opportunities based on those that stand to achieve maximum revenue in the shortest time span. Criteria that will factor into the prioritization will include: a

review and validation of occupancy costs, review of lease(s), analysis of useable and rentable areas of the properties, property conditions and other factors. We will also provide property-by-property disposition recommendations, revenue forecasts, recommended disposition methods and projected timelines.

Transition Advantage

CBRE takes pride in our ability to seamlessly transition management and consulting/brokerage assignments. We believe that the keys to a smooth transition are preparation and transition experience. CBRE has proven time and again that we are "best-in-class" in both of these crucial areas.

Through its many municipal projects, CBRE has learned that the key to a successful asset management program is complete collaboration with City staff and other key stakeholders. Without such teamwork and partnership, it is impossible to manage all parties to a common purpose and outcome. Our goal is to enhance – not replace – City staff capabilities and in this manner, it is critical that the people involved from the City and Project Team sides are regularly communicating, sharing ideas and reviewing activity.

FEES FOR SERVICE

CBRE proposes to provide the requested services for the following compensation:

Broker Opinions of Value

In the event the City requests the Team to prepare a Broker Opinion of Value (BOV) on one or more of the City's assets included as Exhibit A, the fee shall be \$500.00 per BOV. The total cost of the BOVs shall not exceed \$10,500.00.

Disposition of City Property by Lease or Sale

In the event of a lease of any of the 21 properties identified in Exhibit A and/or 316 Vernon Street, the Project Team shall be paid a market-rate commission from lease proceeds generated as a result of such lease. A market-rate commission for representation of the City as landlord is five percent (5.0%) of the gross lease value. If someone other than a member of the Project Team represents the lessee, the Project Team's fee shall be reduced to two and one-half percent (2.5%) and the Tenant Representative fee shall be five percent (5.0%) for a total amount not to exceed seven and one-half percent (7.5%).

For dispositions by sale pertaining to any of the 21 properties identified in Exhibit A, the fee shall not exceed six percent (6.0%) of the gross sales price.

Asset Services

Fees for property management can be structured in different ways (per building, square footage, flat fee) and vary depending on scope, specific services, building type and other factors. CBRE will work with the City to determine the most appropriate resources and arrangement to suit its needs and budget.

WINNING RESULTS

CBRE is proud to offer the talent, resources and programs best suited to complement the City of Roseville Portfolio. Our team looks forward to providing you with unparalleled services that provide future success.

Exhibit A -- List of City Owned Properties

<u>APN</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>ACRES</u>	<u>AREA</u>	<u>GROUP NAME</u>	<u>EXISTING USE</u>	<u>DEPARTMENT</u>
012-120-002-000	201 Pacific St	1.1213	Downtown	Train Station	Union Pacific Railroad	Central Services
013-101-011-000	107 Sutter Ave	0.6533	Downtown	Lions Club	Club	Central Services
470-250-002-000	1205 Gabrielli Dr	0.1702	Meadow Oaks	Leased - buildings	Parking Lot	Central Services
470-050-008-000	919 Oak Ridge Dr	0.1651	Sierra Gardens	Cirby Woods	Residential Potential	Electric
013-022-033-000	87 Parry St	0.1161	Enwood	Enwood	Residential Potential	Parks & Rec.
014-120-062-000	1048 Douglas Blvd	0.0467	Douglas	Median - Douglas	Landscape Easement	Parks & Rec.
015-120-014-000	650 Harding Blvd	0.2362	Enwood	Miners Ravine - Ant Creek	Open Space	Parks & Rec.
013-076-005-000	205 Almond St	0.087	Enwood	Miners Ravine - Ant Creek	Easement or Right of way	Public Works
014-440-090-000	251 Sunrise Ave	0.38	Sierra Gardens	East Roseville Misc	Commercial Potential	Public Works
015-100-058-000	503 Berry St	1.2276	Highland Reserve	Berry Street	Easement or Right of way	Public Works
473-180-011-000	8000 Atkinson St	1.8756	Corp Yard - Booth	Corp Yard - Booth	Commercial Potential	Public Works
013-091-003-000	320 Vernon St	0.59	Downtown	Post Office / Annex	Post Office	Economic Development
017-410-019-000	7400 Galilee Rd	2.34	Industrial Area	West Roseville	Commercial	Economic Development
017-162-074-000	1701 Pleasant Grove Blvd	1.56	Junction West	Future Fire Station Site	Future Fire Station	Fire Department
013-091-010-000	316 Vernon St	0.1049 / 6,405 SF	Downtown	Post Office / Annex	Parking Lot	Central Services
473-080-013-000	1615 Booth Rd	6.84	Vineyard		open space	Parks & Rec.
013-172-012-000	300 Taylor St	0.21	Downtown	Old Courthouse	Government Building	
013-172-021-000	300 Taylor St	0.1	Downtown	Old Courthouse	Parking Lot	
013-172-022-000	300 Taylor St	0.76	Downtown	Old Courthouse	Parking Lot	
013-172-011-000	505 Royer St	0.14	Downtown	Old Courthouse	Government Building	
N/A	N/A	N/A	Historic District	Firehouse	Roseville Historical Society - Roseville Fire Museum	N/A

ORDINANCE NO. 5785

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE
AUTHORIZING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016-17
BUDGET AND DECLARING THIS ORDINANCE TO BE IMMEDIATELY
EFFECTIVE AS AN APPROPRIATION MEASURE

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. The City of Roseville Annual Budget, Fiscal Year 2016-17, is hereby amended by transferring appropriation to and from the activities indicated below:

Appropriate funds for brokerage services, per request of the Economic Development Department, as listed on the attached Request for Budget Adjustment totaling \$10,500.00.

SECTION 2. This ordinance is hereby declared to be an appropriation measure, immediately effective pursuant to the provisions of Section 5.03 of the Charter.

SECTION 3. The City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to post a true copy of the foregoing ordinance in each of three (3) conspicuous locations in the City and she shall immediately after such posting enter in the ordinance book, under the record of the ordinance, a certificate under her hand stating the time and place of such publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville, this
_____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk



REQUEST FOR BUDGET ADJUSTMENT
FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Instructions: Complete all necessary fields. Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory and required for processing. Obtain required approvals and process according to the procedure outlined in:
[A.R. 6.01 Budget Adjustment Policy & Procedure.](#)

For more detailed budget adjustment training information, including examples, please click on the following link:
[Miscellaneous Budget Training Information.](#)

REQUESTER*: Wayne Wiley

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION*: Economic Development

FISCAL YEAR/EFFECTIVE DATE*: FY2016-17

PROPOSED COUNCIL DATE (if applicable): 01/18/2017

USE OF FUNDS*						
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL			JL		
	ORG KEY*	OBJECT*	FUND*	PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
10,500	00301	5101	301			Building Improvement Fund
\$ 10,500	TOTAL					

SOURCE OF FUNDS*						
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL			JL		
	ORG KEY	OBJECT	FUND*	PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
10,500			301			Unrestricted Fund Balance
\$ 10,500	TOTAL					

FINANCE USE	Approved:		
	<i>Kathy Cullen</i>	12/8/16	<i>Wendy Haul</i>
	BUDGET MANAGER/DESIGNEE	DATE	Finance Director
			Date

Justification for Budget Adjustment*:

To retain the services of CBRE to assist with the preparation and implementation of a property management strategy for 21 City owned properties identified as surplus.

Approved:		Approved:	
<i>Cullen</i>	12/16/16		
REQUESTING DEPARTMENT HEAD / DESIGNEE	DATE	CITY MANAGER	DATE



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8191

File #: 0215

Title: Development Impact Fee Report for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2016

Contact: Jeannine Thrash 916-774-5473 jthrash@roseville.ca.us
Monty Hanks 916-774-5313 mhanks@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 10.1.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Accept the following informational Development Impact Fee Reports prepared for fiscal year ended June 30, 2016.

BACKGROUND

In California, State legislation sets certain legal and procedural parameters for the charging of development impact fees ("DIFs"). This legislation was passed as AB1600 by the State Legislature and is now codified as California Government Code Sections (GC §) 66000 through 66008 ("Mitigation Fee Act").

GC § 66006(b) states the following requirements as pertains to the DIFs:

For each separate account or fund established, the local agency shall, within 180 days after the last day of each fiscal year, make available to the public the following information for the fiscal year:

1. A brief description of the type of fee in the account or fund.
2. The amount of the fee.
3. The beginning and ending balance of the account or fund.
4. The amount of the fees collected and interest earned.
5. An identification of each public improvement on which fees were expended and the amount of the expenditures on each improvement including the total percentage of the cost of the public improvement that was funded with fees.
6. An identification of an approximate date by which the construction of the public improvement will commence if the local agency determines that sufficient funds have been collected to complete financing on an incomplete public improvement and the public improvement remains incomplete.
7. A description of each interfund transfer or loan made from the account or fund, including the public improvement on which the transferred or loans fees will be expended, and, in the case of an interfund loan, the date on which the loan will be repaid, and the rate of interest

that the account or fund will receive on the loan.

8. The amount of refunds made (as pursuant to GC § 66001(e)) due to sufficient funds being collected to complete financing on incomplete public improvements, and the amount of reallocation of funds make (as pursuant to GC § 66001(f)) due to administrative costs of refunding unexpended revenues exceeding the amount to be refunded.

The attached Development Impact Fee Reports are for informational purposes. They are also posted on the City's website.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no impact to the City's General Fund.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

The items presented are informational reports. No economic development or jobs were created.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not apply to activities that will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines §15061(b)(3)). These informational reports do not include the potential for a significant environmental effect, and therefore are not subject to CEQA.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jeannine Thrash, Administrative Analyst

Monty Hanks, Finance Director



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Development and User Fee Annual Report

Development and User Fee-JPA/SPWA-Annual Report

Annual Development Impact Fee Report



Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2016

Table of Contents

Reporting Requirements for Development Impact Fees	2
Description of Development Impact Fees.....	3
<u>Fund Balance and Project Descriptions</u>	
Drainage Fees.....	7
Public Facilities.....	8
Local Sewer Connections Fees.....	10
Water Connection Fees.....	11
Traffic Mitigation Fees.....	14
Downtown Specific Plan In-Lieu Parking Fee.....	15
Animal Control Facility Fee.....	16
Parks Fees.....	17
Electric Backbone Impact Fee.....	22
Solid Waste Impact Fee.....	23
Development Agreements Imposed Since 2004.....	24
Attachment 1.....	29

Reporting Requirements for Development Impact Fees

In California, State legislation sets certain legal and procedural parameters for the charging of development impact fees (“DIFs”). This legislation was passed as AB1600 by the California Legislature and is now codified as California Government Code Sections (GC §) 66000 through 66008 (“Mitigation Fee Act”). This State law went into effect on January 1, 1989.

GC § 66006(b) states the following requirements as pertains to DIFs:

For each separate account or fund established, the local agency shall, within 180 days after the last day of each fiscal year, make available to the public the following information for the fiscal year:

- (A) A brief description of the type of fee in the account or fund.
- (B) The amount of the fee.
- (C) The beginning and ending balance of the account or fund.
- (D) The amount of the fees collected and interest earned.
- (E) An identification of each public improvement on which fees were expended and the amount of expenditures on each improvement including the total percentage of the cost of the public improvement that was funded with fees.
- (F) An identification of an approximate date by which the construction of the public improvement will commence if the local agency determines that sufficient funds have been collected to complete financing on an incomplete public improvement and the public improvement remains incomplete.
- (G) A description of each interfund transfer or loan made from the account or fund, including the public improvement on which the transferred or loaned fees will be expended, and, in the case of an interfund loan, the date on which the loan will be repaid, and the rate of interest that the account or fund will receive on the loan.
- (H) The amount of refunds made (as pursuant to GC § 66001(e)) due to sufficient funds being collected to complete financing on incomplete public improvements, and the amount of reallocation of funds made (as pursuant to GC § 66001(f)) due to administrative costs of refunding unexpended revenues exceeding the amount to be refunded.

GC § 65865(e) also requires that in any development agreement entered into on or after January 1, 2004, the City shall comply with GC § 66006 with respect to any fee it receives or cost it recovers.

Description of Development Impact Fees

Drainage Fees

The Drainage Fee is established pursuant to Roseville Municipal Code Chapters 4.48 and 4.49. Drainage fees are required for all new construction that occurs within the Dry Creek Watershed mitigation zone or the Pleasant Grove/Curry Creek Watershed mitigation zones. These mitigation zones are further broken down into sub-zones or sub-areas for which fees vary.

New development, and the expansion of existing development, within the City imposes a burden on the creeks and drainage infrastructure within the Dry Creek watershed and the Pleasant Grove and Curry Creek watershed by adding additional impervious surface, thereby adding more runoff, and by changing discharge rates. Some of the worst burdens imposed by development are on properties located within the Dry Creek watershed and Pleasant Grove and Curry Creek watershed downstream from the City, where additional run-off poses a threat of severe flooding and is a danger to life and property.

The drainage fees have been calculated so as to pay for those facilities listed in the capital improvement program. The fee is to be collected for public improvements and facilities for which an account has been established and funds appropriated, and for which a proposed construction schedule has been adopted.

Public Facilities Fee

The Public Facilities Fee is established pursuant to Roseville Municipal Code Chapter 4.52. New development and the expansion of existing development within the City imposes burdens on existing public facilities and creates a need for additional public facilities. Such burdens may vary by the type of land use. The Public Facilities Fee is applied to new development and expansion of existing development to ensure adequate levels of public services and facilities are maintained. This fee spreads the costs of public facilities to development which creates the need for such public facilities, without generating any surplus to the general fund.

Sewer Connection Fees

Sewer connection fees are established pursuant to Roseville Municipal Code Chapter 14.16. Additional fees may be applicable to properties within sewer special benefit assessment areas.

- *Local Sewer Connection Fee* - The local sewer connection fee is charged for each sewer unit required within the Roseville City limits connected to the City-owned public sewer.

Water Connection Fee

Water connection fees are established pursuant to Roseville Municipal Code Chapter 14.08 and are applicable to all new water service connections within the City limits. This fee ensures the sharing of the costs associated with maintenance and expansion of the City's raw water supply, water treatment, storage, and distribution facilities by those who receive the benefits thereof.

Traffic Mitigation Fees

In 1988 the City of Roseville adopted a city-wide Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, requiring new development within the City to pay traffic impact fees. The fees collected through this program, in addition to other funding sources, allows the City to construct transportation impacts identified in its Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The fee program assesses fair-share costs to each jurisdiction based on their impact on the individual roadways from new development.

City / County Traffic Mitigation Fee - The City of Roseville and Placer County entered into a joint fee program for the purpose of funding improvements on Baseline Road and Walerga Road. The fee program assesses fair-share costs to each jurisdiction based on their impact on the individual improvements from new development. The fees associated with this fee program were originally **collected** by Roseville and Placer County. Fees collected by Roseville were remitted to Placer County quarterly to be held in one account. Effective July 2013, Fiddlyment Road was removed from the program and individual agencies became responsible for holding the fees they **collect in two separate accounts, one with Roseville and one with Placer County**.

Downtown Specific Plan In-Lieu Parking Fee

This fee is established pursuant to Roseville Municipal Code Chapter 19.31. Within the designated Commercial Mixed Use, Old Town and Central Business districts, a parking requirement serving nonresidential uses and residential uses, where a minimum of one space per unit is provided on-site for the residential units, may be met by a cash in-lieu payment to the City prior to issuance of a building permit, or a certificate of occupancy if no building permit is required. The fee is dedicated for use to offset the cost of public off -street parking within the Downtown Specific Plan area in the form of garages or public parking lots.

Animal Control Facility Fee

This fee is established pursuant to Roseville Municipal Code Chapter 4.53 and is collected for all new residential construction. The fee is collected upon issuance of building permits and was adopted to mitigate the impacts of growth on the Placer Animal Control Facilities.

Park Fees

Park fees are authorized pursuant to Roseville Municipal Code Chapters 4.37 and 4.38. There are two different types of park fees applicable to all residential projects. The City-wide Park Fee funds park and recreation facilities intended to serve the entire community, and the Neighborhood and Community Park Fees fund park and recreation facilities intended to serve neighborhood areas. Park fees may vary based on fees and credits that a parcel may be subject to. City-wide Park Credits are granted to all parcels within specific plan areas that have entered into a Development Agreement with the City. Certain parcels may be subject to additional City-wide credits. These additional credits are typically granted for park property dedication above City standards, or other park obligations that were paid for by the original land developers.

Electric Backbone Impact Fee

The Electric Backbone Impact Fee applies to all new customers served by the City's Electric Department and any customer requesting a special service or capacity increase. Fees are based upon a per lot/unit charge and collected upon issuance of the building permit fees. Fees are authorized pursuant to Roseville Municipal Code Chapter 4.54.

Solid Waste Impact Fee

The Solid Waste Impact Fee applies to all new single-family and duplex units. This fee is paid to the Solid Waste Division of the Environmental Utilities Department to set-up solid waste service. Typically, this fee is paid by the developer during the time of construction so that service will be available upon move-in by the homeowner. Fees are authorized pursuant to Roseville Municipal Code Chapter 9.12.

Development Agreement Fees Imposed Since 2004 (GC §65865(e))

- *Sierra Vista Specific Plan Infrastructure Fee* – This fee provides a funding mechanism for Sierra Vista landowners to be reimbursed by other Sierra Vista landowners for various public improvements and public land dedications (e.g., park, school, fire station, etc.) on one landowner's property that benefits other landowner's property.
- *Watt Avenue and Vista Grande Boulevard Extension Traffic Mitigation Fee* – This fee provides fair share funding for extensions of Watt Avenue between the Regional University Specific Plan and future Placer Parkway and "Road B" west of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan boundary to Baseline Road. This fee remains in effect until a city-wide funding mechanism is adopted in cooperation with Placer County.
- *Water Meter Retrofit / Conservation Program* – This fee is established pursuant to Roseville Municipal Code Chapter 14.08 for the maintenance and testing of water meters and installation of Encoder Receiver Transmitter (ERT) devices.
- *Traffic Signal Coordination Fee* – This fee provides funding for the West Roseville Traffic Signal Interconnect project.
- *Bike Trail Fee* – This fee funds construction of Class 1 bike trails through new development areas.
- *City-Wide Park In-Lieu Fee* – This fee is paid as an alternative to dedication of City-wide park land, as specified in individual development agreements.
- *Fire Tax Equivalent Fee* – This fee applies to new growth areas and replaces the Fire Service Facilities Tax that expired in 2009. This fee provides funding for capital fire facilities and related equipment required to serve new growth areas.
- *Public Benefit Fee (AKA Community Benefit Fee)* – This fee applies to new residential growth areas and properties rezoned from non-residential to residential land uses. This fee ensures that new residential growth areas will benefit current and future residents of Roseville through investment in various public infrastructure projects and activities.

- *Air Quality Mitigation Fee (applies to West Roseville Specific Plan)* – This fee provides funding to the Placer County Air Pollution Control District to mitigate impacts to air quality resulting from new residential development.
- *Transit Shuttle Service Fee (applies to West Roseville Specific Plan)* – This fee provides funding for a shuttle service between the West Roseville Specific Plan area and the I80/Watt Avenue light rail station.

Fund Balance Summary

Drainage Fee										
Pleasant Grove/Curry Creek Watershed Drainage Mitigation Fee										
Document Establishing Fee	Project	Fee Formula	Starting Balance	Fees Collected (Refunded)	Interest Earned	Interfund Transfer In/(Out)*	Expenditures	Ending Balance as of June 30, 2016	Sufficient Funds to Complete Project?	% of CIP Funded by Fee
Roseville Municipal Code Chapter 4.48	Pleasant Grove Retention Basin	Ordinances 4433 § 1, 2006; 2399 § 1, 1991	\$5,253,582	\$390,058	70,353	(7,163)	(5,509)	\$5,701,321	No	100%
*Transfers out: \$7,163 for indirect costs to the General Fund.										

Drainage Project Descriptions

Pleasant Grove Retention Basin (Project # 029001) - Costs associated with annexing the Reason Farms and Warnick properties.

Dry Creek Watershed Drainage Mitigation Fee										
Document Establishing Fee	Project	Fee Formula	Starting Balance	Fees Collected (Refunded)	Interest Earned	Interfund Transfer In/(Out)	Expenditures	Ending Balance as of June 30, 2016	Sufficient Funds to Complete Project?	% of CIP Funded by Fee
Roseville Municipal Code Chapter 4.49		Ordinance 2617 § 1, 1992	\$3	-	114	-	-	\$117	No	Unknown at this time

Public Facilities Fee										
Document Establishing Fee	Project	Fee Formula	Starting Balance	Fees Collected (Refunded)	Interest Earned	Interfund Transfer In/(Out)*	Expenditures	Ending Balance as of June 30, 2016	Sufficient Funds to Complete Project?	% of CIP Funded by Fee
Roseville Municipal Code Chapter 4.52		Ordinances 5515 § 2, 2015; 4606 § 1, 2008; 4353 § 1, 2006; 4043 § 1, 2004	\$12,844,229	2,418,151	123,785	14,662,332				
	Radio Tower-West Plan						(9,009)		No	30%
	Downtown Pedestrian Bridge						(188,818)		No	30%
	Oak Street Parking Garage						(502,869)		No	30%
	Downtown Building-316 Vernon Street (Civic Center Expansion)						(14,393,980)		No	30%
								\$14,953,731		
*Transfers in: \$15,027,363 for capital/debt; \$100,000 for loan from Technology Fee-Loan purpose; New permitting system (interest rate of 1% in FY16; matures 6/30/18); \$4,000,000 from Strategic Improvement Fund for 316 Vernon St. project; (\$4,100,000) transfer offset. Transfers out: \$7,982 for indirect costs to the General Fund; \$355,798 for debt service-316 Vernon Street; \$ 1,251 capital/debt transfer for Fiddymment Houses.										

Public Facilities Fee Project Descriptions

Radio Tower-West Plan (Project# 069008) – During the West Plan discussions it was decided that funds would be set aside to build a third 800MHz radio system to cover the recently annexed area in Roseville. This radio system is required to provide adequate public safety and other City support to this new area.

Downtown Pedestrian Bridge (Project #139002) - The Downtown Pedestrian Bridge is aligned with the Civic Center walkway and serves the purpose of providing a prominent connection from Royer Park to the Civic Center and Downtown Roseville. The bridge will incorporate the Works Project Administration style and a natural history theme.

Oak Street Parking Garage (Project #151001) - Design and Construction of multi-story, 400-500 space parking garage between Oak Street and Vernon Street's 200 block. Will initially provide free public parking for the downtown community. Improvements should include pedestrian connections between facility and Oak, Lincoln, and Vernon Streets.

Civic Center Expansion (Project #151002) - The 316 Vernon Street project consists of ±80,000 sq. ft., four-story building on the site of the former City Hall Annex. The building will provide downtown office space necessary to meet the City's needs through 2025. The building will provide short-term instructional space for Sierra College, which would be converted to additional City office space in the future. Ground floor retail will also be provided, as required by the Downtown Code.

Local Sewer Connection Fees										
Document Establishing Fee	Project	Fee Formula	Starting Balance	Fees Collected (Refunded)	Interest Earned/ Other	Interfund Transfer In/(Out)*	Expenditures	Ending Balance as of June 30, 2016	Sufficient Funds to Complete Project?	% of CIP Funded by Fee
Roseville Municipal Code Chapter 14.16		Ordinances 5070 § 6, 2012; 4947 § 9, 2011; 4854 § 9, 2010; 4739 § 11, 2009; 3952 § 8, 2003; 2855 § 1, 1995; 1744 § 1, 1983	\$5,570,293	309,485	55,813	1,042				
	Wastewater System Model						(168,951)		Yes- Started July 2004	100%
	Wastewater Shop Expansion						(5,369)		Yes- Started Sept 2013	100%
	Vactor Washout Facility						(3,576)		Yes- Started 9/29/14	40%
								\$5,758,737		
*Transfer in: \$114,512 for loan payments from Wastewater Rehab Fund- Loan purpose: Green waste program acceleration; fixed rate of 3.94%, matured 6/30/2016; \$1,750 to Highway Users Tax/Water Construction Fund-Vactor Washout. Transfers out: \$1,935 for indirect costs to the General Fund; \$107,756 to the General CIP Rehab. Fund; \$8,367 to the Solid Waste Fund –IDEAScape.										

Local Sewer Connection Fees- Project Descriptions

Wastewater System Model (Project# 043505) – Collection system computer model development and support.

Wastewater Shop expansion (Project# 091002) - The Wastewater Collections Shop needs to be expanded to house the Closed Circuit TV vans and other critical equipment. The expansion will add 5,600 square feet to existing metal building and will consist of a concrete foundation and prefabricated metal siding.

Vactor Washout Facility (Project# 153506) - Project to construct a dedicated facility for Vactor cleanout and washing either at the Corporation Yard or the Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Water Connection Fees										
Document Establishing Fee	Project	Fee Formula	Starting Balance	Fees Collected (Refunded) ⁽¹⁾	Interest Earned	Interfund Transfer In/(Out)*	Expenditures	Ending Balance as of June 30, 2016	Sufficient Funds to Complete Project?	% of CIP Funded by Fee
Roseville Municipal Code Chapter 14.08		Ordinances 5485 § 2, 2015; 4608 § 1, 2008; 3952 § 7, 2003; 3309 § 2, 1998; 2981 § 2, 1996; 2953 § 2, 1996; 2090 § 1, 1988; 1387 § 2, 1978	\$33,459,986	8,031,535	330,892	(97,397)	(6,279,979)			
	Woodcreek North Well						(10,224)		Yes-Started 4/20/06	100%
	Groundwater management plan						(250,071)		Yes-Started 2005	37%
	West side tank/pump Stn Proj						(72,177)		Yes-Started 2006	100%
	Process Control Standards						(13,678)		Yes-Started 4/18/07	100%
	Integr reg. wtr. mgmt. Prop 84 Well						(13,089)		Yes-Started in 2011	75%
	Cook Riolo Rd Bridge 24 in Pipe						(16,993)		Yes-Started 5/25/12	100%
	Intertie-ZN 4 Pmp bck pmp stn						(457,186)		Yes-Started 2014	50%

Water Connection Fees, Continued										
	Project						Expenditures	Ending Balance as of June 30, 2016	Sufficient Funds to Complete Project?	% of CIP Funded by Fee
	Regional wtr supply reliab std						(89,812)		Yes- Started in 2015	100%
	Westbrook Monitoring Well						(193,172)		Yes- Started 11/4/15	100%
								\$34,328,634		
(1)Total includes \$6,324,789 from connection fees, and the remainder from state grants, reimbursements and miscellaneous one-time revenue.										
*Transfers in: \$58,350 for Folsom Pump Station; \$75,071 for groundwater management; \$237,340 for loan payment from Water Rehab Fund-Fixed rate of 2.42%; Loan matures 6/30/2022; and \$686,625 for loan payment from Westpark CFD Improvement; Loan purpose: Westpark completion, interest rate varies: FY16 was 3.2%. (\$923,965) offset loan payments. Transfers out: \$45,750 for indirect costs to the General Fund; \$185,068 for capital/debt.										

Water Connection Fees Project Descriptions

Woodcreek North Well (Project# 043002) – Groundwater well drilling and “top side” improvements.

Groundwater management plan (Project# 053005) - Implement and maintain an SB 1938 compliant Groundwater Management Plan required to maintain future California state grant funding eligibility and implement elements of the Groundwater Management Plan with other agencies.

West side tank/pump Stn Proj (Project#063001) - Design and construct a six million gallon water storage tank, pump station, and chemical addition facility at the City's 5.1 acre site located in the West Roseville Specific Plan. The work will include site master planning to accommodate two six million gallon tanks and satellite facility for Water Distribution operations.

Process Control Standards (Project# 073002) – Development of vertical asset construction standards.

Integr reg. wtr. mgmt. Prop 84 (Project#113002) - The Regional Water Authority (RWA), on behalf of the City and other regional partners, applied for and received a grant from CA Dept. of Water Resources (DWR) for the implementation of the American River Basin Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (ARB IRWMP). The City's project included top side construction of Hayden Parkway Well and construction of the Dell Webb Well. The grant is to cover the design (Engineering Services) and construction portions of the project. The City contributed funds in FY2011 to RWA for preparing the grant application. Engineering and construction costs will be from the Water Construction Fund and additional funds may be spent from Water Construction prior to reimbursement by DWR. This budget also included drought related construction changes.

Cook Riolo Rd Bridge 24 in pipe (Project #123001) – Installation of a 24 inch water main to increase water reliability between neighboring water agencies and increase opportunities of water sharing within the region.

Intertie-ZN 4 Pmp bck pmp stn (Project#143001) – To evaluate and construct pump stations to pump in water from Sacramento Suburban Water District Intertie and pump back water from Zone 4 to Zone 1 in order to meet demands.

Regional wtr supply reliab std (Project#153003) - Regional water supply reliability studies including regional collaboration for water supply reliability.

Westbrook Monitoring Well (Project# 163004) – Construction of a monitoring well for future ASR well.

City/ County Traffic Mitigation Fee										
Document Establishing Fee	Project	Fee Formula*	Starting Balance	Fees Collected (Refunded)	Interest Earned	Interfund Transfer In/(Out)	Expenditures	Ending Balance as of June 30, 2016	Sufficient Funds to Complete Project?	% of CIP Funded by Fee
Roseville Municipal Code Chapter 4.45	Misc. Road Improv.	Ordinances 5203 § 1, 2013; 4739 § 4, 2009; 4118 § 1, 2004	-	\$1,477,361	4,696	-	-	\$1,482,058	No	Unknown at this time

Downtown Specific Plan In-Lieu Parking Fee										
Document Establishing Fee	Project	Fee Formula	Starting Balance	Fees Collected (Refunded)	Interest Earned	Interfund Transfer In/(Out)	Expenditures	Ending Balance as of June 30, 2016	Sufficient Funds to Complete Project?	% of CIP Funded by Fee
Roseville Municipal Code Chapter 19.31, Ordinance 4728 § 11, 2009	Misc. Downtown Parking Improv.	Resolution No. 09-124, Downtown Code 03-Regulatory Incentives	\$9,096	-	2,777	-	-	\$11,873	No	Unknown at this time

Animal Control Facility Fee										
Document Establishing Fee⁽¹⁾	Project	Fee Formula	Starting Balance	Fees Collected (Refunded)	Interest Earned	Interfund Transfer In/(Out)*	Expenditures	Ending Balance as of June 30, 2016	Sufficient Funds to Complete Project?	% of CIP Funded by Fee
Roseville Municipal Code Chapter 4.53	Capital Improv.	Ordinance 4607 § 1, 2008	\$877,649	43,169	2,477	(892,752)	-	\$30,543	No	Unknown at this time
(1) The Animal Control Facility Fee was suspended effective October 1, 2015.										
*Transfer out: \$892,752 for Regional Animal Control Shelter.										

Park Fees										
Neighborhood and Community Park Fees										
Document Establishing Fee	Project	Fee Formula	Starting Balance	Fees Collected (Refunded) ⁽¹⁾	Interest Earned	Interfund Transfer In/(Out)*	Expenditures	Ending Balance as of June 30, 2016	Sufficient Funds to Complete Project?	% of CIP Funded by Fee
Roseville Municipal Code Chapter 4.37		Ordinance 2178 § 1, 1989; 2174 § 1, 1989	\$15,175,543.63	2,576,288	140,289	1,180,697				
	NC 55B Parksite						(1,268)		Yes- Start date FY 10/11	100%
	NC-57 Neighborhood Park						(83)		Yes- Start date FY 10/11	100%
	Overflow Parking/Driveway -RAC						(603,057)		Yes- Start date 9/21/2015	60%
	WM Bill Hughes Park-Diamond Creek						(62,218)		Yes- Start date FY 12/13	77%
	Harry Crabb Park (SSP-29)						(8,411)		No	100%
	Waltrip Jr. Park (Stoneridge)						(110)		Yes-Started 4/1/2016	100%
	Hamel Park Expansion						(25,975)		Yes- Start date FY 14/15	100%
	WRSP Fiddymment F-83 Bike Trail						(556,643)		Yes- Start date 4/20/11	87%
	WRSP PCL W-15 Bike Tr-Offsite						(336,207)		Yes- Start date 7/16/14	100%

Neighborhood and Community Park Fees, Continued										
	Project						Expenditures	Ending Balance as of June 30, 2016	Sufficient Funds to Complete Project?	% of CIP Funded by Fee
	Fiddymment Parcel 50 Park						(59,730)		Yes-Start date 11/1/15	100%
	W-87 Paseo						(466,234)		Yes-Start date 6/1/13	100%
								\$16,952,881		
⁽¹⁾ Includes Neighborhood Park Fees, In-Lieu Fees, Bike Trail Fees, and Paseo Fees.										
*Transfers in: Capital/Debt; \$1,271,469 for capital/debt. Transfers out: \$21,885 for indirect costs to the General Fund; \$68,904 for capital/debt.										

Neighborhood and Community Park Fees Project Descriptions

NC 55B Parksites (Project# 115002) - Design and build a neighborhood park.

NC-57 Neighborhood Park (Project# 155002) – Park improvements in support of the adjacent trail.

Overflow Parking/Driveway-RAC (Project#155003) – Improve McNally lot and add a second driveway.

WM Bill Hughes Park-Diamond Creek (Project# 055001) – Bridge and trail construction at Hughes Park.

Harry Crabb Park (SSP-29) (Project# 035003) - Current phase is for the planning and construction of park amenities, which may include two baseball fields, a soccer field, a splash pad water feature, a group picnic area, basketball courts, tennis courts and expansion of an off-street parking lot.

Waltrip Jr. Park (Stoneridge) (Project#155005) - Neighborhood park under construction at 3800 Miners Ravine Drive near Sierra College Boulevard in the Stoneridge area. This turn-key site includes a pedestrian pathway and play structure.

Hamel Park Expansion (Project# 155007) – Mel Hamel Park is a 10 acre park site and popular because of its soccer fields. The on-going use has prompted the Department to add a restroom to accommodate this use and to address the need for facilities for users who “stay and play” for more than a few hours. Amenities planned for this project would be 2 multi-use restrooms and a storage room.

WRSP Fiddymont F-83 Bike Trail (Project# 109005) – Construction of a 1/3 mile long segment of bike trail within open space Parcel F-83 and the adjacent “off-site” open space in the North Roseville Specific Plan. The “Segment 1” trail runs roughly east-west through the open space, between Crocker Ranch Drive and Orchard View Road (old Fiddymont Road). Most of Segment 1 will be built atop an existing sewer maintenance road. Segment 1 includes a bridge crossing of tributary to Pleasant Grove Creek.

WRSP PCL W-15 Bike Tr-Offsite (Project# 149006) – Construction of the W-15 Trail project, a 4/5 mile long section of multi-use trail, which is planned as part of the West Roseville Specific Plan bikeway system.

Fiddymont Parcel Park 50 (Project#155001) - Eight acre school/park site at 4151 Brick Mason Circle, adjacent to Fiddymont Farm Elementary School. Proposal includes a children's play area, concrete pathway, independent exercise stations, a picnic area and open turf for various sports.

W-87 Paseo (Project#155004) - Paseo construction at Village 15B, adjacent to Westbrook Boulevard, that includes concrete, grading, irrigation and planting.

City-wide Park Fee⁽¹⁾										
Document Establishing Fee	Project	Fee Formula	Starting Balance	Fees Collected (Refunded)	Interest Earned	Interfund Transfer In/(Out)*	Expenditures	Ending Balance as of June 30, 2016	Sufficient Funds to Complete Project?	% of CIP Funded by Fee
Roseville Municipal Code Chapter 4.38		Ordinances 2424 § 1, 1991; 2208 § 1, 1989; 2200 § 1, 1989	\$14,768,666.40	1,719,122	135,792	(141,037)	(15,419)			
	Sports Park Complex						(1,185,851)		TBD	TBD
	Fiddymment Houses						(1,251)		No	100%
	Central Park-Phase One (HRN 52)						(57,418)		No	100%
	Park Site 56-Gibson Park						(71)		No	100%
	Maidu Intrptv Ctr Perm Bldg Ex						(5,000)		Yes-Started 2009	100%
	Storage Units						(21,195)		Yes-Started 3/1/2016	100%
								\$15,196,339		
⁽¹⁾ Includes Park Construction Fees, In-Lieu Fees, and Open Space In-Lieu Fees.										
*Transfers in: \$17,085 for capital/debt. Transfers out: \$6,663 for indirect costs to the General fund; \$151,459 for capital/debt.										

City-wide Park Fee Project Descriptions

Sports Park Complex (Project# 125002 & 155006) – Sports complex at Blue Oaks Blvd/Phillip Road/Hayden Parkway. Current phase is for the planning of amenities, which may include multiple lighted synthetic long fields, restrooms, storage facilities, children's playground area(s), shaded picnic area(s), and pedestrian pathway through landscaped area. Scope is dependent on funding availability.

Fiddymment Houses (Project# 165002) - Demolition, security fencing and historical assessment to preserve the Historical Fiddymment Homestead on Fiddymment Road.

Central Park-Phase One (HRN 52) (Project# 045001) - Phase III improvements to Central Park.

Park Site 56-Gibson Park (Project# 005001) - Future park planned for Gibson Drive and Roseville Parkway.

Maidu Intrptv Ctr Perm Bldg Ex (Project# 085003) - Maidu Museum and Historical Site improvements.

Storage Units (Project# 165001) – Storage unit replacements throughout the City.

Electric Backbone Impact Fee										
Document Establishing Fee	Project	Fee Formula	Starting Balance	Fees Collected (Refunded)	Interest Earned	Interfund Transfer In/(Out)	Expenditures ⁽¹⁾	Ending Balance as of June 30, 2016	Sufficient Funds to Complete Project?	% of CIP Funded by Fee
Roseville Municipal Code Chapter 4.54		Ordinances 5319 § 1, 2014; 4605 § 1, 2008; 2393 § 1, 1991	\$4,579,560	1,361,092	73,615	-	-	\$6,014,268	No	75%
⁽¹⁾ There were no expenditures for the projects funded by the fees collected within the reporting timeframe.										

Solid Waste Impact Fee										
Document Establishing Fee	Project	Fee Formula	Starting Balance	Fees Collected (Refunded)	Interest Earned	Interfund Transfer In/(Out)*	Expenditures	Ending Balance as of June 30, 2016	Sufficient Funds to Complete Project?	% of CIP Funded by Fee
Roseville Municipal Code Chapter 9.12	Solid Waste Services Set Up	Ordinances 4380 § 1, 2006; 3382 § 1, 1999; 2665 § 1, 1993; 2057 § 1, 1987	\$2,143,706	431,750	19,803	(11,909)	(128,048)	\$2,455,300	No	Unknown at this time
* Transfers out: \$3,542 for indirect costs to the General Fund; \$8,367 for capital/debt.										

DA Fees Imposed Since 2004

Sierra Vista Specific Plan Infrastructure Fee

Document Establishing Fee	Project	Fee Formula	Starting Balance	Fees Collected (Refunded)	Interest Earned	Interfund Transfer In/(Out)	Expenditures	Ending Balance as of June 30, 2016	Sufficient Funds to Complete Project?	% of CIP Funded by Fee
Sierra Vista Specific Plan		Reimbursed based on project	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note: No fees have been collected yet.

Watt Avenue and Vista Grande Boulevard Extension Traffic Mitigation Fee

Document Establishing Fee	Project	Fee Formula	Starting Balance	Fees Collected (Refunded)	Interest Earned	Interfund Transfer In/(Out)	Expenditures	Ending Balance as of June 30, 2016	Sufficient Funds to Complete Project?	% of CIP Funded by Fee
Creekview and Sierra Vista DA		Per DA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note: The fee will be based on a fair share allocation. No fee will be established until there is a need to extend the road past city limits.

Water Meter Retrofit/ Conservation Program

Document Establishing Fee	Project	Fee Formula	Starting Balance	Fees Collected (Refunded)	Interest Earned	Interfund Transfer In/(Out)*	Expenditures	Ending Balance as of June 30, 2016	Sufficient Funds to Complete Project?	% of CIP Funded by Fee
Roseville Municipal Code Chapter 14.07	Maint. and Testing of Water Meters and ERT Installs	Ordinance 4001 § 2, 2003	\$738,983	122,918	6,904	(15,904)	(472,025)	\$380,875	No	Unknown at this time

*Transfers out: \$612 for indirect costs to the General Fund; \$15,292 for post-retirement/payoffs.

Please refer to the Development Agreements on the City of Roseville's website: http://www.roseville.ca.us/gov/development_services/_planning/development_agreements.asp

DA Fees Imposed Since 2004, continued

Traffic Signal Coordination Fee

Document Establishing Fee	Project	Fee Formula	Starting Balance	Fees Collected (Refunded)	Interest Earned	Interfund Transfer In/(Out)*	Expenditures	Ending Balance as of June 30, 2016	Sufficient Funds to Complete Project?	% of CIP Funded by Fee
West Roseville Specific Plan	West Roseville Traffic Signal Interconn.	Per Individual DA	\$2,216,017	53,500	20,591	(1,726.00)	(26,879.48)	\$2,261,502	No	Unknown at this time

* Transfers out: \$1,726 for indirect costs to the General Fund.

Bike Trail Fee

Document Establishing Fee	Project	Fee Formula	Starting Balance	Fees Collected (Refunded) ⁽¹⁾	Interest Earned	Interfund Transfer In/(Out)*	Expenditures	Ending Balance as of June 30, 2016	Sufficient Funds to Complete Project?	% of CIP Funded by Fee
West Roseville Specific Plan	Misc. Class 1 Bike Trails	Per Individual DA	\$202,471	735	1,208	112,404	(76,426)	\$240,392	No	Unknown at this time

⁽¹⁾\$417,042 in bike trail fees were collected through various Park Development Funds which are included with the Neighborhood and Community Park Fees. Fund 218 is the Bike Trail Maintenance Fund.

*Transfers in: \$113,857 from various Community Facilities Districts for bike trail maintenance.
Transfers out: \$1,453 for indirect costs to the General Fund.

City-Wide Park In-Lieu Fee

Document Establishing Fee	Project	Fee Formula	Starting Balance	Fees Collected (Refunded)	Interest Earned	Interfund Transfer In/(Out)*	Expenditures	Ending Balance as of June 30, 2016	Sufficient Funds to Complete Project?	% of CIP Funded by Fee
Sierra Vista Specific Plan	Misc. Park Projects per DA	Per DA	\$39,560	-	368	(25)	-	\$39,902	No	Unknown at this time

*Transfers out: \$25 for indirect costs to the General Fund.

Please refer to the Development Agreements on the City of Roseville's website: http://www.roseville.ca.us/gov/development_services/planning/development_agreements.asp

DA Fees Imposed Since 2004, continued										
Fire Tax Equivalent Fee										
Document Establishing Fee ⁽¹⁾	Project	Fee Formula	Starting Balance	Fees Collected (Refunded)	Interest Earned	Interfund Transfer In/(Out)*	Expenditures	Ending Balance as of June 30, 2016	Sufficient Funds to Complete Project?	% of CIP Funded by Fee
Municipal Code Chapter 4.46		Per Individual DA's after Dec. 2009	\$4,911,475	1,183,979	46,470	(4,365)	(5,774)			
	Fire Station 1 Relocation						(943,161)		Yes-start date 6/1/2015	39%
								\$5,188,623		
⁽¹⁾ Roseville Municipal code 4.46 had a sunset date of December 31, 2009. Individual DA's reference a fee 'equivalent to' this original fire service construction tax fee. *Transfers out: \$4,365 for indirect costs to the General Fund; \$239,474 loan payments; (\$239,474) offset loan payments. Loan Purpose - Payoff of Fire Truck Lease- Maturity date of loan was June 30, 2016. Fixed interest rate of 2.25% in FY16.										

Fire Tax Equivalent Fee Project Description

Fire Station 1 Relocation (Project# 121001) - Relocation of Fire Station #1 from its current location to a new facility on the northeast side of the intersection of Oak and Grant.

DA Fees Imposed Since 2004, continued										
Public Benefit Fee (AKA Community Benefit Fee)										
Document Establishing Fee	Project	Fee Formula	Starting Balance	Fees Collected (Refunded)	Interest Earned	Interfund Transfer In/(Out)*	Expenditures	Ending Balance as of June 30, 2016	Sufficient Funds to Complete Project?	% of CIP Funded by Fee
All DA's since 2004		Per Individual DA	\$17,045,157	1,399,128	147,588	4,133,858	(52,386)			
	Regional Animal Control Fac.						(2,108,459)		No	Unknown at this time
								\$20,564,886		
*Transfers in; \$1,650,000 from the Building Fund; \$1,600,000 from NCR CFD #1 Improvement Fund; \$892,752 for capital/debt. Transfer out; \$8,894 for indirect costs to the General Fund; Advance payments of: \$1,967,137 to Downtown Parking Fund for Oak St. Garage; and \$4,000,000 to Public Facilities Fund for 316 Vernon St.; (\$5,967,137 transfer offset).										
Please refer to the Development Agreements on the City of Roseville's website: http://www.roseville.ca.us/gov/development_services/planning/development_agreements.asp										

Public Benefit Fee (AKA Community Benefit Fee) Project Description

Regional Animal Control Facility (Project# 109003) – The City of Roseville is served by the Placer Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA) for animals, and operated out of a facility that is aging and has reached capacity. The City is working on a regional partnership to construct a new Animal Services Shelter in West Placer County.

DA Fees Imposed Since 2004, continued

Air Quality Mitigation Fee

Document Establishing Fee	Project	Fee Formula	Starting Balance	Fees Collected (Refunded)	Interest Earned	Interfund Transfer In/(Out)*	Expenditures	Ending Balance as of June 30, 2016	Sufficient Funds to Complete Project?	% of CIP Funded by Fee
West Roseville Specific Plan	Mitigating Impacts to Air Quality	Per DA	\$362,252	45,173	2,998	(170)	-	\$410,253	No	Unknown at this time

*Transfer out: \$170 for indirect costs to the General Fund.

Transit Shuttle Service Fee

Document Establishing Fee	Project	Fee Formula	Starting Balance	Fees Collected (Refunded)	Interest Earned	Interfund Transfer In/(Out)*	Expenditures	Ending Balance as of June 30, 2016	Sufficient Funds to Complete Project?	% of CIP Funded by Fee
West Roseville Specific Plan	Shuttle Service between WRSP and I80/Watt Ave Light Rail Station	Per DA	\$135,070	36,273	1,261	(1,344)	-	\$171,260	No	Unknown at this time

*Transfer out: \$1,344 for CIP rehab-painting project.

Please refer to the Development Agreements on the City of Roseville's website: http://www.roseville.ca.us/gov/development_services/_planning/development_agreements.asp

Attachment 1:
Fee Ordinances, Resolutions and
Development Agreements

Drainage Fees:

Pleasant Grove/Curry Creek Watershed Drainage Mitigation Fee

Ordinance No. 4433

Dry Creek Watershed Drainage Mitigation Fee

Ordinance No. 2617

ORDINANCE NO. 4433

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AMENDING CHAPTER
4.48 OF TITLE 4 OF THE ROSEVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING PLEASANT
GROVE WATERSHED DRAINAGE MITIGATION FEE

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. Chapter 4.48 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

**4.48 PLEASANT GROVE/CURRY CREEK WATERSHED DRAINAGE MITIGATION
FEE**

4.48.010 Purpose.

The City Council finds and declares that the purpose of this chapter is as follows:

- A. The General Plan of the City requires that the City be provided, in a time frame related to its development, with an adequate level of drainage infrastructure so as to not adversely impact other areas.
- B. New development, and the expansion of existing development, within the City imposes a burden on the creeks and drainage infrastructure within the Pleasant Grove and Curry Creek watershed by adding additional impervious surface, thereby adding more runoff, and by changing discharge rates. This creates a need for new drainage infrastructure and improvements. Such burdens may vary by the type of land use and by the location of the land use within the City since soil characteristics differ. Some of the worst burdens imposed by development are on properties located within the Pleasant Grove and Curry Creek watershed downstream from the City, where additional run-off poses a threat of severe flooding and is a danger to life and property.
- C. Analysis of the land use expected at buildout of the City pursuant to the General Plan and Specific Plans make it possible to estimate the amount of additional run-off generated by different types of land uses, to analyze the drainage infrastructure or facilities necessary to mitigate that run-off, and to determine which land uses will require which portions of such infrastructure. It is therefore possible to construct a fee, based on land use and location which equitably spreads the burden of providing drainage infrastructure or facilities within the Pleasant Grove and Curry Creek watershed to those who will create the need for them. It is the intent of this chapter to create such a fee, spreading costs of drainage infrastructure and facilities to those who create the need for such infrastructure, without generating any surplus to the general fund. It is the further purpose of this chapter to implement the General Plan and Specific Plans by assuring that adequate public facilities are financed and provided to serve the City.
- D. The Fee established by this chapter has been calculated in the manner set forth in the Study so as to pay for those Facilities listed in the Capital Improvement Program.
- E. The Fee established by this chapter is in addition to any other fees or charges required by law as a condition of development.

- F. The Fee established by this chapter is to be collected for public improvements and facilities for which an account has been established and funds appropriated, and for which a proposed construction schedule has been adopted.
- G. That the failure to impose the conditions and regulations of this chapter relating to payment of the Fee on building permits would jeopardize both residents of the community and those outside the community within the Pleasant Grove and Curry Creek watershed, in that it would permit construction to proceed without adequate drainage infrastructure or means of financing said infrastructure.
- H. The requirement of this chapter to pay the Fee is necessary in order to assure compliance with the applicable Zoning Ordinance, Specific Plans and General Plan requirements for the infrastructure funded by this chapter.
- I. That for a period of greater than 10 days prior to adoption of this chapter, data has been available to the public and to developers and their representatives indicating the cost or estimated cost of all the infrastructure to be funded, the revenue sources anticipated and the means of spreading these costs.
- J. That the City Council has considered the effect of the Fee imposed by this chapter with respect to the housing needs of the City as a whole and of the region, particularly as required by the Housing Element of the General Plan, and the City Council finds that this chapter does not unduly adversely affect the City's ability to provide for such needs.
- K. That the establishment of the Fee is for the purpose of obtaining funds for capital projects, necessary to maintain service required by the General Plan within existing service areas and existing portions of the City which are developed or for which land use has already been granted.

4.48.020 Definitions.

The following words are defined for purposes of this chapter as follows:

- A. "Building Permit" means the permit issued or required by the City for construction of any structure pursuant to and as defined by the Building Code.
- B. "Capital Improvement Program" means that list of proposed drainage facilities, improvements, or infrastructure totaling \$23,044,315 (in 2005 dollars) included in the Study.
- C. "Department" means the Department of Public Works.
- D. "Director" means the Director of the Department.
- E. "Facilities" means those public drainage facilities or infrastructure shown and included on the Capital Improvement Program.
- F. "Fee" or "Drainage Mitigation Fee" means the Fee established by this chapter. The Fee shall be collected prior to the approval of any building permit. The Fee shall be used solely to finance the Facilities.
- G. "Improvement Plan" means a site plan of property proposed for development showing all required improvements that must be approved by the City prior to the issuance of a Building Permit for the property.

- H. "Study" means the reports entitled "Pleasant Grove/Curry Creek Watershed Mitigation Fee Report amended Hydrology project report for fee revision" dated May 2006 by Civil Engineering Solutions, Inc.. The Study is on file in the Offices of the Director and the City Clerk.
- J. "Drainage Mitigation Fund" means that special interest-bearing fund established pursuant to Section 4.49.030.

4.48.030 Establishment and administration of Drainage Mitigation Fund.

The Finance Director is hereby directed to establish a special interest-bearing fund entitled the Pleasant Grove/Curry Creek Drainage Mitigation Fund. All Fees collected pursuant to this chapter shall be deposited in the Pleasant Grove/Curry Creek Drainage Mitigation Fund and expended solely to finance the Facilities.

4.48.040 Payment of Drainage Mitigation Fee.

Except as otherwise provided by this chapter, the Fee imposed pursuant to this chapter shall be paid upon the issuance of any Building Permit within the Pleasant Grove and Curry Creek Watershed. Calculation of the Fee shall be determined in accordance with the Study and this chapter, depending upon where within the City development occurs, the type of development and the extent of development.

4.48.045 Payment of Drainage Mitigation Fee where building permits are not issued by the city.

Where Building Permits are issued by an individual or agency other than the City, the Fee imposed pursuant to this chapter shall be paid at or prior to a request for electric, water or sewer service, whichever is first. The fee shall be calculated in the same manner as any other Fee imposed pursuant to this chapter.

4.48.050 Watershed and soil boundaries.

The boundaries of the Pleasant Grove and Curry Creek Watershed are hereby established as shown on that certain map entitled "Pleasant Grove and Curry Creek Watershed Mitigation Boundary" dated August 2006 which is on file in the Office of the City Clerk and the Director and is incorporated herein by this reference.

4.48.060 (Reserved.)

4.48.070 Drainage Mitigation Fee.

62.4453
pg 3

The Fee within the Pleasant Grove and Curry Creek Watersheds shall be:

Land Use Category	Fees
Low Density Residential (LDR): less than 7 units/acre	\$372.03/unit
Medium Density Residential (MDR): 7 to 12.9 units/acre	\$372.03/unit
High Density Residential (HDR): 13 units/acre or higher	\$306.93/unit
Neighborhood Commercial (NC)	\$4,822.99/acre
Community Commercial (CC)	\$4,822.99/acre
Regional Commercial (RC)	\$4,822.99/acre
Business Professional (BP)	\$4,822.99/acre
Light Industrial (LI)	\$4,822.99/acre
General Industrial (IND)	\$4,822.99/acre

4.48.120 Existing development.

No Fee shall be charged for already existing development or for projects which rebuild or remodel without increasing the impervious area, except as provided in this section.

Where any development or project expands or remodels, it shall be charged the appropriate Fee as provided by Sections 4.48; provided, however, that the Fee shall be calculated only as to that portion of the development or project which is expanded or remodeled.

4.48.130 Fee adjustments.

- A. A developer of any project subject to the Fee established by this chapter may apply to the Director for a reduction or adjustment to the Fee based upon the absence of any reasonable relationship or nexus between the impacts of the project and either the amount of the Fee or the Facilities to be financed by the Fee. The application shall be made in writing and filed with the Director not later than twenty (20) calendar days after notification of the amount of the Fee. The application shall state in detail the factual basis for the claim of reduction or adjustment and the amount of the proposed reduction or adjustment. The Director shall consider the application and render his decision in writing not later than forty-five (45) calendar days after the filing of the Fee adjustment request.

Any person aggrieved by the decision of the Director may, within twenty (20) calendar days thereafter, appeal the decision in writing to the City Council by filing an appeal with the City Clerk. The City Council shall consider such appeals within forty-five (45) calendar days after filing. The decision of the City Council shall be final. No Building Permit shall be issued for the project until the final decision pursuant to this

section has been made. No application for a project shall be considered final or complete for purposes of the Permit Streamlining Act (Government Code Section 65920, et seq.), or any other purpose, until a final decision pursuant to this section has been made.

- B. Notwithstanding the provisions of Subsection A, a project proponent or applicant may pay the Fee "under protest" and receive a Building Permit. Provided, however, that the application for reduction or adjustment shall thereafter be filed within ten (10) calendar days or any objection shall be deemed waived. If a reduction or adjustment is received after payment pursuant this subsection is made, a refund to the applicant shall be made of that amount by which the Fee is reduced or adjusted.
- C. The project proponent or applicant applying for a reduction or adjustment shall have the burden of proof, by a preponderance of the evidence, that a reasonable relationship or nexus is lacking between the Fee, or the Facilities to be financed by the Fee, and the particular project.
- D. In the event of any reduction or adjustment in the Fee granted pursuant to this section, any later change in the use, zoning, or land use designation for the property involved shall subject the then owner to payment of the then applicable Fee for such new uses, zoning, or land use designation, whether or not a Building Permit is required.

4.48.140 Inflationary adjustments.

The Fee established by this chapter shall automatically be adjusted on January 1 of each calendar year by a percentage equal to the inflation rate for the prior year for construction costs as determined by the Director on December 1 of each calendar year. The Director's determination shall be based upon the Engineering News Record, Construction Cost Index for the calendar year as of December 1.

4.48.150 Adoption in compliance with Capital Improvement Plan.

When the monies in the Drainage Mitigation Fund are disbursed for use, the Fees shall be used to finance the Facilities. To the extent sufficient Fees are available, all Facilities financed by the Fees shall be constructed or acquired in accordance with the priorities established in the Capital Improvement Program.

4.48.160 Chapter is severable.

If any provision of this chapter or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other provisions of this chapter which can be given effect without the invalid provisions or its application, and to this end the provisions of this chapter are severable.

SECTION 2. This ordinance shall be effective at the expiration of thirty (30) days from the date of adoption.

44493
123


SECTION 3. The City Clerk is hereby directed to cause this ordinance to be published in full at least once within fourteen (14) days after it is adopted in a newspaper of general circulation in the City, or shall within fourteen (14) days after its adoption cause this ordinance to be posted in full in at least three (3) public places in the City and enter in the Ordinance Book a certificate stating the time and place of said publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this 6th day of September, 2006, by the following vote on roll call:


AYES COUNCILMEMBERS: Roccucci, Rockholm, Garbolino

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS: None

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS: Gray, Allard


MAYOR

ATTEST:


City Clerk

Ord 4033

296

ORDINANCE NO. 2617

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE
ADDING CHAPTER 4.49 TO TITLE 4 OF THE ROSEVILLE
MUNICIPAL CODE, RELATING TO THE DRY CREEK
WATERSHED DRAINAGE MITIGATION FEE

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1: Chapter 4.49 is hereby added to Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code to read as follows:

CHAPTER 4.49

DRY CREEK WATERSHED DRAINAGE MITIGATION FEE

4.49.010 Purpose.

The City Council finds and declares that the purpose of this chapter is as follows:

A. The General Plan of the City requires that the city be provided, in a time frame related to its development, with an adequate level of drainage infrastructure so as to not adversely impact other areas.

B. New development, and the expansion of existing development, within the City imposes a burden on the creeks and drainage infrastructure within the Dry Creek watershed by adding additional impervious surface, thereby adding more runoff and changing discharge rates. This creates a need for new drainage infrastructure and improvements. Such burdens may vary by the type of land use and location within the City. Some of the worst impacts imposed by development are on properties located within the Dry Creek watershed downstream from the City, where additional runoff poses a threat to severe flooding and is a danger to life and property.

C. Analysis of the land use expected at buildout of the City pursuant to the General Plan and Specific Plans make it possible to estimate the amount of additional runoff generated by different types of land use, to analyze the drainage infrastructure or facilities necessary to mitigate that runoff, and to determine which land uses will require which portions of such infrastructure. It is therefore possible to charge a fee, based on land use and location, which equitably shares the burden of providing drainage infrastructure or facilities within the Dry Creek watershed among those who will create the need for them. It is the intent of this chapter to create such a fee without generating any surplus to the general fund. It is the further purpose of the chapter to implement the General Plan and Specific Plans by assuring that adequate public facilities are financed and provided to serve the City.

D. The Fee established by this chapter has been calculated in the manner set forth in the Study so as to pay for those Facilities listed in the Capital Improvement Program.

E. The Fee established by this chapter is in addition to any other fees or charges required by law as a condition of development.

F. The Fee established by this chapter is to be collected for public improvements and facilities for which an account has been established and funds appropriated, and for which a proposed construction schedule has been adopted.

G. That the failure to impose conditions and regulations of this chapter relating to payment of the Fee on building permits would jeopardize both residents of the community and those outside the community within the Dry Creek watershed, in that it would permit construction to proceed without adequate drainage infrastructure or means of financing said infrastructure.

H. The requirement of this chapter to pay the Fee is necessary in order to assure compliance with the applicable Zoning Ordinance, Specific Plans, and General Plan requirements for the infrastructure funded by this chapter.

I. That for a period of greater than 10 days prior to adoption of this chapter, data has been available to the public and to developers and their representatives indicating the cost or estimated cost of all the infrastructure to be funded, the revenue sources anticipated, and the means of sharing these costs.

J. That the City Council has considered the effect of the Fee imposed by this chapter with respect to the housing needs of the City as a whole and of the region, particularly as required by the Housing Element of the General Plan, and the City Council finds that this chapter does not unduly adversely affect the City's ability to provide such needs.

K. That the establishment of the Fee is for the purpose of obtaining funds for capital projects, necessary to maintain service required by the General Plan within existing service areas and existing portions of the City which are developed or for which land use has already been granted.

4.49.020 Definitions.

The following words are defined for purposes of this chapter as follows:

A. "Building Permit" means the permit issued or required by the City for construction of any structure pursuant to and as defined by the Building Code.

B. "Capital Improvement Program" means that list of proposed drainage facilities, improvements, or infrastructure totaling \$5,248,700 (in 1991 dollars, Roseville projects only) included in the Study.

C. "Department" means the Department of Public Works.

D. "Director" means the Director of the Department.

E. "Facilities" means those public drainage facilities or infrastructure shown and included on the Capital Improvement Program.

F. "Fee" or "Drainage Mitigation Fee" means the Fee established by this chapter. The Fee shall be collected prior to the approval of any building permit. The Fee shall be used solely to finance the Facilities.

G. "Improvement Plan" means a site plan of property proposed for development showing all required improvements that must be approved by the City prior to the issuance of a Building Permit for the property.

H. "Study" means both the report entitled "Dry Creek Watershed Flood Control Plan" dated April 1992 by James M. Montgomery Consulting Engineers, and the report of the Director entitled "Adoption of Interim Dry Creek Watershed Flood Control Plan and Drainage Mitigation Fee" dated June 4, 1992, taken together. The Study is on file in the Offices of the Director and the City Clerk.

I. "Dry Creek Drainage Mitigation Fund" means that special interest-bearing fund established pursuant to Section 4.49.030.

4.49.030 Establishment and Administration of Dry Creek Drainage Mitigation Fund.

The Finance Director is hereby directed to establish a special interest-bearing fund entitled the Dry Creek Drainage Mitigation Fund. All Fees collected pursuant to this chapter shall be deposited in the Dry Creek Drainage Mitigation Fund and expended solely to finance the Facilities.

4.49.040 Payment of Drainage Mitigation Fee.

Except as otherwise provided by this chapter, the Fee imposed pursuant to this chapter shall be paid at or prior to the issuance of any Building Permit within the Dry Creek Watershed. Calculation of the Fee shall be determined in accordance with the Study and this chapter depending upon where within the City development occurs, the type of development, and the extent of development.

4.49.045 Payment of Drainage Mitigation Fee Where Building Permits are not Issued by the City.

Where Building Permits are issued by an individual or agency other than the City, the Fee imposed pursuant to this chapter shall be paid at or prior to a request for electric, water, or sewer service, whichever is first. The fee shall be calculated in the same manner as any other Fee imposed pursuant to this chapter.

4.49.050 Watershed and Subarea Boundaries.

The boundaries of the Dry Creek Watershed and its subareas are hereby established as shown on that certain map entitled Dry Creek Watershed Subarea Map which is on file in the Office of the City Clerk and the Director and is incorporated herein by reference.

4.49.060 [Reserved]

4.49.070 Drainage Mitigation fee -- Main Stem.

The Fee in that portion of the Dry Creek Watershed which is in the Main Stem subarea shall be:

<u>Land Use Category</u>	<u>Amount of Fee</u>
Commercial, Industrial, or other	\$1,125.00/acre
High-density Residential (More than 4.0 units per acre)	\$94.00/unit
Low-density Residential (4.0 or less units per acre)	\$148.00/unit

4.49.080 Drainage Mitigation fee -- Antelope Creek.

The Fee in that portion of the Dry Creek Watershed which is in the Antelope Creek subarea shall be:

<u>Land Use Category</u>	<u>Amount of Fee</u>
Commercial, Industrial, or other	\$1,350.00/acre
High-density Residential (More than 4.0 units per acre)	\$113.00/unit
Low-density Residential (4.0 or less units per acre)	\$274.00/unit

4.49.090 Drainage Mitigation fee -- Miner's Ravine.

The Fee in that portion of the Dry Creek Watershed which is in the Miner's Ravine subarea shall be:

<u>Land Use Category</u>	<u>Amount of Fee</u>
Commercial, Industrial, or other	\$1,699.00/acre
High-density Residential (More than 4.0 units per acre)	\$142.00/unit
Low-density Residential (4.0 or less units per acre)	\$508.00/unit

4.49.100 Drainage Mitigation fee -- Strap Ravine.

The Fee in that portion of the Dry Creek Watershed which is in the Strap Ravine subarea shall be:

<u>Land Use Category</u>	<u>Amount of Fee</u>
Commercial, Industrial, or other	\$1,277.00/acre
High-density Residential (More than 4.0 units per acre)	\$106.00/unit
Low-density Residential (4.0 or less units per acre)	\$215.00/unit

4.49.110 Drainage Mitigation fee -- Linda Creek North.

The Fee in that portion of the Dry Creek Watershed which is in the Linda Creek North subarea shall be:

<u>Land Use Category</u>	<u>Amount of Fee</u>
Commercial, Industrial, or other	\$1,215.00/acre
High-density Residential (More than 4.0 units per acre)	N/A

Low-density Residential (4.0 or less units per acre)	\$163.00/unit
---	---------------

4.49.120 Drainage Mitigation fee -- Linda Creek South.

The Fee in that portion of the Dry Creek Watershed which is in the Linda Creek South subarea shall be:

<u>Land Use Category</u>	<u>Amount of Fee</u>
Commercial, Industrial, or other	\$1,371.00/acre
High-density Residential (More than 4.0 units per acre)	\$114.00/unit

Low-density Residential (4.0 or less units per acre)	\$194.00/unit
---	---------------

4.49.130 Drainage Mitigation fee -- Secret Ravine.

The Fee in that portion of the Dry Creek Watershed which is in the Secret Ravine subarea shall be:

<u>Land Use Category</u>	<u>Amount of Fee</u>
Commercial, Industrial, or other	\$1,427.00/acre
High-density Residential (More than 4.0 units per acre)	\$119.00/unit

Low-density Residential (4.0 or less units per acre)	\$311.00/unit
---	---------------

4.49.140 Reserved.

4.49.150 Existing Development.

No Fee pursuant to this chapter shall be charged for already existing development or for projects which rebuild or remodel without increasing the impervious area, except as provided in this section.

Where any development or project expands or remodels, it shall be charged the appropriate Fee as provided by Sections 4.49.050 through 4.49.140; provided, however, that the Fee shall be calculated only as to that portion of the development or project which is expanded or remodeled.

4.49.160 Fee Adjustments.

A. A developer of any project subject to the Fee established by this chapter may apply to the Director for a reduction or adjustment to the Fee based on the absence of any reasonable relationship or nexus between the impacts of the project and either the amount of the Fee or the Facilities to be financed by the Fee. The application shall be made in writing and filed with the Director not later than twenty (20) calendar days after notification of the amount of the Fee. The application shall state in detail the factual basis for the claim of reduction or adjustment and the amount of the proposed reduction or adjustment. The Director shall consider the application and render his decision in writing not later than forty-five (45) calendar days after the filing of the Fee adjustment request. Any person aggrieved by the decision of the Director may, within twenty (20) calendar days thereafter, appeal the decision in writing to the City Council by filing an appeal with the City Clerk. The City Council shall consider such appeals within forty-five (45) calendar days after filing. The decision of the City Council shall be final. No Building Permit shall be considered final or complete for purposes of the Permit Streamlining Act (Government Code Section 65920, et seq.), or any other purpose, until a final decision pursuant to this section has been made.

B. Notwithstanding the provisions of Subsection A, a project proponent or applicant may pay the Fee "under protest" and receive a Building Permit. Provided, however, that the application for reduction or adjustment shall thereafter be filed within ten (10) calendar days or any objection shall be deemed waived. If a reduction or adjustment is received after payment pursuant to this subsection is made, a refund to the applicant shall be made of that amount by which the Fee is reduced or adjusted.

C. The project proponent or applicant applying for a reduction or adjustment shall have the burden of proof, by a preponderance of the evidence, that a reasonable relationship or nexus is lacking between the Fee, or the Facilities to be financed by the Fee, and the particular project.

D. In the event of any reduction or adjustment in the Fee granted pursuant to this section, any later change in the use, zoning, or land use designation for the property involved shall subject the then owner to payment of the then applicable Fee for new uses, zoning, or land use designation, whether or not a Building Permit is required.

4.49.170 Inflationary Adjustments.

The Fee established by this chapter shall automatically be adjusted on January 1 of each calendar year by a percentage equal to the inflation rate for the prior year for construction costs as determined by the Director on December 1 of each calendar year. The Director's determination shall be based on the

Engineering News Record, Construction Cost Index for the calendar year as of December 1.

Further the Director shall, during the first meeting in February of every odd-numbered year beginning in 1993, report to the City Council as to the inflation of land costs in the area where the Facilities are intended to be constructed. The council shall at that time adjust the Fee for such inflation.

4.49.180 Adoption in Compliance.

When monies in the Dry Creek Drainage Mitigation Fund are disbursed for use, the Fees shall be used to finance the Facilities. To the extent sufficient Fees are available, all Facilities financed by the Fees shall be constructed or acquired in accordance with the priorities established in the Capital Improvement Program.

4.49.190 Chapter is Severable.

If any provision of this chapter or the application thereof to any person or circumstance held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other provisions of this chapter which can be given effect without the invalid provision or its application, and to this end the provisions of this chapter are severable.

SECTION 2. This ordinance shall be effective at the expiration of sixty (60) days from the date of adoption.

SECTION 3. The City Clerk is hereby directed to cause this ordinance to be published in full at least once within fourteen (14) days after it is adopted in a newspaper of general circulation in the City, or shall within fourteen (14) days after its adoption cause this ordinance to be posted in full in at least (3) public places in the City and enter in the Ordinance Book a certificate stating the time and place of said publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this 1st day of July, 1992, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS: Pauline Roccucci, Fred M. Jackson, Harry Crabb, Jr.,
Mel Hamel, Bill Santucci

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS: None

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS: None

Dee Santucci
MAYOR

ATTEST:

Dee Florence
City Clerk

Public Facilities Fee
Ordinance No. 5515

ORDINANCE NO. 5515

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AMENDING SECTIONS 4.52.020, 4.52.050, 4.52.060, 4.52.070, 4.52.080 AND 4.52.140 OF CHAPTER 4.52 OF TITLE 4 AND ADDING SECTION 4.52.090 TO CHAPTER 4.52 OF TITLE 4 OF THE ROSEVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING PUBLIC FACILITIES FEE

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. Section 4.52.020 of Chapter 4.52 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended as follows:

4.52.020 Definitions.

The following words are defined for purposes of this chapter as follows:

- A. "Building permit" means the permit issued or required by the city for the construction of any structure pursuant to and as defined by the building code.
- B. "Director" means the administrative services director/city treasurer of the City of Roseville.
- C. "Facilities" mean those public facilities, improvements or infrastructure shown and included in the study, including ancillary uses and appurtenances.
- D. "Improvement plan" means a site plan of property proposed for development showing all required improvements that must be approved by the city prior to the issuance of a building permit for the property.
- E. "Fee" or "public facilities fee" means the fee established by this chapter. The fee shall be collected prior to the approval of any building permit. The fee shall be used solely to finance the facilities.
- F. "Public facilities fund" means that special interest-bearing fund established pursuant to Section 4.52.030.
- G. "Public facilities" mean buildings or other improvements owned by the City of Roseville or Placer County.
- H. "Study" means the "Public Facilities Fee Impact Study" prepared by MuniFinancial and dated November 20, 2003, and the Public Facilities Fee Impact Fee Update prepared by MuniFinancial and dated November 7, 2007, and the Public Facilities Fee Update prepared by Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. prepared for the fee increase effective October 1, 2015. The Study and Fee Update are on file in the office of the city clerk.

SECTION 2. Section 4.52.050 of Chapter 4.52 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended as follows:

4.52.050 Public facilities fee—Residential.

The fee for residential development shall be \$1.32 per square foot of dwelling unit. Effective October 1, 2015, the fee for residential development shall be:

Low density residential (LDR) shall be \$2,925 per dwelling unit;

Medium density residential (MDR) shall be \$2,709 per dwelling unit;

Single-Family Age-Restricted shall be \$1,950 per dwelling unit.

SECTION 3. Section 4.52.060 of Chapter 4.52 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended as follows:

4.52.060 Public facilities fee—Commercial.

The fee for commercial or unspecified development shall be \$0.63 per square foot of structure. Effective October 1, 2015, the fee for commercial development shall be \$.056 per square foot of structure.

SECTION 4. Section 4.52.070 of Chapter 4.52 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended as follows:

4.52.070 Public facilities fee—Industrial.

The fee for industrial development shall be \$0.42 per square foot of structure. Effective October 1, 2015, the fee for light industrial development shall be \$0.37 per square foot of structure and for general industrial the fee shall be \$0.22 per square foot of structure.

SECTION 5. Section 4.52.080 of Chapter 4.52 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended as follows:

4.52.080 Public facilities fee—Business/professional.

The fee for business/professional development shall be \$0.83 per square foot of structure. Effective October 1, 2015, the fee for business/professional and central business district development shall be \$0.74 per square foot of structure.

SECTION 6. Section 4.52.140 of Chapter 4.52 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended as follows:

4.52.140 Inflationary adjustments.

The Construction Cost Index (CCI) inflationary fee adjustment shall become effective July 1, 2013. The fee established by this chapter shall be adjusted annually July 1st beginning on July 1, 2013 by a percentage equal to the adjustment rate for the prior year for construction costs as determined by the director in the preceding June. The director's determination shall be based upon averaging the Construction Cost Index (CCI) for 20 cities and for San Francisco, as published in the Engineering News Record publication for the preceding 12 months ending in May. The resultant fee shall be rounded to the nearest dollar figure. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the inflationary adjustment for July 1, 2015, is hereby suspended for one year.

SECTION 7. Section 4.52.090 of Chapter 4.52 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby added as follows:

4.52.090 Public facilities fee Multifamily-HDR and HDR-Age-Restricted (Reserved)

Effective October 1, 2015 the fee for multifamily development shall be \$1,950 per dwelling unit. Effective October 1, 2015 the fee for multifamily age restricted development shall be \$1,625 per dwelling unit.

SECTION 8. This ordinance shall be effective at the expiration of thirty (30) days from the date of adoption.

SECTION 9. The City Clerk is hereby directed to cause this ordinance to be published in full at least once within fourteen (14) days after it is adopted in a newspaper of general circulation in the City, or shall within fourteen (14) days after its adoption cause this ordinance to be posted in full in at least three (3) public places in the City and enter in the Ordinance Book a certificate stating the time and place of said publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this 15th day of July, 2015, by the following vote on roll call:


AYES COUNCILMEMBERS: Gore, Rohan, Herman, Roccucci, Garcia

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS: None

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS: None


MAYOR

ATTEST:


City Clerk

Local Sewer Connection Fees
Ordinance No. 5070

ORDINANCE NO. 5070

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AMENDING
SECTIONS 4.48.140 OF CHAPTER 4.48, 4.52.140 OF CHAPTER 4.52, 4.53.140 OF
CHAPTER 4.53, 4.54.140 OF CHAPTER 4.54 OF TITLE 4, 14.08.031 OF CHAPTER
14.08, AND 14.16.060 OF CHAPTER 14.16 OF TITLE 14 OF THE ROSEVILLE
MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE ANNUAL
INFLATIONARY ADJUSTMENT

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. Chapter 4.48.140 of Chapter 4.48 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

4.48.140 Inflationary adjustments.

The Construction Cost Index (CCI) inflationary fee adjustment shall become effective July 1, 2013. The fee established by this chapter shall be adjusted annually July 1st beginning on July 1, 2013 by a percentage equal to the adjustment rate for the prior year for construction costs as determined by the director in the preceding June. The director's determination shall be based upon averaging the Construction Cost Index (CCI) for 20 cities and for San Francisco, as published in the Engineering News Record publication for the preceding 12 months ending in May. The resultant fee shall be rounded to the nearest dollar figure.

SECTION 2. Chapter 4.52.140 of Chapter 4.52 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

4.52.140 Inflationary adjustments.

The Construction Cost Index (CCI) inflationary fee adjustment shall become effective July 1, 2013. The fee established by this chapter shall be adjusted annually July 1st beginning on July 1, 2013 by a percentage equal to the adjustment rate for the prior year for construction costs as determined by the director in the preceding June. The director's determination shall be based upon averaging the Construction Cost Index (CCI) for 20 cities and for San Francisco, as published in the Engineering News Record publication for the preceding 12 months ending in May. The resultant fee shall be rounded to the nearest dollar figure.

SECTION 3. Chapter 4.53.140 of Chapter 4.53 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

4.53.140 Inflationary adjustments.

The Construction Cost Index (CCI) inflationary fee adjustment shall become effective July 1, 2013. The fee established by this chapter shall be adjusted annually July 1st beginning on July 1, 2013 by a percentage equal to the adjustment rate for the prior year for construction costs as determined by the director in the preceding June. The director's determination shall be based upon averaging the Construction Cost Index (CCI) for 20 cities and for San Francisco, as

published in the Engineering News Record publication for the preceding 12 months ending in May. The resultant fee shall be rounded to the nearest dollar figure.

SECTION 4. Chapter 4.54.140 of Chapter 4.54 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

4.54.140 Inflationary adjustments.

The Construction Cost Index (CCI) inflationary fee adjustment shall become effective July 1, 2013. The fee established by this chapter shall be adjusted annually July 1st beginning on July 1, 2013 by a percentage equal to the adjustment rate for the prior year for construction costs as determined by the director in the preceding June. The director's determination shall be based upon averaging the Construction Cost Index (CCI) for 20 cities and for San Francisco, as published in the Engineering News Record publication for the preceding 12 months ending in May. The resultant fee shall be rounded to the nearest dollar figure.

SECTION 5. Chapter 14.08.310 of Chapter 14.08 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.08.031 Special area water connection fee.

A. A special area water connection fee (for example, but not limited to, water pressure zone, waterline reimbursement and water benefit fees) shall be charged for each water unit connected to the city-owned public water system for infrastructure for areas of special benefit as identified and in amounts as set forth by the city council by resolution, from time to time.

B. For Water Pressure Zone #2 and #4, Doctors Ranch Supplemental Water Benefit Area, Foothills Business Park Annex Benefit Area, North Industrial for North Central Waterline Reimbursement, and North Urban Reserve for North Central Waterline Reimbursement, the Construction Cost Index (CCI) inflationary fee adjustment shall become effective July 1, 2013. The fee established by this chapter shall be adjusted annually July 1st beginning on July 1, 2013 by a percentage equal to the adjustment rate for the prior year for construction costs as determined by the director in the preceding June. The director's determination shall be based upon averaging the Construction Cost Index (CCI) for 20 cities and for San Francisco, as published in the Engineering News Record publication for the preceding 12 months ending in May. The resultant fee shall be rounded to the nearest dollar figure.

SECTION 6. Chapter 14.16.060 of Chapter 14.16 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.16.060 Local sewer connection fee.

A. A local sewer connection fee shall be charged in accordance with Section 14.16.010 for each connection to the city-owned public sewer.

B. The local sewer connection fee shall be \$200.00 per sewer unit.

C. The Construction Cost Index (CCI) inflationary fee adjustment shall become effective July 1, 2013. The fee established by this chapter shall be adjusted annually July 1st beginning on July 1, 2013 by a percentage equal to the adjustment rate for the prior year for construction costs as determined by the director in the preceding June. The director's determination shall be based upon averaging the Construction Cost Index (CCI) for 20 cities and for San Francisco, as published in the Engineering News Record publication for the preceding 12 months ending in May. The resultant fee shall be rounded to the nearest dollar figure.

SECTION 7. This ordinance shall be effective at the expiration of thirty (30) days from the date of adoption.


SECTION 8. The City Clerk is hereby directed to cause this ordinance to be published in full at least once within fourteen (14) days after it is adopted in a newspaper of general circulation in the City, or shall within fourteen (14) days after its adoption cause this ordinance to be posted in full in at least three (3) public places in the City and enter in the Ordinance Book a certificate stating the time and place of said publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this 6th day of June 2012, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS: Allard, Herman, Rohan, Roccucci

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS: None

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS: Garcia


MAYOR

ATTEST:


City Clerk

Water Connection Fees

Ordinance No. 5485

ORDINANCE NO. 5485

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AMENDING SECTIONS
14.08.025, 14.08.026 AND 14.08.029 OF CHAPTER 14.08 OF TITLE 14 OF THE
ROSEVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING CONNECTION FEES

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. Section 14.08.025 of Chapter 14.08 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended:

14.08.025 Water connection fees.

A. In order that appropriate provision be made for sharing the costs of the maintenance and expansion of the raw water supply, water treatment, storage, and distribution facilities of the city by those who receive the benefits thereof, there are established connection fees to such facilities, which fees shall be imposed in addition to the service connection costs charged pursuant to Section 14.08.020. Such additional water connection fees include a "standard connection fee" and an "irrigation connection fee." The fees shall be set so that they are equal to, but not greater than, the cost of service.

B. The water connection fees shall be based upon the applicable "dwelling unit equivalent" ("DUE"). The fee for one DUE shall be \$8,559.00 on July 1, 2015.

C. The connection fee amount set forth above shall be adjusted annually on July 1st of each year by three percent or by a percentage equal to the inflation rate for the prior year for construction costs as determined by the environmental utilities director in the preceding June, whichever is greater. The director's determination of the percentage equal to the inflation rate for the prior year for construction costs shall be based upon the Engineering News Record, Construction Cost Index for the prior 12 months ending in May. The environmental utilities director shall report the amount of the adjustment in percentage terms and the dollar amount due per DUE to the city council annually at the first regular meeting of the council following the adjustment of the fee.

D. Except as otherwise provided, all water connection fees established by this chapter shall be payable upon issuance of a building permit. Connection fees will be determined using the amount in effect on the date of building permit issuance.

SECTION 2. Section 14.08.026 of Chapter 14.08 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended:

14.08.026 Standard connection fee.

A. The standard connection fee for various types of service and applicable DUEs are based upon water service sizes required by the Uniform Plumbing Code and DUEs as shown in

Section 14.08.029 for non-residential connections and upon large lot use density categories for residential connections as defined herein. The standard connection fee shall be calculated as follows:

For all dwellings, as defined in Roseville Municipal Code Section 19.08.080(E), the connection fee shall be based upon the large lot land use density as defined within the Land Use Element of the City's General Plan, the water service size as required by the Uniform Plumbing Code, and the equivalent DUE's as shown in Section 14.08.029. The minimum connection fee shall be based on a three-quarter-inch service size and the equivalent dwelling unit shall be one DUE if zoned low density residential; 60 percent of the cost of one DUE for each dwelling unit if zoned medium density residential; and, 40 percent of the costs of one DUE for each dwelling unit if zoned high density residential. Fees shall not be based on the size of the master meter to a multifamily dwelling. Multifamily dwellings shall also pay an irrigation connection fee as defined in Roseville Municipal Code section 19.08.027.

B. For all dwellings, as defined in Roseville Municipal Code section 19.08.080(E), that require automatic fire protection systems pursuant to Roseville Municipal Code Section 16.16.120, the increased service size will not be assessed an additional fee associated with the fire protection system requirement. Connection fees shall be based on a three-quarter inch service size and the equivalent dwelling units required by Roseville Municipal Code section 14.08.026(A) without consideration for any fire protection system required by Roseville Municipal Code Section 16.16.120.

C No additional water connection fee shall be charged for facilities located within a multifamily dwelling complex that are appurtenant to the general function of the multifamily dwelling complex. Such facilities include, but shall not be limited to, community centers, recreational centers, rental offices, maintenance offices and fire systems.

SECTION 3. Section 14.08.029 of Chapter 14.08 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended:

14.08.029 Dwelling unit equivalents.

DUEs for water connection fees are:

Service Size	DUEs
3/4 in.	1.0
1.0 in.	1.7
1.5 in.	3.3
2.0 in.	5.3
3.0 in.	11.7
4.0 in.	20.0
6.0 in.	41.7
8.0 in.	60.0
10.0 in.	96.7

SECTION 4. This ordinance shall be effective at the expiration of thirty (30) days from the date of adoption.

SECTION 5. The City Clerk is hereby directed to cause this ordinance to be published in full at least once within fourteen (14) days after it is adopted in a newspaper of general circulation in the City, or shall within fourteen (14) days after its adoption cause this ordinance to be posted in full in at least three (3) public places in the City and enter in the Ordinance Book a certificate stating the time and place of said publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this 15th day of April, 2015, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS: Gore, Rohan, Herman, Roccucci, Garcia

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS: None

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS: None


MAYOR

ATTEST:


City Clerk

City/County Traffic Mitigation Fee
Ordinance No. 5203

ORDINANCE NO. 5203

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AMENDING
SECTIONS 4.45.020, 4.45.030 AND 4.45.050 OF CHAPTER 4.45 OF TITLE 4 OF THE
ROSEVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING TRAFFIC MITIGATION FEE

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. Sections 4.45.020, 4.45.030 and 4.45.050 of Chapter 4.45 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

4.45.020 Definitions.

The following words are defined for purposes of this chapter as follows:

- A. "Building permit" means the permit issued or required by the city for the construction of any structure pursuant to and as defined by the building code.
- B. "Covered improvements" means those traffic and circulation facilities, improvements, or infrastructure listed in that document entitled "2013 City/County Traffic Impact Fee Program Update" prepared by Fehr & Peers Transportation Consultants and dated March 15, 2013. Said covered improvements list is on file in the office of the director and the city clerk.
- C. "Department" means the department of development services.
- D. "Director" means the director of the department.
- E. "Dwelling Unit Equivalents" or "D.U.E.'s" means the number of single family dwellings to which a particular type of development or use is equivalent in terms of expected or estimated p.m. peak hour traffic impact.
- F. "Dwelling unit equivalent rates or D.U.E. rates" means multiplication factors used to convert a particular type of development or use to dwelling unit equivalents. D.U.E. rates shall be expressed as the number of D.U.E.'s per unit of a particular use.
- G. "Facilities" means those public traffic and circulation facilities, improvements or infrastructure shown and included on the covered improvements list.
- H. "Improvement plan" means a site plan of property proposed for development showing all required improvements that must be approved by the city prior to the issuance of a building permit for the property.
- I. "Fee" or "traffic mitigation fee" means the fee established by this Chapter 4.45. The fee shall be collected prior to the approval and issuance of any building permit, or as provided otherwise in this chapter. The fee shall be used solely to finance the covered improvements.
- J. "Traffic mitigation fund" means that special interest-bearing fund established pursuant to Section 4.45.030.

K. "Study" means that certain document entitled "2013 City/County Traffic Impact Fee Program Update," dated March 15, 2013. The study is on file in the offices of the director and city clerk.

L. "Infill area" means that portion of the city not within the Northeast, North Central, Northwest, Highland Reserve North, North Roseville, Stoneridge, Southeast, West Roseville, Del Webb, Creekview, or Sierra Vista specific plan areas, nor within the North Industrial Area.

4.45.030 Establishment and administration of traffic mitigation fund.

The finance director is directed to establish a special interest-bearing fund entitled the Baseline/Walerga traffic mitigation fund. All fees collected pursuant to this chapter shall be deposited in the Baseline/Walerga traffic mitigation fund and expended solely to finance the facilities.

4.45.050 Traffic mitigation fee per dwelling unit equivalent by area.

The net traffic mitigation fee for the various areas within the city, as defined in the general plan, shall be:

Area	Amount of Fee (per D.U.E.)
Southeast Roseville Specific Plan Area	\$57.00
Northeast Roseville Specific Plan Area	\$57.00
North Central Roseville Specific Plan Area	\$343.00
Northwest Roseville Specific Plan Area	\$343.00
North Industrial Plan Area	\$343.00
Infill Areas	\$57.00
Del Webb Specific Plan Area	\$343.00
Highland Reserve North Specific Plan Area	\$343.00


North Roseville Specific Plan Area	\$343.00
Stoneridge Specific Plan Area	\$57.00
West Roseville Specific Plan Area	\$770.00
Sierra Vista Specific Plan Area	\$1,350.00
Creekview Specific Plan Area	\$616.00


SECTION 2. This ordinance shall be effective at the expiration of thirty (30) days from the date of adoption.

SECTION 3. The City Clerk is hereby directed to cause this ordinance to be published in full at least once within fourteen (14) days after it is adopted in a newspaper of general circulation in the City, or shall within fourteen (14) days after its adoption cause this ordinance to be posted in full in at least three (3) public places in the City and enter in the Ordinance Book a certificate stating the time and place of said publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this 19th day of June, 2013, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES	COUNCILMEMBERS:	Roccucci, Garcia, Gore, Rohan
NOES	COUNCILMEMBERS:	None
ABSENT	COUNCILMEMBERS:	Herman


MAYOR

ATTEST

City Clerk

Downtown Specific Plan In-Lieu Parking Fee

Resolution No. 09-124

Ordinance No. 4728

Downtown Code 3.0-Regulatory Incentives

RESOLUTION NO. 09-124

ADOPTING A PARKING IN LIEU FEE
FOR THE DOWNTOWN SPECIFIC PLAN

WHEREAS, as part of the Downtown Specific Plan, the City desires to implement a parking in lieu fee; and

WHEREAS, the initial parking in lieu fee will be \$8,000 per parking space and will be automatically adjusted on July 1st of each calendar year by a percentage equal to the inflation rate for the prior year for construction costs as determined by the Planning and Redevelopment Director in the preceding June; and

WHEREAS, the Director's determination shall be based upon the Engineering News Record, Construction Cost Index for the prior 12 months ending in June;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Roseville that the parking in lieu fee and the annual adjustment based on the Construction Cost Index is hereby approved.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this 1st day of April, 2009 by the following vote on roll call:


AYES COUNCILMEMBERS: Allard, Gray, Garcia, Roccucci, Garbolino

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS: None

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS: None


MAYOR

ATTEST:


City Clerk

ORDINANCE NO. 4728

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ADDING SECTION 17.04.235 OF CHAPTER 17.04; DELETING SECTION 17.04.490 OF CHAPTER 17.04; AND AMENDING SECTIONS 17.06.180 AND 17.06.310 OF CHAPTER 17.06 OF TITLE 17; AND AMENDING SECTIONS 19.08.030, 19.08.080 AND 19.08.090 OF CHAPTER 19.08; 19.10.045 OF CHAPTER 19.10; 19.12.010, 19.12.020 AND 19.12.030 OF CHAPTER 19.12; 19.18.030 OF CHAPTER 19.18; 19.49.030 OF CHAPTER 19.49; 19.74.010 OF CHAPTER 19.74; AND ADDING CHAPTER 19.31 OF TITLE 19 OF THE ROSEVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING ZONING

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. Section 17.04.235 of Chapter 17.04 of Title 17 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby added to read as follows:

17.04.235 Downtown specific plan area.

"Downtown specific plan area" means a 176 acre area encompassing historic old town, Vernon Street, and Royer and Saugstad Parks. This area is further defined in the Downtown Specific Plan.

SECTION 2. Section 17.04.490 of Chapter 17.04 of Title 17 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby deleted in its entirety.

SECTION 3. Sections 17.06.180 and 17.06.310 of Chapter 17.06 of Title 17 of the Roseville Municipal Code are hereby amended to read as follows:

17.06.180 Projecting signs in the Riverside Gateway Specific Plan area.

- A. Number. In addition to other signs permitted by this Title, establishments located in the Riverside Gateway Specific Plan area, in a building immediately adjacent to the public sidewalk, will be permitted one (1) projecting sign.
- B. Location.
 - 1. A projecting sign may extend over the sidewalk a maximum of six (6) feet, subject to an encroachment permit whenever the sidewalk is open to the public or part of the public right of way;
 - 2. A projecting sign may not extend onto or over the street;
 - 3. A projecting sign shall have a minimum vertical clearance of eight (8) feet from the sidewalk to the bottom of the sign;
 - 4. A projecting sign may not extend above the roof line; and
 - 5. The sign shall be located on the Riverside Avenue side even if the building entrance is located on a side street.
- C. Area. The area of a projecting sign shall be included in calculating the permitted area for wall signs.

- D. Encroachment Permit. A permanent encroachment permit which includes insurance certificates and/or bonds pursuant to Roseville Municipal Code Chapter 13.28 shall be required for all signs projecting over the public right-of-way.

Article 3. Downtown Specific Plan Area.

17.06.310 Downtown Specific Plan Signs.

Uses located in the Downtown Specific Plan area are permitted signage that is consistent with, and enhances the historic character of that area. The Downtown Code, adopted in Chapter 19.31 of the Roseville Municipal Code, sets forth the criteria, design guidelines and standards for signs located in the Downtown Specific Plan area.

SECTION 4. Sections 19.08.030(C), 19.08.080(D), (H), (I), (J), (K) and (L), and 19.08.090(E), (L), (O) and (V) of Chapter 19.08 Title 19 of the Roseville Municipal Code are hereby amended to read as follows:

Section 19.08.030(C) - Listing of Use Classifications

C. Residential Use Types

Caretaker/Employee Housing
Community Care Facility, Small
Community Care Facility, Large
Dwelling
 Multi-Family
 Single Family
 Two-Family
Efficiency Units
Family Day Care Homes, Small
Family Day Care Homes, Large
Live/Work
Mobile Home Park
Rooming and Boarding Houses
Second Dwelling Unit
Single Room Occupant

Section 19.08.080(D), (H), (I), (J), (K) and (L) - Residential Use Types

- D. Efficiency units, includes a room or group of internally connected rooms that have independent sleeping, cooking, eating and sanitation facilities, which constitutes an independent housekeeping unit, occupied by or intended for one household on a long-term basis.
- H. Live/Work, includes units that are occupied by business operators who live in the same structure that contains commercial activity. The units function primarily as a workspace with incidental residential accommodations.
- I. **Mobile Home Park**, includes any site that is planned and improved to accommodate two or more mobile homes used for residential purposes, or on which two or more mobile home lots are rented, leased, or held out for rent or lease, or were formerly held out for rent or lease and later converted to a subdivision, cooperative,

condominium, or other form of resident ownership, to accommodate mobile homes used for residential purposes. (Also see Chapter 19.48.)

- J. **Rooming and Boarding Houses**, includes the renting of individual bedrooms within a dwelling by a property owner or other manager in residence to three or more people, whether or not meals are provided; or a single-family dwelling occupied by six (6) or more unrelated people, living together as a single housekeeping unit; by prearrangement for definite periods, with compensation.
- K. **Second Dwelling Unit**, a dwelling unit, attached or detached, with permanent provisions for independent living, sleeping, eating, cooking and sanitation within the unit and includes a separate entrance from the primary unit. (Also see Chapter 19.60.)
- L. **Single Room Occupant**, lodging establishments providing a room(s) which does not include a kitchen or bathroom. These establishments include a communal bathroom and may have a communal kitchen and/or living area. This is not a temporary or transitional housing type and is typically found on the second story above a retail use.

Section 19.08.090(E), (L), (O), (V) - Commercial Use Types

- E. **Bars and Drinking Places**, includes establishments within a building where alcoholic beverages are sold for on-site consumption, that are not part of a restaurant. Includes bars, taverns, pubs, brew pubs, wine bars and similar establishments where any food service is subordinate to the sale of alcoholic beverages. Dance floors are not permitted.
- L. **Eating and Drinking Establishments**, includes establishments primarily engaged in the sale of prepared food and beverages for on-premise consumption, but excludes those uses classified under the "Bars and Drinking Places" and "Nightclubs." Music, live or recorded, may be allowed provided that any such music and floor space for dancing is accessory and incidental to the sale of prepared food and beverages (i.e. jukeboxes, open microphone, mariachi, etc.). Fixed seating or chairs are provided for the seating of each patron or customer at all times. Eating and Drinking Establishment use types include:
 - 1. **Fast Food with Drive Through**, includes establishments primarily engaged in the preparation and retail sale of food and beverages at a walk up counter and at a drive through window, and may include seating.
 - 2. **Convenience**, includes establishments primarily engaged in the preparation and retail sale of food and beverages, at a walk up counter and which does not include a drive through or provide for ordering at the tables, if any. Typical uses include pizza parlors, ice cream parlors, and sandwich shops.
 - 3. **Full Service**, includes establishments primarily engaged in the preparation and retail sale of food and beverages, where food is ordered and served at a table, and which may include sales of alcoholic beverages as an accessory or secondary service. Typical uses include full service restaurants.
- O. **Lodging Services**, includes establishments primarily engaged in the provision of commercial lodging on a less than monthly basis to the general public. Lodging Services includes incidental food, drink, and other sales and services intended for the convenience of guests. Typical uses include hotels, motels, and bed-and-breakfasts.
- V. **Offices, Professional**, includes professional or government offices including:
 - Accounting, auditing and bookkeeping services;
 - Advertising agencies;
 - Architectural, engineering, interior design, and surveying services;
 - Attorneys;

- Call and telemarketing centers;
- Computer software designers;
- Court reporting services;
- Data processing and computer services;
- Detective agencies and similar services;
- Secretarial and word processing services;
- Government offices including agency and administrative office facilities;
- Insurance agencies;
- Management, public relations and consulting services;
- Real estate agencies; and
- Writers, photographers and artists offices outside the home.

SECTION 5: Section 19.10.045(A) of Chapter 19.10 of Title 19 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

Section 19.10.045(A) - Design Review Required for Compact Residential Development

- A. Applicability.** Design review shall be required for Compact Residential Development projects that qualify under either of the following:
1. Attached or detached single-family housing units on property with a General Plan land use designation of Medium Density Residential or higher (seven dwelling units per acre or higher, as depicted on the General Plan Land Use Map) (except for properties within the Downtown Specific Plan area), or
 2. Residential projects of any density on a parcel or parcels zoned Small Lot Residential (RS) where modifications to the RS Supplemental Design Standards are requested.

SECTION 6: Section 19.12.010(I), 19.12.020 and 19.12.030(B) of Chapter 19.12 of Title 19 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

Section 19.12.010(I) - Purpose

- I. Old Town Historic (HD) District.** The Old Town Historic district is intended to be applied to the original commercial core of Roseville to acknowledge its historic and architectural significance. The HD zoning district is intended to ensure that new land uses and development within the district further the rehabilitation, revitalization, and preservation of the architectural, aesthetic, historic and economic health of the district. Each parcel within the Historic District shall be subject to the specific Historic District design guidelines contained within the Downtown Code which has been adopted in Chapter 19.31 of the Roseville Municipal Code..

Section 19.12.020 - Permitted Use Types

Primary uses are permitted in commercial zones subject to the requirements of this Title as designated below:

- A.** Principally permitted use, designated as "P";
- B.** Conditionally permitted use, designated as "CUP"; and
- C.** Administratively permitted use, designated as "A".

Permitted uses within the CBD and HD zones are contained within the Downtown Code.

COMMERCIAL ZONE DISTRICTS PERMITTED USES

AGRICULTURE AND OPEN SPACE USE TYPES	BP	NC	CC	GC	HC	RC		CMU	
Resource Protection and Restoration	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP		P	
Resource Related Recreation	P	P	P	P	P	CUP		P	

CIVIC USE TYPES	BP	NC	CC	GC	HC	RC		CMU	
Community Assembly	CUP	P	P	P	-	-		P	
Community Services	P	CUP	P	P	P	P		P	
Essential Services	P	P	P	P	P	P		P	
Hospital Services									
General Hospital Services	-	-	CUP	CUP	-	-		P	
Psychiatric Hospital Services	-	-	CUP	CUP	-	-		P	
Libraries and Museums, Private	-	CUP	P	P	P	P		-	
Public Parking Services	P	P	P	P	P	P		P	
Schools									
College and University	A	-	P	P	-	P		P	
Elementary and Secondary	P	P	P	P	P	P		P	
Private Elementary and Secondary	-	CUP	CUP	CUP	-	-		P	
Social Services									
Food Distribution ⁽²⁾	-	-	-	A/CUP	A/CUP	-		A/CUP	
Food Service ⁽³⁾	-	-	-	A/CUP	A/CUP	-		A/CUP	
Temporary Resident Shelter ⁽⁴⁾	-	-	-	A/CUP	A/CUP	-		A/CUP	
Power Generating Facilities (8)									
Emergency	A	A	A	A	A	A		A	
Supplemental / Individual Use	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP		CUP	

Passive Power	P	P	P	P	P	P		P	
---------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	--	---	--

RESIDENTIAL TYPES	USE	BP	NC	CC	GC	HC	RC		CMU	
Caretaker/Employee Housing		-	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP		P	
Dwelling										
Multi-Family		-	CUP	CUP	-	-	-		P	
Single-Family		-	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	-		P	
Two-Family		-	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	-		P	
Family Day Care Home, Small		P	P	P	P	-	P		P	
Family Day Care Home, Large		CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	-	CUP		P	
Single Room Occupant		-	-	-	-	-	-		CUP	

COMMERCIAL TYPES	USE	BP	NC	CC	GC	HC	RC		CMU	
Adult Oriented Businesses (1)		-	-	-	P	-	P		P	
Animal Sales and Service										
Grooming and Pet Stores		-	P	P	P	-	P		P	
Kennels		-	-	-	-	-	-		P	
Veterinary Clinic		-	CUP	P	P	-	-		P	
Veterinary Hospital		-	-	CUP	CUP	-	-		P	
Automotive and Equipment										
Automotive Body and Equipment Repair		-	-	-	CUP	-	CUP		CUP	
Automotive Rentals		-	-	-	P	P	P		P	
Automotive Repairs		-	-	CUP	P	P	P		P	
Automotive Sales		-	-	CUP	P	-	P		P	
Car Wash and Detailing		-	-	CUP	P	-	P		P	
Commercial		P	-	-	P	P	-		P	

Parking								
Heavy Equipment Rental and Sales	-	-	-	P	-	P		P
Gasoline Sales	CUP	P	P	P	P	P		P

COMMERCIAL USE TYPES	BP	NC	CC	GC	HC	RC		CMU	
Banks and Financial Services	P	P	P	P	-	P		P	
Bars and Drinking Places	-	-	P	P	-	P		P	
Broadcasting and Recording Studios	P	-	-	P	-	-		P	
Building Material Stores	-	-	CUP	P	-	P		P	
Business Support Services	P	-	P	P	-	-		P	
Commercial Recreation									
Amusement Center	-	CUP	P	P	-	P		P	
Indoor Entertainment	-	-	P	P	-	P		P	
Indoor Sports and Recreation	-	-	P	P	-	P		P	
Outdoor Entertainment	-	-	-	CUP	-	CUP		P	
Outdoor Sports and Recreation	-	-	-	P	CUP	P		P	
Large Amusement Complexes	-	-	-	CUP	CUP	P		P	
Community Care Facility	P	P	P	P	-	-		P	
Day Care Center	P	P	P	P	-	P		P	
Eating and Drinking Establishments									
Fast Food with Drive Through	-	-	P	P	P	P		P	
Convenience	P	P	P	P	P	P		P	
Full Service	P	P	P	P	P	P		P	
Food and Beverage Retail Sales	-	-	P	P	-	-		P	
Funeral and Internment Services	-	-	P	P	-	-		P	
Lodging Services	-	-	P	P	P	P		P	

Long Term Care Facility	CUP	CUP	P	P	-	-		P	
Maintenance and Repair	-	P	P	P	-	-		P	
Medical Services, General	P	P	P	P	P	P		P	
Neighborhood Commercial	P	P	-	-	-	-		P	
Nightclubs ⁽⁵⁾	-	-	CUP	CUP	-	CUP		CUP	
Nursery, Retail	-	-	-	P	-	P		P	

COMMERCIAL USE TYPES	BP	NC	CC	GC	HC	RC		CMU	
Offices, Professional	P	P	P	P	-	P		P	
Personal Services	P	P	P	P	P	P		P	
Retail Sales and Services	-	-	P	P	P	P		P	
Specialized Education and Training									
Vocational Schools	-	-	P	P	-	-		P	
Specialty Schools	-	CUP	P	P	-	P		P	
Storage, Personal Storage Facility	-	-	CUP	P	-	-		P	
INDUSTRIAL USE TYPES	BP	NC	CC	GC	HC	RC		CMU	
Laundries, Commercial	-	-	CUP	CUP	-	-		P	
Printing & publishing	-	-	-	CUP	-	-		P	
Research Services	-	-	-	P	-	-		P	
Wholesaling and Distribution, Light	-	-	-	P	-	-		P	

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION USE TYPES	BP	NC	CC	GC	HC	RC		CMU	
Telecommunication Facilities ⁽⁶⁾	P/A/ CUP	P/A/ CUP	P/A/ CUP	P/A/ CUP	P/A/ CUP	P/A/ CUP		P/A/ CUP	
Heliport	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP		P	
Intermodal Facilities ⁽⁷⁾	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP		P	

Notes:

- (1) Additional Requirements are contained in Chapter 19.32.
- (2) Additional Requirements are contained in Chapter 19.40.
- (3) Additional Requirements are contained in Chapter 19.39.
- (4) Additional Requirements are contained in Chapter 19.38.
- (5) Additional Requirements are contained in Chapter 19.49.
- (6) Additional Requirements are contained in Chapter 19.34.
- (7) Additional Requirements are contained in Chapter 19.36.
- (8) Additional Requirements are contained in Chapter 19.55.

Section 19.12.030(B) - Commercial Zone General Development Standards

- A. General.** Permitted uses and structures shall comply with the City's adopted Community Design Guidelines, applicable Specific Plans, approved Design Review Permit and any other applicable requirements of this Title.
- B. Maximum Height.** Notwithstanding the requirements referred to in A, maximum height limits in the Commercial zoning districts are as follows unless otherwise modified by an approved Design Review Permit or Specific Plan:

Zoning District	Height Limit
Business Professional (BP)	50'
Neighborhood Commercial (NC)	35'
Community Commercial (CC)	50'
General Commercial (GC)	50'
Highway Commercial (HC)	50'
Regional Commercial (RC)	50'
Central Business District (CBD)	50'
Commercial Mixed Use (CMU)	50'
Historic District (HD)	50'

SECTION 7: Section 19.18.030(D) of Chapter 19.18 of Title 19 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

Section 19.18.030(D) - Special Area (SA) District

- D. Designation on the Zoning Map.** A SA, Special Area district shall be established with approval of a Zoning Ordinance Amendment as specified in Chapter 19.86, and shall be designated on the Zoning Map with the underlying zone district by the symbol "/SA," followed by the ordinance number. The ordinance number shall refer to the ordinance which adopted the SA district. If a SA is within a Specific Plan, no ordinance number need be specified provided however, a reference to that Specific Plan is identified as follows: -SE (Southeast Roseville Specific Plan); -NE (Northeast Roseville Specific Plan); -NW (Northwest Roseville Specific Plan); -NC (North Central Roseville Specific

Plan); -DW (Del Webb Specific Plan), -NR (North Roseville Specific Plan), -HR (Highland Reserve Specific Plan), -SR (Stoneridge Specific Plan), -WR (West Roseville Specific Plan), RG (Riverside Gateway), and DT (Downtown Specific Plan).

SECTION 8: Section 19.49.030 of Chapter 19.49 of Title 19 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

Section 19.49.030 - General Standards

The following requirement applies to nightclubs where permitted within any zone district (except for nightclubs located within the Downtown Specific Plan area):

- A. Nightclubs are prohibited to be located within 500 feet of a residential zone district as measured from the residential zone district boundary to the structure where the nightclub use is proposed.

SECTION 9: Section 19.74.010(C) of Chapter 19.74 of Title 19 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

Section 19.74.010(C)(2)(a) - Permit Requirements

C. 2. Approving Authority:

a. Administrative Process.

- I.** The Planning Director may approve, conditionally approve or deny a Minor Design Review Permit provided the improvement complies with the following:
 - 1) There has been no previous Design Review Permit for the building/site;
 - 2) The improvement is limited to facade improvements;
 - 3) The improvement consists of a color change;
 - 4) The improvement consists of a modification to or the introduction of a new exterior building material; or
 - 5) The project is within the Downtown Specific Plan area and is consistent with the design guidelines and regulations outlined within the Downtown Code.
- II.** The Planning Director may approve, conditionally approve or deny a Minor Design Review Permit pursuant to the Administrative Permit procedures, except those identified as required by this Title, to be reviewed by the Design Committee or Planning Commission. Design Review Permits approved by the Planning Director shall be in substantial conformance with adopted Specific Plan.

If in the opinion of the Planning Director, a project is not in substantial conformance with applicable, adopted design guidelines, prior conditions of approval, or if the Planning Director determines that, because of location, size or design that the public hearing should not be waived, the Planning Director shall refer the project for public hearing by the Design

Committee or the Planning Commission. The Director shall determine whether the project is to be heard by the Design Committee or the Planning Commission.

The Planning Director may approve:

- 1) Design Review Permit extensions and modifications, including changes in project phasing.
- 2) Design Review Permits for projects within a master or specific plan area where the applicable plan provides for an administrative process.
- 3) Within specific plan areas, subsequent Design Review Permits following Design Committee approval of the first Design Review Permit as provided for in Sub Section b. 2) of this Section.
- 4) Within infill areas, subsequent Design Review Permits following Planning Commission approval of the first Design Review permit as provided in Sub Section c2) of this Section.

SECTION 10: Chapter 19.32 heading is hereby amended to read as follows:

CHAPTER 19.32 – LOCATION AND AMORTIZATION OF ADULT ORIENTED BUSINESSES

19.32.010 – Purpose

19.32.020 – Definitions

19.32.030 – Minimum Proximity Requirements

19.32.040 – Amortization of Nonconforming Adult-Oriented Business Uses

19.32.050 – Extension of Time for Termination of Nonconforming Use

SECTION 11: Chapter 19.31 of Title 19 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby added to read as follows:

**Chapter 19.31
DOWNTOWN SPECIFIC PLAN DOWNTOWN CODE**

Sections:

- | | |
|-----------|--------------------------|
| 19.31.010 | Purpose. |
| 19.31.020 | Definition. |
| 19.31.030 | Downtown Code - Adopted. |
| 19.31.040 | Conflicts. |
| 19.31.050 | Violations. |
- 19.31.010 Purpose.**

The purpose of the Downtown Specific Plan Downtown Code is to direct public and private development consistent with the community vision for the Downtown Specific Plan area. Redevelopment within the older areas of the City of Roseville presents unique development challenges. The Downtown Specific Plan Downtown Code is therefore a comprehensive document for the Downtown Specific Plan area that provides detailed performance criteria and development standards that are intended to facilitate development while recognizing the area's

unique character. Key elements addressed in the Downtown Specific Plan Downtown Code include:

- A. Permitted and conditionally permitted uses for various zone districts.
- B. Prescriptive development standards including setbacks, height requirements, parking standards, and floor area ratios.
- C. Development guidelines addressing buffers and adjacency issues, landscaping, entry monumentation, and public realm improvements.
- D. Entitlement processes that vary from applications throughout the remainder of the City of Roseville.
- E. Downtown sign regulations.
- F. Details that define the character of the Downtown Specific Plan area.
- G. Downtown Specific Plan area incentives.
- H. Parcel specific considerations.

The Downtown Specific Plan Downtown Code is consistent with the City of Roseville's goals, policies and applicable regulations and is intended to be the primary resource for development review within the Downtown Specific Plan area.

19.31.020 Definition.

"Downtown Specific Plan area" means a 176 acre area encompassing historic old town, Vernon Street, and Royer and Saugstad Parks. This area is further defined in the Downtown Specific Plan.

19.31.030 Downtown Code - Adopted.

The Downtown Specific Plan Downtown Code, as amended by the City Council from time to time, is hereby adopted and is incorporated into this Chapter by reference as though it were fully set forth herein. A copy of the Downtown Specific Plan Downtown Code is available for use and examination by the public in the City of Roseville's Planning Department and the City Clerk's Office, and can be found on the City of Roseville's web site.

19.31.040 Conflicts.

In the event of any conflict between the provisions of the Downtown Specific Plan Downtown Code and the provisions of the Roseville Municipal Code, the provisions of the Downtown Specific Plan Downtown Code shall prevail. However, with regard to topics that the Downtown Specific Plan Downtown Code does not address, the provisions of the Roseville Municipal Code shall prevail.

19.31.050 Violations.

A violation of the requirements of the Downtown Specific Plan Downtown Code is punishable as an infraction.

SECTION 12. This ordinance shall be effective at the expiration of thirty (30) days from the date of adoption.


SECTION 13. The City Clerk is hereby directed to cause this ordinance to be published in full at least once within fourteen (14) days after it is adopted in a newspaper of general circulation in the City, or shall within fourteen (14) days after its adoption cause this ordinance to be posted in full in at least three (3) public places in the City and enter in the Ordinance Book a certificate stating the time and place of said publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this 15th day of April, 2009, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS: Allard, Gray, Garcia, Roccucci

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS: None

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS: Garbolino


MAYOR

ATTEST:


City Clerk

624728

3.5 Fee Incentives

3.5.1 Park Dedication Strategy

Based on the number of new residential units within the Plan Area, the park dedication acreage is approximately 29 acres. An important goal of the Specific Plan is to encourage the development of residential units to promote activity and potential consumers on a constant basis. Based on this desire, the plan exempts future residential units from having to dedicate land or pay an in-lieu fee.

Assuming that land values are approximately \$20 per square foot, on average, exempting residential projects from park dedication would amount to a savings of approximately \$19,800 per residential unit. Based on 1,020 new dwelling units, this is a savings benefit of nearly \$20 million in park land acquisition and dedication costs.

Park fees will still be collected in order to fund park improvements, but these fees will be specifically allocated to improvements in the Downtown. Approximately \$1,949,220 in new city-wide park fees, and \$1,042,440 in neighborhood park fees will be generated and specifically allocated to Downtown park improvements.

3.5.2 Parking In lieu Fee



To create a “Park-Once” philosophy within the Downtown, the **Downtown Code** establishes a parking in lieu fee program. With the adoption of the **Downtown Code**, the City Council has approved a parking in lieu fee that allows non-residential uses to meet their parking demand through the public realm parking provided within the Plan Area.

The initial fee shall be determined by the City Council and updated once yearly, based on the construction cost to the City and adjustments to the Construction Cost Index. Future yearly updates will be set by the Director. The fee is intended to be an incentive and will not necessarily recoup the cost of developing parking within the Downtown. The fee is to be paid to satisfy parking requirements in-lieu of providing any or all spaces on-site and shall be further discounted according to Table 3.5.1.

Parking In lieu Fee

Table 3.5.1

Required Parking Spaces	Fee for Parking Space
First Stall	10% of the in-lieu fee
Second Stall	25% of the in-lieu fee
Third Stall	50% of the in-lieu fee
Fourth Stall	75% of the in-lieu fee
Fifth Stall and beyond	100% of the in-lieu fee



Other provisions associated with the payment of the parking in-lieu fee program include:

- 1) Prior to issuance of a building permit, the developer shall enter into a parking in-lieu fee agreement to be reviewed and approved by the Director.
- 2) Before approving payment of a fee for in-lieu of providing off-street parking, the Director shall find:
 - a. That there is adequate capacity within the existing or planned public parking resources to accommodate the requested parking in-lieu off-site, and
 - b. The project benefiting from this approval is furthering the goals and policies of the Downtown Specific Plan and the General Plan relative to uses, revitalization, pedestrian amenities and design.
- 3) Funds collected by the city from in-lieu payment shall be deposited in a special fund and used only by the City to acquire and/or develop on-street or off-street parking and related facilities which are determined to alleviate the need for parking spaces in the Specific Plan Area.
- 4) Such parking will be available to the public and shall be developed per the provisions of the Downtown Specific Plan.
- 5) Funds paid to the City for in-lieu of parking shall not be refundable, except as otherwise provided by State law.
- 6) All in-lieu of parking fees shall be paid prior to the issuance of certificate of occupancy. In the case of multi-tenant buildings, the fees shall be calculated based on, and paid prior to, the issuance of certificate of occupancy for each individual tenant space.

3.6 Process Incentives

3.6.1 Review Process

Chapter 9 of the Specific Plan establishes the various approval processes that are being established in order to streamline the development process. As part of the fiscal analysis associated with the Visioning for Downtown, reducing the timeframes associated with processing projects was a key strategy identified to implement a successful revitalization effort. The following outlines the various modifications to the City's current review process that are meant to streamline the development process.



Animal Control Facility Fee
Ordinance No. 4607

ORDINANCE NO. 4607

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ADDING CHAPTER
4.53 OF TITLE 4 OF THE ROSEVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING ANIMAL
CONTROL FACILITY FEE

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. Chapter 4.53 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby added to read as follows:

Chapter 4.53 Animal Control Facility Fee

4.53.010 Purpose

The city council finds and declares that the purpose of this chapter is as follows:

- A. The city must be provided, in a time frame related to its development, with an adequate animal control facility.
- B. New development and the expansion of existing development within the city imposes a burden on existing public facilities and creates a need for additional facilities. Since the primary users of animal control facilities are residents, the only land use types that will be considered are those relating to residential occupancy density.
- C. Analysis of the current land use within the city makes it possible to estimate the burden or need for an animal control facility generated by different types of land uses. Analysis of the land use expected at buildout of the city pursuant to the general plan makes it possible to estimate the type and size of animal control facility necessary to support that additional land use. It is therefore possible to construct a fee, imposed on new development, which equitably spreads the burden of the animal control facility to development which creates the need for it. It is the intent of this chapter to create such a fee, spreading the costs of the animal control facility to development that creates the need for it without generating any surplus to the General Fund. It is the further purpose of this chapter to implement the General Plan by assuring that an adequate animal control facility is financed and provided to serve the city.
- D. The fee established by this chapter has been calculated in the manner set forth in the Study, as hereinafter defined, so as to pay for the animal control facility listed in the Study.
- E. The fee established in this chapter is in addition to any other fees or charges required by law as a condition of development.
- F. The fee established by this chapter is to be collected for the animal control facility for which an account has been established.
- G. That the failure to impose the conditions and regulations of this chapter relating to payment of the fee on building permits would jeopardize residents of the community, in that it would permit construction to proceed without an adequate animal control facility or means of financing said animal control facility.
- H. The requirement of this chapter to pay the fee is necessary in order to assure compliance with the applicable zoning ordinance and general plan requirements for the facility funded by this chapter.

I. That for a period of 10 days prior to adoption of this chapter, data has been available to the public and to developers and their representatives indicating the cost of the facilities to be funded, the revenue sources anticipated and the means of spreading these costs.

J. That the city council has considered the effect of the fee imposed by this chapter with respect to the housing needs of the city as a whole and of the region, particularly as required by the housing element of the general plan, and the city council finds that this chapter does not unduly adversely affect the city's ability to provide for such needs.

K. That the establishment of the fee is for the purpose of obtaining funds for capital projects, necessary to maintain services required by the existing general plan within existing service areas and existing portions of the city which are developed or for which land use has already been granted.

4.53.020 Definitions

The following words are defined for purposes of this chapter as follows:

A. "Building permit" means the permit issued or required by the city for the construction of any structure pursuant to and as defined by the building code.

B. "Director" means the administrative services director/city treasurer of the City of Roseville.

C. "Facility" means the forthcoming animal control facility and its related field operations equipment included in the study.

D. "Fee" or "Animal Control Facility Fee" means the fee established by this Chapter 4.53. The fee shall be collected prior to the approval of any building permit. The fee shall be used solely to finance the facility.

E. "South Placer Animal Control Shelter Fund" means the special fund to collect the fee. The fee shall be collected prior to the approval of any building permit. The fee shall be used solely to finance the facility.

F. "Study" means the "Animal Control Impact Fee Study" prepared by MuniFinancial and dated June 20, 2007. The study is on file in the office of the city clerk.

4.53.030 Administration of South Placer Animal Control Shelter Fund

All fees collected pursuant to this chapter shall be deposited in the South Placer Animal Control Shelter Fund and expended solely to finance the facility.

4.53.040 Payment of the animal control facility fee

Except as otherwise provided by this chapter, the fee imposed pursuant to this chapter shall be paid at or prior to the issuance of any building permit. Calculation of the fee shall be determined in accordance with the study and this chapter, the type of development and the extent of development. Descriptions of land use categories in this chapter, except as otherwise noted, are utilized in the same manner as in the general plan.

4.53.050 Animal control facility fee—Single family residential

Effective July 1, 2008, the fee for single family residential development shall be \$182 per dwelling unit.

4.53.060 Animal control facility fee—Multi family residential

Effective July 1, 2008, the fee for multi family residential development shall be \$44 per dwelling unit.

4.53.070 Animal control facility fee—Mixed land use

In the case of occurrence of mixed land use, only the appropriate share of residential development will be charged the fee per 4.53.060.

4.53.120 Existing development

No fee shall be charged for already existing development.

A. Where the development or project changes to a different land use, it shall be charged the appropriate fee as provided by Sections 4.53.050 through 4.53.070.

4.53.130 Fee adjustments

A. A developer of any project subject to the fee established by this chapter may apply to the Director for a reduction or adjustment to the fee based upon the absence of any reasonable relationship or nexus between the impacts of the project and either the amount of the fee or the facility to be financed by the fee. The application shall be made in writing and filed with the director not later than 20 calendar days after notification of the amount of the fee. The application shall state in detail the factual basis for the claim of reduction or adjustment and the amount of the proposed reduction or adjustment. The Director shall consider the application and render his/her decision in writing not later than 45 calendar days after the filing of the fee adjustment request. Any person aggrieved by the decision of the Director may, within 20 calendar days thereafter, appeal the decision in writing to the City Council by filing an appeal with the City Clerk. The City Council shall consider such appeals within 45 calendar days after filing. The decision of the City Council shall be final. No building permit shall be issued for the project until the final decision pursuant to this section has been made. No application for a project shall be considered final or complete for purposes of the Permit Streamlining Act (Government Code Section 65920, et seq.), or any other purpose, until a final decision pursuant to this section has been made.

B. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection A, a project proponent or applicant may pay the fee "under protest" and receive a building permit; provided, however, that the application for reduction or adjustment shall thereafter be filed within 10 calendar days or any objection shall be deemed waived. If a reduction or adjustment is received after payment pursuant to this subsection is made, a refund to the applicant shall be made of that amount by which the fee is reduced or adjusted.

C. The project proponent or applicant applying for a reduction or adjustment shall have the burden of proof, by a preponderance of the evidence, that a reasonable relationship or nexus is lacking between the fee, or the facility to be financed by the fee, and the particular project.

D. In the event of any reduction or adjustment in the fee granted pursuant to this section, any later change in the use, zoning, or land use designation for the property involved shall subject the then owner to payment of the then applicable fee for such new uses, zoning, or land use designation, whether or not a building permit is required.

4.53.140 Inflationary adjustments

The fee established by this chapter shall automatically be adjusted on July 1st of each calendar year by a percentage equal to the inflation rate for the prior year for construction costs as determined by the director in the preceding June. The director's determination shall be based upon the Engineering News Record, Construction Cost Index for the prior 12 months ending in June.

4.53.150 Use of the animal control facility

When the monies in the South Placer Animal Control Shelter Fund are disbursed for use, the fees shall be used to fund the facilities.

4.53.160 Chapter is severable

If any provision of this chapter or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect the other provisions of this chapter which can be given effect without the invalid provisions or its application, and to this end the provisions of this chapter are severable.

SECTION 2. This ordinance shall be effective at the expiration of thirty (30) days from the date of adoption.


SECTION 3. The City Clerk is hereby directed to cause this ordinance to be published in full at least once within fourteen (14) days after it is adopted in a newspaper of general circulation in the City, or shall within fourteen (14) days after its adoption cause this ordinance to be posted in full in at least three (3) public places in the City and enter in the Ordinance Book a certificate stating the time and place of said publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this 2nd day of January, 2008, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS: Allard, Roccucci, Garcia, Garbolino, Gray

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS: None

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS: None


MAYOR

ATTEST:


City Clerk

Park Fees:

Neighborhood and Community Park Fees

Ordinance No. 2178

Citywide Park Fee

Ordinance No. 2424

ORDINANCE NO. 2178

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE
ADDING CHAPTER 4.37 TO TITLE 4 OF THE ROSEVILLE
MUNICIPAL CODE, RELATING TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND COMMUNITY
PARK FEE
(URGENCY ORDINANCE)

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1: Chapter 4.37 is hereby added to Title 4 of the
Roseville Municipal Code to read as follows:

CHAPTER 4.37

NEIGHBORHOOD AND COMMUNITY PARK FEE

4.37.010 Purpose.

The City Council finds and declares that the purpose of this chapter is as follows:

A. The General Plan of the City requires that the City be provided, in a time frame related to its development, with an adequate level of neighborhood and community park and recreation facilities so as to maintain 4 acres of developed neighborhood and community parks per 1,000 population.

B. New development, and the expansion of existing development, within the City imposes a burden on the existing park and recreation facilities by adding additional population and by creating a need for new neighborhood and community parks and recreation facilities. The cost of such facilities may vary by the location of the new development within the City.

C. Analysis of the land use expected at buildout of the City pursuant to the General Plan makes it possible to estimate the number of dwelling units to be generated, and the population generated by those dwelling units. It is also possible to determine which dwelling units will utilize which portions of such park and recreation infrastructure. It is therefore possible to construct a fee, based on dwelling unit generation, which equitably spreads the burden of neighborhood and community park and recreation facilities to those who will create the need for them and utilize them. It is the intent of this chapter to create such a fee, spreading costs of neighborhood and community park and recreation facilities to those who create the need for such facilities, without generating any surplus to the general fund. It is the further purpose of this chapter to implement the General Plan by assuring that adequate neighborhood and community park and recreation facilities are financed and provided to serve the City.

D. The Fee established by this chapter has been calculated in the manner set forth in the Study so as to pay for those Facilities listed in the Capital Improvement Program.

E. The Fee established by this chapter is in addition to any other fees or charges, or taxes, required by law as a condition of development, including, but not limited to, the Residential Construction Tax levied by Chapter 4.36 or any

[December 21, 1988 Revision]

1

[Urgency Version]

FILED

JAN 05 1989

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
BY _____

subsequent fee established for City-wide park and recreation facilities.

F. The Fee established by this chapter is to be collected for public improvements and facilities for which an account has been established and funds appropriated, and for which a proposed construction schedule has been adopted.

G. That the failure to impose the conditions and regulations of this chapter relating to payment of the Fee on building permits would jeopardize residents of the community, in that it would permit construction to proceed without adequate infrastructure or means of financing said infrastructure.

H. The requirement of this chapter to pay the Fee is necessary in order to assure compliance with the applicable Zoning Ordinance and General Plan requirements for the infrastructure funded by this chapter.

I. That for a period of greater than 10 days prior to adoption of this chapter, data has been available to the public and to developers and their representatives indicating the cost or estimated cost of all the infrastructure to be funded, the revenue sources anticipated and the means of spreading these costs.

J. That the City Council has considered the effect of the Fee imposed by this chapter with respect to the housing needs of the City as a whole and of the region, particularly as required by the Housing Element of the General Plan, and the City Council finds that this chapter does not unduly adversely affect the City's ability to provide for such needs.

K. That the establishment of the Fee is for the purpose of obtaining funds for capital projects, necessary to maintain service required by the General Plan within existing service areas and existing portions of the City which are developed or for which land use has already been granted.

16.37.020 Definitions.

The following words are defined for purposes of this chapter as follows:

A. "Building Permit" means the permit issued or required by the City for the construction of any dwelling unit pursuant to and as defined by the Building Code.

B. "Capital Improvement Program" means that list of proposed neighborhood and community park and recreation facilities, improvements, or infrastructure totaling \$8,434,276 (in 1988 dollars) prepared by the Department and attached to the Study as Exhibit "A".

C. "Department" means the Department of Parks and Recreation.

D. "Director" means the Director of the Department.

E. "Facilities" means those public neighborhood and community park and recreation facilities, land, improvements, or infrastructure shown and included on the Capital Improvement Program.

F. "Fee" or "Neighborhood and Community Park Fee" means the Fee established by this Chapter 4.37. The Fee shall be collected prior to the approval of any Building Permit. The Fee shall be used solely to finance the Facilities.

G. "Neighborhood and Community Park Funds" means those special interest-bearing funds established pursuant to Section 4.37.030.

H. "Study" means the study entitled "Proposed Park Fees for Specific Plan Areas" dated December 14, 1988 by the Director. The Study is on file in the Offices of the Director and the City Clerk. The Study includes a discussion of the Fee in the Infill and North Industrial Areas.

I. "Infill Area" means that portion of the City not within the Northeast, Northcentral, Northwest, or Southeast Roseville Specific Plan Areas, nor within the North Industrial Area.

J. "Dwelling Unit" means a building or part of a building designed for occupancy as a residence by one family.

K. "Single Family Dwelling" means a building designed for occupancy as a residence by one family, including without limitation, mobile homes.

L. "Multiple Family Dwelling" means a building designed for occupancy as a residence by two or more families, living independently of each other. Provided, that multiple family dwelling also includes forms of congregate living, including, without limitation, senior citizen homes, retirement homes, or boarding homes.

4.37.030 Establishment and Administration of Neighborhood and Community Park Funds.

The Finance Director is hereby directed to establish special interest-bearing funds entitled the Neighborhood and Community Park Funds. One such fund shall be established for each Specific Plan Area. In addition, one such fund shall be established for both the North Industrial Area and the Infill Area. All Fees collected pursuant to this chapter shall be deposited in the Neighborhood and Community Park Fund for the area from which it was collected and shall be expended solely to finance the Facilities planned for that area.

4.37.040 Payment of Neighborhood and Community Park Fee.

Except as otherwise provided by this chapter, the Fee imposed pursuant to this chapter shall be paid at or prior to the issuance of any Building Permit for a dwelling unit. Calculation of the Fee shall be determined in accordance with the Study and this chapter depending upon the location of the City in which development occurs, the type of development, and the extent of development.

4.37.050 Neighborhood and Community Park Fee -- Southeast Roseville Specific Plan Area.

The Fee in the Southeast Roseville Specific Plan Area shall be:

<u>Land Use Category</u>	<u>Amount of Fee</u>
Residential, Single Family Dwelling	\$265.00 per dwelling unit
Residential, Multiple Family Dwelling	\$198.00 per dwelling unit

4.37.060 Neighborhood and Community Park Fee -- Northeast Roseville Specific Plan Area.

The Fee in the Northeast Roseville Specific Plan Area shall be:

<u>Land Use Category</u>	<u>Amount of Fee</u>
Residential, Single Family Dwelling	\$293.00 per dwelling unit
Residential, Multiple Family Dwelling	\$216.00 per dwelling unit

4.37.070 Neighborhood and Community Park Fee -- Northcentral Roseville Specific Plan Area. [reserved]

4.37.080 Neighborhood and Community Park Fee -- Northwest Roseville Specific Plan Area.

The Fee in the Northwest Roseville Specific Plan Area shall be:

<u>Land Use Category</u>	<u>Amount of Fee</u>
Residential, Single Family Dwelling	\$124.00 per dwelling unit
Residential, Multiple Family Dwelling	\$104.00 per dwelling unit

4.37.090 [Reserved]

4.37.100 Neighborhood and Community Park Fee -- North Industrial and Infill Areas.

The Fee in the North Industrial and Infill Areas shall be:

<u>Land Use Category</u>	<u>Amount of Fee</u>
Residential, Single Family Dwelling	\$240.00 per dwelling unit
Residential, Multiple Family Dwelling	\$165.00 per dwelling unit

4.37.110 [Reserved]

4.37.120 Existing Development.

No Fee shall be charged for already existing development or for projects which rebuild or remodel without increasing the number of dwelling units.

4.37.130 Fee Adjustments.

A. A developer of any project subject to the Fee established by this chapter may apply to the Director for a reduction or adjustment to the Fee based upon the absence of any reasonable relationship or nexus between the impacts of the project and either the amount of the Fee or the Facilities to be financed by the Fee. The application shall be made in writing and filed with the Director not later than twenty (20) calendar days after notification of the amount of the Fee. The application shall state in detail the factual basis for the claim of reduction or adjustment and the amount of the proposed reduction or adjustment. The Director shall consider the application and render his decision in writing not later than

forty-five (45) calendar days after the filing of the Fee adjustment request. Any person aggrieved by the decision of the Director may, within twenty (20) calendar days thereafter, appeal the decision in writing to the City Council by filing an appeal with the City Clerk. The City Council shall consider such appeals within forty-five (45) calendar days after filing. The decision of the City Council shall be final. No Building Permit shall be issued for the project until the final decision pursuant to this section has been made. No application for a project shall be considered final or complete for purposes of the Permit Streamlining Act (Government Code Section 65920, et seq.), or any other purpose, until a final decision pursuant to this section has been made.

B. Notwithstanding the provisions of Subsection A, a project proponent or applicant may pay the Fee "under protest" and receive a Building Permit. Provided, however, that the application for reduction or adjustment shall thereafter be filed within ten (10) calendar days or any objection shall be deemed waived. If a reduction or adjustment is received after payment pursuant this subsection is made, a refund to the applicant shall be made of that amount by which the Fee is reduced or adjusted.

C. The project proponent or applicant applying for a reduction or adjustment shall have the burden of proof, by a preponderance of the evidence, that a reasonable relationship or nexus is lacking between the Fee, or the Facilities to be financed by the Fee, and the particular project.

D. In the event of any reduction or adjustment in the Fee granted pursuant to this section, any later change in the use, zoning, or land use designation for the property involved shall subject the then owner to payment of the then applicable Fee for such new uses, zoning, or land use designation, whether or not a Building Permit is required.

4.37.140 Inflationary Adjustments.

The Fee established by this chapter shall automatically be adjusted on January 1 of each calendar year by a percentage equal to the inflation rate for the prior year for construction costs as determined by the Director on December 1 of each calendar year. The Director's determination shall be based upon the Engineering News Record, Construction Cost Index for the calendar year as of December 1.

4.37.150 Adoption in Compliance with Capital Improvement Plan.

When the monies in the Neighborhood and Community Park Funds are disbursed for use, the Fees shall be used to finance the Facilities. To the extent sufficient Fees are available, all Facilities financed by the Fees shall be constructed or acquired in accordance with the priorities established in the Capital Improvement Program.

4.37.160 Chapter is Severable.

If any provision of this chapter or the application thereof to any person or circumstances held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other provisions of this chapter which can be given effect without the invalid provisions or its application, and to this end the provisions of this chapter are severable.

SECTION 2. Ordinance is Severable.

If any provision of this ordinance or the application thereof to any person or circumstances held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other provisions of this ordinance which can be given effect without the invalid provisions or its application, and to this end the provisions of this ordinance are severable.

SECTION 3. City-wide Park Fee. The City Council hereby declares its intention to adopt a fee to recover the costs of providing city-wide park and recreation facilities required by the General Plan. No building permit for a dwelling unit shall be issued unless the applicant shall agree, in writing, to be subject to such a City-wide Park Fee up to the amount of \$735.00 if it is adopted within one hundred and twenty (120) days of the effective date of this ordinance.

SECTION 4. Urgency Ordinance. This ordinance is declared to be an urgency measure, immediately necessary for the public peace, health and safety. It shall take effect immediately upon its adoption. A statement of urgency is as follows:

The extraordinarily rapid pace of development within the City necessitates immediate imposition of fees to fund the infrastructure to serve that development. Delay in adoption or the effective date of this ordinance would result in hundreds of building permits being issued without those permits bearing their fair share of costs.

SECTION 5. Posting. The City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to post a true copy of the foregoing ordinance in each of three (3) conspicuous locations within the City and she shall immediately after such posting enter in the Ordinance Book, under the record of the ordinance, a certificate under her hand stating the time and place of said publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this 4th day of January, 1989, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS: Tom Chambliss, Phil Ozenick, John M. Byouk,
Mel Hamel, Bill Santucci


NOES COUNCILMEMBERS: None

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS: None


[December 21, 1988 Revision]

6

[Urgency Version]


MAYOR

ATTEST:


City Clerk

This Ordinance amends the
Roseville Municipal Code. Case
fasten in codebook until
next update.

ORDINANCE NO. 2424

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE
AMENDING SECTIONS 4.38.020 AND 4.38.050 OF CHAPTER 4.38
OF TITLE 4 OF THE ROSEVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE, RELATING
TO CITY-WIDE PARK FEES

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

Section 1: Sections 4.38.020 and 4.38.050 of Chapter 4.38
of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code are hereby amended to
read as follows:

4.38.020 Definitions.

The following words are defined for purposes of this chapter
as follows:

A. "Building Permit" means the permit issued or required by
the City for the construction of any Dwelling Unit pursuant to
and as defined by the Building Code.

B. "Capital Improvement Program" means that list of
proposed City-wide park and recreation facilities, improvements,
or infrastructure totaling \$35,660,062 (in 1991 dollars) prepared
by the Department and attached to the Study as Exhibit "A".

C. "Department" means the Department of Parks and
Recreation.

D. "Director" means the Director of the Department.

E. "Facilities" means those city-wide park and recreation
facilities, land, improvements, or infrastructure shown and
included on the Capital Improvement Program.

F. "Fee" or "City-Wide Park Fee" means the Fee established
by this Chapter 4.38. The Fee shall be collected prior to the
approval of any Building Permit. The Fee shall be used solely to
finance the Facilities.

G. "City-Wide Park Fund" means the special interest-bearing
fund established pursuant to Section 4.38.030.

H. "Study" means both the study entitled "Proposed City-
wide Park Fees" dated March 3, 1989 and the study entitled
"Increase of the City-Wide Park Fee" dated March 14, 1991 by the
Director. The Study is on file in the Offices of the Director
and the City Clerk.

I. "Dwelling Unit" means a building or part of a building
designed for occupancy as a residence by one family.

J. "Single Family Dwelling" means a building designed for
occupancy as a residence by one family, including without
limitation, mobile homes.

K. "Multiple Family Dwelling" means a building designed for
occupancy as a residence by two or more families, living
independently of each other. Provided, that multiple family
dwelling also includes forms of congregate living, including,
without limitation, senior citizen homes, retirement homes, or
boarding homes.

L. "Credit" means a reduction in the Fee representing the pro-rata share of City-wide park lands already dedicated during approval or development of a development agreement for a specific plan.

4.38.050 Amount of City-Wide Park Fee.

The Fee shall be:

Land Use Category

Amount of Fee

Residential, Single Family Dwelling

\$1,195.50 per Dwelling
Unit

Residential, Multiple Family Dwelling


\$1,195.50 per Dwelling
Unit

SECTION 2. This ordinance shall be effective at the expiration of sixty (60) days from the date of adoption.


SECTION 3. The City Clerk is hereby directed to cause this ordinance to be published in full at least once within fourteen (14) days after it is adopted in a newspaper of general circulation in the City, or shall within fourteen (14) days after its adoption cause this ordinance to be posted in full in at least three (3) public places in the City and enter in the Ordinance Book a certificate stating the time and place of said publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this 15th day of May, 1991, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS: Bill Santucci, Harry Crabb, Jr., John Byouk,
Mel Hamel, Pauline Roccucci
NOES COUNCILMEMBERS: None
ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS: None


MAYOR

ATTEST:


ASSISTANT City Clerk

Electric Backbone Impact Fee
Ordinance No. 5319

ORDINANCE NO. 5319

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AMENDING
SECTIONS 4.54.010(D), (I), 4.54.020(B), (G), (H), 4.54.040, AND 4.54.050 OF
CHAPTER 4.54 OF TITLE 4 OF THE ROSEVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING
ELECTRIC BACKBONE MITIGATION FEE

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. Sections 4.54.010(D), (I), 4.54.020(B), (G), (H), 4.54.040, AND 4.54.050 OF Chapter 4.54 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code are hereby amended to read as follows:

Chapter 4.54 ELECTRIC BACKBONE MITIGATION FEE

4.54.010 Purpose.

D. The fee established by this chapter has been calculated in the manner set forth in the Utility Financial Solutions (UFS) Consultant Study ("Study") so as to pay for those facilities listed in the capital improvement program.

I. That for a period of greater than 10 days prior to adoption of this chapter, data has been available to the public and to developers and their representatives indicating the cost or estimated cost of the entire infrastructure to be funded.

4.54.020 Definitions.

B. "Capital improvement program" means that list of proposed electric system facilities, improvements, or infrastructure totaling \$81,371,000 referenced in the 2013 UFS Study.

G. "Fee" or "electric backbone mitigation fee" or "backbone fee" means the fee established by this Chapter 4.54. The fee shall be collected prior to the approval of any building permit. The fee shall be used solely to finance the facilities. The fee as codified in this chapter has previously been imposed for the same purposes, pursuant to motion of the city council.

H. "Study" or "System Study" means the 2013 UFS Consultant Study. The Study is on file in the office of the city clerk.

4.54.040 Payment of electric backbone mitigation fee.

Except as otherwise provided by this chapter, the fee imposed pursuant to this chapter shall be paid at the time of permit and prior to a request for any electrical inspection. Calculation of the fee shall be determined on a per unit basis in accordance with the billing units defined in the UFS Consultant Study and Section 4.54.050 of this chapter, the number of single-family units, multifamily units, and general service customers (all other commercial/office/industrial types of development) service panel rating of the development. Descriptions of land use categories and type of development in this chapter, except as otherwise noted, are utilized in the same manner as in the city general plan.

4.54.050 Electric backbone mitigation fee.

The electric backbone mitigation fee shall be:

Type of Development	Amount of Fee
Apartments, condominiums, townhouses and mobile homes	\$469.22 per dwelling unit
Other residential units including single-family homes	\$645.18 per dwelling unit
General Service (all other commercial/office/industrial)	\$117.31 per kVA

The fee shall be subject to adjustments for inflation as provided in this chapter.

SECTION 2. This ordinance shall be effective as of July 1, 2014.

SECTION 3. The City Clerk is hereby directed to cause this ordinance to be published in full at least once within fourteen (14) days after it is adopted in a newspaper of general circulation in the City, or shall within fourteen (14) days after its adoption cause this ordinance to be posted in full in at least three (3) public places in the City and enter in the Ordinance Book a certificate stating the time and place of said publication by posting.


PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this 2nd day of April, 2014, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES	COUNCILMEMBERS:	Roccucci, Herman, Garcia, Gore, Rohan
NOES	COUNCILMEMBERS:	None
ABSENT	COUNCILMEMBERS:	None



MAYOR

ATTEST:



City Clerk

Solid Waste Impact Fee
Ordinance No. 4380

ORDINANCE NO. 4380

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AMENDING SECTION
9.12.101 OF CHAPTER 9.12 OF TITLE 9 OF THE ROSEVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE
REGARDING SOLID WASTE IMPACT FEE

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. Section 9.12.101 of Chapter 9.12 of Title 9 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

Section 9.12.101 Solid Waste Impact Fees.

A. Solid Waste Impact Fee Established. Each residential dwelling unit and/or commercial/industrial development to be serviced by City-owned containers collection shall pay a Solid Waste Impact Fee upon issuance of a building permit as described below. The fee is based on a "study" (Solid Waste Impact Fee Model), which is attached to the Council Communication, dated February 15, 2006, entitled Solid Waste Impact Fee.. Containers shall be delivered upon issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the unit/development by the chief building inspector.

1. Non-Commercial
 - a) Single Family Residential Dwelling Unit: \$410 per unit
 - b) Multi-Family Residential Dwelling Unit: \$139 per unit
2. Commercial/Industrial Development: \$0.34 per square foot

B. Ownership. The City shall retain ownership of the refuse containers. Persons owning or renting property served by such containers are responsible for the security of the containers. In the event of fire, theft, or other disappearance of container from the property a replacement container will be obtained from the City upon payment of the fee established in subsection A of this section. Persons owning or renting property served by such containers shall, upon vacating the premises, leave the primary container for the next occupant in a secure location upon the premises. Persons who have ordered an extra container shall, upon vacating the premises, call the City to have the extra container removed. Persons owning or renting property served by such containers are responsible for the appearance and cleanliness of the container.

C. Replacement Containers. A replacement container may be obtained upon payment of the fee established in subsection A of this section. Replacement of a container no longer usable due to normal wear shall not be subject to a replacement fee.

SECTION 2. This ordinance shall be effective at the expiration of thirty (30) days from the date of adoption.

SECTION 3. The City Clerk is hereby directed to cause this ordinance to be published in full at least once within fourteen (14) days after it is adopted in a newspaper of general circulation in the City, or shall within fourteen (14) days after its adoption cause this ordinance to be posted in full in at least three (3) public places in the City and enter in the Ordinance Book a certificate stating the time and place of said publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this 19th day of
April, 2006, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES	COUNCILMEMBERS:	Gray, Allard, Roccucci, Rockholm, Garbolino
NOES	COUNCILMEMBERS:	None
ABSENT	COUNCILMEMBERS:	None


MAYOR

ATTEST:


City Clerk

**Development Agreement Fees
Imposed Since 2004**

Water Meter Retrofit/Conservation Program

Ordinance No. 4001

ORDINANCE NO. 4001

ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ADDING SECTION 14.04.100 OF CHAPTER 14.04, AND CHAPTER 14.07, AMENDING SECTIONS 14.08.020, 14.08.090, 14.08.091, 14.08.105, 14.08.106, 14.08.125, AND 14.08.126 OF CHAPTER 14.08, AND SECTION 14.16.100 OF CHAPTER 14.16 AND DELETING SECTION 14.08.110 OF CHAPTER 14.08 OF TITLE 14 RELATING TO WATER AND WASTEWATER ISSUES AND THE WATER METER RETROFIT PROGRAM

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. Section 14.04.100 of Chapter 14.04 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby added to read as follows:

Section 14.04.100 Billing for metered water services on multi-family parcels

As part of the meter retrofit program, billing for water services will be as follows:

- A. Multiple dwelling units on a single assessor parcel operating off of a single water service line.
 - 1. For a water service feeding three or less dwelling units, a monthly service charge based on the meter size will be established for each connection and residential metered water rates will be used to bill commodity charges.
 - 2. For a water service feeding more than three dwelling units, a monthly service charge based on meter size will be established and non-residential metered water rates will be used to bill commodity charges.
- B. Multiple water services serving a single dwelling unit, or multiple parcels maintained as a single residence.
 - 1. A monthly service charge based on the meter size will be established for each connection.
 - 2. Residential metered water rates will be used to bill commodity charges.
- C. Multiple units on multiple assessor parcels operating off of a single water service line.
 - 1. In the event a water service line serves two or more dwelling units on two or more parcels, the billing charges will be determined by the Environmental Utilities Director.
- D. Multiple privately owned units operating off of a common water system (such as, but not limited to, condominiums).
 - 1. Each owner unit will receive a flat-rate water bill. The flat rate will be calculated based on the amount due for the prior year's usage for the entire complex (not limited to a building or unit within the complex). The Environmental Utilities Director has the authority to calculate the rate each June using the prior twelve months of usage ending in April. The amount will be calculated as follows:
 - i. A monthly service charge based on the meter size for each connection.
 - ii. Non-residential water rates will be used to calculate commodity charges.

- iii. The monthly amount billed to each unit will be the total amount due for all meters and backflow maintenance and repair for the complex for the prior year, divided by the total number of units, divided by 12 months.
 - iv. If an owner (or owners) is/are delinquent, the unpaid balance will be collected through the use of all available legal means.
 - v. The water rates used will be the rates in effect on June 1st.
 - 2. The usage used to calculate the flat rate will include all usage to the complex including landscape irrigation, pools and common areas.
 - 3. The City will not adjust the rate to accommodate differences in dwelling size or occupancy.
 - 4. Each property owner, whether the dwelling is occupied or vacant, is required to maintain water service.
- E. Mobile home parks with a private on-site water system and metered as part of the retrofit program.
- 1. Each dwelling owner will receive a flat-rate water bill. The flat rate will be calculated based on the amount due for the park for the prior year's usage. The Environmental Utilities Director will calculate the rate each June using the prior twelve months of usage ending in April. The amount will be calculated as follows:
 - i. A monthly service charge based on the meter size for each connection.
 - ii. Non-residential water rates will be used to calculate commodity charges.
 - iii. The monthly amount billed to each unit will be the total amount due for all meters and backflow maintenance and repair for the park for the prior year, divided by the total number of mobile home pads, divided by 12 months.
 - iv. If a bill recipient is delinquent, the unpaid balance will be collected through the use of all available legal means.
 - v. The water rates used will be the rates in effect on June 1st.
 - 2. The usage used to calculate the flat rate will include all usage to the park including landscape irrigation, pools and common areas.
 - 3. The City will not adjust the rate to accommodate differences in dwelling size or occupancy.
 - 4. The dwelling owner, if the dwelling is vacant, is required to maintain water service. If the mobile home pad is not leased, the bill will be the responsibility of the owner of the mobile home park.
- F. Apartment complexes with a private on-site water system.
- 1. A monthly service charge based on the meter size will be established for each connection.
 - 2. Non-residential metered water rates will be used to bill commodity charges.
 - 3. The City will not provide individual water bills or allocate bills to individual occupants/users.

SECTION 2. Chapter 14.07 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby added to read as follows:

Chapter 14.07 Water Meter Retrofit Program

Section 14.07.010 Definitions

For the purposes of this chapter, the following are defined as:

- A. "Director" means the Environmental Utilities Director of the City.
- B. "Single-family parcel" means a single dwelling unit with one water service line and only one service connection point on a single assessor's parcel.
- C. "Multi-family parcel" means more than one dwelling unit operating off of one or more shared water service lines on a single assessor's parcel. (Excludes apartments, condominiums, and mobile home parks).
- D. "Apartment complex" means a complex where multiple dwelling units are located on a single parcel and dwelling units are not owned individually.
- E. "Condominium complex" means a complex where dwelling units are individually owned.
- F. "Private water system" means a water system where the service lines and related equipment are owned and maintained by the property owner.
- G. "Public water system" means a water system where the service lines and related equipment are owned and maintained by the City.
- H. "Master meter" means a meter that services more than one dwelling unit on a private water system.
- I. "Sub-metering" means breaking a master meter into components based on individual on-site meters.

Section 14.07.020 General meter retrofit installation provisions

- A. Installation of a water meter will be made at the separation of the public and private system within the public easement.
- B. City will install meter sized to meet anticipated demands based on owner direction.
- C. Meter installation work will be completed by the City of Roseville.
- D. The owner of the real property served by the City shall be charged with, and personally responsible for, all associated costs related to the installation of a water meter, or meters, on owned property and for any subsequent water meter surcharge.
- E. Each parcel shall have at least one metered service connection regardless of the number of dwelling units served.
- F. If owner chooses to abandon a water service line the City will disconnect it from the City's system.
- G. Sub-meters will not be utilized for billing by the City.

Section 14.07.030 Multi-family parcel meter installations

- A. Multiple units on a single assessor parcel operating off of a single water service line.
 - 1. A single meter will be installed on the existing water service line within the right of way (at existing curb stop).
 - 2. If requested by owner, the City can install additional meters at the property line within the public utility easement. Owner will be responsible for additional meter

installations. Full payment of meter installation cost is due upon installation. A ten-year repayment plan may be authorized by the Director, as provided in 14.07.050.

3. If multiple water services exist, the owner may combine the services to a single water service. The owner is responsible for combining the services and abandoning on site services where no meter will be installed.
 4. If multiple surcharges are currently being billed, but fewer meter installations are actually installed, a refund (up to a maximum of 12 months) will be made for surcharges paid over and above the number of actual installations made.
- B. Multiple water services serving a single dwelling unit, or multiple parcels owned by a single owner and maintained as a single residence.
1. Connections at each parcel will be verified by City.
 2. The owner shall identify which connection(s) a meter will be installed on.
 3. If multiple water services exist, the owner may combine the services to a single water service. The owner is responsible for combining the on-site services and abandoning on site services where no meter will be installed.
 4. If multiple connections exist, the installation will be evaluated for cross connection control. Meter setters with dual check assemblies may be required, requiring the owner to install a thermal expansion relief to the system.
 5. If property owner requests additional services, full payment of meter installation costs for these additional services is due upon installation. An alternate payment plan may be authorized by the Finance Director.
- C. Multiple units on multiple assessor parcels operating off of a single water service line.
1. A single meter will be installed on the existing service line and additional meters, one for each parcel, will be installed at the property line within the public utility easement.
 2. The property owner will be required to connect additional service lines and make whatever separation is required on site (including obtaining the proper building permit).
 3. If separation is not completed, the owner of the property served through the adjacent parcel will be required to separate the on-site services upon any improvements to the property that would result in a water/sewer tenant improvement or upon sale of the property.
 4. A ten-year repayment plan may be authorized by the Director, as provided in 14.07.050.
- D. Multiple privately owned units operating off of a common (either public or private) water system (such as, but not limited to, condominiums).
1. One or more master meters will be installed at the separation between the public and private systems but within the existing public utilities easement.
 2. Multiple points of connection will require multiple meter installations.
 3. Cross connection surveys will be completed by City to determine the degree of hazard involved. Appropriate backflow prevention shall be installed by City with the meter improvements. This may require the owner to install a pressure relief feature on the water system.
 4. A surcharge will be calculated based on the actual cost of metering and cross connection control. The total cost will be amortized over 10 years using the 5-

year average City pooled investment interest rate. The annual amount due will be divided on a per unit basis and billed to each unit owner monthly.

- E. Mobile home parks with a private on-site water system.
 - 1. One or more master meters will be installed at the separation between the public and private systems but within the existing public utilities easement.
 - 2. Multiple points of connection will require multiple meter installations.
 - 3. Cross connection surveys will be completed by City to determine the degree of hazard involved. Appropriate backflow prevention shall be installed by City with meter improvements. This may require the owner to install a pressure relief feature on the water system.
 - 4. Mobile home park owner is responsible for the cost of meter installation and system modification, if required.
 - 5. Payment terms for meter installation services will be arranged between the owner and the Finance Director.
- F. Apartment complexes with a private on-site water system.
 - 1. One or more master meters will be installed at the separation between the public and private systems but within the existing public utilities easement.
 - 2. Multiple points of connection will require multiple meter installations.
 - 3. Cross connection surveys will be completed by City to determine the degree of hazard involved. Appropriate backflow prevention shall be installed by City with meter improvements. This may require the owner to install a pressure relief feature on the water system.
 - 4. Mobile home park owner is responsible for the cost of meter installation and system modification, if required.
 - 5. Payment terms for meter installation services will be arranged between the owner and the Finance Director.

Section 14.07.050 Meter Retrofit Program.

- A. Surcharges for the meter retrofit program shall be imposed on each single-family and multi-family parcel based on the number of meters installed.
- B. The water meter surcharge and related water bill is the responsibility of the property owner.
- C. In order to account for the cost of retrofitting meters throughout the community, pursuant to federal mandate, the following rates are hereby imposed:
 - 1. Already metered: \$0.00/mo.
 - 2. Meter-ready: \$1.58/mo.
 - 3. Full meter retrofit: \$7.20/mo.
 - 4. Nonresidential customers: \$0.00/mo./DUE.
 - 5. Under certain circumstances, the surcharge will be based on actual cost of meter installation as identified within this chapter.
- D. For the purposes of this section "meter-ready" shall mean those services which have been made meter-ready by installation of a meter box and meter setter per city standards. Services made meter-ready by the city shall be charged according to the full meter retrofit rate.

E. For purposes of this section, "non-residential customers" shall be defined as commercial, industrial, manufacturing, or other non-residential land uses including residential complexes. Actual costs associated with meter installation will be due from these "non-residential customers" upon meter installation.

Section 14.07.060 Low-income meter retrofit surcharge reduction.

- A. Effective July 1, 2001, any household with total income no greater than that specified by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development as "very low income" may apply for a fifty percent reduction in the water meter retrofit surcharge as charged under the provisions of Section 14.08.106. Applications for a reduced surcharge shall be on forms supplied by the City. All information required to be given on such forms shall be supplied by the applicant on behalf of the household under penalty of perjury.
- B. A reduced surcharge shall be granted a qualifying household which files applications with the Finance Director. A change of address terminates the reduction provided in this section, but a new application at a new address may be made and the reduced surcharge rate shall be allowed, if the requirements set out in this section are satisfied.
- C. For the purposes of this section, a "qualifying household" is defined as any household which owns and currently resides at the address for which application is made, with a verifiable gross household income no greater than that specified by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development as "Very Low Income" for Placer County.
- D. The reduced surcharge will apply to future utility bills for the premises occupied by the applicant at the time of application. The reduction will not be applied retroactively.
- E. The reduction provided in this section may be allowed in addition to the senior citizen rate reduction provided under Section 14.08.120.

Section 14.07.070 Prepayment of meter retrofit surcharge.

- A. Effective with the inclusion of the meter retrofit surcharge on the monthly utility bill as provided in Section 14.08.106, the remaining meter retrofit surcharge due may be paid in full. The prepayment will be in accordance with a schedule discounting the monthly surcharge using a five and five tenths percent (5.5%) discount rate.
- B. The prepayment will apply to the balance of the surcharge assigned to a premises. A change of address will not result in a credit for prior prepayment. If a surcharge has been assigned to the new premises, it will not be affected by a prepayment on a prior premises.
- C. Prepayments may not be required as a result of sale or exchange of a residence.
- D. Prepayments will be made to the utility billing office of the finance department.

SECTION 3: Sections 14.08.020, 14.08.090, 14.08.091, 14.08.105, 14.08.106, 14.08.110, 14.08.125 and 14.08.126 of Chapter 14.08 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code are hereby amended to read as follows:

Section 14.08.020 Service connections-Application-Costs.

- A. The water division shall install service connections and lay service pipes up to the coterminous of the public easement or interest in land and the property of the applicant, except in

the case of improvements installed pursuant to the subdivision regulations, all of which improvements shall be the sole responsibility of the developer. Ordinarily, such service pipes shall terminate within two feet in back of a sidewalk. Where there is no sidewalk, the location of the terminal of the service pipes shall be determined by the Environmental Utilities Director based upon where a sidewalk would ordinarily be located. The responsibility of the city with respect to maintenance of such service connections and service pipes shall not extend, in any case, beyond the terminal of the service pipes or located of the water meter if one is installed.

B. The size of such service connections and pipes shall be determined by the applicant by reference to the Uniform Plumbing Code. The Environmental Utilities Director is not responsible for verifying the calculations and is not responsible for any pressure problems related to improperly sized services.

C. Prior to the installation of such service connections and pipes, the applicant shall pay to the city the estimated costs of installation.

D. The cost of installation shall be established by the Environmental Utilities Director or his designee, based upon the estimated costs of labor, materials, equipment costs and rentals, and administrative costs. Upon the completion of an installation and approving inspection of any connection, the director or his designee shall refund any amounts collected with the application which exceed the actual costs.

Section 14.08.090 Service charges for metered service

There shall be due and payable the following monthly charges, upon submission of the bill by the City to the owner of the property supplied with service, for all treated water measured by meters for residential, commercial, industrial and manufacturing or other purposes:

A. Monthly Quantity Rates.

		Inside City	Outside City
1.	Residential Accounts		
	First 1,200 cu. ft.	0.22 per 100 cu. ft.	.35 per 100 cu. ft.
	Next 3,800 cu. ft.	0.44 per 100 cu. ft.	.71 per 100 cu. ft.
	Over 5,000 cu. ft.	0.66 per 100 cu. ft.	1.05 per 100 cu. ft.
2.	Non-residential Accounts		
	All water use	0.44 per 100 cu. ft.	.71 per 100 cu. ft.

B. Monthly Service Charges.

Meter Size (Inches)	Peak Flow Rate (gallons per minute)	Inside City	Outside City
5/8	20	\$ 10.35	\$ 16.60
3/4	30	10.35	16.60
1	50	16.70	26.70
1-1/2	100	32.20	51.50
2	160	50.85	81.40
3	350	94.55	151.30
4	600	157.40	251.80
6	1250	312.30	499.70
8	1800	500.20	800.30
10	2900	718.60	1149.70
12	4300	1342.00	2147.20

C. The total amount due and payable shall be the sum of the monthly service charge plus the quantity rate. The monthly service charge is due and payable regardless of whether water has been consumed. The service charge shall be the greater of the charge based on the meter size or flow rate. No service charge shall be made for fire service that has backflow prevention with detector check devices approved by the Environmental Utilities Director.

D. For purposes of charging for treated water measured by meters:

1. A residential account is defined as a single metered water service which serves three or less dwelling units.
2. A nonresidential account is defined as a single metered water service which serves more than three dwelling units, or serves commercial, industrial, manufacturing, irrigation or other nonresidential land uses.

Section 14.08.091 Service charge outside city limits.

Charges for water service delivered outside the corporate limits of the city will be at a rate 60% higher than the customers residing within City of Roseville City limits.

Section 14.08.105 Installation of water meters-New Construction

A. New Construction. A water meter shall be required for all residential dwelling units for which a building permit was issued after January 1, 1992.

B. Installation and Location.

1. All water meters and metering equipment will be supplied and installed by the City upon the service premises at a location approved by the Environmental Utilities Director.
 2. The following charges for water meter installation shall be made:
 - a. A seventy-five dollar (\$75.00) labor charge for installation shall be paid by the applicant for service prior to installation. The labor charge shall be increased by the Finance Director as labor costs increase, as reflected in the adoption of the City's salary ordinances.
 - b. A meter supply charge shall be paid by the applicant for service prior to installation. The meter supply charge shall be equal to the per meter amount of the most recent water meter bid awarded by the City.
 - c. In addition to the direct meter supply charge, additional charges any apply for meter appurtenances as required by the Environmental Utilities Director. This includes, but is not limited to, features required to make meter ready for remote reading.
 - d. A seventy-five dollar (\$75.00) water quantity charge per unit for water use during construction of residential units shall be paid by the applicant prior to meter installation. The water quantity charge shall be increased by the Environmental Utilities Director to reflect increases in water supply rates.
 3. All water meters shall be safely accessible to authorized employees of the City at all times for inspection, testing and reading.
 4. The City may require a customer to relocate a metering installation, at customer's expense, if any existing water meter location becomes inaccessible or for other operational needs.
 5. Property owners of condominium and apartment complexes are liable for costs to install meters on their property upon receipt of bill for such services.
- C. Rights of Access.
1. The City shall have the right of access to the customer's premises, at all reasonable hours for any purpose related to the furnishing of water service including, but not limited to meter reading, testing, inspection, construction, maintenance and repair of meter.
 2. Service may be refused or disconnected if permanent safe accessibility is not provided by the customer.
 3. Upon termination of service, the City shall have the right of access to the service premises to remove the water meter.
- D. Customer Responsibilities.
- It shall be the duty of each customer upon whose premises the city has installed a water meter to ensure that such meters are not damaged, destroyed or interfered with and, in the case of any defect in any such meter, to notify the city. The customer is also responsible for keeping the meter box clear and accessible for reading and maintenance by keeping landscape and other improvements from covering or encroaching over the meter box.
- E. Metered Water Rate.
- New services installed after January 1, 2002 will be placed on a metered water rate.

SECTION 4. Section 14.08.110 of Chapter 14.08 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby deleted.

Ord. 4001

SECTION 5. Sections 14.16.100.2 of Chapter 14.16 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

Section 14.16.100.2 Low strength-low quantity commercial or industrial users.

A. For commercial or industrial users described in subsection A of Section 14.16.100.1, sewer units are as follows:

1. Special low-density use, one per five employees or fraction:
 - a. Parking garages,
 - b. Warehouses,
 - c. Storage facilities;
2. Low-density users, one-sixth per one thousand square feet:
 - a. Churches (without kitchen, meeting hall),
 - b. Low-usage retail stores:
 - Hardware stores
 - Appliance stores
 - Furniture stores
3. Medium-density users, one-third per one thousand square feet:
 - a. Theaters,
 - b. Offices,
 - c. Auditoriums, halls, lodges,
 - d. Retail stores,
 - e. Schools (without cafeterias or gymnasiums),
 - f. Banks, financial offices,
 - g. Bowling/entertainment centers (without kitchen);
4. High-density users, two-thirds per one thousand square feet:
 - a. Barber/beauty shops (with lavatories),
 - b. Bars,
 - c. Medical/dental offices,
 - d. Schools (with cafeterias or gymnasiums),
 - e. Service stations,
 - f. Sports/fitness centers;
5. Special commercial users:
 - a. Carwashes (per automatic washing stall), eight units,
 - b. Carwashes (per self-service stall), two units,
 - c. Laundromats, two-thirds per washer,
 - d. Markets (without disposal), two-thirds per one thousand square feet,
 - e. Markets (with disposal), two per one thousand square feet,
 - f. Restaurants, bakeries, cafes, two per one thousand square feet,
 - g. Mortuaries two per one thousand square feet,
 - h. Hospitals, one-half per licensed bed,
 - i. Resthome/convalescent hospital, one-third per licensed bed;
6. Other commercial or industrial users, based on study by the Environmental Utilities Director.

B. General Regulations:

1. Not less than one connection per building.
2. Special provisions can be made within each category where, in the judgment of the city Environmental Utilities Director, application of ordinance produces inequities or irregularities requiring revision.
3. Prescribed connection charges apply only to the particular uses listed; where multiple uses, within the meaning of the connection charge ordinance, are contained in the same structure, the city Environmental Utilities Director, at his discretion, will allocate the respective square footage or employment dedicated to each use, and will determine a composite collection charge composed of the respective collection charges for each such use.
4. Classification of shell buildings having no use when connecting to the sewage system shall be determined based on the judgment of the city Environmental Utilities Director based on building permit data, applicable zoning, and plans of the developer. Subsequent modifications to such buildings may result in reclassification and the assessment of additional incremental charges. No refunding of previously paid connection charges will be made where modifications are made to any structure which place it in a classification with a lower connection charge rates.

SECTION 6. This ordinance shall be effective at the expiration of thirty (30) days from the date of adoption.


SECTION 7. The City Clerk is hereby directed to cause this ordinance to be published in full at least once within fourteen (14) days after it is adopted in a newspaper of general circulation in the City, or shall within fourteen (14) days after its adoption cause this ordinance to be posted in full in at least three (3) public places in the City and enter in the Ordinance Book a certificate stating the time and place of said publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this 5th day of November, 2003, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS: John Allard, Richard Roccucci, Jim Gray, Gina Garbolino, Rocky Rockholm

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS: None

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS: None


MAYOR

ATTEST:


City Clerk

Development Agreements

Please refer to the Development Agreements on the
City of Roseville's website:

http://www.roseville.ca.us/gov/development_services/_planning/development_agreements.asp

Annual Development Impact Fee Report
(JPA and SPWA Funds)



Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2016

Table of Contents

Reporting Requirements for Development Impact Fees	1
Description of Development Impact Fees.....	2
<u>Fund Balance and Project Descriptions</u>	
Sewer Connection Fees.....	3
Traffic Mitigation Fees	5
Attachment 1	6

Reporting Requirements for Development Impact Fees

In California, State legislation sets certain legal and procedural parameters for the charging of development impact fees (“DIFs”). This legislation was passed as AB1600 by the California Legislature and is now codified as California Government Code Sections (GC §) 66000 through 66008 (“Mitigation Fee Act”). This State law went into effect on January 1, 1989.

GC § 66006(b) states the following requirements as pertains to DIFs:

For each separate account or fund established, the local agency shall, within 180 days after the last day of each fiscal year, make available to the public the following information for the fiscal year:

- (A) A brief description of the type of fee in the account or fund.
- (B) The amount of the fee.
- (C) The beginning and ending balance of the account or fund.
- (D) The amount of the fees collected and interest earned.
- (E) An identification of each public improvement on which fees were expended and the amount of expenditures on each improvement including the total percentage of the cost of the public improvement that was funded with fees.
- (F) An identification of an approximate date by which the construction of the public improvement will commence if the local agency determines that sufficient funds have been collected to complete financing on an incomplete public improvement and the public improvement remains incomplete.
- (G) A description of each interfund transfer or loan made from the account or fund, including the public improvement on which the transferred or loaned fees will be expended, and, in the case of an interfund loan, the date on which the loan will be repaid, and the rate of interest that the account or fund will receive on the loan.
- (H) The amount of refunds made (as pursuant to GC § 66001(e)) due to sufficient funds being collected to complete financing on incomplete public improvements, and the amount of reallocation of funds made (as pursuant to GC § 66001(f)) due to administrative costs of refunding unexpended revenues exceeding the amount to be refunded.

GC § 65865(e) also requires that any development agreement entered into on or after January 1, 2004, the City shall comply with GC § 66006 with respect to any fee it receives or cost it recovers.

Description of Development Impact Fees

Sewer Connection Fees

Sewer connection fees are established pursuant to Municipal Code Chapter 14.16. Two sewer connection fees are collected when development occurs – a regional sewer connection fee and a local sewer connection fee. Additional fees may be applicable to properties within sewer special benefit assessment areas.

- *Regional Sewer Connection Fees* - The regional sewer connection fee is charged for each sewer unit required within the Regional Treatment Plan Service Area connected to the city-owned public sewer. The service area includes the City of Roseville and portions of Placer County and South Placer Municipal Utility District.

Traffic Mitigation Fees

In 1988 the City of Roseville adopted a citywide Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, requiring new development within the City to pay traffic impact fees. The fees collected through this program, in addition to other funding sources, allows the City to construct transportation impacts identified in its Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The fee program assesses fair-share costs to each jurisdiction based on their impact on the individual roadways from new development.

This fee applies to all new development in the City. The developers in Specific Plan Areas have built, or will construct, more than the minimum amount of improvements from their funds and will receive a credit for those improvements. Additional fees collected by the City on behalf of regional fee programs:

- *Highway 65 Joint Powers Authority Fee Program* – The cities of Roseville and Rocklin, along with Placer County, formed a joint powers authority for the purpose of funding four interchanges on Highway 65. The interchanges include Stanford Ranch Road/Galleria Boulevard, Pleasant Grove Boulevard, Blue Oaks Boulevard and Sunset Boulevard. The fee program assesses fair-share costs to each jurisdiction based on their impact on the individual improvements from new development. City of Roseville serves as staff to the JPA and administers the fee program.

Fund Balance Summary

Sewer Connection Fees										
Regional Sewer Connection Fees										
Document Establishing Fee	Project	Fee Formula	Starting Balance	Fees Collected (Refunded)	Interest Earned	Interfund Transfer In/(Out)*	Expenditures	Ending Balance as of June 30, 2016	Sufficient Funds to Complete Project?	% of CIP Funded by Fee
Roseville Municipal Code Chapters 14.16		Ordinances 4739 § 11, 2009; 4461 § 1 2006; 2855 § 1, 1995; 1744 § 1, 1983	\$105,768,782	14,025,141	1,022,080	(108,725)	(9,250,494)			
	Radio Telemetry-Regional W/W						(40,238)		Yes-Started 2007	100%
	Process Control Standards						(14,427)		Yes-Started 2007	100%
	Grease Receiving Station						(94,401)		Project Complete	100%
	Dry Creek Bank Stabiliz.						(5,919)		Project Complete	100%
	Pleasant Grove WWTP Exp						(1,034,443)		Yes-Started 2015	100%

Regional Sewer Connection Fees, Continued										
	Project						Expenditures	Ending Balance as of June 30, 2016	Sufficient Funds to Complete Project?	% of CIP Funded by Fee
	Emergency Store Pond Flood Control						(8,054)		Yes- Started 1998	70%
								\$110,259,304		
*Transfers out: \$108,725 for indirect costs to the General Fund.										

Regional Sewer Connection Project Fee Project Descriptions

Radio Telemetry-Regional W/W (Project# 073507) - Implementing preliminary Radio Master Plan recommendations including redesign of SCADA radio system architecture to avoid interference from other regional utilities. Also relocating a key radio repeater from a City structure schedule to be demolished.

Process Control Standards (Project# 073508) – Leverages Roseville’s current standards and equipment naming conventions and will avoid duplicating any existing work.

Grease Receiving Station (Project# 073509) - Study to evaluate feasibility of addition of grease receiving station.

Dry Creek Bank Stabilization (Project# 133504) – Improvements to halt bank erosion near a SPWA trunk sewer line are complete. Staff are working to close out the construction contracts.

Pleasant Grove WWTP Exp (Project# 153507) - Expand wastewater treatment plant capacity.

Emergency Store Pond Flood Control (Project# 983507) - Construct flood control related improvements for the DCWWTP.

Traffic Mitigation Fees										
Highway 65 Joint Powers Authority Fee Program										
Document Establishing Fee	Project	Fee Formula	Starting Balance	Fees Collected (Refunded)	Interest Earned	Interfund Transfer In/(Out)*	Expenditures	Ending Balance as of June 30, 2016	Sufficient Funds to Complete Project?	% of CIP Funded by Fee
Resolution No. 90-312		Joint Powers Agreement Oct, 15, 1990; Amended Aug. 18, 1992	(\$828,478)	1,268,031	18,288	(2,677)	(24,541)			
	Highway 65- Galleria/ Stanford						(246,622)		No	100%
								\$184,002		
*Transfers out: \$2,677 for indirect costs to the General Fund.										

Traffic Mitigation Fee Project Descriptions

Highway 65-Galleria/Stanford (Project# 152515) –The proposed project would modify the SR 65 NB ramps at the Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road interchange as well as reconfigure the lanes along Galleria Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road. The project would construct the following:

- Dual left turn lanes onto the NB SR 65 slip on-ramp.
- Protected median left turn pockets at the NB and SB ramp intersections, eliminating the inside trap lanes.
- Right turn pocket for the SB approach along Stanford Ranch Road to the NB slip on-ramp.
- Widened NB SR 65 to NB Stanford Ranch Road slip off-ramp from one to two lanes at the ramp terminus. Off-ramp will include a signalized intersection at Stanford Ranch Road.
- Widened NB slip on-ramp to two metered general purpose lanes plus an HOV preferential lane.
- Modified terminus of the NB loop off-ramp to reduce speeds and enhance safety for all modes utilizing the facility.

Attachment 1:
Fee Ordinances, Resolutions and
Agreements

Sewer Connection Fees:

Regional Sewer Connection Fees

Ordinance No. 4739

ORDINANCE NO. 4739

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AMENDING SECTIONS 4.37.140 OF CHAPTER 4.37; 4.38.090 OF CHAPTER 4.38; 4.44.140 OF CHAPTER 4.44, 4.45.140 OF CHAPTER 4.45; 4.48.140 OF CHAPTER 4.48; 4.49.170 OF CHAPTER 4.49; 4.52.140 OF CHAPTER 4.52; 4.53.140 OF CHAPTER 4.53; 4.54.140 OF CHAPTER 4.54 OF TITLE 4; SECTIONS 14.08.031 OF CHAPTER 14.08; 14.16.060, 14.16.070 AND 14.16.080 OF CHAPTER 14.16 OF TITLE 14 OF THE ROSEVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING INFLATIONARY ADJUSTMENTS

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. Section 4.37.140 of Chapter 4.37 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

4.37.140 Inflationary adjustments.

The fee established by this chapter shall be adjusted annually July 1st beginning on July 1, 2010 by a percentage equal to the adjustment rate for the prior year for construction costs as determined by the director in the preceding June. The director's determination shall be based upon averaging the Construction Cost Index (CCI) for twenty cities and for San Francisco, as published in the Engineering News Record publication for the preceding 12 months ending in May. The resultant fee shall be rounded to the nearest dollar (\$1.00) figure.

SECTION 2. Section 4.38.090 of Chapter 4.38 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

4.38.090 Inflationary adjustments.

The fee established by this chapter shall be adjusted annually July 1st beginning on July 1, 2010 by a percentage equal to the adjustment rate for the prior year for construction costs as determined by the director in the preceding June. The director's determination shall be based upon averaging the Construction Cost Index (CCI) for twenty cities and for San Francisco, as published in the Engineering News Record publication for the preceding 12 months ending in May. The resultant fee shall be rounded to the nearest dollar (\$1.00) figure.

SECTION 3. Section 4.44.140 of Chapter 4.44 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

4.44.140 Inflationary adjustments.

The fee established by this chapter shall be adjusted annually July 1st beginning on July 1, 2010 by a percentage equal to the adjustment rate for the prior year for construction costs as determined by the director in the preceding June. The director's determination shall be based upon averaging the Construction Cost Index (CCI) for twenty cities and for San Francisco, as

published in the Engineering News Record publication for the preceding 12 months ending in May. The resultant fee shall be rounded to the nearest dollar (\$1.00) figure.

SECTION 4. Section 4.45.140 of Chapter 4.45 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

4.45.140 Inflationary adjustments.

The fee established by this chapter shall be adjusted annually on July 1st by a percentage equal to the adjustment rate for the prior year for construction costs as determined by the director in the preceding June. The director's determination shall be based upon averaging the Construction Cost Index (CCI) for twenty cities and for San Francisco, as published in the Engineering News Record publication for the preceding 12 months ending in May. The resultant fee shall be rounded to the nearest dollar (\$1.00) figure.

SECTION 5: Section 4.48.140 of Chapter 4.48 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

4.48.140 Inflationary adjustments.

The fee established by this chapter shall be adjusted annually July 1st beginning on July 1, 2010 by a percentage equal to the adjustment rate for the prior year for construction costs as determined by the director in the preceding June. The director's determination shall be based upon averaging the Construction Cost Index (CCI) for twenty cities and for San Francisco, as published in the Engineering News Record publication for the preceding 12 months ending in May. The resultant fee shall be rounded to the nearest dollar (\$1.00) figure.

SECTION 6. Section 4.49.170 of Chapter 4.49 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

4.49.170 Inflationary adjustments.

The fee established by this chapter shall be adjusted annually on July 1st by a percentage equal to the adjustment rate for the prior year for construction costs as determined by the director in the preceding June. The director's determination shall be based upon averaging the Construction Cost Index (CCI) for twenty cities and for San Francisco, as published in the Engineering News Record publication for the preceding 12 months ending in May. The resultant fee shall be rounded to the nearest dollar (\$1.00) figure.

SECTION 7. Section 4.52.140 of Chapter 4.52 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

4.52.140 Inflationary adjustments.

The fee established by this chapter shall be adjusted annually July 1st beginning on July 1, 2010 by a percentage equal to the adjustment rate for the prior year for construction costs as determined by the director in the preceding June. The director's determination shall be based upon averaging the Construction Cost Index (CCI) for twenty cities and for San Francisco, as published in the Engineering News Record publication for the preceding 12 months ending in May. The resultant fee shall be rounded to the nearest dollar (\$1.00) figure.

SECTION 8. Section 4.53.140 of Chapter 4.53 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

4.53.140 Inflationary adjustments.

The fee established by this chapter shall be adjusted annually July 1st beginning on July 1, 2010 by a percentage equal to the adjustment rate for the prior year for construction costs as determined by the director in the preceding June. The director's determination shall be based upon averaging the Construction Cost Index (CCI) for twenty cities and for San Francisco, as published in the Engineering News Record publication for the preceding 12 months ending in May. The resultant fee shall be rounded to the nearest dollar (\$1.00) figure.

SECTION 9. Section 4.54.140 of Chapter 4.54 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

4.54.140 Inflationary adjustments.

The fee established by this chapter shall be adjusted annually July 1st beginning on July 1, 2010 by a percentage equal to the adjustment rate for the prior year for construction costs as determined by the director in the preceding June. The director's determination shall be based upon averaging the Construction Cost Index (CCI) for twenty cities and for San Francisco, as published in the Engineering News Record publication for the preceding 12 months ending in May. The resultant fee shall be rounded to the nearest dollar (\$1.00) figure.

SECTION 10. Section 14.08.031 of Chapter 14.08 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.08.031 Special area water connection fee.

A. A special area water connection fee (for example, but not limited to, water pressure zone, waterline reimbursement and water benefit fees) shall be charged for each water unit connected to the city-owned public water system for infrastructure for areas of special

benefit as identified and in amounts as set forth by the city council by resolution, from time to time.

B. The fee established by this chapter shall be adjusted annually July 1st beginning on July 1, 2010 by a percentage equal to the adjustment rate for the prior year for construction costs as determined by the director in the preceding June. The director's determination shall be based upon averaging the Construction Cost Index (CCI) for twenty cities and for San Francisco, as published in the Engineering News Record publication for the preceding 12 months ending in May. The resultant fee shall be rounded to the nearest dollar (\$1.00) figure.

SECTION 11. Sections 14.16.060, 14.16.070 and 14.16.080 of Chapter 14.16 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code are hereby amended to read as follows:

14.16.060 Local sewer connection fee.

A. A local sewer connection fee shall be charged in accordance with Section 14.16.010 for each connection to the city-owned public sewer.

B. The local sewer connection fee shall be \$200.00 per sewer unit.

C. The fee established by this chapter shall be adjusted annually July 1st beginning on July 1, 2010 by a percentage equal to the adjustment rate for the prior year for construction costs as determined by the director in the preceding June. The director's determination shall be based upon averaging the Construction Cost Index (CCI) for twenty cities and for San Francisco, as published in the Engineering News Record publication for the preceding 12 months ending in May. The resultant fee shall be rounded to the nearest dollar (\$1.00) figure.

14.16.070 Special area sewer connection fee.

A. A special area sewer connection fee (for example, but not limited to, special benefit fees) shall be charged in accordance with Section 14.16.010 for each sewer unit connected to the city-owned public sewer for sewer line replacement, enlargement, lift stations or other improvements for areas of special benefit as identified and in amounts as set forth by the city council by resolution, from time to time.

B. The fee established by this chapter shall be adjusted annually on July 1st by a percentage equal to the adjustment rate for the prior year for construction costs as determined by the director in the preceding June. The director's determination shall be based upon averaging the Construction Cost Index (CCI) for twenty cities and for San Francisco, as published in the Engineering News Record publication for the preceding 12 months ending in May. The resultant fee shall be rounded to the nearest dollar (\$1.00) figure.

14.16.080 Regional sewer connection fee.

A. Regional sewer connection fee shall be charged in accordance with Section 14.16.010 for each sewer unit connected to the city-owned public sewer.

B. The regional sewer connection fee shall be \$5,500.00.

C. The fee established by this chapter shall be adjusted annually on July 1st by a percentage equal to the adjustment rate for the prior year for construction costs as determined by the director in the preceding June. The director's determination shall be based upon averaging the Construction Cost Index (CCI) for twenty cities and for San Francisco, as published in the Engineering News Record publication for the preceding 12 months ending in May. The resultant fee shall be rounded to the nearest dollar (\$1.00) figure.

SECTION 12. This ordinance shall be effective at the expiration of thirty (30) days from the date of adoption.

SECTION 13. The City Clerk is hereby directed to cause this ordinance to be published in full at least once within fourteen (14) days after it is adopted in a newspaper of general circulation in the City, or shall within fourteen (14) days after its adoption cause this ordinance to be posted in full in at least three (3) public places in the City and enter in the Ordinance Book a certificate stating the time and place of said publication by posting.


PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this 20th day of May, 2009, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS: Allard, Gray, Garbolino

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS: Roccucci

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS: Garcia


MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk

Traffic Mitigation Fees

Highway 65 Joint Powers Authority Fee Program

Joint Powers Agreement

October 15, 1990

As Amended August 18, 1992

9169

JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT FOR THE FINANCING AND
CONSTRUCTION OF INTERCHANGES ON STATE HIGHWAY 65
CITY OF ROCKLIN CITY OF ROSEVILLE
COUNTY OF PLACER

This Agreement is entered into as of October 15, 1990 by and between the County of Placer, a political subdivision of the State ("County"), and the City of Rocklin and the City of Roseville, municipal corporations organized and existing under the laws of the State of California ("Cities").

RECITALS

1. The County and Cities have the common powers to acquire real property and, with the consent and cooperation of the California State Department of Transportation, to finance and construct freeway interchanges.

2. The County and Cities have determined that the public interest will be served by the joint exercise of these powers through this Agreement and the creation of a joint powers authority to plan for, finance, and construct four interchanges on State Highway 65 to serve their respective jurisdictions and spheres of influence.

AGREEMENT

3. Authority and Purpose.

This Agreement is made pursuant to Chapter 5 of Division 7 of the Title 1 of the California Government Code (commencing with section 6500) (the "Law") relative to the joint exercise of powers common to the County and Cities. The purpose of this Agreement is to provide for the planning, financing, and construction of four interchanges to State Highway 65 located in the jurisdictions of the County and Cities through the creation of a joint powers authority. The four interchanges and their approximate location are shown on Exhibit A attached to this Agreement and incorporated herein.

4. Creation of Authority and Jurisdiction.

There is hereby created the "Bizz Johnson" Highway Interchange Joint Powers Authority ("Authority") a public entity separate from the County and Cities, whose

FILED

NOV 5 1991

1770 1000 10:17 1991
CITY OF ROSEVILLE
BY ma

jurisdiction is as shown and described in Exhibit B, attached hereto and by this reference incorporated herein.

5. Term and Termination.

This Agreement shall be effective as of that date first stated above. It shall remain in effect until the purpose stated in paragraph 3 is fully accomplished and all bonds or other instruments of indebtedness issued by the Authority, if any, have been paid, or until terminated by the unanimous agreement of the respective governing bodies of the County and Cities in accordance with the law.

6. Powers

The Authority shall have all powers necessary or reasonably convenient to carry out the purpose stated in paragraph 3, including but not limited to the following:

A. Administration:

- 1) to secure administrative office space and furnishings;
- 2) to contract for or employ administrative, technical, and support staff;
- 3) to acquire, operate, maintain, and dispose of materials, supplies, equipment and insurance of all types to effect or facilitate achievement of the Authority's purpose;
- 4) all powers incidental to the foregoing.

B. Interchange Construction:

- 1) To develop a plan or formula for determining the timing and sequence of construction of the four interchanges;
- 2) to contract for or employ staff to conduct studies and surveys; to prepare reports; to prepare plans, specifications, and other bid documents; to administer construction contracts; and to coordinate the construction projects with all affected governmental agencies;
- 3) to lease, acquire or dispose of real property by negotiation, dedication, or eminent domain;

4) to lease, acquire, operate, maintain and dispose of materials, supplies, and equipment of all types to effect the construction of the four interchanges;

5) to construct or cause to be constructed the four interchanges and all related or appurtenant structures;

6) all powers incidental to the foregoing.

C. Financing:

1) to accept, hold, invest (pursuant to section 6509.5 of the Law), manage, and expend monies for administrative purposes and for construction of the interchanges;

2) to levy fees and taxes, enter into lease-purchase agreements, and to issue bonds and incur other forms of indebtedness as provided in sections 6547.1, 6547.5, and 6547.6 of the Law to fund the construction of the interchanges and all related costs, including all administrative costs;

3) to form a special assessment district under the Improvement Act of 1911, the Municipal Improvement Act of 1913, the Improvement Bond Act of 1915, or any other authority that exists now or in the future;

4) to form a special tax district under the Mello-Ross Community Facilities District Act or any other authority that may exists now or in the future;

5) to negotiate and enter into reimbursement agreements when monies to construct one or more interchanges are advanced;

6) to develop and adopt an interchange construction financing plan that may include a mechanism for borrowing funds collected for one interchange to fund another;

7) all powers incidental to the foregoing.

7. Duties.

The Authority shall have the duty to do the following within the times specified or, if no time is specified, within a reasonable time:

A. to retain legal counsel for all Authority business, including litigation;

B. to secure liability and errors and omission insurance;

C. to develop and adopt, within 12 months of the date of this Agreement, a plan or formula for determining the timing and sequence of construction of the four interchanges, and an interchange construction financing plan. The plan or formula for determining the timing and sequence of construction shall provide that the Harding Boulevard interchange shall be the first to be constructed. The construction financing plan shall acknowledge the payment of any fees transferred to the Authority under paragraph 8.D.6) and any reimbursement obligations relating thereto, and shall incorporate the relevant terms and conditions of any agreement entered into by the County or either member City with a landowner under which funds were advanced for the construction of one or more of the four interchanges, or a waiver of protest rights was made.

8. Administration.

A. Governing Board -- Membership. The Authority shall be administered by a board of directors ("Board") consisting of three directors and three alternates. One director and one alternate shall be current members of the County's Board of Supervisors; one director and one alternate shall be current members of the Rocklin City Council; and one director and one alternate shall be current members of the Roseville City Council. Each director and each alternate shall be appointed by the Board of Supervisors or the City Council of which he or she is a member and shall serve at the pleasure of the appointing body. Alternates shall serve as directors in the absence of the director representing the same jurisdiction as the alternate.

B. Meetings.

1) Regular Meetings. The Board shall by resolution establish the number of regular

meetings to be held each year and the date, hour, and location at which such regular meetings shall be held; provided, however, that the resolution shall provide for at least one (1) regular meeting quarterly.

2) Special Meetings. Special meetings of the Board may be called in accordance with the provisions of section 54956 of the California Government Code.

3) Conduct of Meetings. All meetings of the Board shall be held in accordance with Chapter 9 of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 5 of the California Government Code (commencing with 54950) (California Open Meeting Law).

4) Minutes. The Secretary of the Authority shall cause minutes of all meetings of the Board to be kept and shall, as soon as possible after each meeting, cause a copy of the minutes to be forwarded to each member of the Board and to the County and Cities.

5) Quorum. Two (2) directors of the Board shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that less than a quorum may adjourn from time to time. Except as provided in paragraph 9, actions of the Board shall require the affirmative vote of a majority of the entire Board.

C. Procedures.

1) The Board shall elect a Chair from among its membership to preside at meetings and shall select a Secretary who may, but need not, be a member of the Board.

2) The Board may adopt by resolution rules of procedure not inconsistent with the provisions of this Agreement to govern the conduct of its meetings.

3) Members of the Board of Directors shall comply with Title 9 of the California Government Code (commencing with 81000) (Political Reform Act of 1974).

D. Fiscal Matters.

1) Treasurer and Auditor.

a) Except as provided in b) below, the treasurer and auditor of County are designated the treasurer and auditor of the Authority with the powers, duties, and responsibilities specified in section 6505 and 6505.5 of the Law.

b) In lieu of the designations in a), above, the Board may appoint one or more of its employees to either or both of the positions of treasurer or auditor as provided in section 6505.6 of the Law. Such appointment shall supersede the designation made in a), above. The persons or persons appointed by the Board under this paragraph shall have the powers, duties and responsibilities specified in sections 6505 and 6505.5 of the Law.

2) Custodian of Property. The treasurer and auditor of the Authority shall be the public officers who have charge of, handle, and have access to the Authority's property and shall file with the Authority an official bond in the amount fixed by the County and Cities.

3) Accounts and Reports. The Board shall establish and maintain such funds and accounts as may be required by good accounting practice. The books and records of the Authority shall be open to inspection at all reasonable times to the County and Cities and their respective representatives. The Authority, within 120 days after the close of each fiscal year, shall give a complete written report of all financial activities for such fiscal year to the County and Cities. The accounts shall be prepared and maintained by the treasurer and auditor of the Authority. The written reports shall be prepared by an independent certified public accountant employed by the Authority.

4) Budgets. The Board shall adopt a budget no later than 90 days after the effective date of this Agreement and no later than June 30 of each year thereafter.

5) Contributions. Within 90 days of the effective date of this Agreement the County and Cities shall contribute to the Authority start-up funds in the amounts determined by the Board. The Board may request additional amounts to be contributed in the future from the County and the Cities which amounts shall be allocated proportionately among the County and Cities based on the traffic trip ends contained in the report entitled "Final Report Interagency Plan for the Financing of Highway 65 Interchange Improvements" dated July 1, 1988 and prepared by Ralph Andersen & Associates or based on another allocation method adopted by the Board. The Board may provide for the reimbursement of all funds contributed by the County and Cities under this Agreement from funds collected for the interchange construction projects.

6) Assignment and Transfer of Funds. Within 90 days of the effective date of this Agreement, the County and each member City shall assign or otherwise transfer to the Authority its rights and obligations relating to the financing and construction of one or more of the four interchanges in connection with the payment of any fee or under any agreement with a landowner under which funds were advanced for the construction of one or more of the four interchanges or a waiver of protest rights was made. The County and each member City shall, concurrent with the assignment or other method of transfer, transfer to the Authority any funds received from a landowner.

9. Voting.

Notwithstanding paragraph 8.B.5), the following actions require three votes of the Board, with each director or alternate voting in accordance with the direction given by his or her appointing body:

- A. To acquire real property by eminent domain;
- B. To levy a tax;
- C. To order formation of an assessment or special tax district;
- D. To authorize the sale of bonds;
- E. To award contracts in excess of \$1,000,000.00;

F. To approve the annual budget.

G. To make a financial commitment with a term of more than one year;

H. To establish limits of liability and errors and omissions insurance;

I. To adopt or amend the plan or formula for determining the timing and sequence of construction of the four interchanges, or to approve construction that is at variance with the approved plan or formula;

J. To determine the amount of the initial contributions of start-up funds, and to adopt or to amend the method of allocating contribution obligations under paragraph 8.D.5).

10. Exercise of Powers.

The powers and duties described in this Agreement shall be exercised and carried out subject only to such restrictions upon the manner of exercising such powers or carrying out such duties as are imposed upon the City of Roseville in the exercise of similar powers or in carrying out similar duties as provided in section 6509 of the law.

11. Debts and Liabilities.

The debts, liabilities and obligations of the Authority shall not constitute a debt, liability or responsibility of the County or the Cities, either jointly or individually.

12. Liberal Construction.

The provisions of the Agreement, and in particular the provisions of paragraphs 6, 7 and 8, shall be liberally construed as necessary or reasonably convenient to achieve the purposes of the Authority.

13. Disposition of Property.

Prior to termination under paragraph 5 the Authority shall dispose of all of its property in a manner determined by the Authority to be most beneficial to the parties hereto. The proceeds of such disposal and any other surplus money shall be distributed to the parties in the same proportion as their original contribution.

14. Severability.

Should any part, term, or provisions of this Agreement be decided by the courts to be illegal or in conflict with any law of the State of California, or otherwise be rendered unenforceable or ineffectual, the validity of the remaining portions or provisions shall not be affected thereby.

15. Successor and Assignment.

This agreement shall be binding upon and shall inure to the benefit of the successors of the parties. No party may assign any right or obligation hereunder without the consent of the others.

16. Amendments.

This Agreement may be amended only by the unanimous agreement of the County and Cities.

The parties have executed and attested this Agreement as of the date first above written.

COUNTY OF PLACER

By *Alfred Ferreira*
Chair, Board of Supervisors

ATTEST:

Georgia Hake
Clerk Placer County

10.3.89

CITY OF ROCKLIN
A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION

By *Carlos Dominguez*
Mayor

ATTEST:

Andrea Bidwell
City Clerk, City of Rocklin

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION

By *Alex Vannon*
City Manager


ATTEST:

Helene Florance
City Clerk, City of Roseville

JPAAGRMT092009

Michael Dees
CITY ATTORNEY
City of Roseville, Calif.

Date 12/4/90



STATE HIGHWAY 65 BYPASS
INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

EXHIBIT A

0702 0000 0017 0025




EXHIBIT B

Boundaries of Highway
65 interchanges JPA

RESOLUTION NO. 90-302

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF ROCKLIN APPROVING AND AUTHORIZING
THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE A JOINT
POWERS AUTHORITY AGREEMENT
FOR THE HIGHWAY 65 INTERCHANGES

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of
Rocklin as follows:

Section 1. The City Council of the City of Rocklin
hereby approves and authorizes the Mayor to execute a Joint
Powers Authority Agreement for the Highway 65 Interchanges,
in the form attached hereto as Exhibit A and by this
reference incorporated herein.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 25th day of September, 1990, by
the following roll call vote:

AYES: Councilmembers: Hill, Lund, Huson, Mitchell,
Dominguez
NOES: Councilmembers: None
ABSENT: Councilmembers: None
ABSTAIN: Councilmembers: None

Leanne Dominguez
Mayor

ATTEST:

B. L. L. L.
City Clerk

CERTIFICATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 90-302

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and
correct copy of Resolution No. 90-302 passed
and adopted by the City Council of Rocklin at a regular
meeting thereof, held 25 Sept. 1990

B. L. L. L.
City Clerk of the City of Rocklin

RESOLUTION NO. 90-312

RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE
APPROVING A JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY OF
ROCKLIN AND COUNTY OF PLACER FORMING THE BIZZ JOHNSON
HIGHWAY INTERCHANGE JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY, AND
AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF
OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

WHEREAS, a joint powers agreement between the Cities of Roseville and Rocklin and the County of Placer ("the JPA") for the purpose of forming the Bizz Johnson Highway Interchange Joint Powers Authority ("the Authority") has been prepared and reviewed by the City Council, and

WHEREAS, the City Council has previously approved and authorized the City Manager to execute said JPA in October, 1989 and said JPA has now been executed by the other public agencies who will be members of the Authority, and

WHEREAS, the City Council now desires to re-approve the said JPA, thereby signifying its continued support and approval of the Authority,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that the said JPA forming the Bizz Johnson Highway Interchange Joint Powers Authority is hereby approved and that the City Manager is authorized to execute it on behalf of the City of Roseville.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this 12th day of December, 1990, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS: Bill Santucci, Harry Crabb, Jr., John Byouk
Mel Hamel, Pauline Roccucci

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS: None

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS: None

Pauline Roccucci
MAYOR

ATTEST:

Helene Florence
City Clerk

The foregoing instrument is a correct copy of the original on file in this office.

ATTEST
City Clerk of the City of Roseville, California
Elly Ortiz
DEPUTY CLERK

Before the Board of Supervisors County of Placer, State of California

In the matter of: A RESOLUTION APPROVING
AND AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A
JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY (JPA)
AGREEMENT FOR FUNDING AND
CONSTRUCTION OF INTERCHANGES
ALONG STATE HIGHWAY 65

Resol. No: 89-358

Ord. No:

First Reading:

The following RESOLUTION was duly passed by the Board of Supervisors
of the County of Placer at a regular meeting held October 3, 1989,
by the following vote on roll call:

Ayes: MAHAN, BELAND, HOGG, FLUTY, FERREIRA

Noes: NONE

Absent: NONE

Signed and approved by me after its passage.

Attest:
Clerk of said Board

Georgia Hake

Alfredo Ferreira
Chairman, Board of Supervisors

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors, County of Placer, State of California, that this Board approves and directs the Chairman to sign the attached Joint Powers Authority (JPA) Agreement for Funding and Construction of Interchanges Along State Highway 65.

FIRST AMENDMENT TO JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT
FOR THE FINANCING AND CONSTRUCTION OF
INTERCHANGES ON STATE HIGHWAY 65
CITY OF ROCKLIN CITY OF ROSEVILLE
COUNTY OF PLACER

This First Amendment to the Joint Powers Agreement for the Financing and Construction of Interchanges on State Highway 65 ("Joint Powers Agreement"), dated October 15, 1990, by and between the County of Placer, a political subdivision of the State ("County"), and the City of Rocklin and the City of Roseville, municipal corporations organized and existing under the laws in the State of California ("Cities"), is entered into as of August 18, 1992.

RECITALS

WHEREAS, County and Cities desire to amend the Joint Powers Agreement; and

WHEREAS, County and Cities have determined that the jurisdiction of the Joint Powers Authority should be larger than initially agreed by the County and Cities, the County and Cities desire to revise and amend the area of jurisdiction, to include all of the city limits of Roseville, and Rocklin and parts of Placer County shown and described on Exhibit B, to the original Joint Powers Agreement for the financing and construction of interchanges on State Highway 65.

WITNESSETH: NOW, THEREFORE, County and Cities do mutually agree as follows;

Section 1: Exhibit B to the Joint Powers Agreement for the Financing and Construction of Interchanges on State Highway 65, dated October 15, 1990, is hereby deleted in its entirety and substituted with a new Exhibit B, which is attached hereto and, by this reference, incorporated herein.

Section 2: All remaining provisions of the Joint Powers Agreement shall remain the same and in full force and effect.

IN WITNESSETH WHEREOF, the parties have entered into this agreement as of the date and year above provided.

COUNTY OF PLACER

By



8-18-92

Chair, Board of Supervisors

ATTEST:

Georgia Pike
Clerk, Placer County

CITY OF ROCKLIN
A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION

By [Signature]
Mayor

ATTEST:

[Signature]
City Clerk, City of Rocklin

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION

By [Signature]
City Manager

ATTEST:

Helene Florence
City Clerk, City of Roseville




EXHIBIT A

Boundaries of Highway
65 interchanges JPA.

2000 01 01 10 00

BOUNDARIES OF HIGHWAY 65 INTERCHANGE JPA





EXHIBIT B

**NOTE: The boundaries of the JPA shall include
all of the city limits of Roseville and Rocklin.**

PROPOSED JPA FEES

Summary of Costs Per DUE		
Jurisdiction	Fee District	Cost Per DUE
Roseville	Infill	\$101
	Northeast	112
	Southeast	69
	Northwest	220
	North Central	534
	North Industrial	<u>722</u>
	<i>Average</i>	<i>\$307</i>
Rocklin	Stanford Ranch/Clover Valley	\$514
	Sunset West	891
	South of Sunset	246
	North of Sunset	269
	East of SPRR	<u>127</u>
	<i>Average</i>	<i>\$441</i>
Placer County	Sunset Industrial	\$532
	Sunset Ranchos	762
	Atherton Tech	<u>696</u>
	<i>Average</i>	<i>\$618</i>
Overall Average		\$368

COMPARISON OF EXISTING TMF V.S. PROPOSED JPA FEES



EXISTING PROPOSED

RESOLUTION NO. 92-161

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY
OF ROCKLIN APPROVING AND AUTHORIZING THE
MAYOR TO EXECUTE A FIRST AMENDMENT
TO JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT FOR THE FINANCING
AND CONSTRUCTION OF INTERCHANGES ON HIGHWAY 65

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of
Rocklin as follows:

Section 1. The City Council of the City of Rocklin
hereby approves and authorizes the Mayor to execute a First
Amendment to Joint Powers Agreement for financing and
construction of interchanges on Highway 65, in the form
attached hereto as Exhibit A and by this reference
incorporated herein.


PASSED AND ADOPTED this 14th day of July, 1992, by the
following roll call vote:

AYES: Councilmembers: Lund, Huson, Magnuson, Hill

NOES: Councilmembers: None


ABSENT: Councilmembers: Dominguez

ABSTAIN: Councilmembers: None



Mayor

ATTEST:



City Clerk

The foregoing instrument is a
correct copy of the original document
on file in this office.

Attest: 

City Clerk, City of Rocklin

RESOLUTION NO. 92-205

RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE APPROVING
AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AND COUNTY OF
PLACER AND THE CITY OF ROCKLIN
AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE IT ON BEHALF OF
THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

WHEREAS, an agreement -- First Amendment to Joint Powers
Agreement for the Financing and Construction of Interchanges on
State Highway 65
has been prepared and has been reviewed by the Council;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City
of Roseville that said agreement is approved and that the
City Manager is authorized to execute it on behalf of the
City of Roseville.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville
this 8th day of July , 1992, by the following vote
on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS: Pauline Roccucci, Fred M. Jackson, Harry Crabb, Jr.,
Bill Santucci
NOES COUNCILMEMBERS: None
ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS: Mel Hamel

Bill Santucci
MAYOR

ATTEST:

Helen Florance
City Clerk

The foregoing instrument is a correct copy of the
original on file in this office.

ATTEST:
City Clerk: Elly Ortiz
DEPUTY CLERK



COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8205

File #: 0103-15-02

Title: Roseville Community Development Corporation - Annual Corporate Update for FY2015-16, FY2016-17 Budget, and Appointment of Directors

Contact: Chris Robles 916-774-5421 crobles@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 10.2.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

The following is an update to City Council regarding the Roseville Community Development Corporation's (RCDC) FY2015-16 audited financial statement report; the RCDC Board-adopted budget for FY2016-17, and report to the City Council related to the RCDC's programs. This current annual report is provided for informational purposes and no Council action is required of the update.

In addition to receiving the RCDC annual report it is recommended that the City Council make the following Director appointments:

1. Reappointment Ed Benoit to the Board of Directors for the Roseville Community Development Corporation for a term to expire February 2019.
2. Reappointment John Norman to the Board of Directors for the Roseville Community Development Corporation for a term to expire February 2019.
3. Reappointment of Nick Alexander to the Board of Directors for the Roseville Community Development Corporation for a term to expire February 2020.
4. Appointment of Louise Walker to the Board of Directors for the Roseville Community Development Corporation for a term to expire February 2020.

BACKGROUND

During the RCDC's six years of operations, November 2010 through June 2016, the Corporation has met the investment goals associated with the City of Roseville's \$5 million startup capital loan and expanded activities to include economic development through Advantage Roseville, downtown revitalization through property acquisition and re-tenanting and affordable housing through a housing rehab program. The following report provides a summary of the FY2016-17 budget and an overview of the FY2015-16 audited financial statement report.

Consistent with the requirements of Article 13, Section 3 of the RCDC bylaws, the RCDC is required to submit to its Board and the City Council as its Sole Member, the Corporation's audited financial statement report and consistent with Article 9, Section 1 the RCDC is required to submit

its Board-approved budget to City Council. Both the financial report and the budget were approved by the RCDC's Board of Directors.

In addition to the required annual reporting this report also includes an update following the March 29, 2016 joint workshop with the RCDC and City Council which was held to review the RCDC Bylaws, Purpose and Mission, review of the financial obligations, projects and corporation assets. Opportunities for future corporation activities that included property management and property exchanges, were also discussed. Corporation activities that may be desirable but do not generate revenue such as loss leader projects and Advantage Roseville were considered. Lastly direction was sought from the City Council on the number of RCDC Board seats desired and professional expertise desired on the board.

This report will address the following:

1. Summary of the FY2016-17 budget
2. Overview of the FY2015-16 audited financial statement
3. Overview of RCDC properties and projects
4. Review of the Council RCDC workshop actions
5. Appointment of Directors

FISCAL YEAR 2016-17 BUDGET

The budget for FY2016-17 was approved in line-item detail by the RCDC's Board of Directors at the June 9, 2016 meeting and is included as Attachment B.

The budget that was approved by the Board is divided into three components:

1. RCDC Operations and Capital & Financing
2. RCDC Programs:
 - a. Advantage Roseville
 - b. 98 Jefferson
3. Limited Liability Corporations:
 - a. 238 Vernon Street LLC
 - b. 240 Vernon Street LLC
 - c. 242-246 Vernon Street LLC

REVENUES

Total revenues budgeted for FY2016 are \$536,690 (down 6% from FY2016) and are predominately comprised of rental income, investment interest and corporate and City of Roseville sponsorship donations to Advantage Roseville.

EXPENSES

Total expenses budgeted for FY2016 are \$2,291,119 (up 23% from FY2016) and are comprised of costs related to Operations, Capital financing, Advantage Roseville, 98 Jefferson and the three LLC (properties).

Operations and Capital Financing - \$1,512,435 (FY2016 = \$970,484)	
Property acquisitions and tenant improvements to further the revitalization efforts mainly in the downtown corridor	\$1,265,000
Deferred interest on the \$5 million City loan	36,593
Reimbursements to the City for salaries only for a half-time Management Assistant and a half-time CEO which are both City of	128,672

Roseville employees;	
Costs related to the corporation's professional legal fees, general office expenses, insurance, auditing services, and indirect costs from the City of Roseville.	82,170
TOTAL	\$1,512,435

238 Vernon Street LLC - \$223,523 (FY2016 = \$305,124)	
Debt Service and Deferred Interest	\$79,765
Depreciation	104,738
Costs related to the LLC's property taxes, depreciation, principal payments, interest, deferred interest, professional legal fees, office expenses, insurance, maintenance, and auditing services.	39,020
TOTAL	\$223,523

240 Vernon Street LLC - \$26,785 (FY2016 = \$56,805)	
Costs related to the LLC's property taxes, depreciation, principal payments, interest, deferred interest, professional legal fees, office expenses, insurance, maintenance, and auditing services.	\$26,786
TOTAL	\$26,786

242-246 Vernon Street LLC - \$327,775 (FY2016 = \$252,647)	
Tenant improvements	\$270,000
Deferred interest on the \$5 million City loan	19,780
Costs related to the LLC's property taxes, depreciation, principal payments, interest, deferred interest, professional legal fees, office expenses, insurance, maintenance, and auditing services.	37,995
TOTAL	\$327,775

Advantage Roseville - \$200,000 (FY2016 = \$276,000)	
Program costs for consulting services to aide in furthering the goals of the program, sponsorships, printing, and legal fees. There are no fees charged to Advantage Roseville by the RCDC for program administration.	200,000
TOTAL	\$200,000

98 Jefferson - \$600 (FY2016 = \$600)	
RCDC-owned property located in downtown Roseville which is being held for future development or resale. The budgeted expenses are for annual property taxes.	\$600
TOTAL	\$600

CASH FLOW

In order to fund this fiscal year's consolidated net deficit of \$1,537,821 (net of revenues, deferred interest and depreciation), the RCDC is relying on cash from unspent City loan proceeds, unspent Advantage Roseville revenues, surplus LLC cash, potential property sale and the remainder of the \$928,077 grant from the City of Roseville approved by Ordinance #5474 on March 18, 2015. The total funds available, including a potential property sale is approximately \$2,705,809. By June 30, 2017, the cash balance should be approximately \$1,373,787 to fund capital and operating

expenditures for FY2017-18. Although these sources are not considered revenue by accounting standards, applying these funds to the budgeted expenses provides a clear picture of how the RCDC is expected to meet its obligations and spending plan goals.

FISCAL ANALYSIS

The RCDC was initially funded with a \$5 million deferred loan from the former Redevelopment Agency via the City's Strategic Improvement fund with the objective that these funds would be used for projects consistent with the RCDC's work programs, business plan and annual fiscal budgets. The first payment on that loan, including interest, will be due in June of 2021. Of that initial startup funding of \$5 million, \$4,808,349 has been spent through June 30, 2016 with \$3,533,859 for property acquisitions and tenant improvements and the balance of \$1,274,490 for land held for resale, general startup and operational expenses. The remainder of the loan (\$191,651) is budgeted to be utilized in the FY2016-17 budget for capital and operating expenses.

\$5,000,000 Startup Funding from the City of Roseville	
Unspent loan proceeds at June 30, 2016	\$191,651
240 VS - Property Acquisition	602,435
242 VS - Property	535,593
Land Held for Resale	35,011
Tenant Improvements - All LLCs	853,191
238 VS – (Loan-converted to Property)	1,542,640
Operations (RCDC & LLCs)	\$1,239,479
Total Loan	\$5,000,000

FY 2015-16 AUDIT

During the weeks of August 15, 2016 through August 26, 2016, VTD audit staff performed their fieldwork and testing as it related to the RCDC's financial transactions and operations. The audit was conducted in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. The consolidated financial statements were issued a clean opinion by the auditors in their Independent Auditor's Report included in the financial statement report.

The Management Representation Letter, a letter drafted by management attesting that all of the information submitted to the auditor is accurate, and that all material information has been disclosed to the auditors, was sent to the auditor and final reports were published on October 3, 2016. The RCDC Board of Directors took action to approve the financial statement report at their November 10, 2016 Board Meeting. The final report is included as Attachment A.

WORKSHOP

The discussion at the March 29, 2016 workshop was broad based and healthy which resulted in five distinct outcomes and actions. The five actions are listed below and followed by a response:

- 1) Reaffirm the RCDC's role in economic development with emphasis on property rehabilitation, tenancing and property management. Economic Development will be furthered by the corporation's administration of Advantage Roseville.
The RCDC is continuing its real estate rehabilitation and tenancing program with recent actions to sell 240 Vernon Street to the Monk's Cellar operators. Acquisition of the Odd

Fellows building in the historic district is the corporations latest acquisition slated for renovation in 2017. Advantage Roseville ended the 2016 fiscal year with its best outcomes ever with a return on investment of \$500 for every dollar spent.

2) Develop a tenancing and property management plan for the 7,000 square feet of retail space in the 316 building. The retail property plan will be presented for consideration to the City Council (representing the landowner).

Following the Council workshop the benefits to both the City and RCDC were evaluated. It was determined it would be in both the City and RCDC's best interest to have a brokerage house manage these properties along with other City properties. By separate action a property management proposal that includes the 316 building is being forwarded to the Council for consideration.

3) Develop a loan program for small businesses in the Downtown. The loan program will focus on lending which develops fixed assets or improves physical infrastructure of buildings or the downtown. The loan program will require sourcing of funds given the risk associated with loans of this type.

Given the corporations fiduciary responsibility to repay the City's \$5 million start up loan the corporation is concerned with the risk associated with such a loan program. Unless grant money can be sourced to fund a loan program the corporation will consider loan requests on an individual basis. Currently the corporation has a loan offer out that is associated with a real estate transaction and is considering a loan associated with a property development.

4) The Council and Board each acknowledged the value of the workshop and indicated a desire to have a workshop at least every two years if not annually.

An annual workshop is being planned for March of 2017.

5) The Council confirmed the intent to continue with a five member RCDC Board. Council directed that upon expiration of a term that a recruitment be advertised. The Council further directed that the makeup consider the opportunity for expertise in retail property, banking, and an entrepreneur. The creation of Ad Hoc committees were also encouraged particularly as it creates opportunity (farm league) for the recruitment of new Board members.

Recruitment of Directors and appointments are included in this report. Consistent with Council direction a new Director is recommended to be seated that brings banking experience to the board. Staff and the Board will continue to look for opportunities to recruit future Directors.

PROPERTIES AND PROJECTS

The Corporation's goals for this past fiscal year were to continue to enhance the business environment in the downtown through strategic real estate investment; identify additional revenue resources to support the activities of the Corporation; and to partner with the City to achieve the City's economic development goals. The corporation had two unplanned vacancies in 2015 with vacancies occurring at 238 and 244 Vernon Street. The vacancies required an adjustment in the business plan with a redirected focus on re-tenancing these properties. Both of these properties have been tenanted with the highly successful Ninja Sushi and the Glue Factory. Specific programs and projects to be implemented during the fiscal year are stated below followed by the status in parentheses:

1. Administering Advantage Roseville program with efforts to grow its success.
2. Support the current tenant of 238 Vernon Street; Ninja Sushi opened in March of 2016 and has been a highly successful addition to the downtown and was awarded the KCRAA list Best Sushi restaurant in the region.
3. Currently the RCDC is in escrow to sell 240 Vernon Street to the Operators of Monk's Cellar. The sale of this property will represent a complete renovation and goal attainment for the corporation in its efforts to revitalize the Downtown.
4. The property at 242 to 246 Vernon Street include Nela's Restaurant, Glue Factory and Eagle Loan and Pawn. The corporation continues to explore opportunities to complete the renovation of these properties as individual suites or in consolidated manner.
5. Acquire additional properties when presented with an opportunity to meet the goals of the Corporation. On October 5, 2016 the corporation seized the opportunity to acquire the Odd Fellows building at the Placer County Tax Default Land Sale. The discussion below provides background on this building and the corporation's plans for this building.

The RCDC intends to redevelop the Independent Order of Odd Fellows Building (IOOF), located at 110 Pacific Street within the City of Roseville. The Odd Fellows building is Roseville's oldest structure built in 1878. The IOOF Building is Roseville's most historic and significant redevelopment site in Old Town Roseville. Roseville's first brick building constructed to replace the numerous wood buildings built and destroyed mainly by fire during Roseville's growth in the early 1900's. The building is viewed as an important historic building by the community and there is significant interest to see it restored and occupied once again. The RCDC will take efforts to restore and preserve the Historic Architecture and features of the building. Upon renovation it will become a primary highlight of Old Town Roseville's revitalization.

The RCDC may partner with a locally known, successful business operator on this project to bring another restaurant and entertainment venue to the area furthering the community's vision for an entertainment district in Old Town. The project may include a ground floor restaurant, brewery, or distillery or combination that includes dining and entertainment on the first and second floor, and third floor loft along with and outdoor patio for dining and entertainment. There may be an opportunity to expand square footage through the construction of a kitchen, bathrooms and elevator to the rear of the building. The use is intended to operate on a 6 to 7 day a week basis.

DIRECTOR RECRUITMENT

On November 10, 2016, the Roseville Community Development Corporation (RCDC) initiated a recruitment for two Board Members for a term that will expire February 2019 and two Board Members for a term of 3 years that will expire January 2020. Applications were accepted until November 23, 2016. Applications for reappointment to the RCDC Board of Directors were received from Directors Ed Benoit, John Norman and Nick Alexander. An application for reappointment was not received from Director Jim Gray whose term will expire February 2017. Conversations with Director Gray confirmed he was not seeking reappointment. One new application for Board of Directors was received from Louise Walker.

Directors Ed Benoit and John Norman were appointed to the founding RCDC Board of Directors on February 16, 2011 for a two year term. Both Director Benoit and Director Norman were reappointed in 2013 for a three year term to expire February of 2016. Given Directors Benoit and Norman's role on the RCDC Ad Hoc real estate committee, the recruitment for director seats was delayed until resolution of current active real estate transactions. The RCDC bylaws allow a director to remain as an active Board Member until such time as a replacement is seated. Given

the delay in recruitment, staff recommends Director Benoit and Norman be recommended to the City Council for reappointment for the two seats with the earlier expiration date of February 2019.

Director Alexander was also appointed to the founding RCDC Board of Directors on February 16, 2011 for a three year term. Director Alexander was reappointed in 2014 for a three year term to expire February of 2017. Staff recommends Director Alexander be recommended to the City Council for reappointment to a term to expire February 2020.

The vacant seat is sought to be filled by Louise Walker as a first term Director to the RCDC. The Board has discussed the value of having a Board Member with banking background and has voiced the desire to seat a future Board vacancy with a banker or individual with a strong financial background. Louise Walker is the President and Chief Executive Officer for First Northern Community Bancorp and has been in senior management with First Northern Bank since 1979. A copy of Ms. Walker's resume (Attachment 1) further identifies her banking and financial experience. Ms. Walker has been actively involved in the Roseville community and is First Northern Bank's representative for Advantage Roseville for which they are a member. Based on Ms. Walker's significant banking experience and involvement in the Roseville community, the RCDC recommends Ms. Walker to the City Council for appointment to a term to expire in February of 2020.

The experience of Directors Benoit, Norman and Alexander in real estate development and business sectors has played an invaluable role in the start-up of the Corporation and business transactions. Additionally, their long-term involvement and interest in the Roseville community has assisted the Corporation in achieving significant milestones set by the City for the revitalization of downtown. Given Ms. Walker's banking experience and involvement in the Roseville community she is an excellent match for the experience desired to fill the vacant seat and is therefore recommended for appointment to the vacant seat.

FISCAL IMPACT

The Roseville Community Development is a private, charitable, nonprofit Section 501(c) (3) corporation. The RCDC is focused on physical, economic and educational development throughout the community to create expanded employment, economic prosperity and housing opportunities. Its initial focus is to help the City achieve the revitalization goals through the reuse of existing buildings or new construction in Roseville's downtown. Board members are appointed by the Roseville City Council and receive no compensation for their service. The RCDC's financial activities have no impact on the City's General Fund.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

This past year RCDC development projects have created construction jobs with the commercial property re-tenanting and property rehabilitation. The tenanting of 238, 240 and 244 Vernon Street results in new businesses and jobs on Vernon Street that did not previously exist. Ninja Sushi plans for a staff of 100 employees and the Glue Factory will bring 10 to 20 employees or entrepreneurs to Vernon Street. The continued work of the RCDC will create jobs, both permanent and construction related, meeting the founding purposes for creating the RCDC.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not apply to activities that will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines §15061(b)(3)). Budget reporting and progress updates do not include the potential for a significant environmental effect, and therefore is not subject to CEQA.

Respectfully Submitted,

Melissa Hagan, Administrative Analyst

Chris Robles, Economic Development Director/RCDC CEO



Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

RCDC Audited Financials

RCDC FY17 Budget

**ROSEVILLE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
CORPORATION, INC.**

CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2016

ATTACHMENT A

**ROSEVILLE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
CORPORATION, INC.**

FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2016

Table of Contents

<u>INTRODUCTORY SECTION</u>	PAGE
Table of Contents	i
Board of Directors	ii
<u>FINANCIAL SECTION</u>	
Independent Auditors' Report	1
Financial Statements	
Consolidated Statement of Financial Position	3
Consolidated Statement of Activities	4
Consolidated Statement of Functional Expenses	5
Consolidated Statement of Cash Flows	6
Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements	7

**ROSEVILLE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
CORPORATION, INC.**

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

JUNE 30, 2016

Howard Rudd, Chair

John Norman, Secretary/Treasurer

Nick Alexander

Ed Benoit

Jim Gray



INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT

Board of Directors
Roseville Community Development Corporation, Inc.
Roseville, California

Report on the Financial Statements

We have audited the accompanying consolidated financial statements of the Roseville Community Development Corporation, Inc. (Organization), which comprise the consolidated statement of financial position as of June 30, 2016, and the related consolidated statements of activities, cash flows and functional expenses for the year then ended, and the related notes to the consolidated financial statements.

Management's Responsibility for the Financial Statements

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of these consolidated financial statements in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America; this includes the design, implementation, and maintenance of internal control relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

Auditors' Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these consolidated financial statements based on our audit. We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free from material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the consolidated financial statements. The procedures selected depend on the auditor's judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the consolidated financial statements, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, the auditor considers internal control relevant to the entity's preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the entity's internal control. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. An audit also includes evaluating the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statements.

We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinion.

Opinion

In our opinion, the consolidated financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the consolidated financial position of the Organization as of June 30, 2016, and the changes in its net assets and its cash flows for the year then ended in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

Vavreck, Trine, Day & Co LLP

Sacramento, California

October 3, 2016

ROSEVILLE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, INC.
CONSOLIDATED STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL POSITION
JUNE 30, 2016

ASSETS

Current Assets:

Cash and cash equivalents	\$ 1,424,295
Accounts receivable	20,400
Total Current Assets	<u>1,444,695</u>

Non-Current Assets:

Property and equipment	<u>3,825,759</u>
TOTAL ASSETS	<u>\$ 5,270,454</u>

LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS

Current Liabilities:

Accounts payable	\$ 1,375
Security deposits	23,204
Prepaid rent	5,200
Current portion of note payable	15,755
Total Current Liabilities	<u>45,534</u>

Non-Current Liabilities:

Accrued interest payable	401,405
Notes payable to City of Roseville	1,530,951
Notes payable to City of Roseville Successor Agency	<u>3,997,542</u>
Total Non-Current Liabilities	<u>5,929,898</u>
TOTAL LIABILITIES	<u>5,975,432</u>

NET ASSETS

Unrestricted (Deficit)	<u>(704,978)</u>
TOTAL LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS (DEFICIT)	<u>\$ 5,270,454</u>

See accompanying notes to consolidated financial statements.

ROSEVILLE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, INC.
CONSOLIDATED STATEMENT OF ACTIVITIES
FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2016

SUPPORT AND REVENUE

City contributions	\$ 95,000
Corporate contributions	100,000
Rental income	146,716
Interest income	2,564
Other Income	<u>10,883</u>
Total Support and Revenue	<u>355,163</u>

EXPENSES

Program services	110,814
Support services:	
Management and general	<u>516,233</u>
Total Expenses	<u>627,047</u>

CHANGE IN NET ASSETS	(271,884)
----------------------	-----------

NET DEFICIT, BEGINNING OF YEAR	<u>(433,094)</u>
--------------------------------	------------------

NET DEFICIT, END OF YEAR	<u><u>\$ (704,978)</u></u>
--------------------------	----------------------------

See accompanying notes to consolidated financial statements.

ROSEVILLE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, INC.
CONSOLIDATED STATEMENT OF FUNCTIONAL EXPENSES
FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2016

	Program Services	Support Services Management and General	Total
Contract wages and benefits	\$ -	\$ 102,049	\$ 102,049
Professional fees	52,917	-	52,917
Legal and accounting	-	33,920	33,920
Insurance	-	23,691	23,691
Taxes and licenses	-	37,217	37,217
Meetings and travel	4,854	593	5,447
Office expenses	2,188	3,846	6,034
Repairs and maintenance	-	33,038	33,038
Indirect costs	-	18,871	18,871
Interest expense	-	103,617	103,617
Advertising	10,650	-	10,650
Miscellaneous	40,205	3,088	43,293
Depreciation	-	156,303	156,303
Total Expenses	<u>\$ 110,814</u>	<u>\$ 516,233</u>	<u>\$ 627,047</u>

See accompanying notes to consolidated financial statements.

ROSEVILLE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, INC.
CONSOLIDATED STATEMENT OF CASH FLOWS
FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2016

CASH FLOWS FROM OPERATING ACTIVITIES

Change in net assets	\$ (271,884)
Adjustments to reconcile changes in net assets to net cash (used) provided by operating activities:	
Depreciation	156,303
(Increase) in accounts receivable	(20,400)
(Decrease) in accounts payable	(18,563)
Increase in security deposits	11,500
Increase in prepaid rent	1,000
Net Cash Used by Operating Activities	<u>(142,044)</u>

CASH FLOWS FROM INVESTING ACTIVITIES

Sale of property and equipment	6,494
Purchase of property and equipment	(243,876)
Interest income	2,564
Net Cash Used by Investing Activities	<u>(234,818)</u>

CASH FLOWS FROM FINANCING ACTIVITIES

Principal payments on notes payable	(32,523)
Interest payments on notes payable	(22,099)
Increase in accrued interest payable	118,435
Net Cash Used for Financing Activities	<u>63,813</u>
Net Change in Cash	(313,049)
Cash and cash equivalents, beginning of year	<u>1,737,344</u>
Cash and cash equivalents, end of year	<u>\$ 1,424,295</u>

See accompanying notes to consolidated financial statements.

**ROSEVILLE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, INC.
NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2016**

NOTE 1 – REPORTING ENTITY

The Roseville Community Development Corporation, Inc. (Organization) was incorporated on January 3, 2011 as a 501(c)(3) not-for-profit corporation whose purpose is to engage in the activity of physical, economic and educational development and revitalization efforts that result in expanded employment, economic prosperity and business and housing opportunities for the businesses and residents of the City of Roseville, California (City).

NOTE 2 – SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

The following items comprise the significant accounting policies of the Organization, and its wholly owned subsidiaries, 240 Vernon Street, LLC, 242-246 Vernon Street, LLC, and 238 Vernon Street, LLC (the LLCs). The policies reflect industry practices and conform to accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

A. *Basis of Accounting and Financial Statement Presentation*

The consolidated financial statements have been prepared on the accrual basis of accounting. Revenues are recognized when earned and expenses are recognized when incurred in accordance with the accrual basis of accounting. The Organization reports information regarding its financial position and activities according to the three classes of net assets: unrestricted net assets, temporarily restricted net assets, and permanently restricted net assets. Unrestricted net assets represent the portion of expendable funds that are available for support of the Organization's operations. Temporarily restricted net assets consist of assets with time and purpose restrictions imposed by donors. Permanently restricted net assets represent a portion of funds that are not expendable, except for the interest earned on these funds.

B. *Principles of Consolidation*

The consolidated financial statements include the accounts of the Organization and its subsidiaries and do not represent those of a single legal entity. All significant intercompany transactions and balances have been eliminated.

C. *Use of Estimates*

The preparation of the consolidated financial statements in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the consolidated financial statements and the reported amounts of revenue and expenses during the reporting period. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

D. *Cash and Cash Equivalents*

The Organization considers all short term deposits purchased with a maturity of three months or less to be cash equivalents.

Cash in bank	\$ 304,384
Money market	<u>1,119,911</u>
Total cash and cash equivalents	<u>\$ 1,424,295</u>

ROSEVILLE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, INC.
NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2016

NOTE 2 – SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES (Continued)

E. Property and Equipment

Property and equipment are recorded at cost or using level 3 fair value inputs such as an appraisal when cost is not available. All capitalizable costs of \$5,000 or more and having a useful life in excess of one year are capitalized. The Organization uses the straight-line method of depreciation over the estimated useful lives of the assets. Building and improvements are depreciated over 39 years, and furniture and equipment are depreciated over 5 years.

F. Revenue and Cost Recognition

Revenue from property rentals is recorded when earned. Costs associated with rental activities are recorded when incurred.

G. Contributions

Contributions received are recorded as unrestricted, temporarily restricted, or permanently restricted support, depending on the existence and/or nature of any donor restrictions. Support that is restricted by the donor is reported as an increase in unrestricted net assets if the restriction expires in the reporting period in which the support is recognized. All other donor-restricted support is reported as an increase in temporarily or permanently restricted net assets, depending on the nature of the restriction. The Organization considers that all contributions for long-lived assets have implied time restrictions and classifies this support as temporarily restricted until the purpose restriction is met. When a restriction expires, that is, when a stipulated time restriction ends or the purpose restriction is accomplished, temporarily restricted net assets are reclassified to unrestricted net assets and reported in the statement of activities as net assets released from restrictions.

H. Financial Instruments

Rates currently available for debt with similar terms and remaining maturities are used to estimate the fair value of existing debt.

I. Advertising

Advertising costs, if any, are expensed as incurred. Advertising costs incurred in the fiscal year was \$10,650.

J. Income Taxes

The Organization is exempt from income tax under Section 501(c)(3) of the U.S. the Internal Revenue Code. Accordingly, no provision for income taxes has been provided in these consolidated financial statements. In addition, the Organization qualifies for the charitable contribution deduction under Section 170(b)(1)(a) and has been classified as an organization that is not a private foundation under Section 509(a)(1).

ROSEVILLE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, INC.
NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2016

NOTE 2 – SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES (Continued)

K. Uncertain Tax Positions

The financial statement effects of a tax position taken or expected to be taken are recognized in the financial statements when it is more-likely-than-not, based on the technical merits, that the position will be sustained upon examination. Interest and penalties, if any, are included in expense in the statement of activities and changes in net assets. As of June 30, 2016, management believes that all tax positions taken by the Organization are more-likely-than-not to be sustained upon examination. The federal and state returns of the Organization for the year ended June 30, 2016 are subject to examination by the taxing authorities for three and four years, respectively, after the due date.

L. Concentration of Credit Risk

The Organization maintains its cash in bank deposit accounts which, at times, may exceed federally insured limits of \$250,000. As of June 30, 2016, the uninsured portion of this balance was \$1,193,281. The Organization has not experienced any losses in such accounts.

M. Fair Value

Fair value is defined as the price that would be received to sell an asset or paid to transfer a liability in an orderly transaction between market participants at the measurement date. Accounting standards set a framework for measuring fair value using a three tier hierarchy based on the extent to which inputs used in measuring fair value are observable in the market. The three levels are defined as follows:

Level 1: Quoted prices in active markets for identical assets or liabilities that the reporting entity has the ability to access at the measurement date.

Level 2: Observable inputs other than Level 1 prices such as quoted prices for similar assets or liabilities, quoted prices in markets that are not active, or inputs (interest rates, currency exchange rates, commodity rates and yield curves) that are observable or corroborated by observable market data for substantially the full term of the assets or liabilities.

Level 3: Unobservable inputs that are supported by little or no market activity and that are significant to the fair value of the assets or liabilities. Level 3 assets and liabilities include financial instruments whose value is determined using pricing models, discounted cash flow methodologies, or similar techniques, as well as instruments for which the determination of fair value requires significant management judgment or estimation.

Deposits and withdrawals are made on the basis of \$1 and not fair Value. Accordingly, the Organizations' investments in money market accounts at June 30, 2016 of \$1,119,911 are an uncategorized input not defined as Level 1, Level 2 or Level 3.

ROSEVILLE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, INC.
NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2016

NOTE 3 – PROPERTY AND EQUIPMENT

Property and equipment consist of the following at June 30:

	Balance at June 30, 2015	Additions	Deletions	Balance at June 30, 2016
Capital assets, not being depreciated				
Land	\$ 605,130	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 605,130
Capital assets, being depreciated				
Building and improvements	3,066,038	140,179	-	3,206,217
Furniture and equipment	318,224	103,697	6,494	415,427
Total property and equipment	3,384,262	243,876	6,494	3,621,644
Less accumulated depreciation	(244,712)	(156,303)	-	(401,015)
Net capital assets, being depreciated	3,139,550	87,573	6,494	3,220,629
Total property and equipment, net	\$ 3,744,680	\$ 87,573	\$ 6,494	\$ 3,825,759

The land, building and improvements consist of three commercial buildings and a vacant lot in downtown Roseville, California, which are held by the Organization. The cost was valued by an independent appraisal. Currently, the buildings are being rented to local businesses under month to month leases. The Organization plans to use the vacant lot for future development along the Vernon Street corridor.

NOTE 4 – NOTES PAYABLE

A. Current Year Transactions and Balances

	Original Issue Amount	Balance June 30, 2015	Additions	Retirements	Balance June 30, 2016	Current Portion
Loans:						
City of Roseville Successor Agency, 1.978%, due June 30, 2030	\$ 3,469,049	\$ 3,469,049	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,469,049	\$ -
City of Roseville 1.978%, due June 30, 2030	1,530,951	1,530,951	-	-	1,530,951	-
City of Roseville Successor Agency, 4%, due June 1, 2023	603,525	576,771	-	(32,523)	544,248	15,755
Total	\$ 5,603,525	\$ 5,576,771	\$ -	\$ (32,523)	\$ 5,544,248	\$ 15,755

On August 30, 2011, the former Redevelopment Agency of the City of Roseville loaned the Organization \$3,469,049, and the City of Roseville loaned an additional \$1,530,951 during fiscal year ended June 30, 2013. The \$5,000,000 note accrues interest at a rate equal to the City's average interest earnings rate plus 1 percent, adjusted every 5 years. Principal and accrued interest payments begin ten years from the date of first disbursement, commencing on June 30, 2021, and will be due annually with final payment maturing on June 30, 2030. As of June 30, 2016, the \$5,000,000 note bears interest at 1.978%, and accrued interest on the loan is \$401,405.

ROSEVILLE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, INC.
NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2016

NOTE 4 – NOTES PAYABLE (Continued)

B. Current Year Transactions and Balances (Continued)

During fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, the Organization assumed a loan payable between KMS Vernon Street LLC and the former Redevelopment Agency of the City of Roseville in the amount of \$603,525 made in connection with the acquisition of 238 Vernon Street. In the fiscal year the Organization made debt principal payments in the amount of \$15,139. The Organization also recorded an adjustment to the payments due in the amount of \$17,384 in the fiscal year based on the agreed upon repayment terms with the City of Roseville Successor Agency. The loan bears an interest rate of 4% and as of June 30, 2016 the total outstanding balance on the note is \$544,248.

C. Debt Service Requirements

Debt service requirement are shown below for all loans:

For the Year Ending June 30	Organization Loans	
	Principal	Interest
2017	\$ 15,755	\$ 109,484
2018	16,399	108,842
2019	17,065	108,174
2020	17,759	107,479
2021	518,483	97,956
2022-2026	2,958,787	299,214
2027-2030	2,000,000	52,800
Totals	<u>\$ 5,544,248</u>	<u>\$ 883,949</u>

NOTE 5 – SUBSEQUENT EVENTS

Management has evaluated subsequent events for recognition and disclosure through October 3, 2016, which is the date the financial statements were available to be issued. Management has determined that there were no subsequent events on transactions that would have a material impact on the current year financial statements.



Board of Directors
Roseville Community Development Corporation, Inc.
Roseville, California

We have audited the financial statements of Roseville Community Development Corporation (Organization) for the year ended June 30, 2016, and have issued our report thereon dated October 3, 2016. Professional standards require that we provide you with information about our responsibilities under generally accepted auditing standards, as well as certain information related to the planned scope and timing of our audit. We have communicated such information in our letter to you dated June 3, 2016. Professional standards also require that we communicate to you the following information related to our audit

Significant Audit Findings

Qualitative Aspects of Accounting Practices

Management is responsible for the selection and use of appropriate accounting policies. The significant accounting policies used by the Organization are described in Note 2 to the financial statements. No new accounting policies were adopted and the application of existing policies was not changed during the year ended June 30, 2016. We noted no transactions entered into by the Organization during the year for which there is a lack of authoritative guidance or consensus. All significant transactions have been recognized in the financial statements in the proper period.

Accounting estimates are an integral part of the financial statements prepared by management and are based on management's knowledge and experience about past and current events and assumptions about future events. Certain accounting estimates are particularly sensitive because of their significance to the financial statements and because of the possibility that future events affecting them may differ significantly from those expected. The most sensitive estimate affecting the financial statements was management's estimate of the depreciation expense which is based on the estimated useful life of the related asset. We evaluated the key factors and assumptions used to develop the depreciation expense in determining that it is reasonable in relation to the financial statements taken as a whole.

The financial statement disclosures are neutral, consistent, and clear.

Difficulties Encountered in Performing the Audit

We encountered no significant difficulties in dealing with management in performing and completing our audit.

Corrected and Uncorrected Misstatements

Professional standards require us to accumulate all known and likely misstatements identified during the audit, other than those that are clearly trivial, and communicate them to the appropriate level of management. Management has corrected all such misstatements. In addition, none of the misstatements detected as a result of audit procedures and corrected by management were material, either individually or in the aggregate, to the Organization's financial statements taken as a whole.

Disagreements with Management

For purposes of this letter, a disagreement with management is a financial accounting, reporting, or auditing matter, whether or not resolved to our satisfaction, that could be significant to the financial statements or the auditor's report. We are pleased to report that no such disagreements arose during the course of our audit.

Management Representations

We have requested certain representations from management that are included in the management representation letter dated October 3, 2016.

Management Consultations with Other Independent Accountants

In some cases, management may decide to consult with other accountants about auditing and accounting matters, similar to obtaining a "second opinion" on certain situations. If a consultation involves application of an accounting principle to the Organization's financial statements or a determination of the type of auditor's opinion that may be expressed on those statements, our professional standards require the consulting accountant to check with us to determine that the consultant has all the relevant facts. To our knowledge, there were no such consultations with other accountants.

Other Audit Findings or Issues

We generally discuss a variety of matters, including the application of accounting principles and auditing standards, with management each year prior to retention as the Organization's auditors. However, these discussions occurred in the normal course of our professional relationship and our responses were not a condition to our retention.

Other Matters

This information is intended solely for the use of the Audit Committee and management of the Organization and is not intended to be, and should not be, used by anyone other than these specified parties.



Sacramento, California
October 3, 2016

ROSEVILLE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, INC.
Schedule of Corrected Misstatements
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2016

No.	Account/Description	Debit	Credit
1	Unrestricted Net Assets	\$ 6,002	
	Note Receivable		\$ 6,002
	<i>(Adjustment to write off receivable not collected.)</i>		
2	Note Payable-Successor Agency	17,384	
	Interest Expense		17,384
	<i>(Adjustment to record modification made to the debt repayment schedule.)</i>		
3	Note Payable-Successor Agency	15,755	
	Current Portion of Note Payable		15,755
	<i>(Reclassification to report the current portion of note payable.)</i>		



Board of Directors
Roseville Community Development Corporation, Inc.
Roseville, California

In planning and performing our audit of the consolidated financial statements of Roseville Community Development Corporation, Inc. (Organization) as of and for the year ended June 30, 2016, in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America, we considered the Organization's internal control over financial reporting (internal control) as a basis for designing auditing procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances for the purpose of expressing our opinion on the financial statements, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Organization's internal control. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the Organization's internal control.

Our consideration of internal control was for the limited purpose described in the previous paragraph and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control that might be material weaknesses or significant deficiencies and, therefore, material weaknesses or significant deficiencies may exist that were not identified. However, as discussed below, we identified certain deficiencies in internal control that we consider to be material weaknesses.

A deficiency in internal control exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct, misstatements on a timely basis. A material weakness is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of the entity's financial statements will not be prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis. We consider the following deficiencies in the Organization's internal control to be material weaknesses:

CAPITAL ASSETS

Observation:

During the testing performed over the Organization's capital assets, the following was noted requiring adjustments to the financial statements. Activity during the year included items that did not meet the \$5,000 threshold for capitalization. Depreciation of capital assets was charged to the group of assets rather than each asset individually. The Organization was not able to determine the accumulated depreciation for several assets sold in the current year. Additionally, we identified items included in the capital asset listing that appeared to be more appropriately categorized as inventory and land held for resale rather than capital assets.

Recommendation:

We recommend enhancing the Organization's capital asset policies and procedures to ensure that only items meeting the definition and threshold of capital assets are capitalized, that depreciation is charged appropriately to each asset, and that the accounting records are properly reconciled.

Management Response:

Going forward, staff will make certain that the thresholds are kept in mind when capitalizing assets.

OPENING EQUITY RECONCILIATION

Observation:

During testing performed over the Organization's opening equity balances, it was noted that beginning equity in the Organization's accounting records was not reconciled to the ending equity presented in the prior year audited financial statements. This resulted in an adjustment to the financial statements.

Recommendation:

We recommend the Organization enhance its processes to ensure that each year the opening equity per the accounting system is reconciled to the prior year financial statements.

Management Response:

The discrepancy in the equity balances were a result of an adjusting journal entry that was inadvertently not processed for fiscal year 2015. The adjustment was suggested again for fiscal year 2016 and has since been processed.

This communication is intended solely for the information and use of the Board of Directors, management, and others within the Roseville Community Development Corporation and is not intended to be, and should not be, used by anyone other than these specified parties.



Sacramento, California

October 3, 2016

ROSEVILLE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, INC.
FY 2016-17 APPROVED BUDGET

Account	CONSOLIDATED	RCDC BUDGET				LLCs BUDGETS			Description
	CONSOLIDATED FY2016 BUDGET	RCDC OPERATIONS	CAPITAL & FINANCING	RCDC Programs		238 Vernon LLC	240 Vernon LLC	242-246 Vernon LLC	
				Advantage Roseville	98 Jefferson				
REVENUES / INCOME									
43400 · DIRECT PUBLIC SUPPORT-DONATIONS									
43410 · Corporate Contributions	100,000	-	-	100,000	-	-	-	-	Advantage Roseville - Sponsorships from Corporations
43420 · Government Contributions	100,000	-	-	100,000	-	-	-	-	Advantage Roseville - Match from City of Roseville
SUBTOTAL	200,000	-	-	200,000	-	-	-	-	
45000 · INVESTMENT									
43500 · Rental Income	335,690	-	-	-	298	239,342	53,850	42,200	
Property Sale (see Cash Flow)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
45010 · Gain/Loss on Investment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
SUBTOTAL	335,690	-	-	-	298	239,342	53,850	42,200	
47200 · PROGRAM									
47250 · Loan Payoffs - Principle	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
SUBTOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
46400 · OTHER INCOME									
45030 · Money Market Interest	1,000	1,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	Interest received from Money Market (500k x .25%)
SUBTOTAL	1,000	1,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	
TOTAL REVENUES	536,690	1,000	-	200,000	298	239,342	53,850	42,200	
EXPENSES									
MANAGEMENT & GENERAL									
60920 · Business Reg / Filing Fees	90	90	-	-	-	-	-	-	Permits, registrations, licenses, moving, royalties, bank charges, filing fees
62110 · Accounting	11,400	6,000	-	-	-	1,800	1,800	1,800	Outside (non-employee) accounting, audit, bookkeeping, tax prep,
62140 · Legal Fees	37,000	25,000	-	-	-	2,000	5,000	5,000	
62180 · Contract Management Assistant	38,554	38,554	-	-	-	-	-	-	Management Assistant - 50% of wages only
62190 · Contract Chief Exec Officer	90,118	90,118	-	-	-	-	-	-	CEO - 50% of wages only
62870 · Property Insurance	11,300	-	-	-	-	6,000	3,300	2,000	Property Insurance
65010 · Books, Subscriptions, Reference	100	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	Books, subscriptions, reference materials, periodicals for use
65020 · Postage, Mailing Service	370	300	-	-	-	20	25	25	Postage, parcel delivery, local courier
65030 · Printing and Copying	500	500	-	-	-	-	-	-	Printing, copying, duplicating, recording
65040 · Office Supplies	400	400	-	-	-	-	-	-	Supplies and materials for admin operations
65050 · Phone Line	100	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	
65070 · Memberships	175	175	-	-	-	-	-	-	Roseville Chamber Membership
65120 · Insurance -Directors & Officers	5,800	5,800	-	-	-	-	-	-	Total Insurance cost \$11,500
65120 · Insurance - General Liability	3,600	3,600	-	-	-	-	-	-	
65120 · Insurance - Excess Liability	2,400	2,400	-	-	-	-	-	-	
65130 · Bank Service Charges	450	400	-	-	-	-	50	-	Bank Charges
65150 · Software	1,000	1,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	Software for permanent record retention
65170 · Indirect Costs-COR Management Assistant	7,133	7,133	-	-	-	-	-	-	Indirect Costs from City charged through secondary labor at 18.5%
65170 · Indirect Costs-COR Economic Dev. Director	16,672	16,672	-	-	-	-	-	-	Indirect Costs from City charged through secondary labor at 18.5%
65180 · Property Taxes	37,310	-	-	-	600	20,700	8,310	7,700	Property insurance; includes PBID costs
65190 · State/Federal Income Tax	2,400	-	-	-	-	800	800	800	
65210 · Professional/Contract Services	20,000	5,000	-	-	-	5,000	5,000	5,000	Misc. Professional and Contract Services
65220 · Miscellaneous	900	500	-	-	-	200	-	200	misc. minor items not covered under other categories
65230 · Sponsorships / RCDC	4,000	4,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	
67200 · Property Repairs/Maintenance	7,500	-	-	-	-	2,500	2,500	2,500	Misc. repairs/maintenance for properties
67300 · Equipment Rental	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
68310 · Training Registration Expense	500	500	-	-	-	-	-	-	program-related meetings, conferences, conventions
68320 · Travel/Meetings	2,000	2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	Misc. travel expenses
68330 · Board Meeting Expense	500	500	-	-	-	-	-	-	Refreshments/Facility rental for Board
68600 · Utilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
62400 · Depreciation	117,708	-	-	-	-	104,738	-	12,970	
SUBTOTAL	419,980	210,842	-	-	600	143,758	26,785	37,995	

ROSEVILLE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, INC.
FY 2016-17 APPROVED BUDGET

Account	CONSOLIDATED	RCDC BUDGET				LLCs BUDGETS			Description
	CONSOLIDATED FY2016 BUDGET	RCDC OPERATIONS	CAPITAL & FINANCING	RCDC Programs		238 Vernon LLC	240 Vernon LLC	242-246 Vernon LLC	
				Advantage Roseville	98 Jefferson				
PROGRAM EXPENSES									
62135 · Misc Program Expenses - Adv. Rsvl.	3,000	-	-	3,000	-	-	-	-	
62171 · Staff (Graphic Designer) Indirect Cost - Adv. Rsvl	2,520			2,520					
62170 · Staff (Graphic Designer) Salary - Adv. Roseville	13,200			13,200					
67010 · Marketing/Advertising - Adv. Rsvl.	43,000	-	-	43,000					
62155 · Contract Services - Adv. Rsvl.	54,780	-	-	54,780	-	-	-	-	
65200 · Sponsorships - Adv. Rsvl.	42,500	-	-	42,500	-	-	-	-	
67020 · Printing & Reproduction - Adv. Rsvl.	5,000	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	
67080 · Travel & Meeting - Adv. Rsvl.	35,000	-	-	35,000	-	-	-	-	
67090 · Legal Fees - Adv. Rsvl.	1,000	-	-	1,000	-	-	-	-	
SUBTOTAL	200,000	-	-	200,000	-	-	-	-	
COMMERCIAL REAL ESTATE EXPENSES									
p 70010 · Real Estate Partnerships-Loans	350,000		350,000	-	-	-	-	-	
p 70020 · Property Acquisitions	700,000	-	700,000	-	-	-	-	-	Property Acquisitions
p 70070 · Façade/Tenant Improvements (Loan to 242)	215,000		215,000						
p 70070 · Façade/Tenant Improvements	270,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	270,000	To come from loan and/or grant from City
SUBTOTAL	1,535,000	-	1,265,000	-	-	-	-	270,000	
DEBT SERVICE									
27230 · Principal Exp - 238 VS	15,755					15,755	-	-	Principal Payment for Successor Agency Loan
80040 · Interest Exp-238 VS	21,483					21,483	-	-	Interest Payment for Successor Agency Loan
80030 · Interest Exp-Deferred - \$5 million City Loan	98,900		36,593	-	-	42,527	-	19,780	Deferred Interest Expense on RDA Loan (not current expense)
SUBTOTAL	136,138	-	36,593	-	-	79,765	-	19,780	
TOTAL EXPENSES	2,291,119	210,842	1,301,593	200,000	600	223,523	26,785	327,775	
TOTAL REVENUES	536,690	1,000	-	200,000	298	239,342	53,850	42,200	
TOTAL EXPENSES	(2,291,119)	(210,842)	(1,301,593)	(200,000)	(600)	(223,523)	(26,785)	(327,775)	
NET INCOME (LOSS)	(1,754,429)	(209,842)	(1,301,593)	-	(302)	15,818	27,065	(285,575)	
ADJUSTMENTS: NET INCOME TO CASH FLOW									
TOTAL REVENUES	536,690	1,000	-	200,000	298	239,342	53,850	42,200	
TOTAL EXPENSES	(2,291,119)	(210,842)	(1,301,593)	(200,000)	(600)	(223,523)	(26,785)	(327,775)	
Add Back Depreciation	117,708	-	-	-	-	104,738	-	12,970	
Add Back Deferred Interest	98,900	-	36,593	-	-	42,527	-	19,780	
TOTAL EXPENSES (Less Depreciation and Deferred Interest)	(2,074,511)	(210,842)	(1,265,000)	(200,000)	(600)	(76,258)	(26,785)	(295,025)	
NET INCOME (LOSS) CASH FLOW	(1,537,821)	(209,842)	(1,265,000)	-	(302)	163,083	27,065	(252,825)	
Estimated Ending Cash @ 6/30/16:	1,435,809	215,862	928,077	217,470	-	14,941	10,485	48,973	
Balance Sheet Cash Transactions:									
Sale of Property (Cash from Monks)							1,270,000		
Transfer from 240 to RCDC for payables (BS total)		119,138	267,993				(387,131)		
Transfer from 240 to RCDC for payables (Def Int)			74,315				(74,315)		
Transfer from 240 to RCDC for Note (Property)			602,435				(602,435)		
Transfer surplus from sale of 240 to RCDC			234,469				(234,469)		
Transfer from RCDC to cover 98 Jefferson deficit		(302)			302				
Transfer from 238 to RCDC for payables			170,000			(170,000)			
Transfer to 242 from RCDC - loan for Tenant Impr								215,000	
Refund of prepaid rent to Tenant							(4,200)		
Refund of Security Deposit to Tenant							(5,000)		
ESTIMATED ENDING CASH @ 6/30/17	1,373,787	124,855	1,012,289	217,470	-	8,024	0	11,148	

PROFESSIONAL DESIGN SERVICES AGREEMENT

Project: Downtown Surveying Services

THIS AGREEMENT is made and entered into this ____ day of _____, 20____,
by and between the City of Roseville, a municipal corporation ("CITY"), and Mark Thomas &
Company, Inc., a California corporation ("CONSULTANT "); and

W I T N E S S E T H:

WHEREAS, CITY desires professional design services consisting of surveying services
in downtown Roseville including boundary resolution of City-owned lots, preparation of a
FEMA elevation certificate for 401 Oak Street, and preparation of tentative and final maps; and

WHEREAS, CONSULTANT has prepared a proposal dated December 6, 2016, which
describes the scope of work to be performed by CONSULTANT, the budget for the work, and
the schedule for performance of the work; and

WHEREAS, CONSULTANT is qualified and experienced to provide such professional
design services.

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties agree as follows:

1. Services. CONSULTANT shall perform, at the direction of CITY, the scope of
services as described in EXHIBIT "A," attached hereto and incorporated herein by this
reference.

2. Compensation. For its services provided hereunder, CONSULTANT shall be compensated on a lump sum basis as described in EXHIBIT "B," attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference. Total compensation shall not exceed thirty-nine thousand, eight hundred fifty-five dollars (\$39,855).

CONSULTANT shall submit monthly invoices for its services. Such invoices shall be delineated by task, the person performing the services, and the hourly rate, which shall be stated in time increments of not greater than one-tenth (1/10) hours. CITY shall pay invoices within thirty (30) days after receipt, if the services specified in the invoice have been satisfactorily completed.

3. Indemnification. To the fullest extent allowed by law, CONSULTANT agrees to indemnify, including the cost to defend CITY, and its officers, agents, employees and volunteers from any and all claims, demands, costs or liability that arise out of, or pertain to, or relate to the negligence, recklessness, or willful misconduct of CONSULTANT and its agents in the performance of services under this contract, but this indemnity does not apply to liability for damages for death or bodily injury to persons, injury to property, or other loss, arising from the sole negligence, willful misconduct or defects in design by CITY or the agents, servants, or independent contractors who are directly responsible to CITY, or arising from the active negligence of CITY.

CONSULTANT's responsibility for such defense and indemnity obligations shall survive the termination or completion of this Agreement for the full period of time allowed by law. The defense and indemnity obligations of this Agreement are undertaken in addition to, and shall not in any way be limited by, the insurance obligations contained in this Agreement.

4. Insurance. CONSULTANT agrees to continuously maintain, in full force and effect, the following minimum policies of insurance during the term of this Agreement.

<u>COVERAGE</u>	<u>LIMITS OF LIABILITY</u>
Workers' Compensation	Statutory
Commercial General Liability	\$2,000,000 each occurrence \$4,000,000 aggregate Personal Injury: \$2,000,000 each occurrence \$4,000,000 aggregate
Automobile Liability	\$1,000,000 combined single limit
Professional Liability (errors and omissions)	\$2,000,000 per claim \$4,000,000 aggregate

a. Form. CONSULTANT shall submit a certificate evidencing such coverage for the period covered by this Agreement in a form satisfactory to Risk Management and the City Attorney, prior to undertaking any work hereunder. Any insurance written on a claims made basis is subject to the approval of Risk Management and the City Attorney.

b. Additional Insureds. CONSULTANT shall also provide a separate endorsement form or section of the policy showing CITY, its officers, agents, employees and volunteers as additional insureds for each type of coverage, except for Workers' Compensation and Professional Liability. Such insurance shall specifically cover the contractual liability of CONSULTANT. The additional insured coverage under the CONSULTANT's policy shall be primary and noncontributory, as evidenced by a separate endorsement or section of the policy, and shall not seek contribution from CITY's insurance or self-insurance. In addition, the additional insured coverage shall be at least as broad as the Insurance Services Office ("ISO") CG 20 01 Endorsement. Any available insurance proceeds in excess of the specified minimum

insurance coverage requirements and limits shall be available to the additional insureds.

Furthermore, the requirements for coverage and limits shall be: (1) the minimum coverage and limits specified in this Agreement; or (2) the full coverage and maximum limits of any insurance proceeds available to the named insureds, whichever is greater.

c. Cancellation/Modification. CONSULTANT shall provide ten (10) days written notice to CITY prior to cancellation or modification of any insurance required by this Agreement.

d. Umbrella/Excess Insurance. The limits of insurance required in this Agreement may be satisfied by a combination of primary and excess insurance. Any excess insurance shall contain or be endorsed to contain a provision that such coverage shall also apply on a primary and noncontributory basis for the benefit of CITY (if agreed to in a written contract) before CITY's own insurance shall be called upon to protect it as a named insured.

e. Subcontractors. CONSULTANT agrees to include in its contracts with all subcontractors the same requirements and provisions of this Agreement, including the indemnity and insurance requirements, to the extent they apply to the scope of the subcontractor's work. Furthermore, CONSULTANT shall require its subcontractors to agree to be bound to CONSULTANT and CITY in the same manner and to the same extent as CONSULTANT is bound to CITY under this Agreement. Additionally, CONSULTANT shall obligate its subcontractors to comply with these same provisions with respect to any tertiary subcontractor, regardless of tier. A copy of CITY's indemnity and insurance provisions will be furnished to the subcontractor or tertiary subcontractor upon request.

f. Self-Insured Retentions. All self-insured retentions ("SIR") must be disclosed to Risk Management for approval and shall not reduce the limits of liability.

Policies containing any SIR provision shall provide or be endorsed to provide that the SIR may be satisfied by either the named insured or CITY. CITY reserves the right to obtain a full certified copy of any insurance policy and endorsements. The failure to exercise this right shall not constitute a waiver of such right.

g. Waiver of Subrogation. CONSULTANT hereby agrees to waive subrogation which any insurer of CONSULTANT may acquire from CONSULTANT by virtue of the payment of any loss under a Workers Compensation, Commercial General Liability or Automobile Liability policy. All Workers Compensation, Commercial General Liability and Automobile Liability policies shall be endorsed with a waiver of subrogation in favor of CITY, its officers, agents, employees and volunteers for all work performed by CONSULTANT, its employees, agents and subcontractors.

h. Liability/Remedies. Insurance coverage in the minimum amounts set forth herein shall not be construed to relieve CONSULTANT of liability in excess of such coverage, nor shall it preclude CITY from taking such other actions as are available to it under any other provisions of this Agreement or law.

5. Records. CONSULTANT and its subcontractors shall maintain all files and records relating to the services performed hereunder during the term of this Agreement and for a period of not less than one (1) year after the date of termination or expiration. Provided, however, that in the event of litigation or settlement of claims arising from the performance of this Agreement, CONSULTANT and its subcontractors shall maintain all files and records until such litigation, appeals or claims are resolved. Duly authorized representatives of CITY shall have right of access during normal business hours and after reasonable notice to CONSULTANT's and subcontractors' files and records relating to the services performed

hereunder, and may review and copy the files and records at appropriate stages during performance of the services and during the one (1) year period following termination or expiration of this Agreement. CONSULTANT shall include this provisions in its contracts with all subcontractors.

6. Time is of the Essence. Time is of the essence of this Agreement.

7. Compliance with Laws. CONSULTANT shall comply with all federal, state and local laws, ordinances and policies as may be applicable to the performance of services under this Agreement.

8. Ability to Perform. CONSULTANT agrees and represents that it has the time, ability and professional expertise to perform the services required under this Agreement.

9. Governing Agreement. In the event of any conflict between this Agreement and its EXHIBITS, the provisions of this Agreement shall govern. In the event of any conflict between any of the EXHIBITS, the provisions of the first in order of attachment shall govern.

10. Assignment. CONSULTANT is employed to perform unique personal services. CONSULTANT shall not assign this Agreement without the prior written consent of CITY. CONSULTANT shall not employ or otherwise incur any obligation to pay other specialists or experts for services in connection with this Agreement, without prior written consent of CITY.

11. Independent Contractor. CONSULTANT shall act as an independent contractor, and covenants and agrees that it will conduct itself consistent with such status, that it will neither hold itself out as, nor claim to be, an officer or employee of CITY by reason of this Agreement.

12. Representation and Warranties. CONSULTANT warrants that it has not employed or retained any company or person, other than a bona fide employee working for CONSULTANT, to solicit or secure this Agreement, and that it has not paid or agreed to pay any

company or person, other than a bona fide employee, any fee, commission, percentage, brokerage fee, gift or any other consideration, contingent upon or resulting from the award or making of this Agreement. For breach or violation of this warranty, CITY shall have the right to terminate as void this Agreement, without liability, or, in its discretion, to deduct from the Agreement price or consideration, or otherwise recover, the full amount of such fee, commission, percentage, brokerage fee, gift or contingent fee.

13. Successors in Interest. This Agreement shall be binding upon the heirs, successors, executors, administrators and assigns of the respective parties hereto.

14. Copyright, Ownership and Use of Materials. All tangible materials ("Material") created or delivered pursuant to this Agreement is considered a work made for hire under the Copyright Act. To the extent such Material does not qualify as a work made for hire, CONSULTANT hereby assigns to CITY all right, title, and interest, including but not limited to all copyrights, in all Material created by CONSULTANT in its performance under this Agreement. Material constitutes the scope of work outlined in Exhibit A and attached hereto, and all written and other tangible expressions, including but not limited to, drawings, papers, documents, reports, surveys, renderings, exhibits, sketches, maps, models, prints, paintings or photographs, in any and all media or formats in which such materials have been created or are maintained. All Material furnished by CONSULTANT is, and shall remain, the property of CITY.

CONSULTANT shall execute any documents necessary to effectuate such assignment. In the event that CONSULTANT uses, employs, designates, or retains any person or entity who is not an employee of CONSULTANT, to perform any work required of it pursuant to this

Agreement, CONSULTANT shall require said person or entity to execute an agreement containing the preceding paragraph.

15. Termination of Agreement. The City may terminate this Agreement without cause by giving CONSULTANT ten (10) days advance written notice from the City Manager. CONSULTANT may terminate this Agreement without cause by giving CITY thirty (30) days advance written notice. In the event of termination through no fault of CONSULTANT, CITY shall compensate CONSULTANT for services performed as of the date of termination, upon the release to CITY of all Material hereunder, in any and all media or formats in which such materials have been created or are maintained. CITY retains the right to receive and use any Material, notwithstanding any termination or any dispute regarding the amount to be paid.

16. Attorney's Fees; Venue; Governing Law. If either party commences any legal action against the other party arising out of this Agreement or the performance thereof, the prevailing party in such action shall be entitled to recover its reasonable litigation expenses, including but not limited to, court costs, expert witness fees, discovery expenses, and attorneys' fees. Any action arising out of this Agreement shall be brought in Placer County, California, regardless of where else venue may lie. This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of California.

17. Modification. This Agreement and each provision contained herein may be waived, amended, supplemented or eliminated only by mutual written agreement of the parties.

18. Severability. If any of the provisions contained in this Agreement is for any reason held invalid or unenforceable, such holding shall not affect the remaining provisions or the validity and enforceability of the Agreement as a whole.

19. Notices. Any notices to parties required by this Agreement shall be delivered personally or mailed, U.S. first class postage prepaid, addressed as follows:

CITY OF ROSEVILLE

Chris Robles
Economic Development Director
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

CONSULTANT

Brandon Benton, PLS
Project Manager
7300 Folsom Boulevard, Suite 203
Sacramento, CA 95826

Either party may amend its address for notice by giving notice to the other party in writing.


20. Integrated Agreement. This is an integrated agreement and contains all of the terms, considerations, understanding and promises of the parties. It shall be read as a whole.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the City of Roseville, a municipal corporation, has authorized the execution of this Agreement in duplicate by its City Manager and attested to by its City Clerk under the authority of Resolution No. _____, adopted by the Council of the City of Roseville on the ____ day of _____, 20__, and CONSULTANT has caused this Agreement to be executed.

CITY OF ROSEVILLE, a
municipal corporation

BY: _____
ROB JENSEN
City Manager

MARK THOMAS & COMPANY, INC., a
California corporation

BY: 
its: President

and

[SIGNATURES CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE]

ATTEST:

BY: R.M. B...
its: Secretary

BY: _____
SONIA OROZCO
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

BY: _____
ROBERT R. SCHMITT
City Attorney

APPROVED AS TO SUBSTANCE:

BY: CR
CHRIS ROBLES
Economic Development Director

EXHIBIT “A”



MARK THOMAS & COMPANY

Providing Engineering, Surveying & Planning Services

December 6, 2016

Mr. Bill Aiken
Development Analyst
City of Roseville

OFFICES

Cupertino

Fresno

Irvine

Oakland

Sacramento

Salinas

San Mateo

San Jose

Walnut Creek

311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

Proposal for Tentative and Final Map in the City of Roseville

Dear Mr. Aiken,

Mark Thomas & Company (MTCO) is pleased to provide the following proposal to provide surveying services. We have completed preliminary research of your project and can offer to provide a property survey of the following Assessor Parcel Numbers:

- **013-120-001**
- **013-131-001 thru 006**
- **013-131-017**
- **013-131-019**
- **013-172-011 & 012**
- **013-172-022 & 023**

A boundary resolution for the impacted parcels will be completed by using record Parcel maps (PM), Records of Survey (RS) & Tract maps (TM). The resolved boundary will be used to complete a tentative and final parcel map for the City of Roseville.

Our current scope, fee estimate and schedule are shown in Exhibit A attached. Sam McIntyre, PLS, will serve as your Project Surveyor and I will be your Project Manager.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call my cell at (916) 403-5753 or email me at bbenton@markthomas.com.

Exhibit 'A'

Scope of Work

The City of Roseville has asked Mark Thomas & Company, Inc. (MTCO) to provide a Tentative and Final Map.

Background

The City of Roseville (City) will be improving the footprint of lots owned by the City located at 401 Oak Street in downtown Roseville and along Dry Creek, Oak St & Taylor St. MTCO has been asked to provide a Tentative and Final Map to combine the lots owned by the City.

Phase 1: Boundary Resolution

MTCO will perform record research to locate recorded right-of-way maps, records of survey, corner records, and other official maps of record necessary to determine right of way and property lines of the subject parcels.

MTCO will locate monuments and physical evidence to assist in right of way and property delineation. It is assumed the monuments shown on record maps will be found and can be located without the need for convoluted retracements. MTCO will resolve the boundary based on best available evidence. It is assumed no traffic control will be necessary to locate monuments on roadways.

It is assumed the City will provide MTCO with title reports for all aforementioned subject parcels, vesting docs and any exceptions listed in the title report. If a conflict or material discrepancies are found, work will stop and options will be discussed with the client to determine further action.

Phase 2: FEMA Elevation Certificate

An elevation certificate is needed for the fire station located at 401 Oak Street in downtown Roseville. MTCO will perform a field survey to determine the elevations required for the elevation certificate. Once the survey has been completed the elevation certificate will be filled out. It is assumed that access will be provided to the Fire Station during the same day that the boundary survey is taking place.

Phase 2 Deliverables: FEMA Elevation Certificate

Phase 3: Tentative Map

Based on the information gathered in Phase 1, MTCO will plot this boundary on a Tentative Map. MTCO will submit the Tentative Map to the City of Roseville for review and comment. The purpose of the tentative map will be to merge and re-subdivide lots owned by the City within the project area, including vacation and/or dedication of rights-of- ways and easements as necessary and utilizing existing monuments. Before beginning work on the Tentative Map, it is assumed that MTCO will be provided with proposed Lot lines by the City.

Phase 3 Deliverables: Tentative Map

Phase 4: Prepare Final Map

After review by the City, and conditions of approval are provided, MTCO will address those applicable to the completion of the Final Map. MTCO will then draft and process through the City Planning Department a Final Map showing the lots in question merged and re-subdivided.

MTCO assumes no more than thirty (30) monuments will be required to be set. Monument wells are not included in this scope and will be provided and set by others if required.

Phase 4 Deliverables: Final Map approved by the City

Schedule

The field survey can be scheduled within one (1) week of NTP. Completion of the Tentative Map will be completed within a month of completing the boundary survey. The processing of the Final Map will be determined at a later date based upon the review of City staff and the conditions of approval provided from that review.

Assumptions

- MTCO **assumes** all access will be granted by the City of Roseville.
- MTCO **assumes** the cost of filing all maps with the County will be paid by the City.
- MTCO **assumes** title reports will be provided by the City or will obtain them at no additional cost to MTCO.
- MTCO **assumes** traffic control will not be required for any portion of the survey work.

Exclusions

- MTCO **excludes** the cost of any fees or permits.
- MTCO **excludes** the following requirements stated in the City of Roseville (SUBD)

Application Checklist:

- Existing and post project elevations shown
- Existing contours at 2' elevations for specified slopes shown
- Cut & Fill slopes and grading quantities
- Existing and proposed drainage
- Water and sewer plan
- Existing trees and trees to be removed
- Arborist Report
- Traffic Study
- Preliminary Stormwater Quality Compliance Form.
- Natural features including: wetlands, streams, etc...
- Phasing Lines

Deliverables

1. FEMA Elevation Certificate
2. Tentative Map submitted to the City of Roseville
3. Final Map filed with the City of Roseville.

Fee

All the above Phases will be performed on a lump sum. Any work outside the provided scope of work, will be completed under separate scope and fee negotiations, or on a time and materials basis based upon current fee schedules for MTCO and only after authorization by the City of Roseville. See attached cost spreadsheet (Attachment I).

Please feel free to call me if you have any questions. My cell phone number is (916) 403-5753. We are looking forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

MARK THOMAS & COMPANY, INC.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Brandon Benton', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Brandon Benton, PLS

Survey Manager

Enclosures: Attachment I— Cost Spreadsheet

EXHIBIT “B”



PURCHASING

CENTRAL SERVICES

SOLE SOURCE FORM

Requesting Department: Economic Development

Division:

Name of Requestor: Bill Aiken

Extension: 5271

Total Dollar Amount: \$ 39,855.00

Vendor: Mark Thomas & Co., Inc.

Sole Source forms are not required for purchases less than \$5,000

DEFINITIONS:

Sole Source means that there is only **one** supplier who can provide the required product or service; or there may be more than one available supplier for a particular product or service; however, a **preferred provider** is being selected based upon one or more of the following reasons:

Check applicable criteria and complete explanation section.

- ☐ **Standardization:** Sole Brand items are used in cases where the City requires the item(s) to standardize parts, design, quality, etc. with a particular brand or model. Sole Brand items may be items which perform a certain function for which no other items are known to exist. *(Explain below)*
- ☒ **Critical Schedule Requirements:** Supplier is the firm best able to meet critical schedule requirements. *(Explain below)*
- ☐ **Specialized Test Facilities/Equipment:** Supplier is known to have facilities and/or test equipment which is highly specialized. *(Explain below)*
- ☐ **Patented, copyrighted, or licensed item:** The item is held under exclusive title, trademark or copyright by a private person or company. *(Attach letter from manufacturer authorizing specific supplier.)*
- ☐ **Distributorship:** Manufacturer defines limited or proprietary distribution channels, i.e., one designated vendor for the local sales territory. *(Attach letter from manufacturer authorizing specific supplier.)*
- ☒ **Other:**

Explanation: *(limited to 325 characters)*

Time sensitive negotiate w/Warwick f/buy of 401 Oak requires lot consolidation. Special services: boundary reso, FEMA Elevation, + Maps. MTCO meets timeline; possess project u/standing based on Town Square, r/about, D/T infra, and D/T Bridge efforts; + adjusts to changes. Initially small scope; requests created larger.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

Vendor Name: Mark Thomas & Co., Inc.

Phone: 916-781-9100

Contact Person: Zach Siviglia

Email Address: zsiviglia@markthomas.com

Address: 7300 Folsom Boulevard, Suite 203, Sacramento, CA 95826

Define / Describe specific product(s) or service(s): *required (limited to 100 characters)

Survey work w/site work boundaries f/adjacent project, FEMA certificate, + Final Subdivision Map

☐ **Central Stores Warehouse:** Check box if product will be ordered/stocked in Central Stores Warehouse**AUTHORIZATION:**

"I, the Undersigned, understand the City's requirement for competitive bidding. I also understand sole source purchases do not allow a competitive bid process. I have researched alternatives and other sources and have made a concerted effort to review comparable/equal equipment and sources. I believe, to the best of my knowledge, this sole source request to be justified and have found the supplier identified above to be the best source for this procurement action, with the agreed-upon pricing to be fair and reasonable and in the best interest of the City of Roseville for the utilization of its public funds."

Signature (Requestor):



Date:

12/8/16

The signatures below certify that the information submitted on this form has been reviewed and has departmental approval. The final determination of sole source approval shall be made by the Purchasing Office in coordination with the City Attorney's office.

CITY
Division Manager Approval

(required for purchases valued over \$5,000)

Signature (Division Manager):



Date:

12/9/16

****Purchasing Signature is not required if over Council Limit**

Purchasing Official Approval

(required for purchases valued over \$5,000 – formal bid limit)

Signature (Purchasing Official):

N/A

Date:

Department Head and City Attorney Approval

(required for purchases valued over the formal bid limit)

Signature (Department Head):



Date:

12/9/16

Signature (City Attorney Official):



Date:

12/12/16

Purchasing Use Only

PR Number: _____ SA/ PO Number: _____ Dollar Amount: \$ _____

Buyer: _____ City Council Approval Date: _____ Expires: _____



REQUEST FOR BUDGET ADJUSTMENT
FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Instructions: Complete all necessary fields. Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory and required for processing. Obtain required approvals and process according to the procedure outlined in:

[A.R. 6.01 Budget Adjustment Policy & Procedure.](#)

For more detailed budget adjustment training information, including examples, please click on the following link:

[Miscellaneous Budget Training Information.](#)

REQUESTER*:

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION*:

FISCAL YEAR/EFFECTIVE DATE*:

PROPOSED COUNCIL DATE (if applicable):

USE OF FUNDS*						
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL			JL		
	ORG KEY*	OBJECT*	FUND*	PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
\$ -	TOTAL					

SOURCE OF FUNDS*						
AMOUNT*	ACCOUNT NUMBER					Account Title/Activity Description*
	GL			JL		
	ORG KEY	OBJECT	FUND*	PROJECT	ACTIVITY	
\$ -	TOTAL					

FINANCE USE	Approved:					
	BUDGET MANAGER/DESIGNEE		DATE		Finance Director: Date	

Justification for Budget Adjustment*:

Approved:		Approved:	
REQUESTING DEPARTMENT HEAD / DESIGNEE	DATE	CITY MANAGER	DATE



MARK THOMAS & COMPANY

Providing Engineering, Surveying & Planning Services

December 6, 2016

Mr. Bill Aiken
Development Analyst
City of Roseville

OFFICES

Cupertino

Fresno

Irvine

Oakland

Sacramento

Salinas

San Mateo

San Jose

Walnut Creek

311 Vernon Street

Roseville, CA 95678

Proposal for Tentative and Final Map in the City of Roseville

Dear Mr. Aiken,

Mark Thomas & Company (MTCO) is pleased to provide the following proposal to provide surveying services. We have completed preliminary research of your project and can offer to provide a property survey of the following Assessor Parcel Numbers:

- **013-120-001**
- **013-131-001 thru 006**
- **013-131-017**
- **013-131-019**
- **013-172-011 & 012**
- **013-172-022 & 023**

A boundary resolution for the impacted parcels will be completed by using record Parcel maps (PM), Records of Survey (RS) & Tract maps (TM). The resolved boundary will be used to complete a tentative and final parcel map for the City of Roseville.

Our current scope, fee estimate and schedule are shown in Exhibit A attached. Sam McIntyre, PLS, will serve as your Project Surveyor and I will be your Project Manager.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call my cell at (916) 403-5753 or email me at bbenton@markthomas.com.

Exhibit 'A'

Scope of Work

The City of Roseville has asked Mark Thomas & Company, Inc. (MTCO) to provide a Tentative and Final Map.

Background

The City of Roseville (City) will be improving the footprint of lots owned by the City located at 401 Oak Street in downtown Roseville and along Dry Creek, Oak St & Taylor St. MTCO has been asked to provide a Tentative and Final Map to combine the lots owned by the City.

Phase 1: Boundary Resolution

MTCO will perform record research to locate recorded right-of-way maps, records of survey, corner records, and other official maps of record necessary to determine right of way and property lines of the subject parcels.

MTCO will locate monuments and physical evidence to assist in right of way and property delineation. It is assumed the monuments shown on record maps will be found and can be located without the need for convoluted retracements. MTCO will resolve the boundary based on best available evidence. It is assumed no traffic control will be necessary to locate monuments on roadways.

It is assumed the City will provide MTCO with title reports for all aforementioned subject parcels, vesting docs and any exceptions listed in the title report. If a conflict or material discrepancies are found, work will stop and options will be discussed with the client to determine further action.

Phase 2: FEMA Elevation Certificate

An elevation certificate is needed for the fire station located at 401 Oak Street in downtown Roseville. MTCO will perform a field survey to determine the elevations required for the elevation certificate. Once the survey has been completed the elevation certificate will be filled out. It is assumed that access will be provided to the Fire Station during the same day that the boundary survey is taking place.

Phase 2 Deliverables: FEMA Elevation Certificate

Phase 3: Tentative Map

Based on the information gathered in Phase 1, MTCO will plot this boundary on a Tentative Map. MTCO will submit the Tentative Map to the City of Roseville for review and comment. The purpose of the tentative map will be to merge and re-subdivide lots owned by the City within the project area, including vacation and/or dedication of rights-of- ways and easements as necessary and utilizing existing monuments. Before beginning work on the Tentative Map, it is assumed that MTCO will be provided with proposed Lot lines by the City.

Phase 3 Deliverables: Tentative Map

Phase 4: Prepare Final Map

After review by the City, and conditions of approval are provided, MTCO will address those applicable to the completion of the Final Map. MTCO will then draft and process through the City Planning Department a Final Map showing the lots in question merged and re-subdivided.

MTCO assumes no more than thirty (30) monuments will be required to be set. Monument wells are not included in this scope and will be provided and set by others if required.

Phase 4 Deliverables: Final Map approved by the City

Schedule

The field survey can be scheduled within one (1) week of NTP. Completion of the Tentative Map will be completed within a month of completing the boundary survey. The processing of the Final Map will be determined at a later date based upon the review of City staff and the conditions of approval provided from that review.

Assumptions

- MTCO **assumes** all access will be granted by the City of Roseville.
- MTCO **assumes** the cost of filing all maps with the County will be paid by the City.
- MTCO **assumes** title reports will be provided by the City or will obtain them at no additional cost to MTCO.
- MTCO **assumes** traffic control will not be required for any portion of the survey work.

Exclusions

- MTCO **excludes** the cost of any fees or permits.
- MTCO **excludes** the following requirements stated in the City of Roseville (SUBD)

Application Checklist:

- Existing and post project elevations shown
- Existing contours at 2' elevations for specified slopes shown
- Cut & Fill slopes and grading quantities
- Existing and proposed drainage
- Water and sewer plan
- Existing trees and trees to be removed
- Arborist Report
- Traffic Study
- Preliminary Stormwater Quality Compliance Form.
- Natural features including: wetlands, streams, etc...
- Phasing Lines

Deliverables

1. FEMA Elevation Certificate
2. Tentative Map submitted to the City of Roseville
3. Final Map filed with the City of Roseville.

Fee

All the above Phases will be performed on a lump sum. Any work outside the provided scope of work, will be completed under separate scope and fee negotiations, or on a time and materials basis based upon current fee schedules for MTCO and only after authorization by the City of Roseville. See attached cost spreadsheet (Attachment I).

Please feel free to call me if you have any questions. My cell phone number is (916) 403-5753. We are looking forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

MARK THOMAS & COMPANY, INC.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Brandon Benton', is written over a horizontal line.

Brandon Benton, PLS

Survey Manager


Enclosures: Attachment I— Cost Spreadsheet



Mark Thomas & Company
Roseville - Lot Merger

PROJECT TASK					SUBTOTAL					TOTAL
	Survey Manager	Project Surveyor	Survey Technician	2 Person Field Crew		Survey Manager	Project Surveyor	Survey Technician	2 Person Field Crew	
						\$200.00	\$145.00	\$110.00	\$270.00	
Total Site Area Utility Investigation										
1. Boundary Resolution	10	32	32	32	106	2,000	4,640	3,520	8,640	\$18,800.00
2. FEMA Elevation Certificate		1	6	4	11		145	870	1,080	\$2,095.00
3. Tentative Map	8	16	40		64	1,600	2,320	4,400		\$8,320.00
4. Final Map	4	8	20	24	56	800	1,160	2,200	6,480	\$10,640.00
CONTRACT SERVICES TOTAL	22	57	98	60	237	4,400	8,265	10,990	16,200	\$39,855.00

PORTION OF SECTION 2,
T.10N, R.4.6 M.D.M.



BEARINGS AND DISTANCES USED IN THE ABOVE DESCRIPTION ARE BASED UPON THE CALIFORNIA COORDINATE SYSTEM OF 1983, EPOCH 1991.35, ZONE (2). DISTANCES ARE IN US SURVEY FEET, MULTIPLY THE DISTANCES SHOWN ABOVE BY 1.00007 TO OBTAIN GROUND LEVEL DISTANCES.

SHEET 1 OF 4



Mark
Thomas &
Company
Inc.

Scale: 1" = 100'
Date Dec. 2016
Drawn By CMD
Checked By MJS

Exhibit B
Project Parcel #01, 02, & 03

Plat to Accompany Legal Description
In the City of Roseville
Placer County, California



EXHIBIT "A"
Project Parcel # 01

All that property situated in the City of Roseville, County of Placer, State of California, being a portion of Section 2, Township 10 North, Range 6 East, Mount Diablo Base & Meridian more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the most northwesterly corner of the lands described in the Grant Deed to CITY OF ROSEVILLE, recorded April 29, 1976 in Book 1721, at Page 338 also being at a point on the southerly line of the Alley as shown on the Map titled "Fractional Part of Block No 16" recorded in Book C, at Page 88, Placer County Records; thence along said southerly line North 29°14'51" East, 134.55 feet; thence leaving said southerly line, South 45°15'56" East, 45.39 feet; thence North 44°44'04" East, 14.61 feet; thence South 45°25'04" East, 126.61 feet; thence South 18°13'43" West, 103.26 feet; thence North 61°15'29" West, 189.49 feet to the **Point of Beginning**.

Containing 0.50 acres or 21,624 square feet, more or less.

Bearings and distances used in the above description are based upon the California Coordinate System of 1983, Epoch 1991.35, Zone (2). Distances are in US Survey feet, multiply the distances shown above by 1.00007 to obtain ground level distances.

EXHIBIT "A"
Project Parcel # 02

All that property situated in the City of Roseville, County of Placer, State of California, being a portion of Section 2, Township 10 North, Range 6 East, Mount Diablo Base & Meridian more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point which bears South 44°46'39" East, 4.40 feet from the most westerly corner of Lot 10 as shown on the Map titled "Fractional Part of Block No 16" recorded in Book C, at Page 88, Placer County Records; thence North 53°52'55" East, 26.60 feet; thence North 45°22'57" East, 64.28 feet; thence North 55°33'55" East, 12.05 feet; thence North 44°42'21" East, 118.67 feet; thence South 45°17'41" East, 22.01 feet; thence North 44°42'19" East, 39.27 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave to the north, having a radius of 55.00 feet and a chord bearing North 88°29'58" East, 45.83 feet; thence easterly through a central angle of 49°14'23", 47.27 feet along said curve; thence South 45°19'41" East, 66.69; thence South 17°12'19" West, 133.70 feet; thence South 25°22'41" West, 142.03 feet; thence South 17°08'12" West, 62.97 feet; thence North 45°25'04" West, 126.61 feet; thence South 44°44'04" West, 14.61 feet; thence North 45°15'56" West, 45.39 feet to the southerly line of the Alley as shown on said map; thence along said southerly line, North 29°14'51" East, 30.19 feet to the easterly line of said Alley; thence along said easterly line, North 44°46'39" West, 85.53 feet the **Point of Beginning**.

Containing 1.30 acres or 56,707 square feet, more or less.

Bearings and distances used in the above description are based upon the California Coordinate System of 1983, Epoch 1991.35, Zone (2). Distances are in US Survey feet, multiply the distances shown above by 1.00007 to obtain ground level distances.

EXHIBIT "A"
Project Parcel # 03

All that property situated in the City of Roseville, County of Placer, State of California, being a portion of Section 2, Township 10 North, Range 6 East, Mount Diablo Base & Meridian more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at Engineers Station 105+50, 73.68 as shown on the map filed with Caltrans as 002375R in District 3, Placer County, Route 3, Sheet 1 of 9; thence South 72°33'09" East, 38.49 feet; thence South 38°04'33" West, 159.37 feet; thence South 15°48'29" West, 37.47 feet; thence North 45°19'41" West, 103.95 feet to the southerly line of Oak Street; thence along said southerly line, North 44°42'21" East, 156.42 feet; thence leaving said southerly line, South 72°33'09" East, 37.37 feet to the **Point of Beginning**.

Containing 0.32 acres or 14,077 square feet, more or less.

Bearings and distances used in the above description are based upon the California Coordinate System of 1983, Epoch 1991.35, Zone (2). Distances are in US Survey feet, multiply the distances shown above by 1.00007 to obtain ground level distances.

Appraisal Report

City of Roseville Fire Department
401 Oak Street
Roseville, California 95678



Date of Report: December 1, 2016

Prepared For:

Mr. Bill Aiken, Development Analyst
Economic Development Department
City of Roseville
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, California 95678

Prepared By:

Nelson M. Wong, MAI



Real Estate Appraisal & Consultation



Seevers
Jordan
Ziegenmeyer

Real Estate Appraisal & Consultation

December 1, 2016

Mr. Bill Aiken, Development Analyst
Economic Development Department
City of Roseville
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, California 95678

RE: City of Roseville Fire Department
401 Oak Street
Roseville, California 95678

Dear Mr. Aiken:

At your request and authorization, Seevers • Jordan • Ziegenmeyer has prepared an Appraisal Report pertaining to the above referenced property. This report is written in conformance with the requirements set forth under Standards Rule 2-2(a) of the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP).

The subject property represents a three-story fire station located at 401 Oak Street, within the city of Roseville, Placer County, California. The improvements were originally constructed in 1971 and contain 32,543± square feet of building area. However, the lower level is in a floodplain and has restrictions on conversion or renovation. Further, this portion of the building has limited marketability due to lower ceilings, reduced window lines, and limited access. Thus, the rentable area is estimated at 19,000 square feet (first and second floors only). The improvements are situated within the confines of six Assessor's parcels identified as 013-120-001, 013-131-001, -002, -003, -017, and -019, containing 401,552± square feet of land area. There is a planned lot line adjustment, and once recorded, the subject will be identified as three parcels with a total land area of 90,977± square feet. While the property is currently 100% owner-occupied by the City of Roseville, it will be vacated following the construction of a new fire station on another parcel (this property currently consists of vacant land). Additionally, employees within the administrative office portion of the building will relocate to a new multi-story office building that is currently under construction on Vernon Street. As a result, continued long-term use of the subject is not probable.

We have been requested to estimate the market value of the subject property assuming completion of the lot line adjustment, as of the date of inspection (October 20, 2016). This value is subject to a hypothetical condition, defined by USPAP as "a condition, directly related to a specific assignment which is contrary to what is known by the appraiser to exist on the effective date of the assignment results, but is used for the purpose of analysis." At the client's request, we will also develop an opinion of market value of the subject as vacant land.

While the subject is currently occupied by a public/government entity for use as a fire station, the subject will be appraised in accordance with its highest and best economic use. Since the building is to be vacated with a new fire station to be constructed on another site, we have considered alternative uses for the subject property. In other words, the existing use as a fire station will not remain into perpetuity. Given the design, layout, and construction of the building, and considering the legally permissible uses under the CMU-SA-DT – Commercial Mixed Use, Special Area, Downtown zoning designation encumbering the subject, the property is most suitable for office use. A significant portion of the building is already improved as office space, and the fire engine bay can be converted.

As a result of our analysis, it is our opinion the fee simple market values of the subject property (based on a hypothetical condition assuming completion of the lot line adjustment), in accordance with the definitions, certifications, assumptions and limiting conditions set forth in the attached document, as of October 20, 2016, are...

Value Estimate	Conclusion
Market Value As of the Date of Inspection	\$190,000
Market Value of the Land as-if Vacant	\$130,000

* Both estimates assume completion of the lot line adjustment (hypothetical condition)

The estimate(s) of market value assume a transfer would reflect a cash transaction or terms considered to be equivalent to cash. The estimate(s) are/is premised on an assumed sale after reasonable exposure in a competitive market under all conditions requisite to a fair sale, with buyer and seller each acting prudently, knowledgeably, for their own self-interest and assuming neither is under duress.

This letter must remain attached to the report, which contains 94 pages, plus related exhibits and Appendix, in order for the value opinion contained herein to be considered valid.

The subject property does not have any significant natural, cultural, recreational or scientific value. The appraisers certify this appraisal assignment was not based on a requested minimum valuation, a specific valuation or the approval of a loan.

This appraisal has been performed in accordance with the requirements of the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP), as well as the Code of Professional Ethics and Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice of the Appraisal Institute.

Mr. Bill Aiken
December 1, 2016
Page 3

Thank you for the opportunity to work with your office on this assignment.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'N. Wong', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Nelson M. Wong, MAI
State Certification No.: AG034862
Expiration Date: August 12, 2018

\dtn

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Transmittal Letter

Table of Contents

Summary of Important Facts and Conclusions 1

Appraisal Conditions

Client, Intended User and Intended Use	3
Appraisal Report Format	3
Type and Definition of Value	3
Property Rights Appraised	3
Dates of Inspection, Value and Report	4
Scope of Work	4
Extraordinary Assumptions and Hypothetical Conditions	6
General Assumptions and Limiting Conditions	7
Certification Statements	9

Subject Property

Property History and Occupancy	10
Property Legal Data	12
Site Description	16
Improvement Description	19
Subject Photographs	20

Market Analysis

Placer County	29
Neighborhood	34
Office Market	38
Highest and Best Use	44

Valuation

Approaches to Value	47
Sales Comparison Approach	49
Income Capitalization Approach	62
Reconciliation	74
Market Value as of the Date of Inspection	75
Land Valuation	79
Conclusions of Market Value	93
Exposure and Marketing Time	94

Appendix

A – Readdressing/Reassigning Appraisal Reports	
B – Glossary of Terms	
C – Qualifications of Appraiser(s)	

SUMMARY OF IMPORTANT FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS

Appraised Property:	Roseville Fire Station
Street Address:	401 Oak Street Roseville, California 95678
Location:	Along the east line of Oak Street, at the terminus of South Grant Street
Assessor's Parcel Number(s):	013-120-001; 013-131-001, -002, -003, -017, and -019
Census Tract Number:	209.01 / 1
Owner(s) of Record:	City of Roseville
Zoning:	CMU-SA-DT, Commercial Mixed Use, Special Area, Downtown
Flood Zone:	The majority of the subject property is located in Zone X, described as areas outside of the 100- and 500-year floodplains. Since the basement is located below street grade and is adjacent to Dry Creek, it is reportedly within the floodplain.
Land Area:	A lot line adjustment is being processed. Once recorded the subject will be identified by three separate parcels with a combined land area 2.09± acres. The estimate of value contained herein is based on a hypothetical condition assuming completion of the lot line adjustment.
Rentable Building Area:	
First Floor	15,070± square feet
Second Floor	<u>3,930± square feet</u>
Total	19,000± square feet
	The subject property also contains 13,543± square feet of basement space. City representatives noted this area is in the floodplain and has restrictions on renovation or conversion. It also has limited marketability due to lower ceilings, reduced window lines, and limited access. The basement is therefore not included in the calculation of rentable area for the subject.
Highest and Best Use:	With a new fire station to be constructed in the immediate area, continued long-term use of the subject

as a fire station is not probable. The highest and best use of the subject property is for conversion into professional office space and lease-up of the building.

Date of Inspection: October 20, 2016

Date of Value: October 20, 2016

Date of Report: December 1, 2016

Property Rights Appraised: Fee simple estate

Exposure and Marketing Time: 12 months

Conclusion of Market Value:

Value Estimate	Conclusion
Market Value As of the Date of Inspection	\$190,000
Market Value of the Land as-if Vacant	\$130,000

* Both estimates assume completion of the lot line adjustment (hypothetical condition)

CLIENT, INTENDED USER AND INTENDED USE

The client and intended user of this appraisal report is the City of Roseville. It is our understanding the appraisal is intended for use in determining market value for the disposition of the property.

APPRAISAL REPORT FORMAT

Our findings are presented in an Appraisal Report, in accordance with the reporting requirements set forth under Standards Rule 2-2(a) of the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP).

TYPE AND DEFINITION OF VALUE

The purpose of this appraisal is to estimate the market value (*fee simple interest*) of the subject property assuming completion of the lot line adjustment, as well as the market value of the subject as vacant land, as of the date of inspection. Market value is defined as follows:

Market Value: The most probable price which a property should bring in a competitive and open market under all conditions requisite to a fair sale, the buyer and seller each acting prudently and knowledgeably, and assuming the price is not affected by undue stimulus. Implicit in this definition is the consummation of a sale as of a specified date and the passing of title from seller to buyer under conditions whereby:

- (1) Buyer and seller are typically motivated;
- (2) Both parties are well informed or well advised, and acting in what they consider their own best interests;
- (3) A reasonable time is allowed for exposure in the open market;
- (4) Payment is made in terms of cash in U.S. dollars or in terms of financial arrangements comparable thereto; and
- (5) The price represents the normal consideration for the property sold unaffected by special or creative financing or sales concessions granted by anyone associated with the sale.¹

PROPERTY RIGHTS APPRAISED

The estimates of market value are for the fee simple interest, which is defined as follows:

Fee Simple Estate: absolute ownership unencumbered by any other interest or estate, subject only to the limitations imposed by the governmental powers of taxation, eminent domain, police power, and escheat.²

¹ Code of Federal Regulations, Title 12, Section 34.42 (55 Federal Register 34696, Aug. 24, 1990; as amended at 57 Federal Register 12202, Apr. 9, 1992; 59 Federal Register 29499, June 7, 1994).

² The Dictionary of Real Estate Appraisal, 6th ed. (Chicago: Appraisal Institute, 2015), 90.

DATES OF INSPECTION, VALUE AND REPORT

An inspection of the subject property was completed on October 20, 2016, which represents the effective date of market value. This report was completed and assembled on December 1, 2016.

SCOPE OF WORK

This appraisal report has been prepared in accordance with the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP). This analysis is intended to be an “appraisal assignment,” as defined by USPAP; the intention is the appraisal service be performed in such a manner that the result of the analysis, opinions, or conclusion be that of a disinterested third party.

We researched and documented several legal and physical aspects of the subject property. A physical inspection of the property was completed and serves as the basis for the site and improvement descriptions contained in this report. We were accompanied by Mr. Bill Aiken, a representative of the City of Roseville, at the time of inspection. We were provided with a floor plan and a map detailing the planned lot line adjustment. The sales history was verified by consulting public records. The subject’s zoning and entitlements, earthquake zone, flood zone, utilities, and tax information were verified with the applicable public agencies.

We analyzed and documented data relating to the subject’s neighborhood and surrounding market areas. This information was obtained through personal inspections of portions of the neighborhood and market areas, newspaper articles, real estate conferences and interviews with various market participants, including property owners, property managers, brokers, developers and local government agencies.

In this appraisal, we have determined the highest and best use of the subject property as though vacant and as improved, based on the four standard tests (legal permissibility, physical possibility, financial feasibility and maximum productivity). In addition, we have estimated a reasonable exposure time and marketing time associated with the market value estimate.

We have been requested to estimate the market value of the subject property assuming completion of the lot line adjustment, as of the date of inspection. As detailed in the *Highest and Best Use* section of this report, the maximally productive use of the subject is for curing of the deferred maintenance issues and conversion of the building into 100% office space and subsequent lease-up. We began the valuation by applying the sales comparison and income capitalization approaches to estimate the market value of the subject property assuming completion of renovation. From this value, we applied deductions for renovation and conversion costs, as well as lease-up costs, yielding an opinion of fee simple market value for the subject property with the lot line adjustment complete (based on a hypothetical condition). At the client’s request, we also estimated the market value of the subject as vacant land, in which we employed the sales comparison approach to analyze several recent land

transactions, then deducted the cost to demolish the building and remove the underground storage tanks.

The cost approach was not considered necessary to produce a credible estimate of market value. Market participants (buyers, sellers, brokers, etc.) put little, if any, reliance on this approach when assessing properties that are not of new or proposed construction, or that are not representative of special use properties. They typically rely on the sales comparison and income capitalization approaches. For the aforementioned reasons, the cost approach was not required in the valuation of the subject property.

The individuals involved in the preparation of this appraisal include Nelson M. Wong, MAI, and Alan Kritscher, Research Analyst. Mr. Kritscher assisted in 1) inspecting the subject property, 2) reviewing the subject property information provided by the client, 3) the collection and confirmation of market data, 4) the analysis of the market data, and 5) preparing portions of the draft report. Mr. Wong 1) inspected the subject property, 2) reviewed Mr. Kritscher's research and also collected and confirmed data, 3) made any necessary revisions and/or amplifications, and 4) completed the final report.

EXTRAORDINARY ASSUMPTIONS AND HYPOTHETICAL CONDITIONS

The valuation is premised on the following extraordinary assumptions and hypothetical conditions, the use of which may have affected assignment results.

Extraordinary Assumptions

1. The City of Roseville prepared a drawing detailing the land area of the subject property once the lot line adjustment is recorded. We have relied on this drawing and information provided by the City in referencing the subject's land area. If, at some future date, it is determined the land area differs from the information provided to us, this could affect our conclusion of market value.
2. City representatives noted there are underground tanks on the site and the building has asbestos. We used information contained in our appraisal files to estimate storage tank and asbestos removal. Note that we are not experts in the field of determining the existence or severity of these issues, and the cost of remediation could vary greatly. It is highly recommended that contractors are consulted to obtain accurate costs. Ultimately, if the costs associated with underground storage tank and asbestos removal differ from the estimates contained herein, this would materially impact the valuation.

Hypothetical Conditions

1. We have been requested to estimate the market value of the subject property assuming completion of the lot line adjustment, both as currently improved and as vacant land. These estimates of value are subject to a hypothetical condition, defined by USPAP as "a condition, directly related to a specific assignment which is contrary to what is known by the appraiser to exist on the effective date of the assignment results, but is used for the purpose of analysis."

GENERAL ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITING CONDITIONS

1. No responsibility is assumed for the legal description provided or for matters pertaining to legal or title considerations. Title to the property is assumed to be good and marketable unless otherwise stated.
2. No responsibility is assumed for matters of law or legal interpretation.
3. The property is appraised free and clear of any or all liens or encumbrances unless otherwise stated.
4. The information and data furnished by others in preparation of this report is believed to be reliable, but no warranty is given for its accuracy.
5. It is assumed there are no hidden or unapparent conditions of the property, subsoil, or structures that render it more or less valuable. No responsibility is assumed for such conditions or for obtaining the engineering studies that may be required to discover them.
6. It is assumed the property is in full compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local environmental regulations and laws unless the lack of compliance is stated, described, and considered in the appraisal report.
7. It is assumed the property conforms to all applicable zoning and use regulations and restrictions unless nonconformity has been identified, described and considered in the appraisal report.
8. It is assumed all required licenses, certificates of occupancy, consents, and other legislative or administrative authority from any local, state, or national government or private entity or organization have been or can be obtained or renewed for any use on which the value estimate contained in this report is based.
9. It is assumed the use of the land and improvements is confined within the boundaries or property lines of the property described and there is no encroachment or trespass unless noted in the report.
10. Unless otherwise stated in this report, the existence of hazardous materials, which may or may not be present on the property, was not observed by the appraiser. The appraiser has no knowledge of the existence of such materials on or in the property. The appraiser, however, is not qualified to detect such substances. The presence of substances such as asbestos, urea-formaldehyde foam insulation and other potentially hazardous materials may affect the value of the property. The value estimated is predicated on the assumption there is no such material on or in the property that would cause a loss in value. No responsibility is assumed for such conditions or for any expertise or engineering knowledge required to discover them. The intended user of this report is urged to retain an expert in this field, if desired.
11. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) became effective January 26, 1992. I (we) have not made a specific survey or analysis of this property to determine whether the physical aspects of the improvements meet the ADA accessibility guidelines. Since compliance matches each owner's financial ability with the cost-to cure the property's potential physical characteristics, the real estate appraiser cannot comment on compliance with ADA. A brief summary of the subject's physical aspects is included in this report. It in no way suggests ADA compliance by


the current owner. Given that compliance can change with each owner's financial ability to cure non-accessibility, the value of the subject does not consider possible non-compliance. Specific study of both the owner's financial ability and the cost-to-cure any deficiencies would be needed for the Department of Justice to determine compliance.

12. The appraisal is to be considered in its entirety and use of only a portion thereof will render the appraisal invalid.
13. Possession of this report or a copy thereof does not carry with it the right of publication nor may it be used for any purpose by anyone other than the client without the previous written consent of Seevers • Jordan • Ziegenmeyer.
14. Neither all nor any part of the contents of this report (especially any conclusions as to value, the identity of the appraiser, or the firm with which the appraiser is connected) shall be disseminated to the public through advertising, public relations, news, sales, or any other media without the prior written consent and approval of Seevers • Jordan • Ziegenmeyer.
15. Acceptance and/or use of the appraisal report constitutes acceptance of all assumptions and limiting conditions stated in this report.
16. An inspection of the subject properties revealed no apparent adverse easements, encroachments or other conditions, which currently impact the subject. However, the appraiser is not a surveyor nor qualified to determine the exact location of easements. It is assumed typical easements do not have an impact on the opinion (s) of value as provided in this report. If, at some future date, these easements are determined to have a detrimental impact on value, the appraiser reserves the right to amend the opinion (s) of value.
17. This appraisal report is prepared for the exclusive use of the appraiser's client. No third parties are authorized to rely upon this report without the express consent of the appraiser.
18. The appraiser is not qualified to determine the existence of mold, the cause of mold, the type of mold or whether mold might pose any risk to the property or its inhabitants. Additional inspection by a qualified professional is recommended.

CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief:

- The statements of fact contained in this report are true and correct.
- The reported analyses, opinions, and conclusions are limited only by the reported assumptions and limiting conditions and are my personal, impartial, and unbiased professional analyses, opinions, and conclusions.
- I have no present or prospective interest in the property that is the subject of this report and no personal interest with respect to the parties involved.
- I have performed no services, as an appraiser or in any other capacity, regarding the property that is the subject of this report within the three-year period immediately preceding acceptance of this assignment.
- I have no bias with respect to the property that is the subject of this report or to the parties involved with this assignment.
- My engagement in this assignment was not contingent upon developing or reporting predetermined results.
- My compensation for completing this assignment is not contingent upon the development or reporting of a predetermined value or direction in value that favors the cause of the client, the amount of the value opinion, the attainment of a stipulated result, or the occurrence of a subsequent event directly related to the intended use of this appraisal.
- My analyses, opinions, and conclusions were developed, and this report has been prepared, in conformity with the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.
- The reported analyses, opinions, and conclusions were developed, and this report has been prepared, in conformity with the Code of Professional Ethics and Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice of the Appraisal Institute.
- I have made an inspection of the property that is the subject of this report.
- Alan Kritscher, Research Analyst, provided significant real property appraisal assistance to the person signing this certification.
- The use of this report is subject to the requirements of the Appraisal Institute relating to review by its duly authorized representatives.
- I certify that my State of California real estate appraiser license has never been revoked, suspended, cancelled, or restricted.
- I have the knowledge and experience to complete this appraisal assignment. Please see the Qualifications of Appraiser(s) portion of the Appendix to this report for additional information.
- As of the date of this report, I have completed the continuing education program for Designated Members of the Appraisal Institute.


Nelson Wong, MAI

State Certification No.: AG034862 (Expires: August 12, 2018)

December 1, 2016
DATE

PROPERTY HISTORY AND OCCUPANCY

The subject property represents a three-story fire station and administrative office located at 401 Oak Street, within the city of Roseville, Placer County, California. The improvements are situated within the confines of six Assessor's parcels identified as 013-120-001, 013-131-001, -002, -003, -017, and -019, which contain 9.22± acres of land area. However, there is a lot line adjustment underway, and - once recorded - the subject will be identified by three parcels with a total land area of 2.09± acres.

The topography of the property slopes downward from northwest to southeast. The building has the appearance of the two-story structure from Oak Street, with the northwest side of the basement being below street grade. Due to the slope of the site, the basement is visible and has exterior access on the southeast side of the property (i.e., walk-out basement). While the property is currently 100% owner-occupied by the City of Roseville, it will be vacated following the construction of a new fire station on another parcel (this property currently consists of vacant land). Additionally, employees within the administrative office portion of the building will relocate to a new multi-story office building that is currently under construction on Vernon Street. As a result, continued long-term use of the subject is not probable.


Since the building is to be vacated with a new fire station to be constructed on another site, we have considered alternative uses for the subject property. In other words, the existing use as a fire station will not remain into perpetuity. Given the design, layout, and construction of the building, and considering the legally permissible uses under the CMU-SA-DT – Commercial Mixed Use, Special Area, Downtown zoning designation encumbering the subject, the property is most suitable for office use. A significant portion of the building is already improved as office space, and the fire engine bay can be converted.

There are several concerns with the subject property that must be addressed when valuing the property under a re-use scenario. First, there are underground storage tanks (count unknown) that require removal. Next, city officials noted the building contains asbestos. Finally, the basement is located in a floodplain and there are restrictions on renovation or conversion. We will use information contained in our appraisal files to estimate storage tank and asbestos removal. Note that we are not experts in the field of determining the existence or severity of these issues, and the cost of remediation could vary greatly. It is highly recommended that contractors are consulted to obtain accurate costs. Regarding the basement, this portion of the building has limited marketability due to lower ceilings, reduced window lines, and limited access. Thus, the basement is not included in the calculation of rentable area. Reportedly, the proposed buyers of the subject will occupy the first and second floors only, as they are concerned with the location of the basement in the floodplain and the inability to renovate/reconfigure the space.

A property condition assessment report was prepared by AEI Consultants in October 2016. In this report, the consultants identified issues of deferred maintenance that require repair. Items include storm water drainage and retaining wall improvements, parking lot repair, sidewalk and curb repair, framing and cladding improvements, and other miscellaneous repairs. The total estimated cost of curing these items is \$122,300. This estimate will be relied upon in the valuation of the subject property.

According to public records, the subject property has not been involved in any transactions within the previous three years. However, the City is currently in negotiations to sell the property to a user who will occupy the building in the interim as an educational facility, and possibly construct new buildings and subsequently demolish the existing building. The sale is in the preliminary stages of negotiation, and the client has requested that all additional information, including the buying entity, remain confidential. This appraisal is intended for use in determining market value for the proposed sale.

PROPERTY LEGAL DATA



Street Address

401 Oak Street
Roseville, California 95678

Location

The subject property is located along the east line of Oak Street, at the terminus of South Grant Street.

Assessor's Parcel Number(s)

The subject property is situated within the confines of six Assessor's parcels identified as 013-120-001, 013-131-001, -002, -003, -017, and -019.

There is a planned lot line adjustment, and - once recorded - the subject will be identified as three parcels with a total land area of 90,977± square feet. Please refer to the site plan in the next section.

Owner(s) of Record

Title to the subject property is presently vested with the City of Roseville.

Legal Description

A complete legal description, which would typically be included in a preliminary title report, was not provided to the appraiser.

Conditions of Title

A preliminary title report was not provided for this appraisal. As a result, the appraiser assumes no negative title restrictions or easements affect the subject property. The client is advised to obtain a title report to determine any possible conditions of title affecting the property appraised. The appraiser accepts no responsibility for matters pertaining to title, and the opinion(s) of value stated herein could be negatively impacted by title restrictions.

Property Taxes and Assessments

The property tax system in California was amended in 1978 by Article XIII to the State Constitution, commonly referred to as Proposition 13. It provides for a limitation on property taxes and for a procedure to establish the current taxable value of real property by reference to a base year value, which is then modified annually to reflect inflation (if any). Annual increases cannot exceed 2% per year.

The base year was set at 1975-76 or any year thereafter in which the property is substantially improved or changes ownership. When either of these two conditions occurs, the property is to be re-appraised at market value, which becomes the new base year assessed value. Proposition 13 also limits the maximum tax rate to 1% of the value of the property, exclusive of bonds and direct charges. Bonded indebtedness approved prior to 1978, and any bonds subsequently approved by a two-thirds vote of the district in which the property is located, can be added to the 1% tax rate.

According to the Placer County Treasurer-Tax Collector's Office, the subject property does not have a property tax obligation due to the fact that the building is a public/quasi-public entity owned and operated by the City of Roseville. However, if the property transferred to a private ownership, taxes would then be assessed. The subject property is located in tax rate area 005-029, which has an annual tax rate of 1.0937% based on assessed value. The subject does not have a special assessment obligation relating to Mello-Roos or Assessment District bonds.

Zoning

Source: City of Roseville Planning Department

Zoning Code: CMU/SA-DT – Commercial Mixed Use, Special Area, Downtown
Description: According to the Municipal Code, CMU zoning is intended to promote a variety of commercial uses types and the flexible citing of other uses that are typically considered to be compatible with commercial development. It is the intent of the CMU zoning district to establish a mix of uses, which will be accompanied by overlay zones, to ensure that different commercial uses will be successfully integrated into desirable, cohesive commercial districts. The CMU zoning district shall always be applied in conjunction with either the DS (Development Standards) or SA (Special Area) overlay zones.

The SA zone is an overlay district which allows modification of the underlying general district regulations (including both permitted use types and development standards) by reference to regulations adopted either in a specific plan, which applies to the property so classified, or in the ordinance rezoning the property so classified.

Parking: Professional offices are required to have one space for each 200 square feet of rentable building area. With a rentable area of 19,000± square feet, 95 parking spaces are required. The subject property meets the parking requirement with 105 spaces. Note that the subject would not be adequately parked if the basement was included as rentable area.

Conclusion: As improved, the subject property represents a legal, conforming use.

Flood Zone

Source: FEMA

Flood Zone: The majority of the subject is located in Zone X, described as areas outside of the 0.2% annual chance floodplain

Map Panel: 06061-C0478F

Panel Date: June 8,1998

Comments: The subject property contains 13,543± square feet of basement space. City representatives noted this area is in the floodplain and has restrictions on renovation or conversion. It also has limited marketability due to lower ceilings, reduced window lines, and limited access. The basement is therefore not included in the calculation of rentable area for the subject.

Earthquake Zone

According to the Seismic Safety Commission, the subject is located within Zone 3, which is considered to be the lowest risk zone in California. There are only two zones in California: Zone 4, which is assigned to areas near major faults; and Zone 3, which is assigned to all other areas of more moderate seismic activity. In addition, the subject is not located in a Fault-Rupture Hazard Zone

(formerly referred to as an Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone), as defined by Special Publication 42 (revised January 1994) of the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology.

Easements

An inspection of the subject property revealed no apparent adverse easements, encroachments or other conditions currently impacting the subject. However, the exact locations of typical roadway and utility easements, or any additional easements, which would be referenced in a preliminary title report, were not provided to the appraiser. The appraiser is not a surveyor nor qualified to determine the exact location of easements. It is assumed any easements noted in a current preliminary title report do not have an impact on the opinion(s) of value as provided in this report. If, at some future date, any easements are determined to have a detrimental impact on value, the appraiser reserves the right to amend the opinion(s) of value contained herein.

SITE DESCRIPTION



Land Area:

A lot line adjustment is being processed. Once recorded the subject will be identified by three separate parcels with a combined land area 2.09± acres. The estimate of value contained herein is based on a hypothetical condition assuming completion of the lot line adjustment.

Topography:

The topography of the subject property slopes downward from northeast to southwest. The western portion of the property is at street grade (level with Oak Street).

Shape:

Irregular

Soils:

The appraiser has not been provided with a soils report to determine the load bearing capacity of the subject property. No adverse subsoil conditions are apparent. Based on the existence of the subject structure, as well as buildings on adjacent parcels, it appears the subject possesses adequate load-bearing capacity for development.

Frontage/Visibility/Access:

Off-Site Characteristics	Oak Street
Paving	Asphalt
Curbs	Yes
Gutters	Yes
Sidewalks	Yes
Lanes	2
Direction of Traffic	Northeast/Southwest
Condition	Average
Traffic Levels	Average
Access/Curb Cuts	Average
Visibility	Average

Drainage:

Based on our physical inspection of the subject property, it appears the site has been graded and paved in such a way so as to provide adequate drainage.

Utilities:

Public utilities, including electricity, natural gas, sewer, water and telephone service, are available to the property.

Environmental Issues:

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was prepared by Brusca Associates, Inc. on October 20, 2016. While there were no contamination issues identified, the surveyors noted the existence of the underground storage tank and stated “the potential for subsurface petroleum hydrocarbon contamination due to the use of the onsite 2,000-gallon diesel UST system is considered a recognized environmental condition that warrants further site assessment (i.e., subsurface soil sampling/testing).” The appraiser has no knowledge of soil contamination on the property but is not qualified to detect such substances. The presence of potentially hazardous materials could affect the value of the property. The value estimate is

predicated on the assumption there is no such material on or in the property that would cause a loss in value. No responsibility is assumed for any such conditions, or for any expertise or engineering knowledge required to discover them.

Adjacent Uses:

North
South
East
West

City of Roseville offices
Roseville public library
Dry Creek and Royer Park
Office and retail development

Conclusion:

Overall, the subject property is functional in terms of its size, topography, shape and overall location within the city of Roseville. There appear to be no unusual or restrictive physical limitations to the property.

IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION

The subject property represents a three-story fire station and administrative office located at 401 Oak Street, within the city of Roseville, Placer County, California. A description of the construction components for the subject's improvements is detailed on the following pages, based on our physical inspection of the subject property on October 20, 2016.

Structural/Exterior/Mechanical

Foundation:	Reinforced concrete
Structure:	The structure is of concrete block, precast concrete, and steel frame construction.
Exterior Walls:	The exterior walls are pre-cast concrete, concrete block and metal on the third floor.
Roof:	Membrane
Doors/Windows:	The doors and windows have aluminum frames with tinted glass.
HVAC:	The property is heated and cooled via a central HVAC system.
Rentable Building Area:	
First Floor	15,070± square feet
Second Floor	<u>3,930± square feet</u>
Total	19,000± square feet
	The subject property also contains 13,543± square feet of basement space. City representatives noted this area is in the floodplain and has restrictions on renovation or conversion. It also has limited marketability due to lower ceilings, reduced window lines, and limited access. The basement is therefore not included in the calculation of rentable area for the subject. Reportedly, the proposed buyers of the subject will occupy the first and second floors only, as they are concerned with the location of the basement in the floodplain and the inability to renovate/reconfigure the space.
Number of Stories:	Three (includes basement)

Interior

Floors:	A combination of commercial grade carpet, ceramic tile, vinyl tile and concrete
Walls:	Textured and painted drywall
Ceilings:	A combination of acoustical panels in T-bar grids and finished ceilings
Lighting:	Recessed fluorescent lighting with some areas having affixed fluorescent fixtures
Restrooms:	The ground level (basement) and first floor each have one set of restrooms. The second floor has two sets of restrooms with a shower area in the sleeping quarters.
Fire Sprinklers:	None
Stairwells/Elevator:	There are two stairwells and one elevator providing access to each floor.

Site Improvements


Parking:	The subject property has approximately 105 spaces.
Landscaping:	Landscaping includes a typical quantity and quality of shrubs and trees around the perimeter of the property.
Site Coverage Ratio:	17% (based on the footprint of the building in relation to the land area, assuming completion of the lot line adjustment)
Floor Area Ratio (FAR):	0.36 (assuming completion of the lot line adjustment)

Age/Condition


Chronological Age:	The building was reportedly constructed in 1971
Effective Age:	25± years

Remaining Economic Life:	25-30± years (upon curing of deferred maintenance)
Deferred Maintenance:	City representatives noted there is an underground tank on the site and the building has asbestos. We used information contained in our appraisal files to estimate storage tank and asbestos removal. Note that we are not experts in the field of determining the existence or severity of these issues, and the cost of remediation could vary greatly. It is highly recommended that contractors are consulted to obtain accurate costs. A property condition assessment report was prepared by AEI Consultants in October 2016. In this report, the consultants identified issues of deferred maintenance that require repair. Items include storm water drainage and retaining wall improvements, parking lot repair, sidewalk and curb repair, framing and cladding improvements, and other miscellaneous repairs. The total estimated cost of curing these items is \$122,300. This estimate will be relied upon in the valuation of the subject property.
Functional Obsolescence:	None determined
Condition:	Average
Quality:	Average

Floor Plan – Basement



Floor Plan – First Floor




Floor Plan – Second Floor

PREPARED FOR:
AKT Properties
3301 C Street, Suite 1000
Sacramento, CA 95816

Measured Area: 3,930 s.f.
Patio: 295 s.f.
Roof Area: 7,341 s.f.

401 OAK STREET
ROSEVILLE, CA
SECOND FLOOR
(As Measured: September 2016)
FLOOR PLAN



Note: All dimensions shown are rounded to the nearest inch, for informational purposes only. All measurements are recorded to 1/8" accuracy as documented in the final CAD drawing supplied.

Survey Accuracy: +/- 0.06%

OAK STREET

LASERTECH is a registered US trademark of LaserTech Floorplans Ltd.
Copyright 1998 LaserTech Floorplans Ltd. All Rights Reserved

8' 4' 0' 8'

SCALE: 1/8" = 1' - 0"

LASERTECH
FLOORPLANS

TEL: (916) 781-6543
FILE: L160904 (16-466)

SUBJECT PHOTOGRAPHS



Northwest side of subject



Northeast side of the subject



Southeast side of the subject property



Southwest side of the building



Fire engine bay



North parking lot



Basement parking garage



Gas tank




South parking lot



1st floor reception and office space



1st floor office space



Restroom



1st floor conference room



1st floor office space



1st floor break room



1st floor gym space



1st floor laundry room



2nd floor restroom and shower




2nd floor living quarters



2nd floor living quarters restroom and shower




2nd floor break room



Fire engine bay



Basement office space



Basement storage area




Looking north along Oak Street



Looking south along Oak Street

PLACER COUNTY



Introduction

Placer County is part of the four-county Sacramento Metropolitan Area, along with the counties of Sacramento, Yolo and El Dorado. The county is located in the north-central part of California, approximately 420 miles north of Los Angeles, 250 miles south of Oregon, 100 miles northeast of San Francisco, 80 miles west of Lake Tahoe, and 100 miles southwest of Reno. The southernmost part of Placer County consists of a valley commonly referred to as South Placer; while the remainder of the county is divided into the Gold Country, where parts of Auburn and Colfax are located, and the High Country, which encompasses Tahoe City and Kings Beach along Lake Tahoe. Placer's largest cities are Roseville, Rocklin and Lincoln. Elevations in the county range from 165 feet above sea level in Roseville to 10,000 feet above sea level in the Sierra Nevada Mountains.

Placer County is developed with a mix of urban and rural uses. The larger cities, namely Roseville and Rocklin, are mostly urban, while the smaller communities, such as Loomis and Newcastle, have remained rural. Auburn and Lincoln both exhibit a combination of urban and rural settings. However, in recent years the city of Lincoln has experienced dramatic growth and development, and has become one of the fastest-growing cities in California.

Population

Placer County has experienced population growth in recent years, primarily in the southern part of the county. The primary points of origin for in-migration to the region are the Bay Area, other parts of the Sacramento region, and Southern California. The state's population data indicate a strong pattern of movement by residents from high-cost, high-density Bay Area counties to inland areas in Northern California.

Following is a table depicting the population change in Placer County and its component cities over the past few years.

POPULATION TRENDS							
City	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	%/Yr
Auburn	13,453	13,631	13,762	13,993	14,022	14,070	0.9%
Colfax	1,979	2,015	2,049	2,062	2,064	2,068	0.9%
Lincoln	43,399	44,167	45,005	45,990	46,688	47,339	1.8%
Loomis	6,493	6,554	6,589	6,633	6,646	6,692	0.6%
Rocklin	58,054	58,735	59,236	59,776	60,325	60,351	0.8%
Roseville	121,052	123,973	127,438	129,822	131,433	134,073	2.2%
Unincorporated	<u>108,798</u>	<u>109,077</u>	<u>108,338</u>	<u>108,900</u>	<u>109,060</u>	<u>109,203</u>	<u>0.1%</u>
Total	353,228	358,152	362,417	367,176	370,238	373,796	1.2%

Source: California Department of Finance

As indicated in the previous table, Placer County has experienced a strong average rate of annual growth of 1.2% over the past five years. The city of Roseville is the fastest growing part of the region. Loomis and the unincorporated communities have had relatively little growth.

Over the past decade, Placer County has been the fastest-growing county within the four-county Sacramento MSA (which also includes Sacramento, El Dorado and Yolo Counties). It is projected this trend will continue for the near future.

Transportation

Interstate 80, State Highway 65 and State Highway 193 are the major routes traversing the region. Major urban arterials in the southern part of the county include Douglas Boulevard, Sierra College Boulevard, Roseville Parkway, Pleasant Grove Boulevard, Sunrise Avenue, Auburn-Folsom Road and Foothills Boulevard. In 2005, a major public improvement project was completed at the Douglas Boulevard/ Sunrise Avenue/ Interstate 80 intersection. The project added new lanes, new on/off ramps and a tunnel that have greatly improved traffic flow in the area.

In addition to roadways within the county limits, south Placer County enjoys proximity to many of the Sacramento region's freeways that provide access to the San Francisco Bay Area to the west, Central and Southern California to the south, Northern California and Oregon to the north, and

Nevada to the east. Sacramento International Airport is situated about 10 miles west of the county border. The county is also home to a couple of small private airports. The region has good railroad service, including the transcontinental Union Pacific Railroad and Amtrak. The Capital Corridor system provides high-speed commuter rail service from Roseville to San Jose.


Employment & Economy

The California Employment Development Department has reported the following employment data for Placer County over the past several years.

EMPLOYMENT TRENDS						
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Labor Force	173,300	173,700	175,200	176,300	176,500	178,200
Employment	153,200	154,900	158,800	162,700	165,500	169,200
Job Growth	(8,200)	1,700	3,900	3,900	2,800	3,700
Unemployment Rate	11.6%	10.8%	9.4%	7.7%	6.2%	5.1%
Source: California Employment Development Department						

The unemployment rate in Placer County was 4.7% in August 2016, which compares to rates of 5.5% for California and 4.9% for the U.S. Most areas within the state and nation, including Placer County, saw declining unemployment rates in 2004 through 2006, increases from 2007 to 2010, and declines during 2011-2016.

Placer County has a diverse economy, with no one sector accounting for a majority of the employment in the region. The following chart indicates the percentage of total employment for each sector within the county.



As can be seen in the chart above, the area’s largest employment sectors are Trade/Transportation/Utilities, which includes retail and wholesale trade (20.2% of total employment); Educational and Health Services (16.4%); Leisure and Hospitality (13.9%); and Government (13.1%).

Although many residents commute to employment centers in Sacramento, Placer County offers thousands of jobs and attracts workers from the local area as well as “reverse commuters” from Sacramento and residents of outlying areas such as Marysville/Yuba City to the north. The largest employers in the county, according to the Sacramento Business Journal Book of Lists 2015, are Kaiser Permanente (3,839 employees in the county), Sutter Health (3,693), Squaw Valley Alpine Meadows (2,500, seasonal), Placer County (2,378), Hewlett-Packard Co. (2,000), and Thunder Valley Casino Resort (1,875).

Household Income

Median household income represents a broad statistical measure of well-being or standard of living in a community. The median income level divides households into two equal segments with one half of households earning less than the median and the other half earning more. The median income is considered to be a better indicator than the average household income as it is not dramatically affected by unusually high or low values. In the year 2014 (most recent data available from the U.S. Census Bureau), Placer County’s median household income was \$75,689, which was higher than the state of California’s median income of \$61,927.

Recreation & Community Services

Placer County has ample community services and recreational opportunities. The County, cities and various park districts operate numerous public parks, golf courses, aquatic centers, libraries and community centers. Many private golf courses are located in the region, and several ski resorts are located in the mountains. Within the county lies a portion of the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area, a boating, fishing, and swimming retreat.

In terms of higher education, Placer County is home to Sierra College in Rocklin, a two-year community college offering a wide range of day and evening classes serving over 25,000 students. Heald College, a business and technology vocational school, is located in Roseville, as is an extension campus for Sierra College, located at the old Sutter Hospital on Sunrise Avenue. In 2004, William Jessup University, a private Christian college, moved from San Jose to a new facility in Rocklin.


The region offers good health services, including hospitals and medical office facilities. Two hospitals are located in Roseville – the Sutter Roseville Medical Center and Kaiser Permanente, both of which have recent or current expansion projects. The city of Auburn is home to Sutter Auburn Faith Hospital, Sutter Medical Center-Auburn, UC Davis Medical Center, Foundation Medical Clinic and Heritage Medical Center Complex. The city of Lincoln contains medical offices/clinics operated by Sutter, UC Davis, Kaiser and Catholic Healthcare West. In addition to these institutional health care facilities, the county is home to a large and growing number of private physicians, dentists, clinics and other medical specialists.

The city of Roseville is south Placer's hub for fine dining and entertainment. Several upscale restaurants are situated along Eureka Road, Roseville Parkway and Galleria Boulevard. Roseville contains two multi-screen movie theatres on Eureka Road. Another theatre recently opened in Rocklin. Shopping centers are widespread, the largest of which is the Galleria at Roseville, a regional shopping mall that opened in 2000 and was expanded in 2008-2009. The mall is anchored by Nordstrom, Macy's, Sears and JC Penney.

Conclusion

Placer County is a diverse area, with growing cities, small towns and rural areas, and an abundance of open space. The cities of Roseville, Rocklin and Lincoln have experienced strong growth in population and development over the past several years. Placer County is one of the most affluent in the greater Sacramento region in terms of household income levels. The area has a number of positive attributes, including seismic stability, a well-educated work force, good transportation systems, relative affordability and availability of housing compared to the Bay Area, and an excellent level of community services. The long-term outlook for the region is very good.

NEIGHBORHOOD



Introduction

This section of the report provides an analysis of the observable data that indicates patterns of growth, structure and/or change that may enhance or detract from property values. For the purpose of this analysis, a neighborhood is defined as “a group of complementary land uses; a congruous grouping of inhabitants, buildings, or business enterprises.”³

Neighborhood Boundaries

The boundaries of a neighborhood identify the physical area that influences the value of the subject property. These boundaries may coincide with observable changes in prevailing land use or occupant characteristics. Physical features such as the type of development, street patterns, terrain, vegetation and parcel size tend to identify neighborhoods. Roadways, waterways and changing elevations can also create neighborhood boundaries.

The subject property is located in the central portion of the city of Roseville. The subject’s neighborhood can generally be described as Interstate 80 to the east, Cirby Way to the south, Foothills Boulevard to the west, and Pleasant Grove Boulevard to the north.

³ The Dictionary of Real Estate Appraisal, 6th ed. (Chicago: Appraisal Institute, 2015), 156.

Demographics

According to demographic reports prepared by Esri Business Analyst Online, current and projected five year demographic information within the subject's zip code (95678) is summarized in the following table.

Demographics	2016	2021
Population	43,107	45,334
Households	16,515	17,369
Families	10,655	11,195
Average Household Size	2.59	2.59
Owner Occupied Housing Units	8,803	9,185
Renter Occupied Housing Units	7,712	8,184
Median Age	34.8	35.4
Median Household Income	\$65,110	\$75,991
Average Household Income	\$81,694	\$88,804
Per Capita Income	\$31,621	\$34,331

As reported by CoreLogic Information Services, the median resale home price in the city of Roseville as of August 2016 (latest available) was \$425,000, which marks an increase of 11.8% from the same period last year. The median resale home price in Placer County as of the same period was \$435,000, which marks an increase of 7.4% from the same period last year.

Transportation

The subject property is located along the east line of Oak Street, at the terminus of Grant Street within Roseville. Primary neighborhood thoroughfares in the subject's vicinity include Vernon Street, Washington Boulevard, Atlantic Street, Douglas Boulevard and Riverside Avenue. The latter three thoroughfares connect with Interstate 80 within two miles of the subject. Interstate 80 is a major east-west freeway connecting the area with Sacramento and San Francisco to the west and Reno, Nevada to the east. Just south of the subject property are railroad tracks used by Union Pacific for freight transport and Amtrak for passenger transport. The Union Pacific Railyards are located at the eastern boundary of the subject neighborhood, just east of Foothills Boulevard. Amtrak's passenger rail station is located on Pacific Street in Downtown Roseville, just south of the subject. Amtrak provides daily service to Sacramento, Davis, Martinez, and Emeryville to the west; to the east, the trains connect with Colfax, Truckee and Reno.

Land Uses

The subject neighborhood contains a mix of residential, commercial and community uses. The neighborhood is estimated to be over 90% built-out. Historic Old Town is located north of the railroad tracks and is bounded by Main Street to the north, Pacific Street to the south, Washington

Boulevard to the west and Lincoln Street to the east. Downtown is located south of the railroad tracks primarily along the Vernon Street corridor. Notable land uses in the area include Royer Park, Chamber of Commerce Offices, Roseville Civic Center, U.S. Post Office, Roseville Theater, Tower Theater and the train station/multi-modal facility.



New construction in Downtown Roseville includes the replacement of the city hall annex building at 316 Vernon Street. The city is currently constructing a four-story, 83,000 square foot office building. Sierra College has reportedly signed a 10-year lease to occupy the entire second and part of the third floor of the building. The city also plans to relocate many departments into the new office building, including fire administration, parks and recreation, and information technology.

Community Uses

There are several community uses in the neighborhood, such as schools, churches, medical facilities, parks, and recreational and cultural facilities. Three other smaller parks in the area include Royer Park/Saugstad Park, located at the northwest corner of Park Drive and Douglas Boulevard, Woodbridge Park, which is situated at the corner of Sierra Boulevard and Mariposa Street. Schools within close proximity include; Roseville High School, Independence High School, Adelante High School, and Ferris Spanger Elementary School. Other community uses in the general area include a number of churches, hospitals, public parks and municipal and public golf courses located throughout the city.

Conclusion

In summary, the subject property is located near the eastern edge of Roseville's Downtown/Historic Old Town neighborhood. A balance of residential and supporting commercial and community uses characterizes the area. The subject neighborhood benefits from several positive factors, including fairly convenient access to Interstate 80 and proximate to employment centers and community services. The area is mostly built-out with a mix of commercial and residential development. It is anticipated the population in the subject neighborhood will continue to be steady to slightly increasing, but at a slow to moderate pace given the high build-out ratio of the area.

OFFICE MARKET

The Sacramento office market has shown signs of stabilization and improvement since 2012 after contracting for the previous couple of years amid high unemployment, tight credit conditions and a large inventory of new office buildings. Net absorption of office space has been positive in 16 of the last 19 quarters. Net absorption was over 1 million square feet in 2015, up from about 519,000 square feet in 2014. The region's vacancy rate has declined over the past four years, except for slight upticks in the first quarters of 2015 and 2016. The average vacancy rate was 14.9% in the third quarter of 2016, down from 15.8% in the previous quarter and down from 17.4% a year earlier. (These figures are based on surveys published by CBRE for office buildings 10,000 square feet or larger, excluding government-owned, medical and owner-user buildings.)


Employment conditions in the region have generally improved over the last couple of years. The unemployment rate in the Sacramento MSA was 5.4% in August 2016, compared to rates of 5.5% for California and 4.9% for the U.S. In the one-year period ending with August 2016, the number of jobs in the region increased by about 2.2%.

The State of California represents the largest user of office space in the Sacramento region. Although the State is currently looking for office space, it is uncertain how their space needs may change over the coming years. Additionally, the State typically has lease cancellation rights in its standard lease agreements. Sacramento County is another major office tenant in the region. According to CBRE, government leases accounted for about 26% of the region's top leases in 2015.


Vacancy & Absorption

The charts on the following page show recent vacancy and net absorption trends in the region.

Sacramento Office Market Vacancy



Sacramento Office Market Net Absorption (SF)



Office vacancy in the region has declined over the past three years, except for slight increases in the first quarters of both 2015 and 2016. In terms of annual net absorption, 2005 was a very strong year, followed by fairly strong absorption in 2006 and 2007, and then a sharp decline in 2008 and 2009. For the year 2010, net absorption of office space in the region was about negative 356,000 square feet. The year 2011 saw a further decline, with net absorption of approximately negative 524,000 square feet. Net absorption has been very strong over the past five years, with over 780,000 square feet in 2012, nearly 1.1 million square feet in 2013, about 519,000 square feet in 2014, and over 1 million square feet in 2015. For year-to-date 2016 (three quarters), net absorption was over 702,000 square feet.

The following table shows recent vacancy and absorption data by submarket.

Sacramento Office Market Summary

Submarket	Total SF (millions)	Vacancy 3Q 2016	Net Absorption 3Q 2016	Net Absorption Year to Date
Midtown	1.9	8.3%	11,873	41,278
West Sacramento	1.2	7.1%	5,238	24,536
South Sacramento	1.3	20.3%	0	(9,722)
East Sacramento	0.4	9.3%	0	3,000
Howe Ave/Fulton Ave	1.8	19.8%	10,340	20,329
Natomas/Northgate	2.4	26.3%	(6,744)	18,098
Watt Ave/Auburn Blvd	1.3	18.3%	4,577	16,778
Highway 50 Corridor	11.4	19.3%	42,204	(218,216)
Carmichael/Fair Oaks	0.3	16.7%	8,726	5,403
Citrus Heights/Orangevale	1.0	11.8%	6,416	18,451
Point West/Tribute	2.5	16.3%	49,799	95,509
Campus Commons	1.5	17.0%	19,488	32,277
Hazel/Folsom	2.6	16.1%	10,289	9,389
Elk Grove/Galt	1.2	8.4%	60,790	79,399
Roseville/Rocklin	7.1	11.8%	60,182	172,504
South Natomas	3.2	9.5%	29,111	194,899
Downtown	<u>10.7</u>	<u>12.0%</u>	<u>31,350</u>	<u>198,257</u>
Total	51.9	14.9%	343,639	702,169

Source: CBRE MarketView Reports

The submarkets with the highest net absorption levels in year-to-date 2016 were Downtown, South Natomas and Roseville/Rocklin. The leaders for the year 2015 were the Highway 50 Corridor, South Natomas and Downtown. The Downtown area is seeing a resurgence of demand due to the recent completion of the Golden 1 Center arena, which is home to the Sacramento Kings NBA basketball team as well as concerts and other events. The Highway 50 Corridor had a large negative net absorption in 2016 due to Bank of America vacating a 194,000 square foot facility.

Significant lease transactions in the third quarter of 2016 included: State Department of Food and Agriculture with 64,000 SF in South Natomas, State Office of Systems Integration with 64,000 SF in

South Natomas, and California Correctional Health Care Services with 46,000 SF in Elk Grove. In the second quarter, notable leases included: State Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development with 124,000 SF in South Natomas, State Department of Human Assistance with 81,000 SF in Natomas, and Judicial Council of California with 29,000 square feet in South Natomas.

Rental Rates

According to CBRE surveys, rental rates for office space in the region generally trended downward from about mid-2008 to mid-2013, and have been flat to slightly increasing for the past three years. As of the third quarter of 2016, the region's average asking rate was \$1.78 psf/month (full service), compared to \$1.78 in the previous quarter and \$1.72 a year earlier. For the suburban submarkets, the average asking rate was \$1.66 psf/month, compared to \$2.40 for the Downtown submarket in the third quarter. In terms of property classes, the average rates in the third quarter were \$2.11 psf/month (full service) for Class A and \$1.72 for Class B. CBRE did not report an average rate for Class C properties.

New Construction

Construction of office buildings has been very limited in the past few years. In 2013, there were two completions totaling 108,000 square feet; both were located in Roseville and both were acquired through foreclosure as partially completed buildings. There were no completions in 2014, 2015 or the first half of 2016. In the third quarter of 2016, a 110,000 square foot building was completed in the Laguna Corporate Center in Elk Grove, and a 50,000 square foot building was under construction in the Midtown submarket. A few small projects are in the early planning stages.

With over 7.7 million square feet of space currently vacant in the region, very little new construction is planned for the foreseeable future. In the more distant future, one of the locations that could see new office development is the Railyards redevelopment area located just north of Downtown Sacramento. Infrastructure work is under way in the area and vertical construction is not expected until at least 2018.

Submarket Analysis

In order to analyze market conditions in the subject's immediate area, we have utilized survey data published by CB Richard Ellis and CoStar Property. The subject is located in the Roseville/Rocklin submarket with approximately 7.1 million square feet of office space.

According to market surveys published by CB Richard Ellis, the overall office vacancy rate in the Roseville/Rocklin submarket was approximately 11.8% as of the third quarter of 2016. During the same quarter, the submarket experienced positive absorption in the amount of 60,120 square feet.

Additionally, absorption was positive 172,504 square feet year-to-date. The submarket's vacancy rate is below the vacancy rate of 14.9% for the Sacramento region overall.

Pertaining to office properties more similar to the subject property, we queried CoStar Property Analytics to determine the supply and vacancy of office buildings containing 10,000 to 40,000 square feet of rentable building area in the subject's neighborhood (using a three-mile radius). This search revealed 97 properties containing a total rentable area of 1,874,876 square feet, of which 135,919 square feet was vacant as of the third quarter of 2016. The implied vacancy rate was 7.2%, which is below the vacancy rate reported by CB Richard Ellis for the Roseville/Rocklin submarket. The difference is likely attributable to the fact that the CoStar survey included only properties in the subject's immediate area, whereas the CBRE survey encompassed all office properties throughout the Roseville/Rocklin submarket.


Absorption and average rental rates were also examined using CoStar Property Analytics with the same parameters discussed above. The table on the following page details vacancy and absorption for the subject's immediate area over the past three years.

Period	Total RBA	Vacancy	Vacancy %	Absorption	Average Rate*
					PSF/Month
2016 Q3	1,874,876	135,919	7.2%	68,374	\$1.60
2016 Q2	1,874,876	204,293	10.9%	(3,865)	\$1.59
2016 Q1	1,838,997	200,428	10.9%	19,805	\$1.56
2015 Q4	1,838,997	220,233	12.0%	10,357	\$1.59
2015 Q3	1,838,997	230,590	12.5%	9,553	\$1.61
2015 Q2	1,838,997	240,143	13.1%	3,466	\$1.68
2015 Q1	1,838,997	243,609	13.2%	792	\$1.61
2014 Q4	1,838,997	244,401	13.3%	16,790	\$1.57
2014 Q3	1,838,997	261,191	14.2%	(5,103)	\$1.56
2014 Q2	1,838,997	256,088	13.9%	18,557	\$1.64
2014 Q1	1,838,997	274,645	14.9%	31,996	\$1.60
2013 Q4	1,838,997	306,641	16.7%	-	\$1.60

* Gross leasing strategy

As can be seen above, vacancy in the subject's market has declined over the past three years. The data analyzed began in the fourth quarter of 2013 when vacancy was 16.7%. The vacancy for the most recently concluded quarter reached a three-year-low of 7.2%. In addition, overall lease rates have been generally stable. Current asking rates are approximately \$1.60 psf/month. Decreasing vacancy is an indication that the market is improving.

The following graph shows the average vacancy rate, absorption and deliveries over the past five years, as well as forecasted vacancy through 2018, as estimated by CoStar Property Analytics.



The above chart indicates there have been a small number of net deliveries of new office space within the subject's area over the last five years. Vacancy is projected to continue to decrease with positive net absorption through 2017 into 2018.

Looking Ahead

Recent market trends suggest the Sacramento office market is in a recovery stage; however, most market participants expect recovery and growth to be a gradual process. Employment gains in the region have been healthy, but office vacancy continues to be somewhat high. On the supply side, new construction has been very limited in the past few years and no major speculative projects are planned in the near term. In light of these factors, office vacancy should be steady to declining over the next year, with slight ups and downs from quarter to quarter. Rental rates are expected to increase over the next 12 months, with Class A properties seeing the largest increases because of stronger demand. Downtown continues to be the most desirable submarket but as space becomes more difficult to find, there could be some spillover demand for suburban properties.

HIGHEST AND BEST USE

The term “highest and best use,” as used in this report, is defined as follows:

The reasonably probable use of property that results in the highest value. The four criteria that the highest and best use must meet are legal permissibility, physical possibility, financial feasibility, and maximum productivity.⁴

Two analyses are typically required for highest and best use. The first analysis is highest and best use of the subject property as though vacant. The second analysis will determine the highest and best use of the property as improved. Definitions of these terms are provided in the *Glossary of Terms* in the Appendix to this report.

Highest and Best Use – As Vacant

In accordance with the definition of highest and best use, it is appropriate to analyze the subject property as though vacant as it relates to legal permissibility, physical possibility, financial feasibility and maximum productivity. The subject property is zoned CMU, SA, DT – Commercial Mixed Use, Special Area, Downtown. A variety of office, retail and personal service uses are considered legally permissible and would be physically possible. Given the subject’s location on an interior street and its surrounding land uses, office development is the most probable use that is legally permissible.

While recent broker surveys suggest stabilization has been occurring for office properties in the subject’s market and region wide over the last couple of years, current market rents and sale prices are still not high enough to justify new construction. In other words, the cost of construction (plus land value) exceeds the market value of the property upon completion of construction. This conclusion is further supported by the property located adjacent to the north of the subject. The property is a large multi-level office building which was constructed in 2008, later foreclosed on, sold at auction, and has remained 100% vacant. Given the length of vacancy, a lack of demand for larger office buildings like the foreclosed property is evident. In other words, it is not expected the probable buyer of the subject would purchase to demolish and construct a multi-story project. New construction is not considered financially feasible. It is our opinion the highest and best use of the subject property as though vacant would be to hold for future office development, and the timing of future development would depend on further improvement in market conditions as it relates primarily to market rent and sale price levels.

⁴ The Dictionary of Real Estate Appraisal, 6th ed. (Chicago: Appraisal Institute, 2015), 109.

Highest and Best Use – As Improved

As with the highest and best use as though vacant, the four tests of highest and best use must also be applied to the subject property considering the in-place improvements. Consideration must be given to the continued as-is use of the subject, as well as alternative uses for the property. The potential alternative uses consist of demolition, expansion, conversion or renovation. A discussion of the possible “as improved” uses is offered as follows:

Demolition

One alternative would be to demolish the subject structure, creating a vacant site. Although it is physically possible to demolish the building, it is not financially feasible since the value of the property as improved exceeds the value of the land as vacant (less demolition costs). Therefore, demolition is not considered economically prudent.

Expansion

The subject structure is situated on the site in such a way that a significant amount of additional space, or a separate improvement, could not feasibly be added to the subject property, especially due to parking requirements. Additionally, expansion (new construction) would not be consistent with our conclusion of highest and best use as vacant. As such, expansion is not an appropriate alternative.

Conversion

While the property is currently 100% owner-occupied as a fire station, it will be vacated following the construction of a new fire station on another parcel (this property currently consists of vacant land), and continued long-term use of the subject as a fire station is not probable.

Since the building will no longer be occupied/operated as a fire station, we have considered alternative uses for the subject property. Given the design, layout, and construction of the building, and considering the legally permissible uses under the CMU zoning designation encumbering the subject, the property is most suitable for office use. A significant portion of the building is already improved as office space, and the engine bay can be converted without incurring substantial costs. As will be shown in the valuation section of this report, conversion is the maximally productive use of the subject property.

Renovation

A property condition assessment report was prepared by AEI Consultants in October 2016. In this report, the consultants identified issues of deferred maintenance that require repair. Items include storm water drainage and retaining wall improvements, parking lot repair, sidewalk and curb repair,

framing and cladding improvements, and other miscellaneous repairs. The total estimated cost of curing these items is \$122,300. This estimate will be relied upon in the valuation of the subject property. Additionally, city representatives noted there is an underground tank on the site and the building has asbestos. We used information contained in our appraisal files to estimate storage tank and asbestos removal. Note that we are not experts in the field of determining the existence or severity of these issues, and the cost of remediation could vary greatly. It is highly recommended that contractors are consulted to obtain accurate costs. Curing the items of deferred maintenance and removal of the asbestos and underground storage tank(s) is required to occupy the subject as an office property (once converted).

Continued Use – As-Is

Although the subject property can continue to be utilized in its as-is condition, continued use as a fire station is not likely given the near-term plan for the construction of a new fire station in the immediate area. The current use as a fire station is an interim use, and an alternative use must be considered.

Conclusion

Legal, physical and financially feasible considerations, as well as alternative uses and market considerations, have been analyzed to evaluate the highest and best use of the subject property as improved. Based on this analysis, the subject's highest and best use as improved is for curing of the deferred maintenance issues and conversion of the subject property for professional office use. Given the subject's rentable area of over 15,000 square feet, it is not likely that a future office user would occupy the entire building. The layout of the building could accommodate at least one tenant per floor. Thus, the probable buyer would be an investor who would renovate and convert the property to manage it as a leased office property (as opposed to an owner-user). Further, given the considerable amount of risk associated with the subject due to its deferred maintenance issues (particularly the asbestos and underground storage tanks), the probable buyer would be a speculator who would renovate the property once vacated.

APPROACHES TO VALUE

The valuation process is a systematic set of procedures an appraiser follows to provide answers to a client's questions about real property value.⁵ This process involves the investigation, organization and analysis of pertinent market data and other related factors that affect the market value of real estate. The market data is analyzed in terms of any one or all of the three traditional approaches to estimating real estate value. These are the cost, sales comparison, and income capitalization approaches. Each approach to value is briefly discussed and defined as follows:

Cost Approach

The cost approach is based on the premise that no prudent buyer would pay more for a particular property than the cost to acquire a similar site and construct improvements of equivalent desirability and utility. Thus, this approach to value relates directly to the economic principle of substitution, as well as supply and demand. The cost approach is most applicable when valuing properties where the improvements are new or suffer only a minor amount of accrued depreciation, and is especially persuasive when the site value is well supported. The cost approach is also highly relevant when valuing special-purpose or specialty properties and other properties that are not frequently exchanged in the market.

The definition of the cost approach is offered as follows:

A set of procedures through which a value indication is derived for the fee simple estate by estimating the current cost to construct a reproduction of (or replacement for) the existing structure, including an entrepreneurial incentive or profit; deducting depreciation from the total cost; and adding the estimated land value. Adjustments may then be made to the indicated value of the fee simple estate in the subject property to reflect the value of the property interest being appraised.⁶

Sales Comparison Approach

The sales comparison approach is based on the premise that the value of a property is directly related to the prices being generated for comparable, competitive properties in the marketplace. Similar to the cost approach, the economic principles of substitution, as well as supply and demand are basic to the sales comparison approach. This approach has broad applicability and is particularly persuasive when there has been an adequate volume of recent, reliable transactions of similar properties that indicate value patterns or trends in the market. When sufficient data is available, this approach is the most direct and systematic approach to value estimation. Typically, the sales comparison approach is most pertinent when valuing land, single-family homes and small, owner-occupied commercial and office properties.

⁵ The Dictionary of Real Estate Appraisal, 6th ed. (Chicago: Appraisal Institute, 2015), 243.

⁶ The Dictionary of Real Estate Appraisal, 54.

The definition of the sales comparison approach is offered as follows:

The process of deriving a value indication for the subject property by comparing sales of similar properties to the property being appraised, identifying appropriate units of comparison, and making adjustments to the sale prices (or unit prices, as appropriate) of the comparable properties based on relevant, market-derived elements of comparison.⁷

Income Capitalization Approach

The income capitalization approach is based on the premise that income-producing real estate is typically purchased as an investment. From an investor's point of view, the potential earning power of a property is the critical element affecting value. The concepts of anticipation and change, as they relate to supply and demand issues and substitution, are fundamental to this valuation approach. These concepts are important because the value of income-producing real estate is created by the expectation of benefits (income) to be derived in the future, which is subject to changes in market conditions. Value may be defined as the present worth of the rights to these future benefits. The validity of the income capitalization approach hinges upon the accuracy of which the income expectancy of a property can be measured.

Within the income capitalization approach there are two basic techniques that can be utilized to estimate market value. These techniques of valuation are direct capitalization and yield capitalization.

A method used to convert an estimate of a single year's income expectancy into an indication of value in one direct step, either by dividing the net income estimate by an appropriate capitalization rate or by multiplying the income estimate by an appropriate factor. Direct capitalization employs capitalization rates and multipliers extracted or developed from market data. Only one year's income is used. Yield and value changes are implied, but not explicitly identified.⁸

A method used to convert future benefits into present value by 1) discounting each future benefit at an appropriate yield rate, or 2) developing an overall rate that explicitly reflects the investment's income pattern, holding period, value change, and yield rate.⁹

The definition of the income capitalization approach is offered as follows:

Specific appraisal techniques applied to develop a value indication for a property based on its earning capability and calculated by the capitalization of property income.¹⁰

⁷ The Dictionary of Real Estate Appraisal, 6th ed. (Chicago: Appraisal Institute, 2015), 207.

⁸ The Dictionary of Real Estate Appraisal, 65.

⁹ The Dictionary of Real Estate Appraisal, 251.

¹⁰ The Dictionary of Real Estate Appraisal, 115.

SALES COMPARISON APPROACH

Using the sales comparison approach, the market value of the subject property will be estimated by a comparison to similar properties that have recently sold, are listed for sale, or are under contract. The underlying premise of the sales comparison approach is the market value of a property is directly related to the price of comparable, competitive properties in the marketplace.


This approach is based on the economic principle of substitution. According to The Appraisal of Real Estate, 14th Edition (Chicago: Appraisal Institute, 2013), *“The principle of substitution holds that the value of property tends to be set by the price that would be paid to acquire a substitute property of similar utility and desirability within a reasonable amount of time. The principle implies that the reliability of the sales comparison approach is diminished if substitute properties are not available in the market.”*

The proper application of this approach requires obtaining sale data for comparison with the subject. In order to assemble the comparable sales, we searched various data sources for leads, and then confirmed the data with parties directly related to the transactions (primarily brokers, buyers and sellers) and/or public records. Data sources included our internal database, CoStar, LoopNet and public records. We also contacted local brokers actively marketing similar properties throughout the region.

On the following pages, we will present and analyze several comparable sales of professional office and flex properties located in the subject’s market area. We will begin by presenting a summary tabulation and location map, followed by detailed sales sheets, a discussion of necessary adjustments, and our conclusion of market value via this approach. We focused our search on Class C/D office properties in the Roseville/Rocklin submarket. While there are recent sales of Class A properties in Roseville, these properties are not deemed as comparable to the subject as the properties analyzed. We are first providing an estimate of value assuming completion of conversion/renovation, and the lease-up and conversion costs will be taken into account following the reconciliation.

IMPROVED SALES SUMMARY

No.	Property Identification	Sale Date	Sale Price	Rentable Area (SF)	Price per SF	Year Built
1	3845 Atherton Road Rocklin	Pending	\$1,725,000	16,666	\$103.50	1988
2	3755 Atherton Road Rocklin	Apr-15	\$3,667,000	50,000	\$73.34	1998
3	500 Menlo Drive Rocklin	Jan-15	\$2,100,000	22,979	\$91.39	2001
4	1 Sierra Gate Plaza, Building A & B Roseville	Oct-14	\$4,630,189	39,037	\$118.61	1983
5	3735 Placer Corporate Drive Rocklin	Listing	\$4,750,000	39,869	\$119.14	2006



IMPROVED SALE 1

Property Identification

3845 Atherton Road
Rocklin, California 95765
Placer County

APN: 017-282-005



Sale Data

Grantor	Noel Properties, LLC
Grantee	Pending
Sale Date	Pending
Deed Book Page	Pending
Property Rights	Leased Fee
Conditions of Sale	Market
Financing Terms	Cash Equivalent
Sale Price	\$1,725,000

Land Data

Land Area	58,198 SF
Zoning	PD/LI - Planned Development/Light Industrial
Corner Orientation	No
Street Frontage	Along Atherton Road

Improvement Data

Rentable Area	16,666 SF
Year Built	1988
Number of Stories	1
Tenancy	Multiple
Construction Type	Concrete tilt-up
Parking	Adequate
Floor Area Ratio	0.30

Indicators

Sale Price per SF	\$103.50
PV of Bonds Per SF	\$0.00
Overall Capitalization Rate	N/Av

Remarks

This property is reportedly 100% occupied by Echelon Fitness, LLC, Direct Energy Retail, Inc., Adult Vocational Services and the owner.

IMPROVED SALE 2

Property Identification

3755 Atherton Road
Rocklin, California 95765
Placer County

APN: 017-283-002



Sale Data

Grantor	Coon Creek Cattle Co.
Grantee	Farm Credit West
Sale Date	4/9/2015
Deed Book Page	027650
Property Rights	Fee Simple
Conditions of Sale	Market
Financing Terms	Cash Equivalent
Sale Price	\$3,667,000

Land Data

Land Area	191,000 SF
Zoning	Commercial
Corner Orientation	Yes
Street Frontage	Along Atherton Road and Menlo Drive

Improvement Data

Rentable Area	50,000 SF
Year Built	1998
Number of Stories	1
Tenancy	Multiple
Construction Type	Concrete tilt-up
Parking	Adequate
Floor Area Ratio	0.26

Indicators

Sale Price per SF	\$73.34
PV of Bonds Per SF	\$0.02
Overall Capitalization Rate	N/Av

Remarks

This property represents an office/flex building. The buyer, Farm Credit West, plans to move into the building during the fourth quarter of 2016.

IMPROVED SALE 3

Property Identification

500 Menlo Drive
Rocklin, California 95765
Placer County

APN: 017-282-010



Sale Data

Grantor	GSMS 2005 Menlo Office LP
Grantee	Vaca Solar Millenium Fund LLC
Sale Date	1/28/2015
Deed Book Page	6008
Property Rights	Leased Fee
Conditions of Sale	Market
Financing Terms	Cash Equivalent
Sale Price	\$2,100,000

Land Data

Land Area	95,832 SF
Zoning	PD -LI, Planned Development-Light Industrial
Corner Orientation	No
Street Frontage	Menlo Drive

Improvement Data

Rentable Area	22,979 SF
Year Built	2001
Number of Stories	1
Tenancy	Single
Construction Type	Concrete tilt-up
Parking	Adequate
Floor Area Ratio	0.24

Indicators

Sale Price per SF	\$91.39
PV of Bonds Per SF	\$0.02
Overall Capitalization Rate	N/Av

Remarks

This property represents the sale of an office building located along Menlo Drive. This comparable is located along the east side of Highway 65 and was 29.5% vacant at the time of purchase.

IMPROVED SALE 4

Property Identification

1 Sierra Gate Plaza, Building A & B
Roseville, California 95678
Placer County

APN: 015-240-018, -021, -022



Sale Data

Grantor	O'Brien Interests, Inc.
Grantee	John Adams Academy
Sale Date	10/17/2014
Deed Book Page	073110
Property Rights	Fee Simple
Conditions of Sale	Market
Financing Terms	Cash Equivalent
Sale Price	\$4,630,189

Land Data

Land Area	102,248 SF
Zoning	BP, Business Professional
Corner Orientation	No
Street Frontage	Sierra Gate Plaza

Improvement Data

Rentable Area	39,037 SF
Year Built	1983
Number of Stories	3
Tenancy	Multiple
Construction Type	Steel
Parking	Adequate
Floor Area Ratio	0.38

Indicators

Sale Price per SF	\$118.61
PV of Bonds Per SF	\$0.00
Overall Capitalization Rate	N/Av

Remarks

This comparable represents a multi-property sale to a single tenant, John Adams Academy. The buildings are visible from Interstate 80.

IMPROVED SALE 5 (LISTING)

Property Identification

3735 Placer Corporate Drive
Rocklin, California 95765
Placer County

APN: 017-270-072



Sale Data

Grantor	Placer Center, LLC
Grantee	Listing
Sale Date	Listing
Deed Book Page	Listing
Property Rights	Fee Simple
Conditions of Sale	Market
Financing Terms	Cash Equivalent
List Price	\$4,750,000

Land Data

Land Area	178,596 SF
Zoning	INP-DC, Industrial Park, Design Review
Corner Orientation	No
Street Frontage	Placer Corporate Drive

Improvement Data

Rentable Area	39,869 SF
Year Built	2006
Number of Stories	1
Tenancy	Single
Construction Type	Concrete tilt-up
Parking	Adequate
Floor Area Ratio	0.22

Indicators

List Price per SF	\$119.14
PV of Bonds Per SF	\$0.00
Overall Capitalization Rate	N/Av

Remarks

This property is reportedly built out as a church with classrooms and offices. It is located proximate to Highway 65.

Adjustment Discussion

The comparable transactions are adjusted to the subject with regard to categories that affect value. If a comparable has an attribute that is considered superior to that of the subject, it is adjusted downward to negate the effect the item has on the price of the comparable. The opposite is true of categories considered inferior to the subject.

To isolate and quantify the adjustments on the comparable sales data, it is considered appropriate to use percent adjustments. At a minimum, the appraiser considers adjustments for the following items:

- Present value of bonds
- Property rights conveyed
- Financing terms
- Conditions of sale (motivation)
- Expenditures after sale
- Market conditions
- Physical characteristics

A paired sales analysis is performed in a meaningful way when the quantity and quality of data are available. However, as a result of the limited data present in the market, many of the adjustments require the appraiser's experience and knowledge of the market and information obtained from those knowledgeable and active in the marketplace. A detailed analysis involving each of these factors is presented below.

Present Value of Bonds

Bond debt can have a direct impact on the amount for which a property will sell, particularly when the bond debt is significant. Sales 2 and 3 are encumbered by bonds. In an effort to account for the difference in bond indebtedness, we have established a present value amount for the bond encumbrance based on the annual assessment associated with these sales. The present value amount is based on the annual assessment payment, a discount rate of 6.0% and the remaining term from the date of sale. The present value of the bond is estimated for the sales, after which they are adjusted to the subject on a dollar-for-dollar basis.

Property Rights Conveyed

In transactions of real property, the rights being conveyed can vary widely and have a significant impact on the sales price. The comparables represent both leased fee and fee simple transactions. To the best of our knowledge, the leased fee properties sold within market parameters and were not influenced by above or below market contract rental rates. Consequently, no adjustments are required for property rights conveyed.

Financing Terms

In analyzing the comparables, it is necessary to adjust for financing terms that differ from market terms. Typically, if the buyer retained third party financing (other than the seller) for the purpose of purchasing the property, a cash price is presumed and no adjustment is required. However, in instances where the seller provides financing as a debt instrument, a premium may have been paid by the buyer for below market financing terms or a discount may have been demanded by the buyer if the financing terms were above market. The premium or discounted price must then be adjusted to a cash equivalent basis. All of the comparable sales were all cash to the seller or cash equivalent transactions. Therefore, no adjustments are made for financing terms.

Conditions of Sale

Adverse conditions of sale can account for a significant discrepancy from the sales price actually paid compared to that of the market. This discrepancy in price is generally attributed to the motivations of the buyer and the seller. Certain conditions of sale are considered to be non-market and may include the following:

- a seller acting under duress,
- a lack of exposure to the open market,
- an inter-family or inter-business transaction for the sake of family or business interest,
- an unusual tax consideration,
- a premium paid for site assemblage,
- a sale at legal auction, or
- an eminent domain proceeding.

Most of the comparable sales represent market transactions and do not require adjustment. Sale 5 is representative of a current listing and is adjusted downward to reflect the likelihood that the transaction price will be lower than the list price due to typical negotiations by the buyer.

Expenditures After Sale

Expenditures after sale include expenses that are incurred after the purchase of a property, such as lease-up costs that would be required to bring a property to stabilized occupancy, or renovation costs. The majority of the comparable sales represent properties at stabilized occupancy with no deferred maintenance. Sale 3 was not operating at stabilized occupancy at the time of sale and receives an upward adjustment. The adjustment is based on rent loss, concessions, a tenant improvement allowance, leasing commissions and entrepreneurial incentive over the course of a projected absorption period. The lease-up cost figure is divided by the sale price to arrive at a percent adjustment.

Market Conditions (Time)

Market conditions generally change over time, but the date of this appraisal is for a specific point in time. Therefore, in an unstable economy, one that is undergoing changes in the value of the dollar, interest rates and economic growth or decline, extra attention needs to be paid to assess changing market conditions. Significant changes in price levels can occur in several areas of a municipality, while prices in other areas remain relatively stable. Although the adjustment for market conditions is often referred to as a time adjustment, time is not the cause of the adjustment.

In evaluating market conditions, changes between the comparable sales date and the effective date of this appraisal may warrant adjustment; however, if market conditions have not changed, then no adjustment is required. Sale 4 transferred in the fourth quarter of 2014 and market conditions have improved since the date of sale; therefore, an upward adjustment is applied.

Physical Characteristics

The physical characteristics of a property can impact the selling price. Those that may impact value include the following:

Location

The subject is located in Downtown Roseville, and the location is considered to be average for an office project. Factors considered in evaluating location include, but are not limited to, demographics, growth rates, surrounding uses and property values. All of the comparable sales are located in similar areas as the subject property, and no adjustments are warranted for this element of comparison.

Visibility/Accessibility

The visibility and accessibility of a property can have a direct impact on property value. For example, if a property is landlocked, this is considered to be an inferior position compared to a property with open accessibility. However, if a property has good visibility or is in proximity to major linkages, this is considered a superior amenity in comparison to a property with limited visibility. The subject has average visibility along Oak Street in Downtown Roseville. Sale 4 is visible from Interstate 80 and is adjusted downward to account for this superior attribute.

Rentable Area (SF)

In general, due to economies of scale, the market exhibits an inverse relationship between building area and price per square foot such that larger buildings sell for a lower price per square foot than smaller buildings, all else being equal. To account for this tendency the comparables that are appreciably smaller than the subject are adjusted downward, and vice versa.

Quality of Construction

The subject is an average quality office building (once converted). All of the comparables exhibit similar overall quality as compared to the subject property. No adjustments are required.

Effective Age/Condition

The subject improvements will exhibit an effective age of approximately 25 years at completion of the renovation and conversion. The comparables display varying effective ages. An adjustment of approximately 1% per year difference in effective age is applied to the comparables to reflect the discrepancy in remaining economic life. Those with newer effective ages are adjusted downward, and vice versa.

Adjustment Grid

During our investigation, we identified several office properties located throughout the Roseville/Rocklin submarket that were analyzed to estimate the market value of the subject property. The adjustment grid details the unadjusted and adjusted value ranges presented by the comparable sales.

ADJUSTMENT GRID

Elements of Comparison:	Subject	Sale 1	Sale 2	Sale 3	Sale 4	Sale 5
Price per SF (Unadjusted)		\$103.50	\$73.34	\$91.39	\$118.61	\$119.14
PV of Bonds	\$0.00	<u>\$0.00</u>	<u>\$0.02</u>	<u>\$0.02</u>	<u>\$0.00</u>	<u>\$0.00</u>
<i>Adjustment</i>		\$0.00	\$0.02	\$0.02	\$0.00	\$0.00
Adjusted Value		\$103.50	\$73.36	\$91.41	\$118.61	\$119.14
Property Rights	Fee Simple	Leased Fee	Fee Simple	Leased Fee	Fee Simple	Fee Simple
<i>Adjustment</i>						
Adjusted Value		\$103.50	\$73.36	\$91.41	\$118.61	\$119.14
Financing Terms	Cash Equiv.	Cash Equiv.	Cash Equiv.	Cash Equiv.	Cash Equiv.	Cash Equiv.
<i>Adjustment</i>						
Adjusted Value		\$103.50	\$73.36	\$91.41	\$118.61	\$119.14
Conditions of Sale	Market	Pending	Market	Market	Market	Listing
<i>Adjustment</i>						-10%
Adjusted Value		\$103.50	\$73.36	\$91.41	\$118.61	\$107.23
Expenditures After Sale	None	Similar	Similar	Lease-Up	Similar	Similar
<i>Adjustment</i>	(Hypothetical)			4%		
Adjusted Value		\$103.50	\$73.36	\$95.06	\$118.61	\$107.23
Market Conditions	Oct-16	Oct-16	Apr-15	Jan-15	Oct-14	Oct-16
<i>Adjustment</i>	(appraisal)				5%	
Effective Price per SF		\$103.50	\$73.36	\$95.06	\$124.54	\$107.23
Physical Characteristics:						
Location	Downtown	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
<i>Adjustment</i>	Roseville					
Visibility/Accessibility	Average	Similar	Similar	Similar	Sig. Superior	Similar
<i>Adjustment</i>					-20%	
Rentable Area (SF)	19,000	16,666	50,000	22,979	39,037	39,869
<i>Adjustment</i>			10%		5%	5%
Overall Quality	Average	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
<i>Adjustment</i>						
Effective Age/Condition	25 yrs/Avg	15 yrs/Avg	20 yrs/Avg	20 yrs/Avg	20 yrs/Avg	10 yrs/Avg
<i>Adjustment</i>		-10%	-5%	-5%	-5%	-15%
Net Adjustment		-10%	5%	-5%	-20%	-10%
Adjusted Price per SF		\$93.15	\$77.03	\$90.31	\$99.63	\$96.50
Unadjusted Range per SF	\$73.36	to	\$119.14			
Adjusted Range per SF	\$77.03		\$99.63			
		to				
Concluded Value per SF	\$90.00					

Market Value Conclusion – Sales Comparison Approach

The adjustment grid on the previous page illustrates the quantitative adjustments applied to the data set in order to equate the comparables with the subject property. Prior to adjusting for differences between the comparables and the subject property, the data set reflects an unadjusted range of \$73.36 to \$119.14 per square foot. Following our application of adjustments, the range of data narrowed to \$77.03 to \$99.63 per square foot, with an average of \$90.87 per square foot and a median of \$93.41 per square foot. No individual comparable provides the best indication of market value, though Sale 5 is given limited emphasis due to its status as a listing. With equal weight placed on Sales 1 through 4, a value estimate of \$90 per square foot is concluded. Applying this indicator to the subject's rentable area results in the following estimate of market value via the sales comparison approach:

$$19,000\pm \text{ square feet } \times \$90 \text{ per square foot } = \textbf{\$1,710,000}$$

The market value estimate is based on a hypothetical condition assuming completion of renovation, conversion, and stabilized occupancy. It also assumes the proposed lot line adjustment has been recorded.

INCOME CAPITALIZATION APPROACH

We will exclusively apply the direct capitalization method of the income capitalization approach. Direct capitalization converts an estimate of a single year's net operating income into an indication of value in one direct step. This step is accomplished either by dividing the income estimate by the relevant income rate (an overall capitalization rate), or by multiplying the income estimate by a proper factor (such as a gross, effective gross or net income multiplier). In the subject's market area, buyers and sellers of properties like the subject typically handle direct capitalization by using an overall rate as opposed to a multiplier. Therefore, this method of direct capitalization will be employed in this analysis.

The components of the direct capitalization method are tabulated as follows:

- Potential Gross Income
- Vacancy and Collection Loss
- Operating Expenses
- Overall Capitalization Rate

These four components are discussed below and will be combined at the end of this section to provide a fee simple market value estimate of the subject property assuming completion of renovation, conversion, and stabilized occupancy.

Potential Gross Income

Contract Rent


While the property is currently 100% owner-occupied as a fire station and administrative offices, it will be vacated following the construction of a new fire station on another parcel (this property currently consists of vacant land). Therefore, continued long-term use of the subject as a fire station is not probable. There is no contract rent associated with the subject property; thus, we will use market rent to determine potential gross income. Once again, the subject is being valued in accordance with its highest and best use as an office property.

Market Rent

For the purpose of estimating market rent for the subject property, we have conducted a rental survey of office properties in the subject's market area and surrounding areas. Adjustments will be applied to account for any differences between the comparables and the subject property relating to differences in lease type, lease conditions, market conditions and physical characteristics. The results of the rent survey are presented on the following pages. Given the subject's rentable area of 19,000 square feet, it is not likely that a future office user would occupy the entire building. The building could accommodate multiple tenants upon completion of conversion.

RENT SURVEY

No.	Tenant / Property Identification	Lease Began	Lease Term	Rentable Area (SF)	Rent PSF/Mo.	Lease Type
1	Building Blocks Behavior Consultants 214 Estates Drive Roseville	Feb-16	3 years	2,304	\$1.28	Full Service
2	Solar City 1376 Lead Hill Boulevard Roseville	Oct-15	2 years, 2 months	22,650	\$1.60	Full Service
3	Psomas 1075 Creekside Ridge Drive Roseville	Aug-15	5 years, 10 months	18,212	\$1.62	Full Service
4	Sterling Backcheck 5700 West Oaks Boulevard Rocklin	Aug-15	2 years	11,254	\$1.50	Full Service
5	Metro Calvary Rocklin 9089 Foothills Boulevard Rocklin	Feb-15	5 years, 3 months	23,396	\$1.00	NNN
6	Listing 3785 Placer Corporate Drive Rocklin	Listing	Negotiable	40,783	\$1.05	NNN



RENT COMPARABLE PHOTOS



Rent 1



Rent 2



Rent 3



Rent 4



Rent 5



Rent 6

ADJUSTMENT GRID

Elements of Comparison:	Subject	Rent 1	Rent 2	Rent 3	Rent 4	Rent 5	Rent 6
Rent PSF/Mo. (Unadjusted)		\$1.28	\$1.60	\$1.62	\$1.50	\$1.00	\$1.05
Lease Type	Full Service	Full Service	Full Service	Full Service	Full Service	NNN	NNN
Adjustment						\$0.50	\$0.50
Adjusted Value		\$1.28	\$1.60	\$1.62	\$1.50	\$1.50	\$1.55
Lease Conditions	Market	Market	Market	Market	Market	Market	Listing
Adjustment							-10%
Adjusted Value		\$1.28	\$1.60	\$1.62	\$1.50	\$1.50	\$1.40
Market Conditions	Oct-16	Feb-16	Oct-15	Aug-15	Aug-15	Feb-15	Oct-16
Adjustment	(appraisal)						
Effective Rent PSF/Mo.		\$1.28	\$1.60	\$1.62	\$1.50	\$1.50	\$1.40
Physical Characteristics:							
Location	Roseville	Similar	Superior	Superior	Similar	Similar	Similar
Adjustment	Downtown		-10%	-10%			
Visibility/Accessibility	Average	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Adjustment							
Rentable Area (SF)	19,000	2,304	22,650	18,212	11,254	23,396	40,783
Adjustment	(divisible)	-5%					5%
Overall Quality	Average	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Adjustment							
Effective Age/Condition	25 yrs/Avg	30 yrs/Avg	10 yrs/Avg	10 yrs/Avg	10 yrs/Avg	10 yrs/Avg	10 yrs/Avg
Adjustment		5%	-15%	-15%	-15%	-15%	-15%
Net Adjustment		0%	-25%	-25%	-15%	-15%	-10%
Adjusted Rent PSF/Mo.		\$1.28	\$1.20	\$1.22	\$1.28	\$1.28	\$1.26
Unadjusted Range	\$1.28	to	\$1.62				
Adjusted Range	\$1.20	to	\$1.28				
Concluded Rent PSF/Mo.	\$1.25						

Market Rent Conclusion

Market rent is the rental income that a property would most probably command in the market place. For purposes of our analysis, market rent will be estimated according to the following assumptions:

- Local or regionally recognizable tenant;
- Full service leasing strategy;
- Moderate rent concessions;
- 1-7 year lease duration

A number of comparable office properties within the Roseville/Rocklin submarket were surveyed in order to estimate market rent for the subject property. The comparable properties presented on the preceding pages are considered the most similar to the subject that we could accurately confirm. We have analyzed the subject on full service terms to be consistent with typical leasing for office properties. Adjustments are made to the comparables with differing lease types to account for the difference in the owner's responsibility for operating expenses. The following table details the expenses that are included in the lease type adjustment. All else being equal, higher base rents are charged as the owner's expense responsibility increases.

Comparable Lease Type	Operating Expenses Paid by Owner	Adjusting to Full Service, adjust for:
NNN	Property management	<i>Upward:</i> Taxes, insurance, CAM, utilities, janitorial, maintenance and repairs

The survey of comparable office properties indicates an unadjusted rental rate range of \$1.28 to \$1.62 psf/month, full service. Other factors considered when adjusting the comparables consist of lease conditions, market conditions, location, visibility/accessibility, rentable area, overall quality and effective age/condition. After comparing the market data to the subject property, and considering the differing property characteristics, the range of data narrowed to \$1.20 to \$1.28 psf/month, full service. The range of data shifted below the unadjusted range mostly due to adjustments associated with the newer effective ages of the comparable properties. Rent 6 represents a listing and is therefore given less emphasis. With more weight placed on Rents 1 through 5, a market rent of \$1.25 psf/month (full service) is concluded for the subject property.

Tenant Reimbursements

Not applicable. The subject is analyzed on full service terms for which there are no tenant reimbursements.

Total Potential Gross Income

The total potential gross income for the subject consists solely of market rent and is calculated in the *Income Capitalization Approach* summary sheet at the end of this section.

Vacancy and Collection Loss

This portion of the analysis considers the valuation of the subject property at stabilized occupancy. Stabilized occupancy is defined as follows:

The occupancy of a property that would be expected at a particular point in time, considering its relative competitive strength and supply and demand conditions at the time, and presuming it is priced at market rent and has had reasonable market exposure. A property is at stabilized occupancy when it is capturing its appropriate share of market demand. An expression of the average or typical occupancy that would be expected for a property over a specified projection period or over its economic life.¹¹

Market vacancy statistics were discussed in depth in the *Office Market* section of this report. Please refer to this section for a detailed discussion of market and/or submarket vacancy factors. After taking into account all market conditions, and the subject's specific attributes, a stabilized vacancy and collection loss factor for the subject property of 10% is considered reasonable over the typical investment holding period.

Operating Expenses

While requested, we were not provided with historical operating expenses for the subject property. Therefore, to estimate pro forma expenses for the subject property, we will draw upon historical operating expenses for comparable office properties throughout the region, and we will consider expense data published by the PwC Investor Survey. This data is presented in the table on the following page.

¹¹ The Dictionary of Real Estate Appraisal, 6th ed. (Chicago: Appraisal Institute, 2015), 219.

OPERATING EXPENSES (PSF/YEAR)

OPERATING EXPENSES (PFI/FEAR)																		
Building Type	Location	Building Area (SF)	Effective Age	Expense Year	Property Taxes	Property Insurance	Utilities	Janitorial	Maint/ Repairs	Property Mgmt								
Comparables																		
2-story, wood frame	Sacramento	60,133	25 yrs	2016	\$0.87	\$0.24	\$2.40	\$1.04	\$1.44	\$1.04								
Single-story, concrete tilt-up	Rocklin	39,869	10 yrs	2015	\$0.70	\$0.30	\$2.87	N/Av	\$0.46	\$1.16								
1-story, steel frame/concrete	Rancho Cordova	20,484	20 yrs	2015	\$1.36	\$0.23	\$0.53	N/Av	\$0.30	\$0.50								
1-story, concrete tilt-up	Sacramento	1,616	7 yrs	2014	\$4.21	N/Av	N/Av	N/Av	\$0.37	N/Av								
2-story, wood/steel/concrete	Sacramento	56,221	25 yrs	2014	\$1.02	\$0.26	\$2.61	\$1.06	\$1.19	\$1.06								
1-story, concrete tilt-up	Rocklin	24,130	10 yrs	2013	N/Av	\$0.53	N/Av	N/Av	\$1.79	N/Av								
Single-story, concrete/steel	Rocklin	12,558	25 yrs	2013	\$1.26	\$0.67	\$0.41	\$1.10	\$2.61	\$1.10								
3-story, concrete	Sacramento	78,078	30 yrs	2013	\$0.76	\$0.23	\$2.69	\$0.73	\$1.63	\$0.73								
				Min.	\$0.70	\$0.23	\$0.41	\$0.73	\$0.30	\$0.50								
				Max.	\$4.21	\$0.67	\$2.87	\$1.10	\$2.61	\$1.16								
				Average	\$1.45	\$0.35	\$1.92	\$0.98	\$1.22	\$0.93								
Institute of Real Estate Management (IREM)																		
Suburban Offices (pg. 173)	Western U.S.			2014 Low:	\$1.76	\$0.27	\$1.59		\$0.73	\$0.64								
				High:	\$3.02	\$1.08	\$2.67		\$2.47	\$1.17								
				Median:	\$2.28	\$0.71	\$2.16		\$1.33	\$0.92								
PwC Real Estate Investor Survey																		
First Quarter 2016 (surveyed only once per year)																		
Property Management Fees (as a % of EGI)																		
		Low	High	Avg														
Central Bus. District Office	1.00%	5.00%	2.54%															
Suburban Office	1.50%	6.00%	3.22%															
Medical Office	1.30%	5.00%	3.71%															
Flex/R&D	1.50%	4.00%	2.80%															
* Utilities include electricity, natural gas, water and sewer. Does not include trash removal, which is part of Maint/Repairs.																		
"C.A." indicates that utilities are for the common areas only (tenants are individually metered for their rentable areas).																		

Property Taxes and Direct Charges

As discussed in the *Property Identification and Legal Data* section of this report, the subject property does not have a property tax obligation due to the fact that the building is owned and operated by the City of Roseville. However, the definition of market value assumes a sale, and if the property transferred to a private ownership, taxes would then be assessed. Therefore, we have estimated property taxes by applying the tax rate of 1.0937% to the market value estimate via the income capitalization approach.

Insurance

An insurance expense of \$0.40 psf/year is concluded for the subject property, which is in line with the comparable properties.

Utilities

A utility expense of \$2.00 psf/year is concluded for the subject property, which is in line with the comparable properties.

Janitorial

We have concluded an estimate of \$1.00 psf/year which is in line with typical market janitorial expenses.

Maintenance and Repairs

Unlike the balance of the operating expenses, maintenance and repairs expenses can fluctuate significantly from year to year depending on items that require repair/replacement in one year but not the next, which is evidenced by the wide range of the comparables. An expense of \$1.50 psf/year is concluded.

Management

Property management expenses for office properties in the subject's market area are typically between 1.5% and 6.0% of effective gross income. An expense of 3.0% of EGI is concluded for the subject property.

Replacement Allowance

A replacement reserve expense has not been estimated for the subject property since the overall capitalization rates extracted from the sales data did not include this as an expense.

Overall Capitalization Rate

To provide an estimate of the market value for the subject property via the direct capitalization method of the income capitalization approach, an overall rate must be derived. The overall capitalization rate is the ratio between the net operating income as of the date of value and a property's cash equivalent sales price. The overall rate is a reflection of the present value of anticipated future benefits.

In our derivation of the appropriate capitalization rate, two sources are considered: 1) market sales and 2) a band of investment analysis. These sources are discussed below.

Market Sales

In the *Sales Comparison Approach*, we analyzed several sales of office properties. We also compiled capitalization rate information for a variety of additional office properties in the region that were leased at the time of sale. This information is presented in the table on the following page.

MARKET CAPITALIZATION RATES

Property Identification	Sale Date	Sale Price	Rentable Area (SF)	Sale Price per SF	Overall Cap Rate
4010 El Camino Avenue Sacramento	Feb-16	\$1,925,000	14,000	\$137.50	7.50%
11130 Sun Center Drive Rancho Cordova	Sep-15	\$4,600,000	30,096	\$152.84	7.00%
5750 Sunrise Boulevard Citrus Heights	Aug-15	\$3,256,009	30,198	\$107.82	7.93%
2237 Douglas Boulevard Roseville	Jan-15	\$5,600,000	25,630	\$218.49	7.23%
216-228 Riverside Avenue Roseville	Dec-14	\$1,590,000	13,402	\$118.64	9.00%

The overall capitalization rate is the rate at which an investor of an income-producing property will see a return on capital used to buy a particular property/investment. Thus, the capitalization rate can reasonably be viewed as a function of risk. A high risk implies a high possibility of investment loss; a property with high risk will have a high capitalization rate causing a lower selling price or value than one with a relatively low risk factor, all else being equal.

Attributes such as location, building area, visibility/accessibility, condition, effective age and overall quality were taken into account when equating sales and rent comparables to the subject in order to determine market value. The same is true when determining a capitalization rate for the subject property. Also considered when deriving a capitalization rate for an income-producing property is deferred maintenance, security of the income stream (terms of leases and strength of tenants), as well as general economic conditions and local market conditions.

When determining an appropriate capitalization rate for the subject, consideration is given to its location, effective age, and overall quality, as well as the fact that the subject would be a converted fire station as opposed to a purpose-built office property. In examining the income-producing potential of the subject in comparison to other properties in the region, as well as its risk factors, an overall rate toward the upper end of the range of data appears reasonable. Based on the factors discussed, we have concluded a capitalization rate for the subject of 8.50%.

Band of Investment Analysis

One method of determining an overall capitalization rate is to build a rate based on current financing requirements through band of investment. Since most income-producing properties are purchased with debt and equity capital, the overall capitalization rate must satisfy the market return requirements of both investment positions. Lenders must anticipate receiving a competitive interest rate commensurate with the perceived risk of the investment or they will not make funds available. Similarly, equity investors must anticipate receiving a competitive equity cash return commensurate with the perceived risk, or they will invest their funds elsewhere.

Band of Investment is defined as follows:

Band of Investment: a technique in which the capitalization rates attributable to components of an investment are weighted and combined to derive a weighted-average rate attributable to the total investment (i.e., debt and equity, land and improvements).¹²

Typical financing parameters based on a database compiled for commercial properties throughout the region will be used in the determination of the mortgage constant (or mortgage capitalization rate). The equity dividend rate generally reflects the risk associated with an investment from the buyer's perspective (or position). In other words, the more risk associated with a property, the higher

¹² The Dictionary of Real Estate Appraisal, 6th ed. (Chicago: Appraisal Institute, 2015), 19.

The following table presents the typical financing parameters, the estimated equity dividend requirement range, and the band of investment analysis based on market participant surveys and publications for commercial properties throughout the region. This analysis indicates a reasonable range of overall capitalization rates for the subject property.

Capitalization Rate Conclusion

Source	Range
Comparable Sales	7.00% to 9.00%
Band of Investment	8.21% to 8.81%

Seevers • Jordan • Ziegenmeyer

Considering the attributes of the subject property and the current state of the local economy, a capitalization rate of 8.50% is estimated for the subject property.

Market Value Conclusion – Income Capitalization Approach

Applying the components discussed on the preceding pages (potential gross income, vacancy, operating expenses and overall capitalization rate), the market value conclusion via the income capitalization approach is presented on the following page. Once again, the estimate of value is based on a hypothetical condition assuming completion of renovation, conversion, and stabilized occupancy. It also assumes the proposed lot line adjustment has recorded.

INCOME CAPITALIZATION APPROACH

POTENTIAL GROSS INCOME CALCULATION

<u>Income</u>	<u>Rentable Area (SF)</u>	<u>Rent PSF/Mo.</u>	<u>Monthly Income</u>	<u>Annual Income</u>
Market Rent	19,000	\$1.25	\$23,750	\$285,000
Total Potential Gross Income				\$285,000
VACANCY & COLLECTION LOSS	@ 10%			<u>(\$28,500)</u>
EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME				\$256,500
EXPENSES	<u>\$/SF/Year</u>	<u>\$/Year</u>	<u>% of EGI</u>	
Property Taxes	\$0.93	\$17,718	6.9%	
Building Insurance	\$0.40	\$7,600	3.0%	
Utilities	\$2.00	\$38,000	14.8%	
Janitorial	\$1.00	\$19,000	7.4%	
Maintenance and Repairs	\$1.50	\$28,500	11.1%	
Management	\$0.41	\$7,695	3.0%	
Total Expenses	\$6.24	\$118,513	46.2%	<u>(\$118,513)</u>
NET OPERATING INCOME				\$137,987
OVERALL CAPITALIZATION RATE				8.50%
VALUE CONCLUSION (NOI ÷ CAP RATE)				\$1,623,377

CONCLUSION OF VALUE BY DIRECT CAPITALIZATION

Rd. \$1,620,000

RECONCILIATION

The fee simple market value conclusions indicated by the sales comparison and income capitalization approaches to value are:

Sales Comparison Approach	\$1,710,000
Income Capitalization Approach	\$1,620,000

In reconciling the two approaches to value, consideration is given to the individual strengths and weaknesses of each approach.

Sales Comparison Approach

We analyzed several comparable sales of office properties throughout the subject's market area and surrounding areas. The sales comparison approach is typically most relevant when valuing small, owner-user properties; however, it can be useful in appraising any type of property for which relevant market sales data can be obtained. This approach is relevant to the valuation of the subject property because there have been several sales of comparable office properties. The data obtained for this analysis was reasonably similar to the subject, and the adjustments accounted for any differences between the comparables and the subject. The value indication via this approach is considered reliable because we identified several comparable sales and the adjustments resulted in a narrowing of the range of data. Overall, it is our opinion the sales comparison approach provides a credible estimate of market value for the subject property.

Income Capitalization Approach

Buyers of income-producing real estate rely primarily upon the income capitalization approach when assessing the feasibility of an investment. This approach is considered relevant to the valuation of the subject because it could be managed as a leased investment. Further, the reliability of this approach is good in light of the fact that we identified several leases of comparable office properties in the subject's market area. Additionally, the data obtained in estimating vacancy, operating expenses and a capitalization rate for the subject property are considered reliable. Based on the strength of data used in this analysis, consideration is given to the income capitalization approach when arriving at a final conclusion of fee simple market value.

Conclusion

Both approaches are considered applicable to the valuation of the subject property. The indications via the two approaches are within 6% of one another. Based on the preceding discussion and analysis, our final conclusion of fee simple market value of the subject property – assuming completion of renovation, conversion and stabilized occupancy (based on a hypothetical condition) – is **\$1,670,000**.

MARKET VALUE AS OF THE DATE OF INSPECTION

As detailed in the *Highest and Best Use* section of this report, the maximally productive use of the subject property is for renovation, conversion and lease-up of the building as professional office space. The preceding analysis considered a hypothetical condition of the subject property assuming completion of all three provisions. In order to determine the market value of the subject property as of the date of inspection, deductions are required for rent loss, concessions, leasing commissions, conversion costs, tenant improvement (renovation) costs and developer's incentive over a reasonable absorption period. These items are discussed below.

Rent Loss

Income loss from rent would be incurred until the subject is leased to stabilized occupancy. While the subject is currently 100% owner-occupied, the current use as a fire station is not consistent with our conclusion of highest and best use for the subject property (conversion to conventional professional office). Thus, we must take into account the lease-up period required to lease the subject. In the income capitalization approach, we identified a 90% stabilized occupancy level for the subject property. Multiplying this figure by the total rentable area indicates that 17,100 square feet would need to be leased in order to achieve stabilized occupancy.

Considering the specifics of the subject property (location, configuration, etc.), as well as current market conditions, we have estimated an absorption period of 18 months for the vacant space to lease. This projected absorption is considered reasonable based on lease-up times reported for other office properties throughout the region, as well as taking account an estimated renovation period of six months. There is not expected to be any pre-leasing, and lease-up of the subject property will begin once renovation is complete.

The estimated absorption period takes into account the competitive rental rate concluded for the subject property. Rent loss over the 18 months is calculated based on a rental rate of \$1.25 (full service), consistent with the market rent concluded in the *Income Capitalization Approach*.

Rental Concessions

Consistent with leasing at comparable properties, it is expected that the property owner of the subject property will use rental concessions as a marketing tool to attract potential tenants. The comparable rents utilized in the *Income Capitalization Approach* indicate that rental concessions range from 0 to 3 months in the subject's area. As such, a rental concession (free rent) of three months is deducted in this portion of the analysis.

Leasing Commissions

A leasing commission of 6% of the rental payments over the term of the lease is typical in the subject's market area. A lease term of three years (36 months) is assumed.

Renovation Costs

The subject property is currently occupied by a public/government entity for use as a fire station, the subject will be appraised in accordance with its highest and best economic use. In assuming completion of renovation, conversion and stabilized occupancy (based on a hypothetical condition) the building will be converted to conventional office space. The subject property contains 13,543± square feet of basement office area. The space is reportedly located in the floodplain and has restrictions on renovation or conversion. It also has limited marketability due to lower ceilings, reduced window lines, and limited access. The basement is therefore not included in the calculation of rentable area for the subject.

We can estimate build-out costs for office space by referencing to the Marshall Valuation Service, a nationally recognized cost-estimating guide published by Marshall & Swift. For the Marshall estimate, we will obtain and employ a per square foot cost indicator (Calculator Method) for Average “Class C” Office Space. In light of the physical characteristics of the subject property, this category of improvements is deemed as being most similar to the subject.

The cost indicator applicable to the subject’s building area is calculated below. Once again, the basement space is excluded.

Average Office Space (Section 14, Page 35)		
Base Cost	\$	51.71
Total Base Cost	\$	51.71
Perimeter Multiplier		1.013
Height Multiplier		1.000
Current Multiplier		1.010
Local Multiplier		1.180
Total Cost	\$	62.43

The cost estimate presented above is representative of the cost to build out new space within a shell building. Thus, we will use this cost figure for the fire engine bay (approximately 3,870 square feet). Since second-generation space is already built out, the tenant improvement allowances are typically substantially less and vary considerably based on the condition of existing space, market conditions, type of tenant, and the negotiating strength of the parties involved. Since the administrative office and sleeping quarters are already improved, a lower cost of \$20 per square foot is concluded for the renovation and conversion of this area to conventional professional office space.

City representatives noted there are underground tanks on the site and the building has asbestos. Note that we are not experts in the field of determining the existence or severity of these issues, and the cost of remediation could vary greatly. In June 2015, CB Richard Ellis (CBRE) published an article titled “Approximation of the Asbestos Cleanup Liability for Large Real Property Portfolios.” In this article, they estimated asbestos cleanup costs for commercial properties, and we will use these reported costs to estimate the cost of removal of asbestos for the subject property. For removal and disposal costs, they used a sample of 40 actual cleanup cost estimates from several sites on the east coast, and the properties represented administration, housing, mission support, maintenance and production, storage, and utilities buildings. The median cost was \$5.48 per square foot, which was also consistent with the median cost for asbestos removal found in a separate study of California public buildings. In addition to the removal costs, CBRE estimates a survey cost of \$0.37 per square foot for buildings measuring 20,000 square feet, which indicates a total cost of \$5.85 per square foot (\$5.48 + \$0.37). This figure will be used as an estimate of cost for asbestos removal. We will be calculating the asbestos removal for the entire area of the building of 32,543 square feet. It is expected that the buyer would fully remediate the problem since asbestos is a harmful substance that can cause lung and respiratory conditions.

The number of underground storage tanks and possible soil contamination of the subject property is unknown. An environmental study prepared by Brusca Associates, Inc. and dated October 20, 2016 indicated that there are no environmental or soils concerns at the subject property. A property proximate to the subject at 316 Vernon Street recently underwent the removal of large and small storage tanks, and the cost of removal as reported by the City of Roseville was \$60,000. This property is within two blocks of the subject, and it is assumed the costs incurred will be similar for the subject property.

A property condition assessment report was prepared by AEI Consultants in October 2016. In this report, the consultants identified issues of deferred maintenance that require repair. Items include storm water drainage and retaining wall improvements, parking lot repair, sidewalk and curb repair, framing and cladding improvements, and other miscellaneous repairs. The total estimated cost of curing these items is \$122,300. This estimate will be relied upon in the valuation of the subject property.

Entrepreneurial Profit

We must also consider the entrepreneurial profit factor an investor would require to undertake the project considering the scope of work involved with conversion and renovation. A profit factor of 10% of the capital at risk is considered reasonable under current market conditions. Capital at risk includes the costs associated with the aforementioned items.

Conclusion

Based on the preceding discussion and analysis, the market value of the subject property is calculated on the following table.

Market Value Assuming Renovation, Conversion and Stabilized Occupancy						\$1,670,000
	<u>Month</u>	<u>SF Vacant</u>	<u>Absorp./Mo.</u>	<u>Market Rent PSF/Month</u>	<u>Rent Loss/Mo.</u>	
Rent Loss:	1	17,100	0	\$1.25 =	\$21,375	
	2	17,100	0	\$1.25 =	\$21,375	
	3	17,100	0	\$1.25 =	\$21,375	
	4	17,100	0	\$1.25 =	\$21,375	
	5	17,100	0	\$1.25 =	\$21,375	
	6	17,100	0	\$1.25 =	\$21,375	
	7	17,100	0	\$1.25 =	\$21,375	
	8	17,100	0	\$1.25 =	\$21,375	
	9	17,100	0	\$1.25 =	\$21,375	
	10	17,100	0	\$1.25 =	\$21,375	
	11	17,100	0	\$1.25 =	\$21,375	
	12	17,100	5,700	\$1.25 =	\$21,375	
	13	11,400	0	\$1.25 =	\$14,250	
	14	11,400	0	\$1.25 =	\$14,250	
	15	11,400	5,700	\$1.25 =	\$14,250	
	16	5,700	0	\$1.25 =	\$7,125	
	17	5,700	0	\$1.25 =	\$7,125	
	18	5,700	5,700	\$1.25 =	\$7,125	
Total Rent Loss						\$320,625
Rent Concessions	17,100	SF @	\$1.25	psf/mo. for 3 mos.		\$64,125
Leasing Commissions	17,100	SF @	\$1.25	psf/mo. for 36 mos. x 6%		\$46,170
Conversion Costs						
Fire Engine Bay Renovation	3,870	SF @	\$62.43	psf		\$241,601
Interior Renovation	15,130	SF @	\$20.00	psf		\$302,600
Asbestos Removal	32,543	SF @	\$5.85	psf		\$190,377
Storage Tank Removal						\$60,000
Deferred Maintenance						\$122,300
Entrepreneurial Incentive	10%	of capital at risk				<u>\$134,780</u>
Total Costs						<u>(\$1,482,577)</u>
Market Value as of the Date of Inspection						\$187,423
(Assumes Completion of the Lot Line Adjustment)						Rd. \$190,000

LAND VALUATION

Using the sales comparison approach, the market value of the subject's land will be estimated by a comparison to similar properties that have recently sold, are listed for sale or are under contract. The underlying premise of the sales comparison approach is the market value of a property is directly related to the price of comparable, competitive properties in the marketplace.

This approach is based on the economic principle of substitution. According to The Appraisal of Real Estate, 14th Edition (Chicago: Appraisal Institute, 2013), *“The principle of substitution holds that the value of property tends to be set by the cost of acquiring a substitute or alternative property of similar utility and desirability within a reasonable amount of time.”* The sales comparison approach is applicable when there are sufficient recent, reliable transactions to indicate value patterns or trends in the market.


The proper application of this approach requires obtaining sale data for comparison with the subject property. In order to assemble the comparable sales, we searched public records and other data sources for leads, then confirmed the raw data obtained with parties directly related to the transactions (primarily brokers, buyers and sellers) and/or public records. In the selection of market data for this appraisal, our search criteria for comparable market data was as follows:

- Vacant land properties
- Zoning (Commercial)
- Date of sale (within the last 24 months)
- Size (between 1.25 to 3 acres)
- Location (Roseville and similar surrounding market areas)

On the following pages, we will present and analyze several comparable properties. We will begin by presenting a summary tabulation and location map, followed by detailed sales sheets, a discussion of necessary adjustments, and our conclusion of market value via this approach. The sales on the following page are the most recent transactions considered reasonably similar to the subject property.

LAND SALES SUMMARY

Sale No.	Location	Sale Date	Sale Price	Land Area (Acre/SF)	Sale Price/SF	Zoning / Land Use
1	4680 Rocklin Road Rocklin	Sep-16	\$700,000	<u>2.40</u> 104,544	\$6.70	PD-C
2	Bowman Road Auburn	May-16	\$750,000	<u>2.90</u> 126,324	\$5.94	HS-DC
3	5220 Douglas Boulevard Granite Bay	May-16	\$625,000	<u>2.80</u> 121,968	\$5.12	C2-UP-Dc
4	824 Sutter Street Folsom	Dec-14	\$356,000	<u>1.58</u> 68,803	\$5.17	HD
5	4700 Grove Street Rocklin	Listing	\$316,245	<u>1.32</u> 57,499	\$5.50	C-3




LAND SALE 1

Property Identification

4680 Rocklin Road
Rocklin, California 95677
Placer County

APN: 045-130-056



Sale Data

Grantor	Elihu J Kearney Living Trust
Grantee	CJ Phen, LLC
Sale Date	9/19/2016
Deed Book Page	078729
Property Rights	Fee Simple
Conditions of Sale	Market
Financing Terms	Cash Equivalent
Sale Price	\$700,000

Land Data

Land Area (SF)	104,544
Land Area (Acres)	2.40
Zoning	PD-C, Planned Development, Commercial
Shape	Rectangular
Corner Orientation	No
Street Frontage	Along Rocklin Road
Topography	Level
Off-Site Improvements	All to site
On-Site Improvements	None

Indicators

Sale Price per SF	\$6.70
PV Bonds per SF	\$0.00

Remarks


This comparable represents a parcel located along the south line of Rocklin Road, near Interstate 80. Reportedly, the buyer purchased the property as a long term investment.

LAND SALE 2

Property Identification

Bowman Road
Auburn, California
Placer County

APN: 053-103-049



Sale Data

Grantor Norman R Nedde Md, Inc.
Grantee James & Carol Babcock
Sale Date 5/9/2016
Deed Book Page 035029
Property Rights Fee Simple
Conditions of Sale Market
Financing Terms Cash Equivalent
Sale Price \$750,000

Land Data

Land Area (SF) 126,324
Land Area (Acres) 2.90
Zoning HS-DC, Highway Service District, Airport Industrial Design Control District
Shape Irregular
Corner Orientation No
Street Frontage Along Bowman Road
Topography Level
Off-Site Improvements Some to site
On-Site Improvements None

Indicators

Sale Price per SF \$5.94
PV Bonds per SF \$0.00

Remarks


This comparable represents a vacant parcel that is situated proximate to Interstate 80. The comparable is also near residential and retail development.

LAND SALE 3

Property Identification

5220 Douglas Boulevard
Granite Bay, California 95746
Placer County

APN: 048-142-081



Sale Data

Grantor	Granite Estates Professional
Grantee	CJC Investments, LLC
Sale Date	5/27/2016
Deed Book Page	041411
Property Rights	Fee Simple
Conditions of Sale	Market
Financing Terms	Cash Equivalent
Sale Price	\$625,000

Land Data

Land Area (SF)	121,968
Land Area (Acres)	2.80
Zoning	C2-UP-DC, General Commercial, Use Permit Required, Design Review
Shape	Irregular
Corner Orientation	No
Street Frontage	Along Douglas Boulevard
Topography	Level
Off-Site Improvements	All to site
On-Site Improvements	None

Indicators

Sale Price per SF	\$5.12
PV Bonds per SF	\$0.00

Remarks


This comparable is located along the south line of Douglas Boulevard. This comparable is proximate to retail, commercial and residential developments.

LAND SALE 4

Property Identification

824 Sutter Street
Folsom, California 95630
Sacramento County

APN: 070-0052-022, -024, -025, -026



Sale Data

Grantor

The Successor Agency to the Former Redevelopment
Agency of the City of Folsom

Grantee

Folsom Railroad Block Developers, LLC

Sale Date

12/24/2014

Deed Book Page

20141224-0090

Property Rights

Fee Simple

Conditions of Sale

Market

Financing Terms

Cash Equivalent

Sale Price

\$356,000

Land Data

Land Area (SF)

68,803

Land Area (Acres)

1.58

Zoning

HD, Historic Downtown

Shape

Irregular

Corner Orientation

No

Street Frontage

Along Sutter Street

Topography

Level

Off-Site Improvements

All to site

On-Site Improvements

None

Indicators

Sale Price per SF

\$5.17

PV Bonds per SF

\$0.00

Remarks


This comparable represents the sale of four parcels in Folsom's historic downtown.

LAND SALE 5

Property Identification

4700 Grove Street
Rocklin, California 95677
Placer County

APN: 010-082-059



Sale Data

Grantor	Bullard, Bryan E
Grantee	Listing
Sale Date	Listing
Deed Book Page	Listing
Property Rights	Fee Simple
Conditions of Sale	Market
Financing Terms	Cash Equivalent
Sale Price	\$316,245

Land Data

Land Area (SF)	57,499
Land Area (Acres)	1.32
Zoning	C-3, Heavy Commercial
Shape	Irregular
Corner Orientation	No
Street Frontage	Along Grove Street
Topography	Level
Off-Site Improvements	All to site
On-Site Improvements	None

Indicators

Sale Price per SF	\$5.50
PV Bonds per SF	\$0.00

Remarks

This listing represents a vacant parcel located near Old Town Rocklin. It is situated just off of Pacific Street, which is a major thoroughfare.

Adjustment Discussion

The comparable transactions are adjusted based on the profile of the subject property with regard to categories that affect market value. If a comparable has an attribute that is considered superior to that of the subject, it is adjusted downward to negate the effect the item has on the price of the comparable. The opposite is true of categories considered inferior to the subject.

Percentage or dollar adjustments are considered appropriate in order to isolate and quantify the adjustments on the comparable sales data. At a minimum, the appraiser considers adjustments for the following items:

- Present value of bonds
- Property rights conveyed
- Financing terms
- Conditions of sale (motivation)
- Expenditures after sale
- Market conditions
- Physical characteristics

A paired sales analysis is performed in a meaningful way when the quantity and quality of data are available. However, many of the adjustments require the appraiser's experience and knowledge of the market and information obtained from those knowledgeable and active in the marketplace. A detailed analysis involving each of these factors is presented as follows:

Present Value of Bonds

Neither the subject property nor the comparable sales are encumbered by bonds. No adjustments are required for this element of comparison.

Property Rights Conveyed

In transactions of real property, the rights being conveyed vary widely and have a significant impact on the sales price. The opinions of value in this report are based on a fee simple estate, subject only to the limitations imposed by the governmental powers of taxation, eminent domain, police power and escheat, as well as non-detrimental easements, community facility districts and conditions, covenants and restrictions (CC&Rs). All of the comparables represent fee simple estate transactions. Therefore, adjustments for property rights are not necessary.

Financing Terms

In analyzing the comparables, it is necessary to adjust for financing terms that differ from market terms. Typically, if the buyer retained third party financing (other than the seller) for the purpose of purchasing the property, a cash price is presumed and no adjustment is required. However, in instances where the seller provides financing as a debt instrument, a premium may have been paid

by the buyer for below market financing terms or a discount may have been demanded by the buyer if the financing terms were above market. The premium or discounted price must then be adjusted to a cash equivalent basis. All of the comparable sales represented cash to the seller transactions and, therefore, do not require adjustments.

Conditions of Sale

Adverse conditions of sale can account for a significant discrepancy from the sales price actually paid compared to that of the market. This discrepancy in price is generally attributed to the motivations of the buyer and the seller. Certain conditions of sale are considered to be non-market and may include the following:

- a seller acting under duress,
- a lack of exposure to the open market,
- an inter-family or inter-business transaction for the sake of family or business interest,
- an unusual tax consideration,
- a premium paid for site assemblage,
- a sale at legal auction, or
- an eminent domain proceeding.

The majority of the comparables represent arm's length, market transactions. Sale 5 represents a current listing and is adjusted downward to reflect typical negotiations between buyer and seller over the list price.

Expenditures after Sale

This category includes all costs required after the transaction. None of the sales required costs immediately after the sale; therefore, no adjustments are warranted for this category.

Market Conditions

Market conditions generally change over time, but the date of value is for a specific point in time. Therefore, in an unstable economy, one that is undergoing changes in the value of the dollar, interest rates and economic growth or decline, extra attention needs to be paid to assess changing market conditions. Significant changes in price levels can occur in several areas of a municipality, while prices in other areas remain relatively stable. Although the adjustment for market conditions is often referred to as a time adjustment, time is not the cause of the adjustment.

In evaluating market conditions, changes between the comparable sales date and the effective date of this appraisal may warrant adjustment; however, if market conditions have not changed, then no adjustment is required. Sale 4 transferred in late-2014 and is adjusted upward to account for the improvement in market conditions since the date of the transaction. All of the other comparables sold in May 2016 or later, and no further adjustments are required.

Physical Characteristics

The physical characteristics of a property can impact the selling price. Those that may impact value are discussed as follows:

Location

The subject is located in Downtown Roseville area. Factors considered in evaluating location include, but are not limited to, demographics, growth rates, surrounding uses and property values. The subject is surrounded by residential and commercial development. Sales 1 and 5 are considered to be in inferior areas compared to the subject, and upward adjustments are applied.

Visibility/Accessibility

The visibility and accessibility of a property can have a direct impact on value. For example, a property with limited access is considered to be an inferior position compared to a property with open accessibility. Conversely, if a property has freeway visibility, or is situated in proximity to major linkages, this is considered to be a superior site amenity in comparison to a property with limited visibility and positioning.

The subject property is considered to possess average visibility/accessibility. Sales 1 and 2 are located on a major thoroughfare exhibiting superior visibility and accessibility, warranting downward adjustments. Sale 5 has slightly inferior visibility than the subject and is therefore adjusted upward.

Land Area

The market generally exhibits an inverse relationship between land area and price per square foot such that larger parcels sell for a lower price per square foot than smaller parcels, all else being equal. For purposes of analysis, comparables with appreciably smaller parcel sizes than the subject are adjusted downward, and vice versa.

Off-Site Improvements

The subject property has all off-site improvements in place, including asphalt-paved streets, curbs, gutters and sidewalks. All of the comparables have off-site improvements in place; thus, no adjustments are made.

Site Utility

The subject property has average site utility given its shape, generally level topography, and lack of vegetation, trees, rocks or other impediments to development. All of the sales have similar site utility as the subject and no adjustments are required.

Zoning/Restrictions

Similar to the subject property, all of the sales have zoning permitting a variety of commercial development. No adjustments are applied for zoning.

Adjustment Grid

During our investigation, we identified several land sales located throughout the subject's area and surrounding areas that were analyzed to estimate the market value of the fee simple interest in the subject property. The adjustment grid on the following page details the unadjusted and adjusted value ranges presented by the comparable sales.

ADJUSTMENT GRID

Elements of Comparison	Subject	Sale 1	Sale 2	Sale 3	Sale 4	Sale 5
Price per SF (Unadjusted)		\$6.70	\$5.94	\$5.12	\$5.17	\$5.50
PV of Bonds per SF	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<i>Adjustment</i>		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Adjusted Value		\$6.70	\$5.94	\$5.12	\$5.17	\$5.50
Property Rights Conveyed	Fee Simple	Fee Simple	Fee Simple	Fee Simple	Fee Simple	Fee Simple
<i>Adjustment</i>						
Adjusted Value		\$6.70	\$5.94	\$5.12	\$5.17	\$5.50
Financing Terms	Cash Equiv.	Cash Equiv.	Cash Equiv.	Cash Equiv.	Cash Equiv.	Cash Equiv.
<i>Adjustment</i>						
Adjusted Value		\$6.70	\$5.94	\$5.12	\$5.17	\$5.50
Conditions of Sale	Market	Market	Market	Market	Market	Listing
<i>Adjustment</i>						-5%
Adjusted Value		\$6.70	\$5.94	\$5.12	\$5.17	\$5.22
Expenditures After Sale	None	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
<i>Adjustment</i>						
Adjusted Value		\$6.70	\$5.94	\$5.12	\$5.17	\$5.22
Market Conditions	Oct-16	Sep-16	May-16	May-16	Dec-14	Oct-16
<i>Adjustment</i>					5%	
Effective Price per SF		\$6.70	\$5.94	\$5.12	\$5.43	\$5.22
Physical Characteristics						
Location	Roseville	Similar	Sl. Inferior	Similar	Similar	Inferior
<i>Adjustment</i>	Downtown		5%			10%
Visibility / Accessibility	Average	Superior	Superior	Similar	Similar	Sl. Inferior
<i>Adjustment</i>		-10%	-10%			5%
Land Area (SF)	90,977	104,544	126,324	121,968	68,803	57,499
<i>Adjustment</i>			5%	5%	-5%	-5%
Off-Site Improvements	In-Place	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
<i>Adjustment</i>						
Site Utility	Average	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
<i>Adjustment</i>						
Zoning/Restrictions	CMU-SA-DT	PD-C	HS-DC	C2-UP-DC	HD	C-3
<i>Adjustment</i>						
Net Adjustment		-10%	0%	5%	-5%	10%
Adjusted Price per SF		\$6.03	\$5.94	\$5.38	\$5.16	\$5.75
Unadjusted Range	\$5.12	to	\$6.70			
Adjusted Range	\$5.16	to	\$6.03			
Concluded Value per SF	\$5.75					

Market Value Conclusion – Land Valuation

The adjustment grid on the preceding page illustrates the quantitative adjustments applied to the market data in order to equate them with the subject. Prior to adjusting for differences between the comparables and the subject property, the data set reflects a relatively narrow unadjusted range of \$5.12 to \$6.70 per square foot of land area. After our application of adjustments, the range of data narrows to \$5.12 to \$6.03 per square foot. Most emphasis is placed on Sales 1 through 3 due to their recent sale dates, and a market value estimate of \$5.75 per square foot is concluded. Applying this indicator to the subject's land area results in the following estimate of market value:

$$90,977\pm \text{ square feet} \times \$5.75 \text{ per square foot} = \$523,118$$

As previously discussed, the subject's land is currently improved with a fire station containing 19,000 square feet of rentable area, as well as basement space of 13,543 square feet. To determine the market value of the subject property as vacant land, the demolition costs must be deducted from the previously concluded market value.

In order to estimate demolition costs for the subject property, we will rely on demolition cost estimates from the Marshall Valuation Service, a nationally recognized cost estimating guide published by the Marshall and Swift Corporation (Section 66, page 11). According to the Marshall booklet, demolition costs are between \$6.69 to \$9.20 per square foot for commercial buildings. A property proximate to the subject at 316 Vernon Street was recently demolished, and the cost as reported by the City of Roseville was \$240,000 for 13,750 square feet of building area, or approximately \$17.45 per square foot. Due to the larger gross building area of the subject property (32,543 square feet), and considering the principle of economies of scale, it is expected the demolition cost for the subject would be less per square foot relative to the property at 316 Vernon Street. We will utilize a demolition cost at the upper end of the range indicated by the Marshall Valuation Service, or \$9.20 per square foot. We will also deduct for the cost of tank removal, which was previously estimated at \$60,000, as well as a factor for entrepreneurial incentive. The table on the following page details our final conclusion of market value assuming completion of the lot line adjustment for the subject's land.

Market Value of the Land Prior to Demolition	\$523,118
Less:	
Demolition Costs	(\$299,396)
Underground Storage Tank Removal	(\$60,000)
Entrepreneurial Incentive (10% of above costs)	<u>(\$35,940)</u>
Market Value Assuming Completion of Lot Line Adjustment	\$127,783
Rd.	\$130,000

CONCLUSIONS OF MARKET VALUE

The purpose of this appraisal has been to estimate the market values (fee simple estate) of a fire station and administrative office building located at 401 Oak Street, within the city of Roseville, California. As a result of our analysis, and in accordance with the assumptions and limiting conditions set forth in this report, it is our opinion the market values of the subject property, as of October 20, 2016, are ...

Value Estimate	Conclusion
Market Value As of the Date of Inspection	\$190,000
Market Value of the Land as-if Vacant	\$130,000

* Both estimates assume completion of the lot line adjustment (hypothetical condition)

EXPOSURE AND MARKETING TIME

Exposure time and marketing time may or may not be similar depending on whether market activity in the immediate future continues in the same manner as in the immediate past. Indications of the exposure time associated with the market value estimate are provided by the marketing times of sale comparables, interviews with participants in the market and analysis of general economic conditions. Estimation of a future marketing time is more difficult, requiring forecasting and analysis of trends.

Exposure Time

Exposure time is the period a property interest would have been offered on the market prior to the hypothetical consummation of a sale at market value on the effective date of the appraisal. For a complete definition of exposure time, please reference the Glossary of Terms in the Appendix.

In attempting to estimate a reasonable exposure time for the subject property, we looked at both the historical exposure times of a number of sales, as well as current and past economic conditions. Based on a survey of market participants, a transfer of commercial properties in the region typically occurs within 12 months of exposure. It is estimated the exposure time for the subject property, if appropriately priced, would have been within 12 months of initial exposure.

Marketing Time

Marketing time is an estimate of the time to sell a property interest in real estate at the estimated market value during the period immediately after the effective date of value. A reasonable marketing time is estimated by comparing the recent exposure time of similar properties, and then taking into consideration current and future economic conditions and how they may impact marketing of the subject property.

The marketing time for the subject property is not anticipated to vary significantly from the exposure time. Thus, the marketing time is estimated at 12 months or less.

APPENDIX

**A - READDRESSING/REASSIGNING
APPRAISAL REPORTS**



Readdressing/Reassigning Appraisal Reports

Seevers Jordan Ziegenmeyer adheres to the requirements of the 2016-2017 Edition of the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP). This edition is effective from January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2017. The following excerpts pertain to readdressing/reassigning appraisal reports:

Advisory Opinion 26, Page A-164:

Once a report has been prepared for a named client(s) and any other identified intended users and for an identified intended use, the appraiser cannot “readdress” (transfer) the report to another party.

Advisory Opinion 27, Pages A-166 to A-169:

Situations often arise in which appraisers who have previously appraised a property are asked by a different party to appraise the same property.... Accepting the assignment from the subsequent prospective client is not prohibited by USPAP, assuming appropriate disclosure is made to the client before being engaged and any existing confidential information is handled properly.... If there is a new potential client, valuation services performed for that new client would constitute a new assignment and the assignment results would be specific to that new assignment.

Frequently Asked Question No. 119, Page F-266:

It is never permissible to readdress a report by simply changing the client’s name on a completed report, regardless of whether the first client gave a release. The request from Lender B must be treated as a new assignment.

B - GLOSSARY OF TERMS

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Unless otherwise noted, the following definitions are from The Dictionary of Real Estate Appraisal, 6th ed. (Chicago: Appraisal Institute, 2015).

Aggregate of Retail Values: The sum of the separate and distinct market value opinions for each of the units in a condominium, subdivision development, or portfolio of properties, as of the date of valuation. The aggregate of retail values does not represent the value of all the units as though sold together in a single transaction; it is simply the total of the individual market value conclusions.

As Is Market Value: The estimate of the market value of real property in its current physical condition, use, and zoning as of the appraisal date.

Band of Investment: A technique in which the capitalization rates attributable to components of an investment are weighted and combined to derive a weighted-average rate attributable to the total investment.

Bulk Value: The value of multiple units, subdivided plots, or properties in a portfolio as though sold together in a single transaction.

Comparative-Unit Method: A method used to derive a cost estimate in terms of dollars per unit of area or volume based on known costs of similar structures that are adjusted for time and physical differences; usually applied to total building area.

Cost Approach: A set of procedures through which a value indication is derived for the fee simple estate by estimating the current cost to construct a reproduction of (or replacement for) the existing structure, including an entrepreneurial incentive or profit; deducting depreciation from the total cost; and adding the estimated land value. Adjustments may then be made to the indicated value of the fee simple estate in the subject property to reflect the value of the property interest being appraised.

Depreciation: In appraisal, a loss in property value from any cause; the difference between the cost of an improvement on the effective date of the appraisal and the market value of the improvement on the same date.

Direct Capitalization: A method used to convert an estimate of a single year's income expectancy into an indication of value in one direct step, either by dividing the net income estimate by an appropriate capitalization rate or by multiplying the income estimate by an appropriate factor. Direct capitalization employs capitalization rates and multipliers extracted or developed from market data. Only one year's income is used. Yield and value changes are implied, but not explicitly identified.

Discounted Cash Flow (DCF) Analysis: The procedure in which a discount rate is applied to a set of projected income streams and a reversion. The analyst specifies the quantity, variability, timing, and duration of the income streams and the quantity and timing of the reversion, and discounts each to its present value at a specified yield rate.

Discount Rate: A rate of return on capital used to convert future payments or receipts into present value; usually considered to be a synonym for *yield rate*.

Disposition Value: The most probable price that a specified interest in property should bring under the following conditions: 1) consummation of a sale within a specified time, which is shorter than the typical exposure time for such a property in that market; 2) the property is subjected to market conditions prevailing as of the date of valuation; 3) both the buyer and seller are acting prudently and knowledgeably; 4) the seller is under compulsion to sell; 5) the buyer

is typically motivated; 6) both parties are acting in what they consider to be their best interests; 7) an adequate marketing effort will be made during the exposure time; 8) payment will be made in cash in US dollars (or the local currency) or in terms of financial arrangements comparable thereto; 9) the price represents the normal consideration for the property sold, unaffected by special or creative financing or sales concessions granted by anyone associated with the sale.

Easement: The right to use another's land for a stated purpose.

Exposure Time: The estimated length of time that the property interest being appraised would have been offered on the market prior to the hypothetical consummation of a sale at market value on the effective date of the appraisal.

External Obsolescence: A type of depreciation; a diminution in value caused by negative external influences and generally incurable on the part of the owner, landlord, or tenant. The external influence may be either temporary or permanent.

Extraction: A method of estimating land value in which the depreciated cost of the improvements on an improved property is calculated and deducted from the total sale price to arrive at an estimated sale price for the land.

Extraordinary Assumption: An assumption, directly related to a specific assignment, as of the effective date of the assignment results, which, if found to be false, could alter the appraiser's opinions or conclusions.

Fair Market Value: The highest price on the date of valuation that would be agreed to by a seller, being willing to sell but under no particular or urgent necessity for so doing, nor obliged to sell, and a buyer, being ready, willing, and able to buy but under no particular necessity for so doing, each dealing with the

other with full knowledge of all the uses and purposes for which the property is reasonably adaptable and available. (California Code of Civil Procedure, Section 1263.320(a))

Fee Simple Estate: Absolute ownership unencumbered by any other interest or estate, subject only to the limitations imposed by the governmental powers of taxation, eminent domain, police power, and escheat.

Floor Area Ratio (FAR): The relationship between the above-ground floor area of a building, as described by the zoning or building code, and the area of the plot on which it stands; in planning and zoning, often expressed as a decimal, e.g., a ratio of 2.0 indicates that the permissible floor area of a building is twice the total land area.

Functional Obsolescence (Curable): An element of depreciation; a curable defect caused by a flaw in the structure, materials, or design, which can be practically and economically corrected.

Functional Obsolescence (Incurable): An element of depreciation; a defect caused by a deficiency or superadequacy in the structure, materials, or design that cannot be practically or economically corrected as of the effective date of the appraisal.

Highest and Best Use: The reasonably probable use of property that results in the highest value. The four criteria that the highest and best use must meet are legal permissibility, physical possibility, financial feasibility, and maximum productivity.

Hypothetical Condition: A condition, directly related to a specific assignment, which is contrary to what is known by the appraiser to exist on the effective date of the assignment results, but is used for the purpose of analysis.

Income Capitalization Approach: Specific appraisal techniques applied to develop a value indication for a property based on its earning capability and calculated by the capitalization of property income.

Leased Fee Interest: The ownership interest held by the lessor, which includes the right to receive the contract rent specified in the lease plus the reversionary right when the lease expires.

Leasehold Interest: The right held by the lessee to use and occupy real estate for a stated term and under the conditions specified in the lease.

Marketing Time: An opinion of the amount of time it might take to sell a real or personal property interest at the concluded market value level during the period immediately after the effective date of an appraisal. Marketing time differs from exposure time, which is always presumed to precede the effective date of an appraisal.

Neighborhood: A group of complementary land uses; a congruous grouping of inhabitants, buildings, or business enterprises.

Obsolescence: One cause of depreciation; an impairment of desirability and usefulness caused by new inventions, changes in design, improved processes for production, or external factors that make a property less desirable and valuable for a continued use; may be either functional or external.

Prospective Opinion of Value: A value opinion effective as of a specified future date. The term does not define a type of value. Instead, it identifies a value opinion as being effective at some specific future date. An opinion of value as of a prospective date is frequently sought in connection with projects that are proposed, under construction, or under conversion to a new use, or those that have not yet achieved sellout or a stabilized level of long-term occupancy.

Quantity Survey Method: A cost-estimating method in which the quantity and quality of all materials used and all categories of labor required are estimated and unit cost figures are applied to arrive at a total cost estimate for labor and materials.

Replacement Cost: The estimated cost to construct, at current prices as of a specified date, a substitute for a building or other improvements, using modern materials and current standards, design, and layout.

Reproduction Cost: The estimated cost to construct, at current prices as of the effective date of the appraisal, an exact duplicate or replica of the building being appraised, using the same materials, construction standards, design, layout, and quality of workmanship and embodying all the deficiencies, superadequacies, and obsolescence of the subject building.

Sales Comparison Approach: The process of deriving a value indication for the subject property by comparing sales of similar properties to the property being appraised, identifying appropriate units of comparison, and making adjustments to the sale prices (or unit prices, as appropriate) of the comparable properties based on relevant, market-derived elements of comparison.

Site Coverage Ratio: The gross area of the building footprint divided by the site area.

Stabilized Occupancy: 1. The occupancy of a property that would be expected at a particular point in time, considering its relative competitive strength and supply and demand conditions at the time, and presuming it is priced at market rent and has had reasonable market exposure. A property is at stabilized occupancy when it is capturing its appropriate share of market demand. 2. An expression of the average or typical occupancy that would be expected for a property over a specified projection period or over its economic life.

Subdivision Development Method: A method of estimating land value when subdividing and developing a parcel of land is the highest and best use of that land. When all direct and indirect costs and entrepreneurial incentive are deducted from an estimate of the anticipated gross sales price of the finished lots (or the completed improvements on those lots), the resultant net sales proceeds are then discounted to present value at a market-derived rate over the development and absorption period to indicate the value of the land.

Superadequacy: An excess in the capacity or quality of a structure or structural component; determined by market standards.

Unit-In-Place Method: A cost-estimating method in which total building cost is estimated by adding together the unit costs for the various building components as installed; also called the *segregated cost method*.

Yield Capitalization: A method used to convert future benefits into present value by 1) discounting each future benefit at an appropriate yield rate, or 2) developing an overall rate that explicitly reflects the investment's income pattern, holding period, value change, and yield rate.

Yield Rate: A rate of return on capital, usually expressed as a compound annual percentage rate. A yield rate considers all expected property benefits, including the proceeds from sale at the termination of the investment.

C - QUALIFICATIONS OF APPRAISER(S)



Seevers
Jordan
Ziegenmeyer

Real Estate Appraisal & Consultation

Northern California/Nevada
3825 Atherton Road, Suite 500
Rocklin, California 95765

P: (916) 435-3883 F: (916) 435-4774

Nelson M. Wong, MAI, Partner

Introduction

Mr. Wong is a Certified General real estate appraiser with Seevers Jordan Ziegenmeyer, a real estate appraisal firm that engages in a wide variety of real estate valuation and consultation assignments. Since beginning his career in real estate in August 2001, Mr. Wong has been writing narrative appraisal reports for a variety of properties. Today, he is involved in appraisal assignments covering office, retail, industrial, apartments, subdivisions, land and special-purpose properties. He has also been involved in appraisals for bond-underwriting purposes relating to the formation of new community facilities districts and assessment districts. His geographical experience has been predominantly within the Sacramento Metropolitan Area, but includes areas extending to Chico to the north, Fresno to the south, Reno to the east and the San Francisco Bay Area to the west. Mr. Wong has developed the experience and background necessary to deal with complex assignments covering an array of property types.

Professional Affiliations

Appraisal Institute - MAI designation

Certified General Real Estate Appraiser – State of California (No. AG034862)

Real Estate Appraiser - Certified General – State of Nevada (No. A.0006030-CG)

Education

Academic:

Bachelor of Arts in Economics, University of California, Davis

Appraisal and Real Estate Courses:

Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice

Appraisal Principles

Appraisal Procedures

Advanced Income Capitalization

Advanced Concepts and Case Studies

Advanced Market Analysis and Highest and Best Use

California Real Estate Economics

Report Writing and Valuation Analysis



Seevers
Jordan
Ziegenmeyer

Real Estate Appraisal & Consultation

Northern California/Nevada
3825 Atherton Road, Suite 500
Rocklin, California 95765

P: (916) 435-3883 F: (916) 435-4774

Sample of Appraisal Experience

N Street Office Building
Sacramento, California

This appraisal involved the valuation of a high-rise Class A professional office building. The building contains 449,138± square feet of rentable area and the property also included a three-story parking structure with 711 spaces. The building had deferred maintenance issues and the scope of work called for the prospective market valuation of the property upon completion of remediation/renovation, in addition to the as-is market value of the property. The report was prepared for University Enterprises, Inc. – Research Administration and Contract Administration.

Woodland Gateway Shopping Center
Woodland, California

This appraisal involved the valuation of a multi-tenant regional shopping center, along with three additional vacant land parcels. The unit mix included anchor space, in-line space, and ground-leased pads. The report was prepared for U.S. Bank. Redwood Capital Finance Company.

I Street Office Building
Sacramento, California

This project involved the valuation of a three-story professional office building in Downtown Sacramento. The property is leased to multiple tenants and has frontage and visibility along I Street. This report was prepared for the Special District Risk Management Authority.

Highland Reserve, Parcel 18C
Roseville, California


This project involved the valuation of a proposed 248-lot cluster housing subdivision in the city of Roseville. The property contained 26.17 acres of land area, with an overall density of 9.48 units/acre, as proposed. The report was prepared for Bank of America.

Folsom Boulevard Office Building
Sacramento, California

This single-tenant office property was constructed as a build-to-suit for the Social Security Administration. Due to the high security protocols of the United States Government, the construction quality is superior to that of typical office properties in the market and adheres to the design requirements of the Interagency Security Committee's Level II Standards. The appraisal was prepared for First Northern Bank.

Proposed Apartment Project
Tracy, California

This report involved the market valuation of a proposed apartment project in Tracy. The project was planned for 301 units with one, two and three bedroom unit types, in addition to a fitness center, a clubhouse with kitchen, restrooms and media center, a swimming pool, an outdoor theater, a bocce ball court, a children's play area, an outdoor pet play area, an indoor bike storage area and an outdoor living/dining pavilion.



Business, Consumer Services & Housing Agency
BUREAU OF REAL ESTATE APPRAISERS
REAL ESTATE APPRAISER LICENSE

Nelson M. Wong

has successfully met the requirements for a license as a residential and commercial real estate appraiser in the State of California and is, therefore, entitled to use the title:

“Certified General Real Estate Appraiser”

This license has been issued in accordance with the provisions of the Real Estate Appraisers' Licensing and Certification Law.

BREA APPRAISER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER:

AG 034862

Effective Date:

August 13, 2016

Date Expires:

August 12, 2018

Jim Martin

Jim Martin, Bureau Chief, BREAA

3027983



Seevers
Jordan
Ziegenmeyer

3825 Atherton Road Ste 500
Rocklin, CA 95765
(916) 435-3883 FAX (916) 435-4774
TAX I.D. 91-1766837

INVOICE


DATE	INVOICE #
10/24/2016	17032

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
FINANCE DEPARTMENT
311 VERNON STREET
ROSEVILLE, CA 95678

JOB NO.	TERMS	APPRAISER
25016-444	TEN DAYS	AEK

DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT
FEE FOR APPRAISAL SERVICES CITY OF ROSEVILLE FIRE DEPARTMENT 401 OAK STREET ROSEVILLE, CALIFORNIA 95678	4,650.00
A finance charge of 1.25% per month may be assessed on past due balances. To ensure proper credit, return one copy of this invoice with remittance.	Total Amount \$4,650.00
	Balance Due \$4,650.00

•DOWNTOWN BRIDGE AND ROYER PARK CONCEPT PLAN | OPTION 2•



3/24/2014



DOWNTOWN BRIDGES, TRAIL & FIRE STATION SITE IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS




MARK THOMAS & COMPANY
Providing Engineering, Surveying & Planning Services



Callander Associates
Landscape Architecture, Inc.


P I C H E S
ARCHITECTURE

401 OAK STREET PROPERTIES - PARCEL 1 RECONFIGURED



Legend

-  Parcel 1 Reconfigured
-  Parcel Polygon





COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

CC #: 8182

File #: 0215

Title: Adoption of Master Schedule of User and Regulatory Fees

Contact: Jeannine Thrash 916-774-5473 jthrash@roseville.ca.us
Jay Panzica 916-774-5320 jpanzica@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 1/18/2017

Item #: 11.2.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Staff recommends the City Council:

1. Introduce for first reading various amendments to the Roseville Municipal Code regarding user and regulatory fees,
2. Adopt a resolution adopting a Schedule of Use and Regulatory Fees effective March 20, 2017 through June 30, 2017,
3. Adopt a resolution adopting a Schedule of Use and Regulatory Fees effective July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018, and authorizing the Finance Director to make automatic annual inflationary adjustments to various fees identified in the schedule based on the all-urban Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose area.

BACKGROUND

The City recently completed a city-wide study to identify the cost of providing various user and regulatory fee-related services. For the first time, as a result of the study, a consolidated schedule of fees was prepared. The schedule provides a convenient, one-stop location for users to identify services provided by the City and the amounts charged for providing these services.

Fee-related services typically provide a benefit to a particular individual, business, or group, as compared to the city as a whole. Since these services provide a specific benefit, communities often seek to recover all, or a portion of, the costs of providing these fee-related services from those benefiting from the service provided. This allows unobligated revenues, typically tax-related, to be more appropriately directed to funding services performed for the community as a whole (e.g. public safety services).

User and regulatory fees are established by the City Council.

Public Hearing

This item and staff's recommendations are intended to be considered upon completion of a public hearing. The public hearing provides all interested parties with an opportunity to comment or request clarification regarding any of the fees proposed for update. Prior to the public hearing, the

City published a newspaper notice of the public hearing, and notified all interested parties that have requested to be notified regarding proposed fee updates.

As part of the City's last major update of development services fees (the most significant category of fees examined as part of this study), numerous outreach meetings were held. During the outreach, City staff notified stakeholder groups, including the BIA, Chamber of Commerce, and the Economic Development Advisory Committee, of proposed fee changes, including a recommendation to include an annual inflationary adjustment for fees. Stakeholders responded positively to the proposed changes.

This item is consistent with the recommendations of the prior study. It allows for consolidating the schedule of fees, and helps formally establish a pattern for annual review and update of fees including annual inflationary adjustments.

Proposed Adjustment

The fee schedules proposed for adoption are included as attachments to the resolutions proposed for adoption. Additionally, the Appendix of the User and Regulatory Fee Study, attached hereto, provides detailed costs of service information to support the fees proposed for modification.

The following four sections provide a brief summary of primary changes the City Council is being asked to consider:

1. Introduce for first reading various amendments to the Roseville Municipal Code regarding user and regulatory fees.

Currently, the city's municipal code specifically identifies the dollar amount of various fees. For instance, the municipal code may identify a \$75 fee for a particular service. A thorough analysis of all municipal codes was undertaken to identify all such fee amounts. The proposed municipal code changes continue to reference fees for service. However, instead of identifying a specific dollar amount, they now indicate that fees will be established by resolution adopted by the City Council. This will allow for the annual update of all user fees without numerous required modifications to the municipal code.

Additionally, the proposed changes repeal six sections of the municipal code which are no longer valid or necessary. The following table identifies those sections being repealed and the purpose of repealing the sections.

Table 1 – Summary of Municipal Code Sections Being Repealed

4.50.050	Fee for Police Department videotaping of private personal property at owner's request	This service is no longer provided by the Police Department.
4.50.060	Fee for Police Department registration of controlled substance offenders and sex offenders	The City does not intend to charge for providing this service.
4.50.080	Fee for fingerprinting services	The City does not provide fingerprinting services. A contract

		service provider performs these services.
4.50.100	Criminal justice administration fee for booking or processing arrested persons at City detention facility	The City no longer operates a detention facility (e.g. jail).
7.56.040	Fee for animal disposal	This fee is already referenced in Section 7.56.030. Repealing this section eliminates a duplicate reference.
14.04.200	Utility Billing Services Fees	These fees are referenced in other sections of the Municipal Code. Repealing this section eliminates a duplicate reference.

2. Adopt a resolution adopting a Schedule of Use and Regulatory Fees effective March 20, 2017 through June 30, 2017.

The main purpose of this action is to consolidate the City's existing user and regulatory fees into one schedule, to be effective only until June 30, 2017 since the majority of the fees are scheduled to increase on July 1, 2017 and a new fee schedule will go into effect then.

Additionally, twenty-three fees are proposed to increase and three new fees are proposed. The following table provide additional details regarding these proposed adjustments.

Table 2 – Summary of Changes to Fees Examined

Fees Proposed to Remain Unchanged	366	93%
Fees Proposed to Increase	23	6%
New Fees Proposed	3	1%
Total Fees Examined	392	100%

Table 3-Summary of Fees Proposed to Increase

<u>Administrative Fees</u>			
1	Passport Photo Fee	\$8	\$10
2	Budget Book	\$10	Actual Cost (free on web)
<u>Environmental Utilities Fees</u>			
3	Construction Water		
	a) Fire Hydrant Fee	\$100	\$225
	b) Meter/Backflow Rent	\$50/month	\$100/month
4	Meter Install Labor Charge - New	\$75	\$125

	Residential		
5	Water Backflow Device Re-inspection Fee	\$30	\$60

Table 3 (continued)- Summary of Fees Proposed to Increase

<u>Police Fees</u>			
6	Impounded Vehicle Release	\$98	\$150
7	Commercial Indoor Firing Range Permit	\$50	\$100
8	Retail Firearms Dealer Permit	\$25	\$100
9	Adult-Oriented Business Permit	\$188	\$250
10	Dance Permit	\$94	\$100
11	Entertainment Permit	\$188	\$200
12	Ice Cream Vendor Permit	\$25	\$35
13	Pawnbroker/Secondhand Dealer Permit (Renewal)	\$50	\$60
14	Supplemental Law Enforcement Services	\$38 - \$80/hr	\$42 - \$77/hr
<u>Animal License Fees</u>			
15	Dog License (One-Year)		
	a) Certified-altered Dog	\$15	\$20
	b) Non-altered Dog	\$30	\$40
	<i>(note: multi-year discount of \$1/yr)</i>		
16	Special Animal Permit	\$25	\$35
<u>Trench Cut Recovery Fee</u>			
17 through 23	Trench Cut Recovery Fee		
	a) Permit Fee	\$100	\$300
	b) Trench Cut Fee	Vary based on LF ≈ \$4-\$12/LF	Vary based on LF ≈ \$8-\$22/LF

While the majority of the City's fees have been adjusted during the last several years (e.g. development fees, fire prevention fees, alarm permit fees), many of the fees proposed for adjustment in the table above have not been adjusted in many years. For example, animal licensing fees have not been adjusted since 2008. The proposed adjustments are based on a recalibration of the cost of service and updated cost recovery targets.

Table 4– New Fees Proposed

--	--	--	--

Police Fees			
1	Traffic Collision Report	\$0	\$10
2	Vehicle Tow Hearing	\$0	\$75
Parks, Recreation, & Libraries Department Fees			
3	Parks and Recreation Programs Capital Replacement Fee	\$0	Not to exceed 10% of program fee

The new fees are proposed to address the following needs:

- Traffic Collision Reports
 - The Police Department receives more than 1,000 requests per year for traffic collision reports. The California Vehicle Code allows for recovery of the costs of providing these reports.
- Vehicle Tow Hearing
 - Owners of impounded vehicles can request a hearing to consider a reduction in the number of days a vehicle will be impounded. The hearing is not required and is performed at the request of the vehicle owner. The proposed fee is intended to recover a portion of the department's costs of conducting the hearing.
- Parks & Recreation Programs Capital Replacement Fee
The Parks, Recreation, & Libraries Department has identified more than \$1M in annual rehabilitation needs for the facilities and amenities currently used by program participants. While the proposed capital replacement fee will only fund a minor portion of the total need (<20%), any amounts collected will be directed toward replacement needs.

3. Adopt a resolution adopting a Schedule of Use and Regulatory Fees effective July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018.

The majority of fees are proposed to increase to 2% effective July 1, 2017.

4. Authorize annual inflationary adjustments for various fees.

This will allow the Finance Director to make automatic adjustments to various fees, based on the consumer priced index- all-urban consumers for San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, CA (CPI). The inflationary adjustment will be based on the CPI change from October to October of the immediately preceding year.

If the CPI does not change or goes down, no change shall be made to the fee schedule for that year unless an adjustment is made to targeted cost recovery levels or fee study findings indicate that an adjustment is appropriate.

To increase clarity, and allow for an effective annual fee update process, the fee schedule identifies each fee for service along with an indicator of whether the fee is subject to annual adjustment.

While the proposed action provides for an annual review and update of fees, during the course of the year the City Council may elect to adopt new fees, modify existing fees, or repeal existing fees. As these changes are made, the consolidated fee schedule should be updated to reflect the changes.

Additionally, staff intends to conduct a full city-wide bi-annual study, similar to the one just completed, that will identify the city's full cost of providing fee-related services based on current labor rates and service delivery methods. These studies will provide an opportunity to recalibrate fees based on the findings of the cost of service, as well as any recommended adjustments to the targeted cost recovery levels.

FISCAL IMPACT

FY 2016/17

The fiscal impact is proposed to be immaterial (~\$0).

- The majority of fees are proposed to remain unchanged, and new fees proposed will be implemented in the second half of the year.

FY 2017/18

The fiscal impact is proposed to be an increase of roughly \$350,000.

- The majority of fees are proposed to increase two percent (2%). Additionally, the City will have a full fiscal year of collections from the increased parks and recreation capital replacement fee, as well as increased animal license fees, vehicle impound fees, and traffic collision report fees.

It is important to note that while adjusting fees will provide a fiscal impact in the form of additional revenue, the revenue is not intended to be used to fund new services, rather the revenue is intended to offset the costs of providing existing services that are recoverable from fees. Consequently, while fees may rise annually, typically labor costs (the primary driver of fee-related costs) also rise annually. Recalibration of these fees simply provides an offset of existing expenditures/needs rather than a source of funding for expanded service levels.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / JOBS CREATED

Periodically adjusting fees to recover some or all of the costs of providing services provides multiple benefits including, but not limited to:

- Increasing the availability of General Fund revenues to be used for services and activities available to all Roseville residents and business, such as public safety services or citywide economic development initiatives.
- Avoiding fee spikes that are more likely to occur when municipalities leave fees unchanged for a multi-year period.
- Providing fee payers (e.g. developers and residents), city staff, and city policymakers with a pattern of consistency that provides for information for forecasting and decision-making purposes.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Adoption of the fee schedules is statutorily exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to section 15273 of the CEQA Guidelines. No further CEQA action is required.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jeannine Thrash, Administrative Analyst

Monty Hanks, Finance Director

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'Rob Jensen', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Rob Jensen, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Fee Study- Executive Summary

Resolution No. 17-02

Master Fee Schedule 03/20/17

Resolution No. 17-03

Master Fee Schedule - 7/1/17

Muni code-proposed amendments



City of Roseville

User and Regulatory Fee Study

- November 2016 -



Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
Legislative Guidance	10
Study Methodology and Data Sources.....	11
Appendices.....	13

Executive Summary

Brief Overview of User and Regulatory Fees and Purpose of this Study

The City derives its annual revenue from a number of sources. These include, but are not limited to, property taxes, sales taxes, franchise fees, fines, rates for service, and user and regulatory fees. Generally, user and regulatory fees are intended to cover all, or a portion of, the costs incurred by the City for providing fee-related services and activities that are not otherwise provided to those not paying the fee.

California law provides guidance regarding the amounts the City may charge for fee-related services and activities. Specifically, in order to avoid being considered taxes, the fees charged shall not exceed the estimated reasonable cost of providing the services, activities, or materials for which fees are charged.

The focus of this study is to identify the City's cost of providing various fee-related services and activities and to establish a consolidated schedule of fees that corresponds to the services provided by the City, reflects targeted cost recovery levels, and complies with applicable laws.

Recovering the Costs of Providing Fee-Related Services Directly Influences the City Council's Goal of Maintaining Fiscal Soundness

As discussed in the City's Fiscal Year 2016/17 adopted budget, fairly allocating costs to the services provided creates value and predictability for City customers and reimburses the City for services requested by a single party, as compared to the public at large. Fees in general ensure equity; those who benefit the most should pay the most, and pricing ensures that users pay appropriate fees.

Staff desires to implement a practice of annual review and adjustment of fees. Implementing this practice will provide multiple benefits, including:

- Increasing the availability of General Fund revenues to be used for services and activities available to all Roseville residents and businesses, such as public safety services.
- Keeping pace with general cost inflation.
- Avoiding fee spikes that are more likely to occur when municipalities leave fees unchanged for a multi-year period.
- Providing fee payers, city staff, and city policymakers with a pattern of consistency that provides information for forecasting and decision-making purposes.
- Encouraging generational equity among fee payers by avoiding long-term stagnation of fees followed by significant fee increases.

Fee Categories that Were Examined in this Study

This study specifically examined the following categories of fees:

- **Planning Fees**, such as entitlement review and review for compliance with the zoning code
- **Engineering Fees**, such as encroachment and public improvement review
- **Building Fees**, such as permitting of new construction or modifications to existing structures
- **Utility Fees**, such as requests for new water or electric meters
- **Police Fees**, such as vehicle impound and animal licensing fees
- **Fire Fees**, such as annual inspections conducted to ensure compliance with the fire code
- **Recreation Fees**, such as swimming and other sports program related fees
- **Facility Rental Fees**, such as requests for rental of meetings spaces, or picnic shelters
- **Special Event, Film, and Banner Permit Fees**
- **Parking Permit and Oversize Vehicle Permit Fees**
- **Administrative Fees**, such as requests for public records

Fee/Fine Categories that Were Not Examined in this Study

This study specifically excluded examination of the following:

- **Taxes**
- **Assessments**
- **Franchise Fees**
- **Development Impact Fees**
- **Fines or Penalties**
- **Utility Rates and Services Charges**

These items are subject to different approval thresholds or are not subject to the same cost of service limitations as the fees examined as part of this study. Consequently, they are specifically excluded from the scope of this study.

Primary Recommendations for City Council Consideration

The following provides a summary of primary changes the City Council is being asked to consider based on this study.

Remove User and Regulatory Fee Amounts (\$XX) from the City's Municipal Code to Allow for Fee Updates via Resolution, Without Modification to the Municipal Code

Currently, the city's municipal code specifically identifies various fee amounts. For instance, the municipal code may identify a \$75 fee for service. The proposed municipal code changes continue to reference fees for service. However, instead of identifying a specific amount, they indicate that fees will be established by resolution adopted by the city council. This will allow for the annual update of all user fees without numerous required modifications to the municipal code.

Adoption of Consolidated Schedule of Fees

- *Adopt an updated schedule of fees to be used through June 30, 2017*
- *Adopt a 2% increase to fees effective July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018*
- *Adopt language to allow for subsequent update of fees by the change in regional CPI*

While the proposed action provides for an annual review and update of fees, during the course of the year the city council may elect to adopt new fees, modify existing fees, or repeal existing fees. As these changes are made, the consolidated fee schedule should be updated to reflect the changes.

The following tables provide additional details regarding the proposed adjustments

Table 1 – Summary of Changes to Fees Examined

Description	Count	Percentage
Fees Proposed to Remain Unchanged	366	93%
Fees Proposed to Increase	23	6%
New Fees Proposed	3	1%
Total Fees Examined	392	100%

Table 2 – Summary of Fees Proposed to Increase

Description	Current Fee	Proposed Fee
<u>Administrative Fees</u>		
1 Passport Photo Fee	\$8	\$10
2 Budget Book	\$10	Actual Cost (free on web)
<u>Environmental Utilities Fees</u>		
3 Construction Water		
a) Fire Hydrant Fee	\$100	\$225
b) Meter/Backflow Rent	\$50/month	\$100/month
4 Meter Install Labor Charge for New Resid'tl	\$75	\$125
5 Water Backflow Device Re-inspection Fee	\$30	\$60
<u>Police Fees</u>		
6 Impounded Vehicle Release	\$98	\$150
7 Commercial Indoor Firing Range Permit	\$50	\$100
8 Retail Firearms Dealer Permit	\$25	\$100
9 Adult-Oriented Business Permit	\$188	\$250
10 Dance Permit	\$94	\$100
11 Entertainment Permit	\$188	\$200
12 Ice Cream Vendor Permit	\$25	\$35
13 Pawnbroker/S'cndhnd Dealer Prmt (Renewal)	\$50	\$60
14 Supplemental Law Enforcement Svcs	\$38 - \$80/hr	\$42 - \$77/hr
<u>Animal License Fees</u>		
15 Dog License (One-Year)		
a) Certified-altered Dog	\$15	\$20
b) Non-altered Dog	\$30	\$40
<i>(note: multi-year discount of \$1/yr)</i>		
16 Special Animal Permit	\$25	\$35
<u>Trench Cut Recovery Fee</u>		
17 Trench Cut Recovery Fee		
through a) Permit Fee	\$100	\$300
23 b) Trench Cut Fee	Vary based on LF	Vary based on LF
	≈ \$4-\$12/LF	≈ \$8-\$22/LF

While the majority of the City's fees have been adjusted during the last several years (e.g. development fees, fire prevention fees, alarm permit fees), many of the fees proposed for adjustment have not been adjusted in many years. For example, animal licensing fees have not been adjusted since 2008. The proposed adjustments are based on a recalibration of the cost of service and updated cost recovery targets.

Table 3 – New Fees Proposed

Description		Current Fee	Proposed Fee
<u>Police Fees</u>			
1	Traffic Collision Report	\$0	\$10
2	Vehicle Tow Hearing	\$0	\$75
<u>Parks, Recreation, & Libraries Department Fees</u>			
3	Parks and Recreation Programs Capital Replacement Fee	\$0	Not to exceed 10% of program fee

The new fees are proposed to address the following needs:

- **Traffic Collision Reports**
 - The Police Department receives more than 1,000 requests per year for traffic collision reports. The California Vehicle Code allows for recovery of the costs of providing these reports.
- **Vehicle Tow Hearing**
 - Owners of impounded vehicles can request a hearing to consider a reduction in the number of days a vehicle will be impounded. The hearing is not required and is performed at the request of the owner. The proposed fee is intended to recover a portion of the department's costs of conducting the hearing.
- **Parks and Recreation Programs Capital Replacement Fee**
 - The Parks, Recreation, & Libraries Department has identified more than \$1M in annual rehabilitation needs for the facilities and amenities currently used by program participants. While the proposed capital replacement fee will only fund a minor portion of the total need (< 20%), any amounts collected will be directed toward rehabilitative needs.

Other Recommendations and Findings

The following summarizes additional finding and recommendations and findings of this report.

Implement a Pattern of Ongoing Examination and Update of Fees

- *The pattern will provide for annual review of fees that includes bi-annual review of the full costs of service and CPI adjustments for interim years. For example:*
 - *Year 1 – Full cost of service study*
 - *Year 2 – Adjustment to fees by change in regional CPI*
 - *Year 3 – Full cost of service study*
 - *Year 4 – Adjustment to fees by change in regional CPI*
 - *Year ... - Continue above pattern*

Periodically Review and Update Cost Recovery Policies for Various Fee Categories

Formally establishing and periodically reviewing and updating cost recovery policies provides the city council, city staff, and fee-payers with general guidelines for establishing and updating fee amounts.

Policies can be simply worded while providing clear direction. An example is provided below:

- **Example Fee-Related Cost Recovery Policy:** *“The city council intends to periodically adjust fees toward recovering the full cost of any fee-based service except where the council and the community see a clear public interest in full or partial subsidy.”*
 - This policy indicates that full cost recovery will be targeted with specific exceptions made based on aligning fees with other community values and goals.
 - To help effectively implement the policy additional consideration may be given toward parameters for achievement of recovery targets. For example, in areas where full cost recovery is targeted, but not immediately achievable, staff may deliberately plan for achievement of full cost recovery over a multi-year period (e.g. when moving toward full cost recovery existing fees will not be increased by more than 10% per year).

The Parks, Recreation, & Libraries Department has established a formal pricing policy, and several of the City’s other departments have informally established cost recovery practices and policies that influence recommended fees and cost recovery. For illustrative purposes, the Parks, Recreation, & Libraries Department pricing policy is included in the Appendix of this report.

Current and Proposed Cost Recovery Levels for Services

The majority of the City's fee-related revenues are derived from the following sources:

- Development Services fees (e.g. building, planning, engineering fees)
- Fire Prevention fees (e.g. annual inspection fees, and development review fees)
- Parks, Recreation, & Libraries Department fees (e.g. recreation, facilities, and use fees)

The following tables summarize fee-related cost recovery amounts for these service providers.

Table 4 – Estimated Cost Recovery for Development Services Department Fee Services

Functional Unit	Est. Annual Revenue and/or Expenditure Offsets	Est. Fee-Related Exp. (inc. c'wide overhead)	Est. Cost Recovery for Fee Services	Est. General Fund Subsidy
Building	\$3.5M	\$3.9M	91%	\$0.4M
Planning	\$0.9M	\$1.4M	62%	\$0.5M
Engineering	\$1.4M	\$1.8M	74%	\$0.4M
Total	\$5.8M	\$7.1M	82%	\$1.3M

** Table values exclude Code Enforcement expenditures. Code enforcement recoveries are typically made in the form of fines and penalties. The division is not presumed to provide fee-related services.*

The Development Services Department targets full cost recovery of building fees (100%) and partial cost recovery of Planning and Engineering fees (62% and 74% respectively). Many of the Planning and Engineering fees collected by the City are billed on a "time & materials" basis with presumed recovery of all direct and indirect costs that are attributable to the City staff members providing services. The Department has historically not elected to recover the full costs of providing these services. While revenue generation and offsetting costs is a primary focus of the Development Services Department, providing the development community and Roseville residents with consistent fees that are comparable with other regional agencies is also a focus. The department proposes to increase its fixed fees annually by the change in a regional consumer price index. "Time and materials" reimbursement rates will increase annually by the change in annual labor costs.

Table 5 – Estimated Cost Recovery for Fire Prevention Division Fee Services

Functional Unit	Est. Annual Revenue and/or Expenditure Offsets	Est. Fee-Related Exp. (inc. c'wide overhead)	Est. Cost Recovery for Fee Services	Est. General Fund Subsidy
Fire Prevention	\$0.8M	\$1.2M	67%	\$0.4M

While the annual inspection services provided by the Fire Prevention Division provide a specific benefit to the facility inspected, there is also a presumed public benefit from the risk mitigation recommendations provided by Fire staff as part of the inspection process. The Fire Department does

not propose targeting full cost recovery for these services. Instead, the Fire Department recommends maintaining current fee levels and annually adjusting fees by the change in regional CPI.

Table 6 – Estimated Cost Recovery for Parks, Recreation, & Libraries Department Fee Services

Functional Unit	Est. Annual Revenue and/or Expenditure Offsets	Est. Exp. (inc. c'wide overhead)	Est. Cost Recovery from Fees	Est. General Fund Subsidy
Recreation Fees	\$4.7M	\$7.8M	60%	\$3.1M
Library	\$0.4M	\$4.3M	9%	\$3.9M
Dept. Admin & Parks Maint	\$0.9M	\$10.9M	8%	\$10.0M
Total	\$6.0M	\$23.0M	26%	\$17.0M

** Table values exclude non-General Fund programs such as child care and golf.*

The Department sets fees in accordance with a pricing policy developed in 2013. Pricing takes into consideration the public benefit, users' ability to pay, level of benefit and exclusivity the user receives above what a general taxpayer receives. Pricing ensures equity; those who benefit the most should pay the most. Pricing ensures that users pay appropriate fees and available taxpayer funds are used to achieve the optimal return on investment and ensure access to parks and programs. The Department currently reviews fees annually, and makes the following general considerations:

- **Departmental Administration and Parks Maintenance expenses** – These expenses are presumed to be primarily funded from unobligated General Fund revenues (e.g. tax revenues)
- **Library expenses** – These expenses are presumed to be primarily funded from unobligated General Fund revenues.
- **Recreation expenses** – The expenses are presumed to be funded from a combination of user fees and unobligated General Fund revenues. Additionally,
 - The department's share of citywide overhead costs are presumed to be funded by unobligated General Fund revenues.
 - Fee cost recovery levels vary by program. For example:
 - Adult sports and Youth Classes recover roughly 90% of total costs from fees.
 - Aquatics programs recover roughly 60% of costs from fees.

The Department conducts periodic comparisons of recreation fees to those charged by neighboring communities. If the Department feels a fee adjustment is appropriate based on program demand or a regional fee comparison, adjustments are made. The Department recommends adoption of a capital replacement fee to help offset a portion of the annual funding need for replacement of facilities and amenities used by program participants. No other changes are recommended for the Department's pricing policy and practice.

Revenue Impact of Proposed Fee Changes

- FY 2016/17
 - The fiscal impact is proposed to be immaterial (≈\$0).
 - The majority of fees are proposed to remain unchanged, and new fees proposed will be implemented in the second half of the year.
- FY 2017/18
 - The fiscal impact is proposed to be roughly \$350,000.
 - The majority of fees are proposed to increase 2%. Additionally, the City will have a full fiscal year of collections from the increased parks and recreation capital replacement fee, as well as increased animal license fees, vehicle impound fees, and traffic collision report fees

It is important to note that while adjusting fees will provide a fiscal impact in the form of additional revenue, the revenue is not intended to be used to fund new services, rather the revenue is intended to offset the costs of providing existing services that are recoverable from fees. Consequently, while fees may rise annually, typically labor costs (the primary driver of fee-related costs) also rise annually. Recalibration of these fees simply provides an offset of existing expenditures/needs rather than a source of funding for expanded service levels.

Legislative Guidance

The objectives of the study, the methodology used to complete the study, and the proposed fees were significantly influenced by Article 13C of the California Constitution and Section 66014 of the California Government Code.

Article 13C states that the local government bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that a levy, charge, or other exaction is not a tax, that the amount is no more than necessary to cover the reasonable costs of the governmental activity, and that the manner in which those costs are allocated to a payor bear a fair or reasonable relationship to the payor's burdens on, or benefits received from, the governmental activity. Additionally, Article 13C identifies the following as items that are *not* defined as taxes:

- 1) A charge imposed for a specific benefit conferred or privilege granted directly to the payor that is not provided to those not charged, and which does not exceed the reasonable costs to the local government of conferring the benefit or granting the privilege.
- 2) A charge imposed for a specific government service or product provided directly to the payor that is not provided to those not charged, and which does not exceed the reasonable costs to the local government of providing the service or product.
- 3) A charge imposed for the reasonable regulatory costs to a local government for issuing licenses and permits, performing investigations, inspections, and audits, enforcing agricultural marketing orders, and the administrative enforcement and adjudication thereof.
- 4) A charge imposed for entrance to or use of local government property, or the purchase, rental, or lease of local government property.
- 5) A fine, penalty, or other monetary charge imposed by the judicial branch of government or a local government, as a result of a violation of law.
- 6) A charge imposed as a condition of property development.
- 7) Assessments and property-related fees imposed in accordance with the provisions of Article XIII D.

Section 66014(a) of the California Government Code includes the following, “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, when a local agency charges fees for zoning variances; zoning changes; use permits; building inspections; building permits; ...the processing of maps under the provisions of the Subdivision Map Act...; or planning services...; those fees may not exceed the estimated reasonable cost of providing the service for which the fee is charged, unless a question regarding the amount of the fee charged in excess of the estimated reasonable cost of providing the services or materials is submitted to, and approved by, a popular vote of two-thirds of those electors voting on the issue.

Study Methodology and Data Sources

The study calculated the estimated reasonable cost of providing fee-related services and activities (services). The majority of these services are commonly identified as development review services. Broad categories of development review services include, project entitlement review, review of requests for land dedications, parcel mergers, lot line adjustments, encroachment in the public right-of-way, and building permitting, plan review, and inspection services. Additionally, the City collects fees for recreation programs, administrative services, vehicle impound release, etc.

Generally, the estimated reasonable cost of providing the fee-related services and activities examined in the study can be calculated as the product of the estimated labor time required to process a typical request for service and the composite fully-burdened hourly labor rate of the division responsible for providing services. The estimated reasonable cost of service also includes costs or fees imposed by outside agencies or contract service providers used by the City to provide the requested services.

A combination of sources were used to complete the analysis and develop the findings and recommendations of this study. The data sources included, but were not limited to:

- Adopted budgets, actual expenditure history, and personnel salary and benefit information.
- Historical project volume and revenues from fees.
- Current schedule of fees for each department.
- Citywide cost allocation plan.
- On-site and telephone interviews with City staff.

The following page provides a summary of the steps utilized to complete this study.

Summary of methodology used to calculate estimated costs of service and cost recovery levels

Step One

Identify annual hours spent providing fee services for each division →

This information is developed and tested using a combination of interviews, questionnaires, historical project information, and historical revenue information.

Step Two

Identify annual cost of providing fee services for each division →

This information is developed and tested using a combination of information found in the City's adopted budget, expenditure history, and the overhead cost plan.

Step Three

Calculate the estimated hourly rate using information from Steps 1 and 2 →

$Annual\ cost \div Annual\ hours = Hourly\ rate$

Step Four

Estimate labor time required to process individual request for service →

This information is developed and tested using a combination of interviews, questionnaires, commonly-used measures, and information developed in Step 1.

Step Five

Calculate estimated cost of service using information from Steps 3 and 4 →

$Hourly\ rate * Labor\ hours = Cost\ of\ service$

Step Six

Calculate current cost recovery level for a specific service →

$Current\ fee \div Cost\ of\ service = Current\ Cost\ recovery$

Step Seven

Use laws, industry standards, goals and policies, and historical trends to determine targeted cost recovery →

$Proposed\ fee \div Cost\ of\ service = Targeted\ Cost\ Recovery$

Step Eight

Test to confirm forecast revenue from fees will not exceed program costs →

Use historical permit volume and proposed fees to forecast anticipated revenue from fees. Forecast revenues should not exceed program costs.

Appendices

The appendices provide detailed analytical findings from the study, including the amount of cost, or estimated cost, required to provide the services for which the fee or service charge is levied and the revenue sources anticipated to provide the service, including General Fund revenues. For any fees targeted to recover less than 100% of the estimated reasonable cost of service, it is anticipated that General Fund revenues of the City will fund the difference between the targeted recovery level and 100% recovery of the estimated cost of service unless the fee-related services are provided by Enterprise Funds (e.g. Electric fees and Environmental Utilities fees). These amounts are identified in the appendices.

Appendix A – Summary of Current and Proposed Fees and Cost Recovery Levels



User and Regulatory Fees

Presentation of "Current" and "Proposed" Fees

For Illustrative Purposes Only - Adopted Fees are Identified in the City's Master Fee Schedule

Table of Contents**Page(s)**

Administrative Fees	3 - 4
Utility Customer Billing, Accounting, and Services Fees	5
Planning (Entitlement) Fees	6
Development Services Engineering and Encroachment Fees	7
Trench Cut Recovery Fees	8
Building Fees	9
Development Impact Fee Deferral Fees	10
Electric Fees	11
Environmental Utilities Fees	12 - 14
Fire Prevention Fees	15 - 19
Police Department Fees	20 - 23
Animal Licensing and Permit Fees	24
Oversize Vehicle Permit Fees and Building Moving Permit Fees	25
Parking Permit Fees	26
Special Event, Film, and Banner Permit Fees	27
Parks, Recreation, & Libraries Department Fees	28

Administrative Fees

Fee Description	Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Fee at Full Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Fee Change \$	Note
1 City-Wide Records							
Documents							
a) 8.5 x 11 - Black and White							
i) 0 - 9 Copies	\$0.00	0%	\$0.22	\$0.00	0%	\$0.00	≈ 99% of requests, pay \$0
ii) 10+ Copies	\$0.10	45%	\$0.22	\$0.10	45%	\$0.00	
b) 8.5 x 14 and 11 x 17 - Black and White	\$0.20	43%	\$0.47	\$0.20	43%	\$0.00	
c) Color Copies							
i) 8.5 x 11	\$0.50	80%	\$0.62	\$0.50	80%	\$0.00	
ii) 11 x 17	\$1.00	92%	\$1.09	\$1.00	92%	\$0.00	
iii) 18 x 24	\$2.00	92%	\$2.18	\$2.00	92%	\$0.00	
iv) 24 x 36	\$3.00	89%	\$3.36	\$3.00	89%	\$0.00	
2 Photos	\$0.50	80%	\$0.62	\$0.50	80%	\$0.00	
3 Recordings	\$6.00	36%	\$16.90	\$6.00	36%	\$0.00	
4 Agenda Subscription							
a) 6 Months	\$20.00	28%	\$71.73	\$20.00	28%	\$0.00	
b) 12 Months	\$40.00	28%	\$143.45	\$40.00	28%	\$0.00	
5 Budget Book							
a) Available on City website	No charge		\$0.00	No charge	0%	n/a	\$0 for access via website increase fee to actual cost of hardcopy
b) Hardcopy	\$10.00	15%	\$66.00	Actual cost or per page charge	100%	varies	
6 Requests Requiring Special Programming or Formatting	billed hourly or actual cost	100%		billed hourly or actual cost	100%	\$0.00	[a]
Passport							
7 Passport Processing Fee	\$25.00	n/a		\$25.00	n/a	\$0.00	[b]
8 Passport Photo Fee	\$8.00	68%	\$11.76	\$10.00	85%	\$2.00	high volume request
9 Passport Express Postage	\$19.99	100%		Actual postage	100%		
Notary							
10 Notary Charge	\$10.00	n/a		\$10.00	n/a	\$0.00	
Subpoena							
11 Subpoena Fees	varies			varies	0%	varies	[b]
Election							
11 Candidate Nomination Filing Fee	\$25.00	n/a		\$25.00	n/a	\$0.00	[b]
12 Fee for Late Filing of Reports of Campaign Contributions and Expenditures	See Note	0%		See Note	0%		[c]

Administrative Fees

Fee Description	Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Fee at Full Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Fee Change \$	Note
13 Amplified Sound Sound Permit	\$20.00	87%	\$22.99	\$20.00	87%	\$0.00	
14 Franchise Application Franchise Application Fee							
a) Refuse Hauler	\$260.00			\$260.00		\$0.00	Franchise fees not examined as part of this study
b) Community Antenna Television System	\$100.00			\$100.00		\$0.00	
c) All Others	\$150.00			\$150.00		\$0.00	

[a] Fee for preparation of reports/formats that need to be generated by the City because they are not typically maintained. Amounts charged will include a pass-through of any vendor costs incurred.

[b] Maximum fees established by State/Federal agencies.

[c] See Roseville Municipal Code Fine Schedule and/or Roseville Municipal Bail Schedule.

Utility Customer Billing, Accounting, and Service Fees

Fee Description	Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Fee at Full Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Fee Change \$	Note
Service Fees							
1 Reestablishment Fee - Residential Electric							Re-establishment fees, late payment fees, access fees, etc. were not examined as part of this study.
a) During Normal Hours	\$40	n/a		\$40	n/a	\$0	
b) After Hours	\$85	n/a		\$85	n/a	\$0	
2 Reestablishment Fee - Commercial Electric							These fees are intended to include a behavior modification component. While the current costs of re-establishing service are significantly higher than fees charged, even if costs are reduced these fees may include a punitive component and function more closely to a penalty.
a) During Normal Hours	\$150	n/a		\$150	n/a	\$0	
b) After Hours	\$175	n/a		\$175	n/a	\$0	
3 Reestablishment Fee - Water	\$150	n/a		\$150	n/a	\$0	
4 Returned Check/ABD/ACH Fee	\$25	n/a		\$25	n/a	\$0	
5 On-Line American Express Fee	2% of payment amount	100%		2% of payment amount	100%	\$0	Over the next few years significant technological changes are anticipated that will reduce the cost of shut-off and re-activation of service.
6 Late Payment Fee	5% of late balance	n/a		5% of late balance	n/a	\$0	
7 Unauthorized Service Reconnect Fee	\$50	n/a		\$50	n/a	\$0	
8 Utility Bill Reprint Fee	\$1	n/a		\$1	n/a	\$0	
9 Access Fee	\$50	n/a		\$50	n/a	\$0	
10 Same Day Service	Equal to Reestablishment Fee	n/a		Equal to Reestablishment Fee	n/a	\$0	

Planning (Entitlement) Fees

Fee Description		Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Fee at Full Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Fee Change \$	Note
1	Examples: Environmental review, specific plan amendments, subdivision review, zoning ordinance entitlements, etc.	The majority of planning (entitlement) fees vary depending on development project characteristics. Most services are billed hourly with collection of an initial deposit.	62%	The majority of planning (entitlement) fees vary depending on development project characteristics. Most services are billed hourly with collection of an initial deposit.	The majority of planning (entitlement) fees vary depending on development project characteristics. Most services are billed hourly with collection of an initial deposit.	62%	\$0	Most services are billed hourly with collection of an initial deposit. The following illustrates the impact of moving from current cost recovery levels to full cost recovery: Current billing rate = \$132/hr Full cost billing rate = \$213/hr ≈ 61% increase.

Development Services Engineering and Encroachment Fees

Fee Description		Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Fee at Full Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Fee Change \$	Note
1	Development-related (Private) Plan Review, Inspection, and Permitting Fees (Examples: review of subdivision and parcel maps, grading, public improvements, and requests for encroachment)	The majority of land development engineering fees vary depending on development project characteristics. Most services are billed hourly with collection of an initial deposit.	74%	The majority of land development engineering fees vary depending on development project characteristics. Most services are billed hourly with collection of an initial deposit.	The majority of land development engineering fees vary depending on development project characteristics. Most services are billed hourly with collection of an initial deposit.	74%	\$0	Most services are billed hourly with collection of an initial deposit. The following illustrates the impact of moving from current cost recovery levels to full cost recovery: Current billing rate = \$121/hr Full cost billing rate = \$163/hr ≈ 35% increase

Trench Cut Recovery Fees

Fee Description		Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Fee at Full Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Fee Change \$	Note
1	Permit Fees	\$100	23%	\$438	\$300	69%	\$200	
2	Trench Cut Fees	Fees vary based on linear ft and pavement quality index ≈ \$4 - \$12 per LF	56%	Fees vary based on linear ft and pavement quality index ≈ \$8 - \$22 per LF	Fees vary based on linear ft and pavement quality index ≈ \$8 - \$22 per LF	100%	80%	Current fees based on 1998 pavement costs. Proposed fees based on 2016 pavement costs.

Building Fees

Fee Description		Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Fee at Full Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Fee Change \$	Note
1	Building Permit, Plan Review, and Processing Fees	Fees vary depending on development project characteristics	98%	Fees vary depending on development project characteristics	Fees vary depending on development project characteristics	98%	\$0	There are hundreds of fee variations depending on project characteristics. The following illustrates the impact of moving from current cost recovery levels to full cost recovery: Current billing rate = \$172/hr Full cost billing rate = \$176/hr ≈ 2% increase

Development Impact Fee Deferral Fees

Fee Description		Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Fee at Full Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Fee Change \$	Note
1	Development Impact Fee Deferral							
	a) Residential	\$250	56%	\$445	\$250	56%	\$0	
	b) Non-Residential							
	i) Administrative Fee	\$0	0%	\$1,245	\$625	50%	\$625	new fee; 50% recovery target [a]
	ii) Interest Charge on Deferred Fees	equal to unearned interest based on City's 10-yr avg pooled interest rate	100%	equal to unearned interest based on City's 10-yr avg pooled interest rate	equal to unearned interest based on City's 10-yr avg pooled interest rate	100%	\$0	

[a] Fee deferral will result in a loss of interest income on monies deferred over the construction timeframe. The interest charge is intended to cover these costs.

Electric Fees

Fee Description		Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Fee at Full Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Fee Change \$	Note
Solar Energy Program - Meter Upgrade								
1	Residential PV Net-Meter	\$596.64	100%	\$596.64	\$596.64	100%	\$0.00	Full cost recovery is targeted for majority of electric fees
2	Business PV Net-Meter (<10kW system size)	\$1,462.56	100%	\$1,462.56	\$1,462.56	100%	\$0.00	
3	Business PV Net & PBI Meter (10-100kW system size, up to 200amp PBI panel)	\$3,132.23	100%	\$3,132.23	\$3,132.23	100%	\$0.00	
4	Business PV Net & PBI Meter (10-100kW system size, >200amp PBI panel)	\$5,227.53	100%	\$5,227.53	\$5,227.53	100%	\$0.00	
5	Variance Review Request	\$177.44	100%	\$177.44	\$177.44	100%	\$0.00	
6	Plan Reviews or Field Meets Exceeding the Initial and Subsequent Submittal Limit	\$177.44	100%	\$177.44	\$177.44	100%	\$0.00	
7	PBI Meter Installations Requiring a Phone Switcher	\$290.34	100%	\$290.34	\$290.34	100%	\$0.00	
Other Service Fees								
8	Pedestal Meter Fee	\$324.28			\$324.28		\$0.00	↓
9	Temporary Power Meter Set							
	a) Temp Power Meter Set Fee - Residential	\$391.66			\$391.66		\$0.00	
	b) Temp Power Meter Set Fee - Commercial	Actual Cost	100%	varies	Actual Cost	100%	\$0.00	
10	Extension of Facilities	Actual Cost	100%	varies	Actual Cost	100%	\$0.00	
11	Svc Connections and Facilities on Customer's Premises	Actual Cost	100%	varies	Actual Cost	100%	\$0.00	
12	Meter Test							
	a) More than six-months since prior test	\$0.00	0%	\$177.44	\$0.00	0%	\$0.00	
	b) Within six-months of meter install or prior test	Actual Cost	100%	\$177.44	Actual Cost	100%	\$0.00	
13	Overhead-to-Underground Conversion of Overhead Utilities	Actual Cost	100%	varies	Actual Cost	100%	\$0.00	

Environmental Utilities Fees

Fee Description	Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Fee at Full Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Fee Change \$	Note
Water							
1 Construction Water							Fees and billing rates developed by Environmental Utilities Department as part of a separate analysis.
a) Fire Hydrant Application Fee	\$100			\$225		\$125	
b) Usage Rate	\$0.40			Current rate per Ccf			
c) Meter and Backflow Rental							
i) Monthly Rental Charge	\$50			\$100		\$50	
ii) Initial Deposit	\$500			\$1,500		n/a	
2 Meter Installation for New Residential							
a) Labor Charge	\$75			\$125		\$50	
b) Meter and Meter Appurtenance Charge	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
c) Quantity Charge	\$75			\$75		\$0	
3 Meter Installation - All Other	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	↓
4 Service Connections	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
5 Tap	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
6 Abandon Water Service Line	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
7 Installation of Facilities in Subdivisions/Other Dev'lpmts	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
Water Conservation							
8 Water - Water Efficient Landscape Review	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
Backflow Prevention Inspection and Cross-Connection Control							
9 Backflow Prevention Assembly - Installation, Repair, Replacement	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
10 Backflow Prevention Assembly - Reinspection Fee	\$30			\$60		\$30	
Well Water							
11 Well Permit							
a) First Well	\$250			\$250		\$0	
b) Each Additional Well	\$125			\$125		\$0	
c) Soil Boring (no well)	\$250			\$250		\$0	
Sewer							
12 Private Sewage Disposal System - Plan Review and Inspection	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
13 Building Sewers and Connections							
a) Residential and Commercial Service	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
b) Service Establishments Producing Industrial Waste	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	

Environmental Utilities Fees

Fee Description	Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Fee at Full Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Fee Change \$	Note
14 Review of Grease, Oil, and Grit Interceptors	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
15 Rate-of-Flow Controller Facility							
a) Installation	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
b) Re-inspection	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
16 Industrial Waste Manhole - Plan Review and Inspection	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
17 Closed Circuit TV for Inspection and Warranty Service	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
18 Vactor Service for Cleaning of New Infrastructure for Final Acceptance	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
19 Fabrication of Special Fittings	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
20 Fats, Oils, and Grease Program (FOG) - Costs incurred by the City as a result of required on-site sampling and analysis	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
21 FOG Program Violation Appeal Cost							
a) Public Utilities Commission	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
b) City Council	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
Recycled Water							
22 Recycled Water - Cost of Meter and Installation							
a) 3/4"	\$469.23			\$469.23		\$0	
b) 1"	\$530.32			\$530.32		\$0	
c) 1 1/2"	\$1,223.66			\$1,223.66		\$0	
d) 2"	\$1,385.06			\$1,385.06		\$0	
e) 3"	\$1,872.40			\$1,872.40		\$0	
f) 4"	\$3,133.49			\$3,133.49		\$0	
g) 6"	\$5,265.56			\$5,265.56		\$0	
h) 8"	\$8,389.14			\$8,389.14		\$0	
i) 10"	\$10,697.23			\$10,697.23		\$0	
23 Recycled Water - Plan Review and Inspection	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
Industrial Wastewater							
24 On-Site Sampling	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
Other Fees							
25 Plan Review	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
26 On-site Inspections	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
27 Water Warranty Inspections	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	

Environmental Utilities Fees

Fee Description		Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Fee at Full Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Fee Change \$	Note
28	Wastewater Warranty Inspections	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
29	Cross Connection Testing	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
30	Cross Connection Testing for Backflows	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
31	Water Continuity Testing	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
32	Spark Testing	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
33	Mapping	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
34	Standby	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
35	Disposal of Chlorinated or Contaminated Water	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
36	Tee Installation	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
37	401 Transition Pipe	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	
38	Pipe Coating	Actual Cost			Actual Cost		\$0	

Fire Prevention Fees

Fee Description		Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Fee at Full Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Fee Change \$	Note
1	Permits to Operate (Type of Permit Activity)							
1	Amusement Building	\$292.60	67%	\$437.63	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	Considering ongoing CPI adjustments for fees. Need to discuss with City leadership, Development Services, and stakeholders (e.g. Chamber, BIA). Unlikely to achieve full cost recovery. Focus on recovery, compliance, and mitigation of potential community risks. 
2	Carnivals and Fairs	\$292.60	67%	\$437.63	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	
3	Combustible Dust Operations	\$292.60	67%	\$437.63	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	
4	Covered Mall Buildings	\$292.60	67%	\$437.63	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	
5	Exhibits and Trade Shows	\$292.60	67%	\$437.63	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	
6	Explosives or Blasting Agents	\$731.50	67%	\$1,094.07	\$731.50	67%	\$0.00	
7	Recreational or Bon Fire	\$146.30	67%	\$218.81	\$146.30	67%	\$0.00	
8	Theatrical Fire Performance	\$292.60	67%	\$437.63	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	
9	High Pile Storage	\$292.60	67%	\$437.63	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	
10	Hot Work Operations	\$292.60	67%	\$437.63	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	
11	Industrial Ovens	\$292.60	67%	\$437.63	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	
12	Lumber Yards	\$292.60	67%	\$437.63	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	
13	Misc. Combustible Storage	\$292.60	67%	\$437.63	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	
14	Places of Assembly							
	a) Less than 300 occupant load	\$292.60	67%	\$437.63	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	
	b) 300 - 999 occupant load	\$438.90	67%	\$656.44	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	
	c) 1,000 or more occupant load	\$585.20	67%	\$875.26	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	
15	Commercial Day Care Facility							
	a) 7 - 49 persons	\$292.60	67%	\$437.63	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	
	b) 50 - 149 persons	\$438.90	67%	\$656.44	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	
	c) 150 or more persons	\$585.20	67%	\$875.26	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	
16	Institutional							
	a) Less than 6 patients	\$292.60	67%	\$437.63	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	
	b) 6 or more patients	\$438.90	67%	\$656.44	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	
	c) Detention facilities	\$585.20	67%	\$875.26	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	
17	Apartments/Hotels/Motels							
	a) 3 - 16 units	\$219.45	67%	\$328.22	\$219.45	67%	\$0.00	
	b) 17 - 32 units	\$292.60	67%	\$437.63	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	
	c) 33 or more units	\$438.90	67%	\$656.44	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	
18	Large Family Day Care	\$292.60	67%	\$437.63	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	
19	Residential Care Facilities							
	a) 7 or more residents	\$438.90	67%	\$656.44	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	
	b) Pre-inspection (at hourly rate)	\$146.30	67%	\$218.81	\$146.30	67%	\$0.00	
20	Temporary Membrane Structures (Tents/Canopies)							
	a) 401 - 1,499 SF	\$219.45	67%	\$328.22	\$219.45	67%	\$0.00	

Fire Prevention Fees

Fee Description		Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Fee at Full Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Fee Change \$	Note
	b) 1,500 - 2,999 SF	\$292.60	67%	\$437.63	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	
	c) 3,000 - 5,999 SF	\$438.90	67%	\$656.44	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	
	d) 6,000 or more SF	\$585.20	67%	\$875.26	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	
	Plan Review (Including Inspection Service)							
21	Fire Alarm System							
	a) New Installation	\$1,316.17	67%	\$1,968.54	\$1,316.17	67%	\$0.00	
	b) Tenant Improvement	\$585.20	67%	\$875.26	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	
	c) Large Project > 50 Notification Devices	\$3,511.20	67%	\$5,251.56	\$3,511.20	67%	\$0.00	
	d) High Rise	\$5,266.80	67%	\$7,877.33	\$5,266.80	67%	\$0.00	
22	Fire Sprinkler System - New Installation							
	a) 1 - 99 heads	\$1,755.60	67%	\$2,625.78	\$1,755.60	67%	\$0.00	
	b) 100 - 199 heads	\$2,194.50	67%	\$3,282.22	\$2,194.50	67%	\$0.00	
	c) 200 or more heads	\$2,926.00	67%	\$4,376.30	\$2,926.00	67%	\$0.00	
23	Fire Sprinkler System - Tenant Improvement							
	a) 1 - 50 heads	\$585.20	67%	\$875.26	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	
	b) 51 or more heads	\$1,170.40	67%	\$1,750.52	\$1,170.40	67%	\$0.00	
24	Fire Stand Pipe System	\$1,170.40	67%	\$1,750.52	\$1,170.40	67%	\$0.00	
25	Fire Pump System	\$2,194.50	67%	\$3,282.22	\$2,194.50	67%	\$0.00	
26	Hood and Duct System	\$1,024.10	67%	\$1,531.70	\$1,024.10	67%	\$0.00	
27	Special Suppression System (Clean agent, Co2, etc.)	\$1,463.00	67%	\$2,188.15	\$1,463.00	67%	\$0.00	
28	Compressed Gas System							
	a) Hazardous Material	\$585.20	67%	\$875.26	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	
	b) Medical Gas	\$585.20	67%	\$875.26	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	
29	Smoke Management Systems	\$3,511.20	67%	\$5,251.56	\$3,511.20	67%	\$0.00	
30	Spray Booths (Includes fire protection system)	\$1,170.40	67%	\$1,750.52	\$1,170.40	67%	\$0.00	
31	Radio Amplification System	\$3,511.20	67%	\$5,251.56	\$3,511.20	67%	\$0.00	
	Fireworks							
32	Fireworks - Public Display (High/Low Level & Ground Devices)							
	a) 200 or less devices	\$877.80	67%	\$1,312.89	\$877.80	67%	\$0.00	
	b) 201 or more devices	\$1,024.10	67%	\$1,531.70	\$1,024.10	67%	\$0.00	
33	Fireworks - Retail Stand	\$292.60	67%	\$437.63	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	
34	Fireworks - Special Pyrotechnic Effects	\$585.20	67%	\$875.26	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	
	Hazardous Materials							
35	Flammable or Combustible Liquids							

Fire Prevention Fees

Fee Description	Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Fee at Full Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Fee Change \$	Note
36 a) Class I, II, or IIIA ≥ 25 gallons inside storage	\$438.90	67%	\$656.44	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	
b) Class I, II, or IIIA ≥ 60 gallons outside storage	\$438.90	67%	\$656.44	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	
c) Class IIIB ≥ 110 gallons	\$438.90	67%	\$656.44	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	
36 Hazardous Materials Storage, Use, or Handling							
a) Carbon Dioxide System	\$292.60	67%	\$437.63	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	
b) 1 - 10 chemicals	\$438.90	67%	\$656.44	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	
c) 11 - 20 chemicals	\$877.80	67%	\$1,312.89	\$877.80	67%	\$0.00	
d) 21 or more chemicals	\$1,755.60	67%	\$2,625.78	\$1,755.60	67%	\$0.00	
37 Hazardous Waste Generator							
a) Hazardous Waste Generator Fee < 55 gal	\$292.60	67%	\$437.63	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	
b) Hazardous Waste Generator Fee 55 - 500 gal	\$438.90	67%	\$656.44	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	
c) Hazardous Waste Generator Fee 501 - 2,500 gal	\$585.20	67%	\$875.26	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	
d) Hazardous Waste Generator Fee > 2,500 gal	\$877.80	67%	\$1,312.89	\$877.80	67%	\$0.00	
38 Tiered Permitting							
a) Permit by Rule (PBR)	\$877.80	67%	\$1,312.89	\$877.80	67%	\$0.00	
b) Conditionally Authorized	\$438.90	67%	\$656.44	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	
c) Conditionally Exempt	\$438.90	67%	\$656.44	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	
39 Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG)							
a) Annual tank > 125 gal	\$292.60	67%	\$437.63	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	
b) Tank installation (plan review and inspection)	\$585.20	67%	\$875.26	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	
40 State of California Surcharge CALARP	\$270.00	n/a	n/a	\$270.00	n/a	\$0.00	
41 State of California Surcharge Hazardous Materials	\$35.00	n/a	n/a	\$35.00	n/a	\$0.00	
42 Review of Hazardous Materials Risk Management Plans	\$146.30	67%	\$218.81	\$146.30	67%	\$0.00	
43 Review of Hazardous Materials Emergency Response Plans	\$146.30	67%	\$218.81	\$146.30	67%	\$0.00	
44 Hazardous Materials Emergency Spill Response	Actual Cost	100%	varies	Actual Cost	100%	\$0.00	
45 Hazardous Materials Oversight of Remediation	\$146.30	67%	\$218.81	\$146.30	67%	\$0.00	
Underground Storage Tanks							
46 Annual Permit	\$1,463.00	67%	\$2,188.15	\$1,463.00	67%	\$0.00	

Fire Prevention Fees

Fee Description	Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Fee at Full Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Fee Change \$	Note
47 Tank Installation (plan review and inspection)							
a) First tank	\$2,926.00	67%	\$4,376.30	\$2,926.00	67%	\$0.00	
b) Each additional tank	\$438.90	67%	\$656.44	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	
48 Transfer of Ownership	\$292.60	67%	\$437.63	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	
49 Tank Removal or Abandonment	\$1,463.00	67%	\$2,188.15	\$1,463.00	67%	\$0.00	
50 System Modification	\$585.20	67%	\$875.26	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	
51 UST Piping Upgrade	\$1,170.40	67%	\$1,750.52	\$1,170.40	67%	\$0.00	
52 State of California UST Surcharge (per tank)	\$15.00	n/a	n/a	\$15.00	n/a	\$0.00	
Aboveground Storage Tanks							
53 Annual Permit							
a) Annual Permit ≥ 1,320 gal & < 10,000 gal	\$292.60	67%	\$437.63	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	
b) Annual Permit ≥ 10,000 gal & < 100,000	\$438.90	67%	\$656.44	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	
c) Annual Permit ≥ 100,000 gal & < 1,000,000 gal	\$585.20	67%	\$875.26	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	
d) Annual Permit > 1,000,000 gal	\$877.80	67%	\$1,312.89	\$877.80	67%	\$0.00	
54 Tank Installation (plan review and inspection)							
a) First tank	\$585.20	67%	\$875.26	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	
b) Each additional tank	\$146.30	67%	\$218.81	\$146.30	67%	\$0.00	
55 Transfer of Ownership	\$292.90	67%	\$438.08	\$292.90	67%	\$0.00	
56 Tank Removal or Abandonment	\$585.20	67%	\$875.26	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	
57 System Modification	\$438.90	67%	\$656.44	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	
58 State of California APSA Surcharge	\$26.00	n/a	n/a	\$26.00	n/a	\$0.00	
Administrative Fees							
59 Copy of Incident Report (per incident)	\$10.00		varies	\$10.00		\$0.00	
60 Media Reproduction (audio, video, photographic)	Actual Cost		varies	Actual Cost		\$0.00	
61 Emergency Response Caused by DUI	Actual Cost		varies	Actual Cost		\$0.00	
62 Weed Abatement Administrative Parcel Fee	\$292.60	67%	\$437.63	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	
63 Code Appeal	\$731.50	67%	\$1,094.07	\$731.50	67%	\$0.00	
64 Fire Flow / Hydrant Test	\$438.90	67%	\$656.44	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	
65 Fire & Life Safety Division Hourly Rate	\$146.30	67%	\$218.81	\$146.30	67%	\$0.00	
66 Minimum Intake Fee	\$146.30	67%	\$218.81	\$146.30	67%	\$0.00	
67 Voluntary Inspection	\$292.60	67%	\$437.63	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	
68 Technical Report (alternate material or method request)	\$1,170.40	67%	\$1,750.52	\$1,170.40	67%	\$0.00	
69 Inspection Requests (after normal business hours)	\$438.90	67%	\$656.44	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	

Fire Prevention Fees

Fee Description		Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Fee at Full Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Fee Change \$	Note
70	Administrative Fee (excessive resubmittals and inspections)	\$365.75	67%	\$547.04	\$365.75	67%	\$0.00	
71	Expedited Plan Review Fee (per hour)	\$172.00	63%	\$273.52	\$172.00	63%	\$0.00	
72	Re-inspection Fee	\$292.60	67%	\$437.63	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	
73	Administrative Fee (work without a permit)	\$438.90	67%	\$656.44	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	
74	Code Review or Design Consultation (per hour)	\$146.30	67%	\$218.81	\$146.30	67%	\$0.00	
75	False Alarm Fee	\$365.75	67%	\$547.04	\$365.75	67%	\$0.00	
76	Fire Extinguisher Training	\$438.90	67%	\$656.44	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	
77	Late Payment Penalty for Permits							
	a) 30 days past due	\$50.00	n/a	n/a	\$50.00	n/a	\$0.00	
	b) 60 days past due	\$100.00	n/a	n/a	\$100.00	n/a	\$0.00	
	c) 90 days past due	\$200.00	n/a	n/a	\$200.00	n/a	\$0.00	

Fee Description		Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Fee at Full Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Fee Change \$	Note
1	Alarm Permit Application							
	a) Initial permit application	\$35			\$35		\$0	Not examined as part of this study. Contracted service. Updated in calendar year 2015.
	b) Renewal permit application	\$15			\$15		\$0	
	c) Late Filing Fees							
	i) Less than 30 days late	\$5			\$5		\$0	
	ii) 30 Days	\$20			\$20		\$0	
	iii) 60 Days	\$40			\$40		\$0	
	iv) 90 Days	\$80			\$80		\$0	
	v) 91+ Days							
	a) Base Fee	\$80			\$80		\$0	
	b) Administrative Citation	TBD			TBD		\$0	
	c) Fine	\$100			\$100		\$0	
2	Excessive False Alarms:							
	a) First false alarm							
	i) Burglary	\$0			\$0		\$0	
	ii) Duress/robbery	\$0			\$0		\$0	
	b) Second false alarm							
	i) Burglary	\$60			\$60		\$0	
	ii) Duress/robbery	\$60			\$60		\$0	
	c) Third false alarm							
	i) Burglary	\$85			\$85		\$0	
	ii) Duress/robbery	\$85			\$85		\$0	
	d) Fourth false alarm							
	i) Burglary	\$100			\$100		\$0	
	ii) Duress/robbery	\$150			\$150		\$0	
	e) Fifth and subsequent false alarms							
	i) Burglary	\$150			\$150		\$0	
	ii) Duress/robbery	\$200			\$200		\$0	
3	Appeal of Decision to Deny, Suspend, or Revoke an Alarm Permit	\$75			\$75		\$0	
4	Traffic Collision Report	\$0	0%	\$12	\$10	86%	\$10	new fee proposed
5	Impounded Vehicle Release Fee	\$98	59%	\$165	\$150	91%	\$52	move toward full recovery
6	Vehicle Tow Hearing	\$0	0%	\$117	\$75	64%	\$75	new fee proposed
7	Criminal Background / Good Conduct Letter (aka Records Check and Clearance Letter)	\$20	43%	\$47	\$20	43%	\$0	fee limited by State

Police Department Fees

Fee Description	Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Fee at Full Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Fee Change \$	Note
8 Commercial Indoor Firing Range Permit	\$50	48%	\$105	\$100	95%	\$50	move toward full recovery
9 Retail Firearms Dealer License							
a) Initial permit application	\$25	24%	\$105	\$100	95%	\$75	move toward full recovery
b) Renewal permit application	\$25	24%	\$105	\$100	95%	\$75	move toward full recovery
10 Adult-oriented Business							
a) Initial permit application							
i) Permit fee	\$188	58%	\$327	\$250	77%	\$62	move toward full recovery
ii) Dept of Justice fee	\$32			\$32		\$0	
iii) LiveScan fingerprint processing fee	\$15			\$15		\$0	
iv) Additional FBI fingerprinting fee, if applicable	\$17			\$17		\$0	
b) Renewal permit application							
i) Permit fee	\$188	58%	\$327	\$250	77%	\$62	move toward full recovery
11 Dance Permit Application	\$94	90%	\$105	\$100	95%	\$6	move toward full recovery
12 Entertainment Permit							
a) Initial permit application							
i) Permit fee	\$188	90%	\$210	\$200	95%	\$12	move toward full recovery
ii) Dept of Justice fee	\$32			\$32		\$0	
iii) LiveScan fingerprint processing fee	\$15			\$15		\$0	
iv) Additional FBI fingerprinting fee, if applicable	\$17			\$17		\$0	
b) Renewal permit application							
i) Permit fee	\$188	90%	\$210	\$200	95%	\$12	move toward full recovery
13 Ice Cream Vendor Permit Application							
a) Initial permit application							
i) Permit fee	\$25	24%	\$105	\$35	33%	\$10	incremental increase
ii) Dept of Justice fee	\$32			\$32		\$0	
iii) LiveScan fingerprint processing fee	\$15			\$15		\$0	
iv) Additional FBI fingerprinting fee, if applicable	\$17			\$17		\$0	
b) Renewal permit application							
i) Permit fee	\$25	40%	\$62	\$35	56%	\$10	incremental increase
14 Massage Therapist Permit Application							
a) Initial permit application							
i) Permit fee	\$28	27%	\$105	\$28	27%	\$0	incremental increase

Police Department Fees

Fee Description		Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Fee at Full Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Fee Change \$	Note
15	ii) Dept of Justice fee	\$32	0%		\$32			
	iii) LiveScan fingerprint processing fee	\$15	0%		\$15			
	iv) Additional FBI fingerprinting fee, if applicable	\$17	0%		\$17			
	b) Renewal permit application		0%					
	i) Permit fee	\$25	40%	\$62	\$25	40%	\$0	incremental increase
	a) Initial permit application							
	i) Permit fee	\$100	95%	\$105	\$100	95%	\$0	
	ii) Dept of Justice fee	\$32			\$32		\$0	
	iii) LiveScan fingerprint processing fee	\$15			\$15		\$0	
	iv) Additional FBI fingerprinting fee, if applicable	\$17			\$17		\$0	
16	b) Renewal permit application							
	i) Permit fee	\$50	48%	\$105	\$60	57%	\$10	incremental increase
	Taxicab Driver Permit Application							
	a) Initial permit application							
	i) Permit fee	\$50	48%	\$105	\$50	48%	\$0	incremental increase
	ii) Dept of Justice fee	\$32			\$32		\$0	
	iii) LiveScan fingerprint processing fee	\$15			\$15		\$0	
	iv) Additional FBI fingerprinting fee, if applicable	\$17			\$17		\$0	
	b) Renewal permit application							
	i) Permit fee	\$50	80%	\$62	\$50	80%	\$0	incremental increase
17	Noise Violation	actual cost of enforcement	100%	varies	actual cost of enforcement	100%	\$0	
18	Extraordinary Law Enforcement Services (multiple responses to disturbance w/in 12-hrs)	actual cost of enforcement	100%	varies	actual cost of enforcement	100%	\$0	
19	Supplemental Law Enforcement Services							
	a) Hourly Rates for Police Dept Personnel							
	i) Community Service Officers	\$38	90%	\$42	\$42	100%	\$4	overtime rate
	ii) Police Officers	\$60	92%	\$65	\$65	100%	\$5	overtime rate
	iii) Sergeants	\$80	103%	\$77	\$77	100%	(\$3)	overtime rate
	iv) Dispatchers	\$45	85%	\$53	\$53	100%	\$8	overtime rate
	b) Hourly Rates for Marked Vehicles							
	i) Base Rate	\$25			\$25		\$0	

Police Department Fees

Fee Description		Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Fee at Full Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Fee Change \$	Note
20	ii) Per mile rate, for each mile over 50	\$0.50			\$0.50		\$0.00	
	Concealed Weapon License	n/a - issued by Placer County Sheriff			n/a - issued by Placer County Sheriff			

Animal Licensing and Permit Fees

Fee Description		Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Fee at Full Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Fee Change \$	Note
1	Dog License							Standard animal licensing services performed via contract service provider ↓
	a) 1 Year							
	i) Certified altered dogs	\$15	38%	\$40	\$20	50%	\$5	
	ii) Non-altered dogs	\$30	76%	\$40	\$40	101%	\$10	
	iii) Senior Discount	\$5 off standard fee			\$5 off standard fee		\$0	
	b) 2 Years							
	i) Certified altered dogs	\$29	37%	\$79	\$39	49%	\$10	
	ii) Non-altered dogs	\$57	72%	\$79	\$79	99%	\$22	
	iii) Senior Discount	\$5 off standard fee			\$5 off standard fee		\$0	
	c) 3 Years							
	i) Certified altered dogs	\$43	36%	\$119	\$58	49%	\$15	
	ii) Non-altered dogs	\$86	72%	\$119	\$118	99%	\$32	
	iii) Senior Discount	\$5 off standard fee			\$5 off standard fee		\$0	
	d) Transfer of active license from other jurisdiction	\$0	0%	\$40	\$0	0%	\$0	
2	Delinquent Penalty for Failure to Renew License within 15 days of Expiration							
	a) Altered dog	\$5			\$5		\$0	
	b) Unaltered dog	\$10			\$10		\$0	
3	Lost License or Tag	\$5			\$5		\$0	
4	Kennel License	\$10	4%	\$246	\$10	4%	\$0	One permit in City
5	Special Animal Permit	\$25	10%	\$246	\$35	14%	\$10	Increase fee incrementally
6	Voluntary Disposal Fee							
	a) Dogs and Other Animals Commonly Considered Pets	\$2	3%	\$62	\$0	0%	(\$2)	Rarely requested. City pays flat fee for storage. Recommend no charge.
	b) Livestock and Wild Animals	\$25	41%	\$62	\$0	0%	(\$25)	
7	Appeal of Decision to Destroy Vicious Animal	\$75	varies	varies	\$75	varies	\$0	

Oversize Vehicle Permit Fees and Building Moving Permit Fees

Fee Description		Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Fee at Full Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Fee Change \$	Note
1	Oversize Vehicle Permit							
	a) Single trip permit	\$16	n/a		\$16	n/a	\$0	Industry standard fees set to match CalTrans.
	b) Annual permit	\$90	n/a		\$90	n/a	\$0	
2	Building Moving Permit							
	a) Base Fee	\$25	varies	varies	\$25	varies	\$0	
	b) Costs of plan review, utility and street light moving, tree trimming, traffic directing, etc.	actual costs		varies	actual costs		\$0	

[a] Oversize vehicle permit fees set to match fees adopted by California Department of Transportation (CalTrans).

Parking Permit Fees

Fee Description		Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Fee at Full Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Fee Change \$	Note
1	Residential Parking Permit	\$0	n/a	n/a	\$0	n/a	\$0	[a],[b] - no change proposed
2	Merchant Parking Permit							
	a) January 1st through December 31st	\$20	n/a	n/a	\$20	n/a	\$0	[a],[b] - low volume activity
	b) July 1st through December 31st	\$10	n/a	n/a	\$10	n/a	\$0	[a],[b] - low volume activity

[a] Fee for use of City property is not limited to the cost of permit issuance, since the permit also provides limited, exclusive, access to public facilities.

[b] For informational purposes only - Current estimated labor cost of permit issuance is \$20.40.

Special Event, Film, and Banner Permit Fees

Fee Description		Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Fee at Full Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Fee Change \$	Note
1	Special Event Permit							
	a) Application Fee							Fees proposed to remain unchanged.
	i) Event that requires limited site/plan review, no closures, etc. (i.e. park rentals/activities, misc. events, etc.)	\$75	22%	\$339	\$75	22%	\$0	
	ii) Event that requires, but not limited to, street/parking lot closures, site/plan review, trail use, etc. (i.e. fun runs, festivals, parking garage, etc.)	\$150	11%	\$1,356	\$150	11%	\$0	Initial application fees set at less than full cost recovery to encourage community events, film projects, etc.
	b) Service Charges	actual costs		varies	actual costs		\$0	Recover hourly costs for services provided.
	c) Insurance fee, if applicable	\$50			\$50		\$0	
	d) Park/facility rental fee	varies		varies	varies		\$0	
	e) Cancellation fee	\$125			\$125		\$0	
2	Photography and Filming Permit							
	a) Application Fee	\$0	0%	\$339	\$0	0%	\$0	
	b) Service Charges	actual costs		varies	actual costs		\$0	
3	Banner Permit	\$30	9%	\$339	\$30	9%	\$0	

Parks, Recreation, & Libraries Department Fees

Fee Description		Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Fee at Full Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Fee Change \$	Note
1	Parks, Recreation, & Libraries Department Program, Class, Facility Use, and Service Fees	Fees vary	Recovery amounts are based on departmental pricing policy. Recovery levels vary by program and are influenced by community v. individual benefit	Fees vary	Fees vary	Recovery amounts are based on departmental pricing policy. Recovery levels vary by program and are influenced by community v. individual benefit		Recovery amounts are based on departmental pricing policy. Recovery levels vary by program and are influenced by community v. individual benefit

Appendix B – Fee-Related Cost of Service Analysis



User and Regulatory Fees

Fee-Related Cost of Service Analysis

Table of Contents**Page(s)****Fee-Related Cost of Service Analysis**

Administrative Fees (City Clerk)

3 - 10

Utility Billing, Accounting, and Meter Reading Services

11 - 14

Development Services Fees (Planning, Engineering, Building, Permit Center, Code Enforcement)

15 - 50

Development Impact Fee Deferral Fees

51 - 54

Electric Fees

55 - 60

Environmental Utilities Fees

61 - 69

Fire Prevention Fees

70 - 78

Police Fees

79 - 86

Animal Licensing Fees

87 - 91

Parking Permits and Other Vehicle/Moving Permits (e.g. Oversize Loads)

92 - 96

Parks, Recreation, & Libraries Department Fees

97 - 103

Alternative Transportation Divisions

104 - 106

Fiscal Impact Analysis of Proposed Fee Changes

107 - 109

Fee-Related Cost of Service Analysis

- *Administrative Fees (City Clerk)* -

Statistical Information

Description	Total	Notes
Estimated Recurring Dept. Non-Labor as a Percent of Salaries for Fee-Related Services Hourly Rate Calculation	0%	[a]
Estimated Citywide Overhead as a Percent of Salaries for Fee-Related Services Hourly Rate Calculation	0%	[a]

Labor Allocation Statistics

Direct Service Units (functional units for fee-setting purposes)	Est. FTE	Notes
City Clerk - Administration	7.00	
Total	7.00	

Calculation of Estimated Expenditures for Direct Services Units**Direct Service Units (Functional Units) - City Clerk Administration**

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Notes
03200	City Clerk - Admin	7.00	\$ 536,326	\$ 269,911	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 806,237	
Total		7.00	\$ 536,326	\$ 269,911	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 806,237	

Calculation of Targeted Hourly Rate**Direct Services for Fee-Related Cost of Service (Functional Units)****City Clerk Administration**

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Est. Annual Leave Hours Per FTE [b]	Est. Productive Hours Per FTE	Est % of Time Spent on Indirect Activities [c]	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours (All FTE)	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	Notes
03200	City Clerk - Admin	7.00	\$ 806,237	2,080	320	1,760	0%	1,760	12,320	\$ 65	[b],[c]
Total		7.00	\$ 806,237	2,080	320	1,760	0%	1,760	12,320	\$ 65	

Calculation of Estimated ICR Multiplier

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Total Est. Annual Hours	Hourly Wage Rate Only Assuming 2,080 Hours	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	ICR Multiplier	Straight Hourly Rate * ICR Multiplier * Direct Hours	Notes
03200	City Clerk - Admin	7.00	\$ 536,326	2,080	14,560	\$ 37	\$ 65	1.78	\$ 806,237	

City of Roseville

User and Regulatory Fee Study

City Clerk Department - Calculation of Targeted Hourly Rates and Indirect Cost Rate Multipliers *(for Public Records Requests)*

Source: Estimated labor and FTE information based on FY 16/17 position budgeting data. Estimated recurring non-labor expenditures and estimated citywide overhead based on conservative estimates developed for purposes of this analysis only (see footnote [a] for additional details regarding estimates for recurring non-labor and citywide overhead expenditures.

[a] The calculated hourly rate is intended to comply with Government Code 6253(b). The hourly rate shown represents only the labor costs of City Clerk personnel that typically perform reproduction services. Estimated non-labor and citywide overhead costs are deliberately excluded.

[b] Annual leave assumes the following: Holiday - 12 days; Vacation - 14 days; Sick - 12 days; Mgmt/Jury/Other - 2 days. Actual amounts may vary based on employee length of service and job title. Amounts shown are intended to serve as reasonable for purposes of estimation.

[c] Indirect activities and services may include mandatory rest periods, meetings, training, and other administrative activities. However, these amounts have been excluded in order to err on the side of caution in an effort to comply with Government Code 6253(b) regarding requests for public records. The hourly rate shown represents only the labor costs of City Clerk personnel that typically perform reproduction services.

Statistical Information

Description	Total	Notes
Estimated Citywide Overhead as a Percent of Salaries for Fee-Related Services Hourly Rate Calculation	15%	[a]

Labor Allocation Statistics

Direct Service Units (functional units for fee-setting purposes)	Est. FTE	Notes
City Clerk - Administration	7.00	
Total	7.00	

Calculation of Estimated Expenditures for Direct Services Units**Direct Service Units (Functional Units)**

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Notes
03200	City Clerk - Admin	7.00	\$ 536,326	\$ 269,911	\$ 76,450	\$ 80,449	\$ 963,136	
Total		7.00	\$ 536,326	\$ 269,911	\$ 76,450	\$ 80,449	\$ 963,136	

Calculation of Targeted Hourly Rate**Direct Services for Fee-Related Cost of Service (Functional Units)**

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Est. Annual Leave Hours Per FTE [b]	Est. Productive Hours Per FTE	Est % of Time Spent on Indirect Activities [c]	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours (All FTE)	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	Notes
03200	City Clerk - Admin	7.00	\$ 963,136	2,080	320	1,760	15%	1,496	10,472	\$ 92	[b],[c]
Total		7.00	\$ 963,136	2,080	320	1,760	15%	1,496	10,472	\$ 92	

Calculation of Estimated ICR Multiplier

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Total Est. Annual Hours	Hourly Wage Rate Only Assuming 2,080 Hours	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	ICR Multiplier	Straight Hourly Rate * ICR Multiplier * Direct Hours	Notes
03200	City Clerk - Admin	7.00	\$ 536,326	2,080	14,560	\$ 37	\$ 92	2.50	\$ 963,136	

Source: Estimated labor and FTE information based on FY 16/17 position budgeting data. Estimated recurring non-labor expenditures based on FY 16/17 adopted budget. Estimated citywide overhead based on conservative estimates developed for purposes of this analysis only (see footnote [a] for additional details regarding estimates for citywide overhead).

[a] Amount is intended to serve as a reasonable, conservative, estimate of central service support received by the City Clerk Department from other central service units, such as finance, attorney, city manager, etc. The City's existing overhead cost allocation plan allocates central service costs to direct service units. Consequently, there is no formal allocation of citywide overhead to the City Clerk. While, the City Clerk Department primarily operates as a central service unit, for certain fee-related services the department provides direct services. The overhead allocation is intended to provide an estimate of support received by the City Clerk Department that enables staff to perform direct services, when requested.

[b] Annual leave assumes the following: Holiday - 12 days; Vacation - 14 days; Sick - 12 days; Mgmt/Jury/Other - 2 days. Actual amounts may vary based on employee length of service and job title. Amounts shown are intended to serve as reasonable for purposes of estimation.

[c] Indirect activities and services may include mandatory rest periods, meetings, training, and other administrative activities. Source: personnel services analysis.

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Administrative Fees
Calculation of the Estimated Costs of Providing Fee Related Services

Fee Description		Cost of Service					Notes	Current Fee	Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee Change (\$)	Proposed Fee Change (%)
		Est. Labor Cost	+	Paper	+	Toner, Postage, Other	=	Est. Cost of Service					
City-Wide Records													
1	Documents												
	a) 8.5 x 11 - Black and White												
	i) 0 - 9 Copies	\$0.18	+	\$0.01	+	\$0.03	=	\$0.22	[a],[b],[c]	\$0.00	0%	\$0.00	0%
	ii) 10+ Copies	\$0.18	+	\$0.01	+	\$0.03	=	\$0.22	[a],[b],[c]	\$0.10	45%	\$0.00	0%
	b) 8.5 x 14 and 11 x 17 - Black and White	\$0.36	+	\$0.05	+	\$0.06	=	\$0.47	[d],[e],[c]	\$0.20	43%	\$0.00	0%
	c) Color Copies												
	i) 8.5 x 11	\$0.36	+	\$0.01	+	\$0.25	=	\$0.62	[b],[c],[d]	\$0.50	80%	\$0.00	0%
	ii) 11 x 17	\$0.55	+	\$0.05	+	\$0.50	=	\$1.09	[f],[e],[c]	\$1.00	92%	\$0.00	0%
	iii) 18 x 24	\$1.09	+	\$0.09	+	\$0.99	=	\$2.18	[g]	\$2.00	92%	\$0.00	0%
	iv) 24 x 36	\$1.19	+	\$0.18	+	\$1.98	=	\$3.36	[h]	\$3.00	89%	\$0.00	0%
2	Photos	\$0.36	+	\$0.01	+	\$0.25	=	\$0.62	[b],[c],[d]	\$0.50	80%	\$0.00	0%
3	Recordings	\$16.36	+	\$0.54		\$0.00	=	\$16.90	[i],[j]	\$6.00	36%	\$0.00	0%
4	Agenda Subscription												
	a) 6 Months	\$65.44	+	\$0.64	+	\$5.64	=	\$71.73	[k]	\$20.00	28%	\$0.00	0%
	b) 12 Months	\$130.88	+	\$1.29	+	\$11.28	=	\$143.45	[l]	\$40.00	28%	\$0.00	0%
5	Budget Book												
	a) Available on City website								No charge				
	b) Hardcopy		+		+	\$66.00	=	\$66.00	[m]	\$10.00	15%	Actual cost or per page charge	100%
6	Requests Requiring Special Programming or Formatting					varies			[n]	billed hourly or actual cost	100%	billed hourly or actual cost	100%
	Passport												
7	Passport Processing Fee					n/a			[o]	\$25.00	n/a	\$0.00	0%
8	Passport Photo Fee	\$11.50	+	\$0.01	+	\$0.25	=	\$11.76	[p]	\$8.00	68%	\$10.00	85%
9	Passport Express Postage					actual cost			[q]	\$19.99	100%	Actual	100%

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Administrative Fees
Calculation of the Estimated Costs of Providing Fee Related Services

Fee Description		Cost of Service				Notes	Current Fee	Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee Change (\$)	Proposed Fee Change (%)
		Est. Labor Cost	+ Paper	+ Toner, Postage, Other	= Est. Cost of Service							
Notary												
10	Notary Charge			n/a		[r]	\$10.00	n/a	\$10.00	n/a	\$0.00	0%
Subpoena												
11	Subpoena Fees			varies		[r]	varies		varies		\$0.00	
Election												
11	Candidate Nomination Filing Fee			n/a		[r]	\$25.00	n/a	\$25.00	n/a	\$0.00	0%
12	Fee for Late Filing of Reports of Campaign Contributions and Expenditures			n/a		[s]	See Note		See Note			
Amplified Sound												
13	Sound Permit	\$22.99			= \$22.99	[t]	\$20.00	87%	\$20.00	87%	\$0.00	0%
Franchise Application												
14	Franchise Application Fee											
	a) Refuse Hauler			not examined as part of this study		[u]	\$260.00		\$260.00		\$0.00	0%
	b) Community Antenna Television System			not examined as part of this study		[u]	\$100.00		\$100.00		\$0.00	0%
	c) All Others			not examined as part of this study		[u]	\$150.00		\$150.00		\$0.00	0%

- [a] Assumes 10 seconds per page.
[b] Source: Staples.com - Staples per case price of \$49.99 plus tax for 5,000 sheets of paper.
[c] Source: Xerox - US Cost per page assuming varying levels of coverage.
[d] Assumes 20 seconds per page processing time.
[e] Source: Staples.com - Hammermill per ream price of \$21.49 per 500 sheets of paper.
[f] Assumes 30 seconds per page processing time.
[g] Non-standard request. Estimates based on twice the 11x17 amount.
[h] Non-standard request. Estimates based on twice the 18x24 amount.
[i] Assumes 15 minutes per request.
[j] Source: Staples.com - \$24.99 plus tax for 50 re-writeable CDs.
[k] Assumes 5 minutes per agenda mailing, plus 5 pages per agenda, plus standard postage rates for two meetings per month for six months.
[l] Assumes 5 minutes per agenda mailing, plus 5 pages per agenda, plus standard postage rates for two meetings per month for twelve months.
[m] The City's current cost for printing a budget book is \$66 per book.
[n] Amounts vary depending on request.
[o] Processing fee is payable separately from amount payable to US Department of State.
[p] Assumes 7.5 minutes per typical request (avg. of 5 to 10 minutes) and conservative estimate for materials costs.
[q] City will pass-through any requested express postage costs.

City of Roseville
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Administrative Fees
 Calculation of the Estimated Costs of Providing Fee Related Services

Fee Description	Cost of Service					Notes	Current Fee	Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee Change (\$)	Proposed Fee Change (%)
	Est. Labor Cost	+	Paper	+	Toner, Postage, Other	= Est. Cost of Service						

- [r] Maximum fees established by other governmental entities.
- [s] See Roseville Municipal Code Fine Schedule and/or Roseville Municipal Bail Schedule.
- [t] Assumes 15 minutes per request.
- [u] Franchise application fees are not examined as part of this study. Certain reviews are now conducted by the State.

Fee-Related Cost of Service Analysis

- *Utility Billing, Accounting, and Meter Reading Services* -

Calculation of Estimated Expenditures for Departmental Overhead and Direct Services Units**Department Overhead**

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages [a]	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Notes
05040	Util Billing & Serv - Admin	1.00	\$ 113,130	\$ 83,610	\$ 3,683	\$ 32,431	\$ 232,854	
Total		1.00	\$ 113,130	\$ 83,610	\$ 3,683	\$ 32,431	\$ 232,854	

Direct Services for Fee-Related Cost of Service (Functional Units)

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages [a]	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Est. Alloc. of Dept. Overhead Based on FTE	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Notes
05041	Util Billing & Srv - Field Srv	8.50	\$ 552,722	\$ 344,891	\$ 134,022	\$ 296,471	\$ 67,667	\$ 1,395,772	[b]
05042	Util Billing & Srv - Billing	6.00	\$ 396,881	\$ 227,166	\$ 18,721	\$ 371,130	\$ 47,765	\$ 1,061,664	
05043	Util Billing & Srv - Service	14.75	\$ 750,190	\$ 478,996	\$ 33,145	\$ 424,179	\$ 117,422	\$ 1,803,932	
Total		29.25	\$ 1,699,793	\$ 1,051,053	\$ 185,888	\$ 1,091,780	\$ 232,854	\$ 4,261,369	

Calculation of Estimated Fully-Burdened Hourly Rates**Direct Services for Fee-Related Cost of Service (Functional Units)**

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Est. Annual Leave Hours Per FTE [c]	Est. Productive Hours Per FTE	Est % of Time Spent on Indirect Activities [d]	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours (All FTE)	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	Notes
05041	Util Billing & Srv - Field Srv	8.50	\$ 1,395,772	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	13,090	\$ 107	
05042	Util Billing & Srv - Billing	6.00	\$ 1,061,664	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	9,240	\$ 115	
05043	Util Billing & Srv - Service	14.75	\$ 1,803,932	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	22,715	\$ 79	
Total		29.25	\$ 4,261,369	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	45,045	\$ 95	

Calculation of Estimated ICR Multiplier

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Total Est. Annual Hours	Hourly Wage Rate Only Assuming 2,080 Hours	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	ICR Multiplier	Straight Hourly Rate * ICR Multiplier * Direct Hours	Notes
05041	Util Billing & Srv - Field Srv	8.50	\$ 552,722	2,080	17,680	\$ 31	\$ 107	3.41	\$ 1,395,772	
05042	Util Billing & Srv - Billing	6.00	\$ 396,881	2,080	12,480	\$ 32	\$ 115	3.61	\$ 1,061,664	
05043	Util Billing & Srv - Service	14.75	\$ 750,190	2,080	30,680	\$ 24	\$ 79	3.25	\$ 1,803,932	
Total		29.25	\$ 1,699,793	2,080	60,840	\$ 28	\$ 95	3.39	\$ 4,261,369	

Source: Estimated labor and FTE information based on FY 16/17 position budgeting data. Estimated recurring non-labor expenditures based on FY 16/17 adopted budget. Estimated citywide overhead based on Citywide overhead cost allocation plan.

[a] Amounts exclude estimated overtime and temporary help wages.

[b] Adjustment to exclude distorting expenses. Estimated recurring non-labor expenses set at 3% of salaries and benefits for purposes of this analysis. This is intended to serve as a conservative estimate and corresponds to recurring services and supplies share for budget unit 05043.

[c] Annual leave assumes the following: Holiday - 12 days; Vacation - 14 days; Sick - 12 days; Mgmt/Jury/Other - 2 days. Actual amounts may vary based on employee length of service and job title. Amounts shown are intended to serve as reasonable for purposes of estimation.

[d] Amounts shown are intended to serve as conservative estimates. Indirect activities and services may include mandatory rest periods, meetings, training, public information and assistance, and other administrative activities.

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Utility Customer Services - Billing, Accounting, and Meter Reading Services
Cost of Service Calculation - At Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate

Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate				
Util Bill Svc	Util Field Svc	Elec Meter Wrkr	EU Meter Wrkr	Total
\$ 79	\$ 107	\$ 172	\$ 110	n/a

Fee Description		Est. Labor Hours					Estimated Cost of Service					Current Fee	Current Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Recovery	Proposed Fee Change
		Util Bill Svc	Util Field Svc	Elec Meter Wrkr	EU Meter Wrkr	Total	Util Bill Svc	Util Field Svc	Elec Meter Wrkr	EU Meter Wrkr	Total					
1	Service Fees															
	Reestablishment Fee - Residential Electric															
	a) During Normal Hours											\$40	n/a	\$40	n/a	\$0
	b) After Hours											\$85	n/a	\$85	n/a	\$0
2	Reestablishment Fee - Commercial Electric															
	a) During Normal Hours											\$150	n/a	\$150	n/a	\$0
	b) After Hours											\$175	n/a	\$175	n/a	\$0
3	Reestablishment Fee - Water											\$150	n/a	\$150	n/a	\$0
4	Returned Check/ABD/ACH Fee											\$25	n/a	\$25	n/a	\$0
5	On-Line American Express Fee											2% of payment amount	100%	2% of payment amount	100%	\$0
6	Late Payment Fee											5% of late balance	n/a	5% of late balance	n/a	\$0
7	Unauthorized Service Reconnect Fee											\$50	n/a	\$50	n/a	\$0
8	Utility Bill Reprint Fee											\$1	n/a	\$1	n/a	\$0
9	Access Fee											\$50	n/a	\$50	n/a	\$0
10	Same Day Service											Equal to Reestablis hment Fee	n/a	Equal to Reestablis hment Fee	n/a	\$0

* Maximum returned check fees are governed by State law.

Fee-Related Cost of Service Analysis

- *Development Services Fees (Planning, Engineering, Building, Permit Center, Code Enforcement)* -

Calculation of Estimated Expenditures for Departmental Overhead and Direct Services Units

Department Overhead

Org Key	Description	Est. Salaries and Wages	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Adjustments	Est. Recurring Expenses After Adjustments	Allocation to Direct Svc Units	Allocated Amount	Notes
08800	Dev Svcs - Admin	\$ 473,788	\$ 239,053	\$ 56,000	\$ 257,832	\$ 1,026,673	\$ -	\$ 1,026,673	100%	\$ 1,026,673	
08801	Dev Svcs - Permit Ctr	\$ 867,414	\$ 456,328	\$ 76,720	\$ 64,133	\$ 1,464,595	\$ -	\$ 1,464,595	100%	\$ 1,464,595	
Total		\$ 1,341,202	\$ 695,381	\$ 132,720	\$ 321,965	\$ 2,491,268	\$ -	\$ 2,491,268		\$ 2,491,268	

Allocation of Department Overhead to Direct Service Units

Org Key	Description	Allocated Amount	Planning	Building Inspection	Engineering	Code Enforcement	Total	Notes
08800	Dev Svcs - Admin	\$ 1,026,673	30%	25%	30%	15%	100%	[a]
08801	Dev Svcs - Permit Ctr	\$ 1,464,595	20%	55%	20%	5%	100%	[b]
Total		\$ 2,491,268						

Org Key	Description	Allocated Amount	Planning	Building Inspection	Engineering	Code Enforcement	Total	Notes
08800	Dev Svcs - Admin	\$ 1,026,673	\$ 308,002	\$ 256,668	\$ 308,002	\$ 154,001	\$ 1,026,673	
08801	Dev Svcs - Permit Ctr	\$ 1,464,595	\$ 292,919	\$ 805,527	\$ 292,919	\$ 73,230	\$ 1,464,595	
Total		\$ 2,491,268	\$ 600,921	\$ 1,062,196	\$ 600,921	\$ 227,231	\$ 2,491,268	

Direct Service Unit Costs of Service (Functional Units)

Org Key	Description	Est. Salaries and Wages	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. Alloc. of Dept. Overhead	Est. C'wide Overhead	Total Est. Share of Recurring Expenses	Adjustments	Est. Share of Recurring Expenses After Adjustments	Notes
08200	Planning	\$ 1,028,242	\$ 516,738	\$ 93,780	\$ 600,921	\$ 463,004	\$ 2,702,685	\$ -	\$ 2,702,685	
08810	Bldg Inspection	\$ 1,263,903	\$ 673,773	\$ 597,000	\$ 1,062,196	\$ 283,644	\$ 3,880,516	\$ -	\$ 3,880,516	
08820	Engineering	\$ 1,552,303	\$ 769,790	\$ 172,500	\$ 600,921	\$ 241,320	\$ 3,336,834	\$ -	\$ 3,336,834	
08815	Code Enforcement	\$ 336,907	\$ 188,191	\$ 87,506	\$ 227,231	\$ 49,229	\$ 889,064	\$ -	\$ 889,064	
Total		\$ 4,181,355	\$ 2,148,493	\$ 950,786	\$ 2,491,268	\$ 1,037,197	\$ 10,809,099	\$ -	\$ 10,809,099	

Calculation of Estimated Fully-Burdened Hourly Rates

Direct Services for Fee-Related Cost of Service (Functional Units)

Org Key	Description	Total Est. Share of Recurring Expenses	Est Direct Svcs Ratio	Est Hours Available to Recover Costs	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	Notes
08200	Planning	\$ 2,702,685	60%	11,440	\$ 236	[c]
***	Bldg Inspect & Prmt Techs	\$ 3,880,516	60%	22,000	\$ 176	[c]
08820	Engineering	\$ 3,336,834	60%	17,952	\$ 186	[c]
08815	Code Enforcement	\$ 889,064	75%	6,688	\$ 133	[d]
Total		\$ 10,809,099				

Calculation of Estimated ICR Multiplier

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages [a]	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Total Est. Annual Hours	Hourly Wage Rate Only Assuming Total Annual Hours	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	ICR Multiplier at Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	Straight Hourly Rate * ICR Multiplier * Direct Hours	Notes
08200	Planning	11.00	\$ 1,060,602	2,080	22,880	\$ 46	\$ 236	5.10	\$ 2,702,685	[e]
***	Bldg Inspect & Prmt Techs	20.00	\$ 1,573,325	2,080	41,600	\$ 38	\$ 176	4.66	\$ 3,880,516	[e][f]
08820	Engineering	16.00	\$ 1,464,854	2,080	33,280	\$ 44	\$ 186	4.22	\$ 3,336,834	[e]
08815	Code Enforcement	5.00	\$ 336,908	2,080	10,400	\$ 32	\$ 133	4.10	\$ 889,064	[e]

Estimated Cost Recovery for Divisions that Rely Primarily on Hourly Billing via ICR

Org Key	Description	Current ICR Used for Hourly Billings	Calculated ICR at Full Cost Recovery	Estimated Cost Recovery
08200	Planning	3.15	5.10	62%
08820	Engineering	3.13	4.22	74%

Current ICR	Proposed ICR	Current Cost Recovery	Proposed Cost Recovery	Notes
3.15	3.15	62%	62%	
3.13	3.13	74%	74%	

Estimated Cost Recovery for Divisions that Rely Primarily on Uniform Underlying Hourly Rate for Fee Setting

Org Key	Description	Current Hourly Rate Used for Fee Setting	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	Estimated Cost Recovery
***	Bldg Inspect & Prmt Techs	\$ 172	\$ 176	98%

Current Hourly Rate Used for Fee Setting	Proposed Hourly Rate Used for Fee Setting	Current Cost Recovery	Proposed Cost Recovery	Notes
\$ 172	\$ 172	98%	98%	

Departmental Cost Recovery Overview

Org Key	Description	Est. Annual Revenue	Est. Share of Recurring Expenses	Est. Divisional Cost Recovery	Notes
08200	Planning	\$ 893,446	2,702,685	33%	[g]
***	Bldg Inspect & Prmt Techs	\$ 3,528,882	3,880,516	91%	[g]
08820	Engineering	\$ 1,358,253	3,336,834	41%	[g]
08815	Code Enforcement	\$ 8,094	889,064	1%	[g]
Total		\$ 5,788,675	\$ 10,809,099	54%	

Alternative Presentation of Departmental Cost Recovery

Departmental Cost Recovery Overview Excluding Code Enforcement

Org Key	Description	Est. Annual Revenue	Est. Share of Recurring Expenses	Est. Divisional Cost Recovery
08200	Planning	\$ 893,446	2,702,685	33%
***	Bldg Inspect & Prmt Techs	\$ 3,528,882	3,880,516	91%
08820	Engineering	\$ 1,358,253	3,336,834	41%
Total		\$ 5,780,581	\$ 9,920,035	58%

** Note: For purposes of this analysis, annual revenues include expenditure offsets and annual expenditures exclude expenditure offsets.*

Source: Estimated labor and FTE information based on FY 16/17 position budgeting data. Estimated recurring non-labor expenditures based on FY 16/17 adopted budget. Estimated citywide overhead based on Citywide overhead cost allocation plan.

[a] Allocation assumes 60% to Planning and Engineering and 40% to Building and Code Enforcement. Although Building has the highest permit volume, the most significant time required from personnel in the Administration division occurs in the project planning and land development stages.

[b] Allocation assumes the majority of permit technician staff perform building permit processing activities. Allocation assumes majority of mapping and GIS staff provide services with greater benefit to Planning and Engineering divisions.

[c] Assumes 60% of productive hours are spent performing direct activities (e.g. permit processing, plan review, inspection, etc.). Assumes 40% of productive hours are spent performing indirect activities (e.g. general administration and management, training, code and policy development, public information and assistance, etc.).

[d] Assumes 75% of productive hours are spent performing direct activities (e.g. inspections). Assumes 25% of productive hours are spent performing indirect activities (e.g. general administration and management, training, code and policy development, public information and assistance, etc.).

[e] Estimated salaries and wages vary from amounts shown in tables above because they exclude estimated longevity pay, overtime, temporary help wages, vacancy factor, etc.

[f] Includes personnel assigned to Building Inspection and permit personnel in Permit Center.

[g] Estimated annual revenue based on FY 15/16 actual revenues. Minor revenues from Admin and Permit Center assigned to Planning.

Planning Rates Currently Used for Project Billing

A		Core Svc Area																								
		Planning								Police	Fire	Bldg	Alt'rn Transportation			Engineering			Environmental Utilities				Clerk	Parks & Recreation		
		Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	C'mnty Rel. Anlyst	Fire Insp S'pvsr	Bldg Insp S'pvsr	Alt'rn Trnsp Anlyst II	Alt'rn Trnsp Mgr	Admin Tech	(DS) City Eng'r	Sr Eng'r	(DS) Eng'r Mgr	Dev Tech	Sr Eng'r	Eng'r Mgr	Assoc Eng'r	City Clerk Tech	P&R Plan & Dev S'pvsr	P&R Tech	P&R D'rctr
B	Job Title																									
C	Base Hourly Wage Rate	\$23	\$33	\$42	\$42	\$46	\$53	\$61	\$73	\$34	\$52	\$49	\$48	\$59	\$28	\$66	\$56	\$74	\$33	\$56	\$74	\$46	\$30	\$53	\$30	\$87
D	ICR Multiplier used for Project Billing	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	1.80	2.32	2.17	1.69	1.69	1.69	3.13	3.13	3.13	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	1.69	3.48	3.48	3.48
E	Hourly Rate used for Project Billing	\$74	\$103	\$132	\$132	\$145	\$167	\$192	\$230	\$61	\$120	\$107	\$81	\$100	\$47	\$206	\$176	\$232	\$103	\$177	\$234	\$146	\$51	\$184	\$103	\$302



Continue to use these ICR multipliers for Planning, Building, and Engineering, until different direction is received from City Council or Development Services Director. ICR multipliers will remain unchanged, but hourly rates used for project billing will increase as base hourly wages increase. Goal is for flat fees to increase by roughly CPI every year. Since the City's labor costs typically increase annually, these increases should also increase, even without a CPI adjustment to ICR multiplier. If the City's wage rates remain unchanged, but CPI increases, the ICR multiplier could be increased.

Planning Rates At Full Cost Recovery

A	Core Svc Area	Planning								Police	Fire	Bldg	Alt'rn Transportation			Engineering			Environmental Utilities				Clerk	Parks & Recreation		
		Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	C'mnty Rel. Anlyst	Fire Insp S'pvsr	Bldg Insp S'pvsr	Alt'rn Trnsp Anlyst II	Alt'rn Trnsp Mgr	Admin Tech	(DS) City Eng'r	Sr Eng'r	(DS) Eng'r Mgr	Dev Tech	Sr Eng'r	Eng'r Mgr	Assoc Eng'r	City Clerk Tech	P&R Plan & Dev S'pvsr	P&R Tech	P&R D'rctr
B	Job Title																									
C	Base Hourly Wage Rate	\$23	\$33	\$42	\$42	\$46	\$53	\$61	\$73	\$34	\$52	\$49	\$48	\$59	\$28	\$66	\$56	\$74	\$33	\$56	\$74	\$46	\$30	\$53	\$30	\$87
D	ICR Multiplier at Full Cost Recovery	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	3.24	4.29	4.66	2.92	2.92	2.92	4.22	4.22	4.22	3.25	3.25	3.25	3.25	2.50	5.31	5.31	5.31
E	Hourly Rate used for Project Billing if the City Targeted Full Cost Recovery	\$119	\$167	\$213	\$213	\$235	\$270	\$310	\$372	\$109	\$222	\$230	\$140	\$173	\$82	\$279	\$237	\$313	\$106	\$182	\$241	\$150	\$75	\$281	\$158	\$461

Current Targeted Cost Recovery

A	Core Svc Area	Planning								Police	Fire	Bldg	Alt'rn Transportation			Engineering			Environmental Utilities				Clerk	Parks & Recreation		
		Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	C'mnty Rel. Anlyst	Fire Insp S'pvsr	Bldg Insp S'pvsr	Alt'rn Trnsp Anlyst II	Alt'rn Trnsp Mgr	Admin Tech	(DS) City Eng'r	Sr Eng'r	(DS) Eng'r Mgr	Dev Tech	Sr Eng'r	Eng'r Mgr	Assoc Eng'r	City Clerk Tech	P&R Plan & Dev S'pvsr	P&R Tech	P&R D'rctr
B	Job Title																									
C	Hourly Rate Currently Used for Project Billing	\$74	\$103	\$132	\$132	\$145	\$167	\$192	\$230	\$61	\$120	\$107	\$81	\$100	\$47	\$206	\$176	\$232	\$103	\$177	\$234	\$146	\$51	\$184	\$103	\$302
D	Hourly Rates at Full Cost Recovery	\$119	\$167	\$213	\$213	\$235	\$270	\$310	\$372	\$109	\$222	\$230	\$140	\$173	\$82	\$279	\$237	\$313	\$106	\$182	\$241	\$150	\$75	\$281	\$158	\$461
E	Current Cost Recovery for Project Billing	62%	62%	62%	62%	62%	62%	62%	62%	56%	54%	47%	58%	58%	58%	74%	74%	74%	97%	97%	97%	97%	68%	66%	66%	66%

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Development Services (Planning - 08200)
Cost of Service at Targeted ICR Multiplier Rates

Planning Rates Currently Used for Project Billing

A		Core Svc Area	Planning								Police	Fire	Bldg	Alt'rn Transportation			Engineering			Environmental Utilities				Clerk	Parks & Recreation		
		Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	C'mnty Rel. Anlyst	Fire Insp S'pvsr	Bldg Insp S'pvsr	Alt'rn Trnsp Anlyst II	Alt'rn Trnsp Mgr	Admin Tech	(DS) City Eng'r	Sr Eng'r	(DS) Eng'r Mgr	Dev Tech	Sr Eng'r	Eng'r Mgr	Assoc Eng'r	City Clerk Tech	P&R Plan & Dev S'pvsr	P&R Tech	P&R D'rctr	
B	Job Title																										
C	Base Hourly Wage Rate		\$23	\$33	\$42	\$42	\$46	\$53	\$61	\$73	\$34	\$52	\$49	\$48	\$59	\$28	\$66	\$56	\$74	\$33	\$56	\$74	\$46	\$30	\$53	\$30	\$87
D	ICR Multiplier used for Project Billing		3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	1.80	2.32	2.17	1.69	1.69	1.69	3.13	3.13	3.13	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	1.69	3.48	3.48	3.48
E	Hourly Rate used for Project Billing		\$74	\$103	\$132	\$132	\$145	\$167	\$192	\$230	\$61	\$120	\$107	\$81	\$100	\$47	\$206	\$176	\$232	\$103	\$177	\$234	\$146	\$51	\$184	\$103	\$302

Estimated Costs for Required Meetings - At Targeted Hourly Billing Rates

		Estimated Labor Hours									Est Cost of Svc (Hourly Rate for Fee Setting * Est Labor Hrs)									Discrete Costs				Total Est Cost of Svc	
		Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	Total	Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	Total	Public Notice	SIRE Sys Cost	Total			
PC	Planning Comm, Design Comm, or Subdivision Comm	8.25		1.00	1.50			0.50		11.25	\$ 608	\$ -	\$ 132	\$ 198	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 96	\$ -	\$ 1,034	+	\$ 50	\$ 15	\$ 65	=	\$ 1,099
CC	Additional Public Hearing at City Council (legislative actions)	2.25			3.00			1.00	0.25	6.50	\$ 166	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 396	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 192	\$ 57	\$ 811	+	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	=	\$ 811
AR	Administrative Review (Public Hearing not Required)	4.50		0.25	1.50			0.50		6.75	\$ 332	\$ -	\$ 33	\$ 198	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 96	\$ -	\$ 658	+	\$ -	\$ 15	\$ 15	=	\$ 673
NM	Neighborhood Meeting	0.50			3.75		3.00			7.25	\$ 37	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 495	\$ -	\$ 501	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,032	+	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	=	\$ 1,032
PN	Public Notice									0.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	+	\$ 50	\$ -	\$ 50	=	\$ 50

A		Core Svc Area																								
B	Job Title	Planning								Police	Fire	Bldg	Alt'rn Transportation			Engineering			Environmental Utilities				Clerk	Parks & Recreation		
		Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	C'mnty Rel. Anlyst	Fire Insp S'pvsr	Bldg Insp S'pvsr	Alt'rn Trnsp Anlyst II	Alt'rn Trnsp Mgr	Admin Tech	(DS) City Eng'r	Sr Eng'r	(DS) Eng'r Mgr	Dev Tech	Sr Eng'r	Eng'r Mgr	Assoc Eng'r	City Clerk Tech	P&R Plan & Dev S'pvsr	P&R Tech	P&R D'rctr
		\$23	\$33	\$42	\$42	\$46	\$53	\$61	\$73	\$34	\$52	\$49	\$48	\$59	\$28	\$66	\$56	\$74	\$33	\$56	\$74	\$46	\$30	\$53	\$30	\$87
		3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	1.80	2.32	2.17	1.69	1.69	1.69	3.13	3.13	3.13	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	1.69	3.48	3.48	3.48
		\$74	\$103	\$132	\$132	\$145	\$167	\$192	\$230	\$61	\$120	\$107	\$81	\$100	\$47	\$206	\$176	\$232	\$103	\$177	\$234	\$146	\$51	\$184	\$103	\$302
E		Hourly Rate used for Project Billing																								

Estimated Cost of Service at Targeted Hourly Billing Rates

Fee Description		Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	C'mnty Rel. Anlyst	Fire Insp S'pvsr	Bldg Insp S'pvsr	Alt'r'n Trnsp Anlyst II	Alt'r'n Trnsp Mgr	Admin Tech	(DS) City Eng'r	Sr Eng'r	(DS) Eng'r Mgr	Dev Tech	Sr Eng'r	Eng'r Mgr	Assoc Eng'r	City Clerk Tech	P&R Plan & Dev S'pvsr	P&R Tech	P&R D'rctr	Total	PC	CC	AR	NM	PN			
	Appeals																																		
1	Planning Director's Decision				9.5			4.5	1.0																		15.0	Yes							
2	PC/DC to City Council				10.0			3.5	1.5																		15.0		Yes						
Annexations (Full Cost)																																			
1	Annex/PZ/Detach/SOI			30.0	34.5			6.5	0.5																		71.5	Yes	Yes			Yes			
Development Agreements (DA)																																			
1	Adoption of DA			10.0	14.0			5.0	1.5		3.0		3.5	1.0		15.0	4.0	7.0		14.0	7.0		2.0	5.0	5.5	5.0	102.5	Yes	Yes						
2	Amendment of DA			10.0	14.0			5.0	1.5	0.5	3.0	0.5	2.0			15.0	4.0	7.0	0.5	14.0	7.0		2.0	5.0	5.5	5.0	101.5	Yes	Yes						
3	Associated with Affordable Housing				10.0			2.5																			12.5	Yes	Yes						
4	Associated with Single Topic Item			9.0	10.0			2.5																			21.5	Yes	Yes						
Environmental Review																																			
1	Exemption without Initial Study	0.5			1.5																						2.0								
2	Exemption with Initial Study	0.5			4.3																						4.8								
3	Negative Declaration with No Mitigation	0.5			6.5																						7.0								
4	Tiered Negative Declaration with Mitigation	0.5			12.5			1.0																			14.0								
5	EIR Deposit			18.0	34.0			6.5	0.5	0.5	3.0	0.5					4.0		0.5	7.0	1.0	24.0	2.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	111.5	Yes	Yes			Yes			
General Plan Amendment (GPA)																																			
1	GPA 10 Acres or Less, Map/Text			18.0	26.0			5.0	0.5	0.5	3.0	0.5					10.0	4.0	0.5	5.0	4.0	8.0	2.0	6.5	7.0	7.0	107.5	Yes	Yes						
2	GPA 10+ Acres, Map/Text			20.0	34.0			6.5	0.5	0.5	3.0	0.5	1.0				15.0	6.0	0.5	7.0	4.0	12.0	2.0	6.5	7.0	7.0	133.0	Yes	Yes			Yes			
3	GPA-Text/Policy Amend			18.0	34.0			6.5	0.5	0.5	3.0	0.5					10.0	4.0	0.5	5.0	1.0	8.0	2.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	103.5	Yes	Yes			Yes			
Public Utility Easement Abandonment																																			
1	Summary Vacation				4.0			1.5	0.5	0.5		0.5	0.5		0.5				0.5	1.0	1.0	2.0			0.5		13.0				Yes				
2	General Vacation				7.5			2.5	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5		0.5	2.0			0.5	1.0	1.0	2.0		1.0	0.5		21.5	Yes							
Signs																																			
1	Standard Sign Permit	0.3	2.8																								3.0								
2	Planned Sign Permit Program (PSP)				5.0			1.0																			6.0					Yes			
3	Sign Permit/Program Public Hearing Req	4.3			7.3			1.5																			13.0					Yes		Yes	
4	Administrative Permit for Sign Exception				7.0			0.5	0.3																		7.8					Yes			
5	PSP Minor Modification			1.5																							1.5								
Specific Plan Amendment (SPA)																																			
1	SPA Adoption, Map or Text			22.0	34.0			6.5	0.5	0.5	3.0	0.5	2.0			15.0	20.0	5.0	0.5	20.0	7.0		2.0	10.0	11.0	11.0	170.5	Yes	Yes			Yes			
2	SPA 10 Acres or Less			20.0	27.0			5.5	0.5	0.5	3.0	0.5	1.0			10.0	20.0			15.0	3.0	10.0	2.0				118.0	Yes	Yes			Yes			
3	SPA 10+ Acres, Map/Text			26.0	34.0			7.0	0.5	0.5	3.0	0.5	4.0		1.5	10.0	28.0	3.0		20.0	3.0	15.0	2.0	6.5	7.0	7.0	178.5	Yes	Yes			Yes			
4	SPA Text/Policy Deposit			22.0	34.5			8.0	0.5	0.5	3.0	0.5				5.0	15.0	2.0	0.5	5.0	2.0	10.0	2.0	6.5	7.0	7.0	131.0	Yes	Yes			Yes			
Subdivisions																																			
1	Grading Plan/Minor				5.0			5.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5			0.5	2.0			0.5	1.0	1.0	2.0		1.0	0.5		21.5				Yes				

A		Core Svc Area																								
B	Job Title	Planning								Police	Fire	Bldg	Alt'r'n Transportation			Engineering			Environmental Utilities				Clerk	Parks & Recreation		
		Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	C'mnty Rel. Anlyst	Fire Insp S'pvsr	Bldg Insp S'pvsr	Alt'r'n Trnsp Anlyst II	Alt'r'n Trnsp Mgr	Admin Tech	(DS) City Eng'r	Sr Eng'r	(DS) Eng'r Mgr	Dev Tech	Sr Eng'r	Eng'r Mgr	Assoc Eng'r	City Clerk Tech	P&R Plan & Dev S'pvsr	P&R Tech	P&R D'rctr
		\$23	\$33	\$42	\$42	\$46	\$53	\$61	\$73	\$34	\$52	\$49	\$48	\$59	\$28	\$66	\$56	\$74	\$33	\$56	\$74	\$46	\$30	\$53	\$30	\$87
C	Base Hourly Wage Rate	\$23	\$33	\$42	\$42	\$46	\$53	\$61	\$73	\$34	\$52	\$49	\$48	\$59	\$28	\$66	\$56	\$74	\$33	\$56	\$74	\$46	\$30	\$53	\$30	\$87
D	ICR Multiplier used for Project Billing	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	1.80	2.32	2.17	1.69	1.69	1.69	3.13	3.13	3.13	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	1.69	3.48	3.48	3.48
E	Hourly Rate used for Project Billing	\$74	\$103	\$132	\$132	\$145	\$167	\$192	\$230	\$61	\$120	\$107	\$81	\$100	\$47	\$206	\$176	\$232	\$103	\$177	\$234	\$146	\$51	\$184	\$103	\$302

Estimated Cost of Service at Targeted Hourly Billing Rates

Fee Description		Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	C'mnty Rel. Anlyst	Fire Insp S'pvsr	Bldg Insp S'pvsr	Alt'r'n Trnsp Anlyst II	Alt'r'n Trnsp Mgr	Admin Tech	(DS) City Eng'r	Sr Eng'r	(DS) Eng'r Mgr	Dev Tech	Sr Eng'r	Eng'r Mgr	Assoc Eng'r	City Clerk Tech	P&R Plan & Dev S'pvsr	P&R Tech	P&R D'rctr	Total Labor Svcs	+	PC	CC	AR	NM	PN	Total Mtgs	=	Total Est. Cost of Svc	
1	Appeals Planning Director's Decision	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,253	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 864	\$ 230	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,346	+	\$ 1,099	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,099	=	\$ 3,445
2	PC/DC to City Council	-	-	-	1,319	-	-	672	345	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 2,335	+	-	811	-	-	-	-	\$ 811	=	\$ 3,146
Annexations (Full Cost)																																					
1	Annex/PZ/Detach/SOI	-	-	3,957	4,551	-	-	1,247	115	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 9,871	+	1,099	811	-	1,032	-	\$ 2,941	=	\$ 12,812	
Development Agreements (DA)																																					
1	Adoption of DA	-	-	1,319	1,847	-	-	959	345	-	361	-	285	100	-	3,097	703	1,626	-	2,475	1,636	-	102	922	568	1,510	\$ 17,855	+	1,099	811	-	-	-	\$ 1,909	=	\$ 19,764	
2	Amendment of DA	-	-	1,319	1,847	-	-	959	345	30	361	54	163	-	-	3,097	703	1,626	51	2,475	1,636	-	102	922	568	1,510	\$ 17,768	+	1,099	811	-	-	-	\$ 1,909	=	\$ 19,678	
3	Associated with Affordable Housing	-	-	-	1,319	-	-	480	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 1,799	+	1,099	811	-	-	-	\$ 1,909	=	\$ 3,708	
4	Associated with Single Topic Item	-	-	1,187	1,319	-	-	480	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 2,986	+	1,099	811	-	-	-	\$ 1,909	=	\$ 4,895	
Environmental Review																																					
1	Exemption without Initial Study	37	-	-	198	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 235	+	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -	=	\$ 235	
2	Exemption with Initial Study	37	-	-	561	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 597	+	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -	=	\$ 597	
3	Negative Declaration with No Mitigation	37	-	-	857	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 894	+	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -	=	\$ 894	
4	Tiered Negative Declaration with Mitigation	37	-	-	1,649	-	-	192	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 1,878	+	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -	=	\$ 1,878	
5	EIR Deposit	-	-	2,374	4,485	-	-	1,247	115	30	361	54	-	-	-	-	703	-	51	1,237	234	3,498	102	553	362	1,057	\$ 16,464	+	1,099	811	-	1,032	-	\$ 2,941	=	\$ 19,405	
General Plan Amendment (GPA)																																					
1	GPA 10 Acres or Less, Map/Text	-	-	2,374	3,430	-	-	959	115	30	361	54	-	-	-	-	1,757	929	51	884	935	1,166	102	1,198	723	2,114	\$ 17,184	+	1,099	811	-	-	-	\$ 1,909	=	\$ 19,093	
2	GPA 10+ Acres, Map/Text	-	-	2,638	4,485	-	-	1,247	115	30	361	54	81	-	-	-	2,635	1,394	51	1,237	935	1,749	102	1,198	723	2,114	\$ 21,151	+	1,099	811	-	1,032	-	\$ 2,941	=	\$ 24,093	
3	GPA-Text/Policy Amend	-	-	2,374	4,485	-	-	1,247	115	30	361	54	-	-	-	-	1,757	929	51	884	234	1,166	102	553	362	1,057	\$ 15,761	+	1,099	811	-	1,032	-	\$ 2,941	=	\$ 18,703	
Public Utility Easement Abandonment																																					
1	Summary Vacation	-	-	-	528	-	-	288	115	30	-	54	41	-	24	-	-	-	51	177	234	291	-	-	52	-	\$ 1,884	+	-	-	673	-	-	\$ 673	=	\$ 2,557	
2	General Vacation	-	-	-	989	-	-	480	230	30	60	54	41	-	24	413	-	-	51	177	234	291	-	184	52	-	\$ 3,310	+	1,099	-	-	-	-	\$ 1,099	=	\$ 4,408	
Signs																																					
1	Standard Sign Permit	18	283	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 301	+	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -	=	\$ 301	
2	Planned Sign Permit Program (PSP)	-	-	-	660	-	-	192	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 851	+	-	-	673	-	-	\$ 673	=	\$ 1,525	
3	Sign Permit/Program Public Hearing Req	313	-	-	956	-	-	288	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 1,557	+	-	-	-	-	50	\$ 50	=	\$ 1,607	
4	Administrative Permit for Sign Exception	-	-	-	923	-	-	96	57	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 1,077	+	-	-	673	-	-	\$ 673	=	\$ 1,750	
5	PSP Minor Modification	-	-	198	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 198	+	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -	=	\$ 198	
Specific Plan Amendment (SPA)																																					
1	SPA Adoption, Map or Text	-	-	2,902	4,485	-	-	1,247	115	30	361	54	163	-	-	3,097	3,513	1,161	51	3,536	1,636	-	102	1,844	1,137	3,323	\$ 28,757	+	1,099	811	-	1,032	-	\$ 2,941	=	\$ 31,698	
2	SPA 10 Acres or Less	-	-	2,638	3,562	-	-	1,055	115	30	361	54	81	-	-	2,065	3,513	-	-	2,652	701	1,457	102	-	-	-	\$ 18,387	+	1,099	811	-	1,032	-	\$ 2,941	=	\$ 21,328	
3	SPA 10+ Acres, Map/Text	-	-	3,430	4,485	-	-	1,343	115	30	361	54	325	-	71	2,065	4,918	697	-	3,536	701	2,186	102	1,198	723	2,114	\$ 28,455	+	1,099	811	-	1,032	-	\$ 2,941	=	\$ 31,397	
4	SPA Text/Policy Deposit	-	-	2,902	4,551	-	-	1,535	115	30	361	54	-	-	-	1,032	2,635	465	51	884	468	1,457	102	1,198	723	2,114	\$ 20,678	+	1,099	811	-	1,032	-	\$ 2,941	=	\$ 23,620	
Subdivisions																																					
1	Grading Plan/Minor	-	-	-	660	-	-	1,055	115	30	60	54	41	-	24	413	-	-	51	177	234	291	-	184	52	-	\$ 3,441	+	-	-	673	-	-	\$ 673	=	\$ 4,114	

A	Core Svc Area
B	Job Title
C	Base Hourly Wage Rate
D	ICR Multiplier used for Project Billing
E	Hourly Rate used for Project Billing

Estimated Cost of Service at Targeted Hourly Billing Rates

Fee Description		Current Fixed Fee	Current Deposit	Fixed Fee / Deposit	Current Cost Recovery at Target ICRs	Final Cost Recovery Target Using Existing ICR Multipliers	Proposed Fixed Fee	Proposed Deposit	Fixed Fee / Deposit	Proposed Cost Recovery at Target ICRs	Final Cost Recovery Target Using Existing ICR Multipliers	Fixed Fee Change \$	Deposit Change \$	Fixed Fee Change %	Deposit Change %
1	Appeals														
1	Planning Director's Decision	\$1,171		Fixed	34%	30%	\$1,171		Fixed	34%	30%	\$0		0%	
2	PC/DC to City Council	\$1,096		Fixed	35%	30%	\$1,096		Fixed	35%	30%	\$0		0%	
	Annexations (Full Cost)														
1	Annex/PZ/Detach/SOI		\$20,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$20,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
	Development Agreements (DA)														
1	Adoption of DA		\$20,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$20,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
2	Amendment of DA		\$20,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$20,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
3	Associated with Affordable Housing	\$2,134		Fixed	58%	50%	\$2,134		Fixed	58%	50%	\$0		0%	
4	Associated with Single Topic Item	\$4,825		Fixed	99%	100%	\$4,825		Fixed	99%	100%	\$0		0%	
	Environmental Review														
1	Exemption without Initial Study	\$282		Fixed	120%	100%	\$282		Fixed	120%	100%	\$0		0%	
2	Exemption with Initial Study	\$712		Fixed	119%	100%	\$712		Fixed	119%	100%	\$0		0%	
3	Negative Declaration with No Mitigation	\$1,069		Fixed	120%	100%	\$1,069		Fixed	120%	100%	\$0		0%	
4	Tiered Negative Declaration with Mitigation	\$2,218		Fixed	118%	100%	\$2,218		Fixed	118%	100%	\$0		0%	
5	EIR Deposit		\$20,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$20,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
	General Plan Amendment (GPA)														
1	GPA 10 Acres or Less, Map/Text		\$10,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$10,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
2	GPA 10+ Acres, Map/Text		\$17,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$17,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
3	GPA-Text/Policy Amend		\$15,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$15,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
	Public Utility Easement Abandonment														
1	Summary Vacation	\$2,203		Fixed	86%	100%	\$2,203		Fixed	86%	100%	\$0		0%	
2	General Vacation	\$3,208		Fixed	73%	100%	\$3,208		Fixed	73%	100%	\$0		0%	
	Signs														
1	Standard Sign Permit	\$227		Fixed	75%	50%	\$227		Fixed	75%	50%	\$0		0%	
2	Planned Sign Permit Program (PSP)	\$874		Fixed	57%	50%	\$874		Fixed	57%	50%	\$0		0%	
3	Sign Permit/Program Public Hearing Req	\$1,777		Fixed	111%	100%	\$1,777		Fixed	111%	100%	\$0		0%	
4	Administrative Permit for Sign Exception	\$1,469		Fixed	84%	100%	\$1,469		Fixed	84%	100%	\$0		0%	
5	PSP Minor Modification	\$210		Fixed	106%	100%	\$210		Fixed	106%	100%	\$0		0%	
	Specific Plan Amendment (SPA)														
1	SPA Adoption, Map or Text		\$30,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$30,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
2	SPA 10 Acres or Less		\$10,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$10,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
3	SPA 10+ Acres, Map/Text		\$20,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$20,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
4	SPA Text/Policy Deposit		\$15,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$15,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
	Subdivisions														
1	Grading Plan/Minor	\$2,018		Fixed	49%	100%	\$2,018		Fixed	49%	100%	\$0		0%	

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Development Services (Planning - 08200)
Cost of Service at Targeted ICR Multiplier Rates

A		Core Svc Area																								
B	Job Title	Planning								Police	Fire	Bldg	Alt'rn Transportation			Engineering			Environmental Utilities				Clerk	Parks & Recreation		
		Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	C'mnty Rel. Anlyst	Fire Insp S'pvsr	Bldg Insp S'pvsr	Alt'rn Trnsp Anlyst II	Alt'rn Trnsp Mgr	Admin Tech	(DS) City Eng'r	Sr Eng'r	(DS) Eng'r Mgr	Dev Tech	Sr Eng'r	Eng'r Mgr	Assoc Eng'r	City Clerk Tech	P&R Plan & Dev S'pvsr	P&R Tech	P&R D'rctr
		\$23	\$33	\$42	\$42	\$46	\$53	\$61	\$73	\$34	\$52	\$49	\$48	\$59	\$28	\$66	\$56	\$74	\$33	\$56	\$74	\$46	\$30	\$53	\$30	\$87
		3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	1.80	2.32	2.17	1.69	1.69	1.69	3.13	3.13	3.13	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	1.69	3.48	3.48	3.48
		\$74	\$103	\$132	\$132	\$145	\$167	\$192	\$230	\$61	\$120	\$107	\$81	\$100	\$47	\$206	\$176	\$232	\$103	\$177	\$234	\$146	\$51	\$184	\$103	\$302

Estimated Cost of Service at Targeted Hourly Billing Rates

|--|

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Development Services (Planning - 08200)
Cost of Service at Targeted ICR Multiplier Rates

A		Core Svc Area																								
B	Job Title	Planning								Police	Fire	Bldg	Alt'rn Transportation			Engineering			Environmental Utilities				Clerk	Parks & Recreation		
		Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	C'mnty Rel. Anlyst	Fire Insp S'pvsr	Bldg Insp S'pvsr	Alt'rn Trnsp Anlyst II	Alt'rn Trnsp Mgr	Admin Tech	(DS) City Eng'r	Sr Eng'r	(DS) Eng'r Mgr	Dev Tech	Sr Eng'r	Eng'r Mgr	Assoc Eng'r	City Clerk Tech	P&R Plan & Dev S'pvsr	P&R Tech	P&R D'rctr
		\$23	\$33	\$42	\$42	\$46	\$53	\$61	\$73	\$34	\$52	\$49	\$48	\$59	\$28	\$66	\$56	\$74	\$33	\$56	\$74	\$46	\$30	\$53	\$30	\$87
C	Base Hourly Wage Rate	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	1.80	2.32	2.17	1.69	1.69	1.69	3.13	3.13	3.13	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	1.69	3.48	3.48	3.48
D	ICR Multiplier used for Project Billing	\$74	\$103	\$132	\$132	\$145	\$167	\$192	\$230	\$61	\$120	\$107	\$81	\$100	\$47	\$206	\$176	\$232	\$103	\$177	\$234	\$146	\$51	\$184	\$103	\$302
E	Hourly Rate used for Project Billing																									

Estimated Cost of Service at Targeted Hourly Billing Rates

|--|

A	Core Svc Area
B	Job Title
C	Base Hourly Wage Rate
D	ICR Multiplier used for Project Billing
E	Hourly Rate used for Project Billing

Estimated Cost of Service at Targeted Hourly Billing Rates

Fee Description		Current Fixed Fee	Current Deposit	Fixed Fee / Deposit	Current Cost Recovery at Target ICRs	Final Cost Recovery Target Using Existing ICR Multipliers	Proposed Fixed Fee	Proposed Deposit	Fixed Fee / Deposit	Proposed Cost Recovery at Target ICRs	Final Cost Recovery Target Using Existing ICR Multipliers	Fixed Fee Change \$	Deposit Change \$	Fixed Fee Change %	Deposit Change %
2	Grading Plan/Major		\$8,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$8,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
3	Lot Line Adjustment	\$2,018		Fixed	49%	100%	\$2,018		Fixed	49%	100%	\$0		0%	
4	Extension to a Tentative Map	\$2,018		Fixed	49%	100%	\$2,018		Fixed	49%	100%	\$0		0%	
5	Voluntary Merger	\$2,018		Fixed	49%	100%	\$2,018		Fixed	49%	100%	\$0		0%	
6	Reversion to Acreage	\$2,880		Fixed	43%	100%	\$2,880		Fixed	43%	100%	\$0		0%	
7	Minor Modification to a Tentative Map		\$2,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$2,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
8	Major Modification to a Tentative Map		\$10,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$10,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
9	Tentative Parcel Map with 4 or fewer lots		\$6,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$6,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
10	Tentative Map, 5 through 99 lots		\$11,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$11,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
11	Tentative Map, 100 through 499 lots		\$16,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$16,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
12	Tentative Map, 500+ lots		\$24,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$24,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
Zoning Ordinance Entitlements															
1	Administrative Permit	\$1,006		Fixed	55%	50%	\$1,006		Fixed	55%	50%	\$0		0%	
2	Conditional Use Permit		\$9,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$9,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
3	CUP Modification		\$5,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$5,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
4	CUP Extension	\$4,630		Fixed	110%	100%	\$4,630		Fixed	110%	100%	\$0		0%	
5	Design Review Permit		\$8,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$8,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
6	DRP Modification		\$5,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$5,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
7	DRP Extension	\$4,124		Fixed	102%	100%	\$4,124		Fixed	102%	100%	\$0		0%	
8	Minor DRP	\$156		Fixed	112%	100%	\$156		Fixed	112%	100%	\$0		0%	
9	DRP- Additional or New Construction (DTSP only)	\$156		Fixed		100%	\$156		Fixed		100%	\$0		0%	
10	DRP- Façade Improvements (DTSP only)	\$156		Fixed		100%	\$156		Fixed		100%	\$0		0%	
11	DRP - Predesign (DTSP only)	\$156		Fixed		100%	\$156		Fixed		100%	\$0		0%	
12	DRP/Residential Subdivision w/other Permit	\$4,481		Fixed	100%	100%	\$4,481		Fixed	100%	100%	\$0		0%	
13	Flood Encroachment Permit		\$8,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$8,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
14	MPP Stg 1 or Stages 1&2		\$20,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$20,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
15	MPP Modification		\$7,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$7,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
16	MPP Stg 2, Mod/Exten of Stage 1 &/or 2		\$7,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$7,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
17	MPP Administrative Modification	\$1,285		Fixed	122%	100%	\$1,285		Fixed	122%	100%	\$0		0%	
18	Planned Development Permit		\$11,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$11,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
19	TP Admin - Approved Public Counter	\$157		Fixed	125%	100%	\$157		Fixed	125%	100%	\$0		0%	
20	TP-Req PH for SFD or less than 10 trees	\$3,108		Fixed	110%	100%	\$3,108		Fixed	110%	100%	\$0		0%	
21	TP-Req PH for DRP/TM or 11+ trees	\$4,750		Fixed	113%	100%	\$4,750		Fixed	113%	100%	\$0		0%	
22	Administrative Variance	\$1,004		Fixed	57%	50%	\$1,004		Fixed	57%	50%	\$0		0%	
23	Variance to Develop. Standards Req PH	\$3,555		Fixed	110%	100%	\$3,555		Fixed	110%	100%	\$0		0%	
24	Variance to Parking Standards	\$4,234		Fixed	111%	100%	\$4,234		Fixed	111%	100%	\$0		0%	

A		Core Svc Area																									
B	Job Title	Planning								Police	Fire	Bldg	Alt'rn Transportation			Engineering			Environmental Utilities				Clerk	Parks & Recreation			
		Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	C'mnty Rel. Anlyst	Fire Insp S'pvsr	Bldg Insp S'pvsr	Alt'rn Trnsp Anlyst II	Alt'rn Trnsp Mgr	Admin Tech	(DS) City Eng'r	Sr Eng'r	(DS) Eng'r Mgr	Dev Tech	Sr Eng'r	Eng'r Mgr	Assoc Eng'r	City Clerk Tech	P&R Plan & Dev S'pvsr	P&R Tech	P&R D'rctr	
		\$23	\$33	\$42	\$42	\$46	\$53	\$61	\$73	\$34	\$52	\$49	\$48	\$59	\$28	\$66	\$56	\$74	\$33	\$56	\$74	\$46	\$30	\$53	\$30	\$87	
		3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	1.80	2.32	2.17	1.69	1.69	1.69	3.13	3.13	3.13	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	1.69	3.48	3.48	3.48	
		\$74	\$103	\$132	\$132	\$145	\$167	\$192	\$230	\$61	\$120	\$107	\$81	\$100	\$47	\$206	\$176	\$232	\$103	\$177	\$234	\$146	\$51	\$184	\$103	\$302	

Estimated Cost of Service at Targeted Hourly Billing Rates

Fee Description		Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	C'mnty Rel. Anlyst	Fire Insp S'pvsr	Bldg Insp S'pvsr	Alt'r'n Trnsp Anlyst II	Alt'r'n Trnsp Mgr	Admin Tech	(DS) City Eng'r	Sr Eng'r	(DS) Eng'r Mgr	Dev Tech	Sr Eng'r	Eng'r Mgr	Assoc Eng'r	City Clerk Tech	P&R Plan & Dev S'pvsr	P&R Tech	P&R D'rctr	Total	PC	CC	AR	NM	PN
25	Zoning Clearance Approved Public Counter		1.5																								1.5					
26	Zoning Interpretation - Hearing Required				7.0			1.0	0.5																		8.5	Yes				
27	Zoning Interpretation - Non-Hearing Item (ZI/City - Zoning Ordinance Amendments				1.0			0.3																			1.3					
1	Zoning Text Amend (Zoning, Subd, Sign (Full Cost/Deposit) (OA/City)			14.0	22.0			6.5	1.0	0.5	3.0	0.5				5.0	10.0	5.0	0.5	5.0	1.0	10.0	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	94.5	Yes	Yes			
2	Zoning Map Change (RZ) 10 Acres or Less (RZ/City -			14.0	26.5			6.5	0.5	0.5	3.0	0.5	0.5		0.5	5.0	10.0		0.5				2.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	78.0	Yes	Yes			
3	Zoning Map Change (RZ) 11+ Acres (Full Other			21.0	28.0			6.5	0.5	0.5	3.0	0.5	0.5		0.5	5.0	10.0	3.0	0.5	7.0	1.0	10.0	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	108.0	Yes	Yes		Yes	
1	Pre-Application Meeting																															
2	Non-Residential Plan Check		0.3		8.0			0.5					1.0														9.8					
3	Commercial Tenant Improvement Review																															
4	Planning Dept Plot Plan Review(Bundle of 10)		1.0																								1.0					
5	Radius List Prep-Previously Developed Area		0.8																								0.8					
6	Preparation-Undeveloped Area/Mailing		2.0																								2.0					
7	Farmer's Market (Farmer)				3.5			0.5																			4.0			Yes		
8	Home Occupation Permit																															
9	Parking in Lieu Fee (DTSP Only)1																															
10	In-Lieu Tree Mitigation Fee																															
11	CUP-Vernon St. & HOT Only																															
12	Technology Fee																															

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Development Services (Planning - 08200)
Cost of Service at Targeted ICR Multiplier Rates

A		Planning								Police	Fire	Bldg	Alt'rn Transportation			Engineering			Environmental Utilities				Clerk	Parks & Recreation			
B	Job Title	Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	C'mnty Rel. Anlyst	Fire Insp S'pvsr	Bldg Insp S'pvsr	Alt'rn Trnsp Anlyst II	Alt'rn Trnsp Mgr	Admin Tech	(DS) City Eng'r	Sr Eng'r	(DS) Eng'r Mgr	Dev Tech	Sr Eng'r	Eng'r Mgr	Assoc Eng'r	City Clerk Tech	P&R Plan & Dev S'pvsr	P&R Tech	P&R D'rctr	
		\$23	\$33	\$42	\$42	\$46	\$53	\$61	\$73	\$34	\$52	\$49	\$48	\$59	\$28	\$66	\$56	\$74	\$33	\$56	\$74	\$46	\$30	\$53	\$30	\$87	
		3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	1.80	2.32	2.17	1.69	1.69	1.69	3.13	3.13	3.13	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	1.69	3.48	3.48	3.48	
		D ICR Multiplier used for Project Billing																									
		E Hourly Rate used for Project Billing		\$74	\$103	\$132	\$132	\$145	\$167	\$192	\$230	\$61	\$120	\$107	\$81	\$100	\$47	\$206	\$176	\$232	\$103	\$177	\$234	\$146	\$51	\$184	\$103

Estimated Cost of Service at Targeted Hourly Billing Rates

Fee Description		Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	C'mnty Rel. Anlyst	Fire Insp S'pvsr	Bldg Insp S'pvsr	Alt'n Trnsp Anlyst II	Alt'n Trnsp Mgr	Admin Tech	(DS) City Eng'r	Sr Eng'r	(DS) Eng'r Mgr	Dev Tech	Sr Eng'r	Eng'r Mgr	Assoc Eng'r	City Clerk Tech	P&R Plan & Dev S'pvsr	P&R Tech	P&R D'rctr	Total Labor Svcs	+	PC	CC	AR	NM	PN	Total Mtgs	=	Total Est. Cost of Svc
25	Zoning Clearance Approved Public Counter	-	154	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 154	+	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -	=	\$ 154
26	Zoning Interpretation - Hearing Required	-	-	-	923	-	-	192	115	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 1,230	+	1,099	-	-	-	-	\$ 1,099	=	\$ 2,329
27	Zoning Interpretation - Non-Hearing Item (ZI/City - Zoning Ordinance Amendments	-	-	-	132	-	-	48	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 180	+	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -	=	\$ 180
1	Zoning Text Amend (Zoning, Subd, Sign (Full Cost/Deposit) (OA/City)	-	-	1,847	2,902	-	-	1,247	230	30	361	54	-	-	-	1,032	1,757	1,161	51	884	234	1,457	102	461	310	906	\$ 15,027		1,099	811	-	-	-	\$ 1,909		\$ 16,936
2	Zoning Map Change (RZ) 10 Acres or Less (RZ/City -	-	-	1,847	3,496	-	-	1,247	115	30	361	54	41	-	24	1,032	1,757	-	-	-	-	-	102	461	310	906	\$ 11,782	+	1,099	811	-	-	-	\$ 1,909	=	\$ 13,691
3	Zoning Map Change (RZ) 11+ Acres (Full Other	-	-	2,770	3,694	-	-	1,247	115	30	361	54	41	-	24	1,032	1,757	697	51	1,237	234	1,457	102	461	310	906	\$ 16,580	+	1,099	811	-	1,032	-	\$ 2,941	=	\$ 19,521
1	Pre-Application Meeting	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		+	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -	=	\$ -
2	Non-Residential Plan Check	-	26	-	1,055	-	-	96	-	-	-	-	81	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 1,258	+	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -	=	\$ 1,258
3	Commercial Tenant Improvement Review	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		+	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -	=	\$ -
4	Planning Dept Plot Plan Review(Bundle of 10)	-	103	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 103	+	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -	=	\$ 103
5	Radius List Prep-Previously Developed Area	-	77	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 77	+	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -	=	\$ 77
6	Preparation-Undeveloped Area/Mailing	-	206	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 206	+	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -	=	\$ 206
7	Farmer's Market (Farmer)	-	-	-	462	-	-	96	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 558	+	-	-	673	-	-	\$ 673	=	\$ 1,231
8	Home Occupation Permit	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		+	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -	=	\$ -
9	Parking in Lieu Fee (DTSP Only)1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		+	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -	=	\$ -
10	In-Lieu Tree Mitigation Fee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		+	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -	=	\$ -
11	CUP-Vernon St. & HOT Only	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		+	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -	=	\$ -
12	Technology Fee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		+	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -	=	\$ -

A	Core Svc Area
B	Job Title
C	Base Hourly Wage Rate
D	ICR Multiplier used for Project Billing
E	Hourly Rate used for Project Billing

Estimated Cost of Service at Targeted Hourly Billing Rates

Fee Description		Current Fixed Fee	Current Deposit	Fixed Fee / Deposit	Current Cost Recovery at Target ICRs	Final Cost Recovery Target Using Existing ICR Multipliers	Proposed Fixed Fee	Proposed Deposit	Fixed Fee / Deposit	Proposed Cost Recovery at Target ICRs	Final Cost Recovery Target Using Existing ICR Multipliers	Fixed Fee Change \$	Deposit Change \$	Fixed Fee Change %	Deposit Change %
25	Zoning Clearance Approved Public Counter	\$119		Fixed	77%	50%	\$119		Fixed	77%	50%	\$0		0%	
26	Zoning Interpretation - Hearing Required	\$2,663		Fixed	114%	100%	\$2,663		Fixed	114%	100%	\$0		0%	
27	Zoning Interpretation - Non-Hearing Item (ZI/City - Zoning Ordinance Amendments	\$104		Fixed	58%	50%	\$104		Fixed	58%	50%	\$0		0%	
1	Zoning Text Amend (Zoning, Subd, Sign (Full Cost/Deposit) (OA/City)		\$10,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$10,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
2	Zoning Map Change (RZ) 10 Acres or Less (RZ/City -		\$10,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$10,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
3	Zoning Map Change (RZ) 11+ Acres (Full Other		\$17,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$17,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
1	Pre-Application Meeting		\$4,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$4,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
2	Non-Residential Plan Check	[b]		Fixed			[b]		Fixed						
3	Commercial Tenant Improvement Review	\$117		Fixed		100%	\$117		Fixed		100%	\$0		0%	
4	Planning Dept Plot Plan Review(Bundle of 10)	\$117		Fixed		100%	\$117		Fixed		100%	\$0		0%	
5	Radius List Prep-Previously Developed Area	\$109		Fixed		100%	\$109		Fixed		100%	\$0		0%	
6	Preparation-Undeveloped Area/Mailing	\$272		Fixed		100%	\$272		Fixed		100%	\$0		0%	
7	Farmer's Market (Farmer)	\$368		Fixed	30%	50%	\$368		Fixed	30%	50%	\$0		0%	
8	Home Occupation Permit	\$119		Fixed		50%	\$119		Fixed		50%	\$0		0%	
9	Parking in Lieu Fee (DTSP Only)1	\$9,680		Fixed		100%	\$9,680		Fixed		100%	\$0		0%	
10	In-Lieu Tree Mitigation Fee	\$118		per inch			\$118		per inch			\$0		0%	
11	CUP-Vernon St. & HOT Only	\$1,006		Fixed		100%	\$1,006		Fixed		100%	\$0		0%	
12	Technology Fee	3%		Fixed			3%		Fixed			\$0		0%	

Planning Rates At Full Cost Recovery

A		Planning								Police	Fire	Bldg	Alt'rn Transportation			Engineering			Environmental Utilities				Clerk	Parks & Recreation			
B	Job Title	Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	C'mnty Rel. Anlyst	Fire Insp S'pvsr	Bldg Insp S'pvsr	Alt'rn Trnsp Anlyst II	Alt'rn Trnsp Mgr	Admin Tech	(DS) City Eng'r	Sr Eng'r	(DS) Eng'r Mgr	Dev Tech	Sr Eng'r	Eng'r Mgr	Assoc Eng'r	City Clerk Tech	P&R Plan & Dev S'pvsr	P&R Tech	P&R D'rctr	
		\$23	\$33	\$42	\$42	\$46	\$53	\$61	\$73	\$34	\$52	\$49	\$48	\$59	\$28	\$66	\$56	\$74	\$33	\$56	\$74	\$46	\$30	\$53	\$30	\$87	
		5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	3.24	4.29	4.66	2.92	2.92	2.92	4.22	4.22	4.22	3.25	3.25	3.25	3.25	2.50	5.31	5.31	5.31	
		E		Hourly Rate used for Project Billing	\$119	\$167	\$213	\$213	\$235	\$270	\$310	\$372	\$109	\$222	\$230	\$140	\$173	\$82	\$279	\$237	\$313	\$106	\$182	\$241	\$150	\$75	\$281

Estimated Costs for Required Meetings - At Full Cost Recovery

		Estimated Labor Hours									Est Cost of Svc (Hourly Rate for Fee Setting * Est Labor Hrs)									Discrete Costs					Total Est Cost of Svc
		Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	Total	Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	Total	Public Notice	SIRE Sys Cost	Total			
PC	Planning Comm, Design Comm, or Subdivision Comm	8.25		1.00	1.50			0.50		11.25	\$ 983	\$ -	\$ 213	\$ 320	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 155	\$ -	\$ 1,672	+	\$ 50	\$ 15	\$ 65	=	\$ 1,737
CC	Additional Public Hearing at City Council (legislative actions)	2.25			3.00			1.00	0.25	6.50	\$ 268	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 640	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 310	\$ 93	\$ 1,312	+	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	=	\$ 1,312
AR	Administrative Review (Public Hearing not Required)	4.50		0.25	1.50			0.50		6.75	\$ 536	\$ -	\$ 53	\$ 320	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 155	\$ -	\$ 1,065	+	\$ -	\$ 15	\$ 15	=	\$ 1,080
NM	Neighborhood Meeting	0.50			3.75		3.00			7.25	\$ 60	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 800	\$ -	\$ 810	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,670	+	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	=	\$ 1,670
PN	Public Notice									0.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	+	\$ 50	\$ -	\$ 50	=	\$ 50

A		Core Svc Area																								
B	Job Title	Planning								Police	Fire	Bldg	Alt'rn Transportation			Engineering			Environmental Utilities				Clerk	Parks & Recreation		
		Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	C'mnty Rel. Anlyst	Fire Insp S'pvsr	Bldg Insp S'pvsr	Alt'rn Trnsp Anlyst II	Alt'rn Trnsp Mgr	Admin Tech	(DS) City Eng'r	Sr Eng'r	(DS) Eng'r Mgr	Dev Tech	Sr Eng'r	Eng'r Mgr	Assoc Eng'r	City Clerk Tech	P&R Plan & Dev S'pvsr	P&R Tech	P&R D'rctr
		\$23	\$33	\$42	\$42	\$46	\$53	\$61	\$73	\$34	\$52	\$49	\$48	\$59	\$28	\$66	\$56	\$74	\$33	\$56	\$74	\$46	\$30	\$53	\$30	\$87
C	Base Hourly Wage Rate	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	3.24	4.29	4.66	2.92	2.92	2.92	4.22	4.22	4.22	3.25	3.25	3.25	3.25	2.50	5.31	5.31	5.31
D	ICR Multiplier used for Project Billing	\$119	\$167	\$213	\$213	\$235	\$270	\$310	\$372	\$109	\$222	\$230	\$140	\$173	\$82	\$279	\$237	\$313	\$106	\$182	\$241	\$150	\$75	\$281	\$158	\$461
E	Hourly Rate used for Project Billing																									

Estimated Cost of Service at Full Cost Recovery

Fee Description		Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	C'mnty Rel. Anlyst	Fire Insp S'pvsr	Bldg Insp S'pvsr	Alt'r'n Trnsp Anlyst II	Alt'r'n Trnsp Mgr	Admin Tech	(DS) City Eng'r	Sr Eng'r	(DS) Eng'r Mgr	Dev Tech	Sr Eng'r	Eng'r Mgr	Assoc Eng'r	City Clerk Tech	P&R Plan & Dev S'pvsr	P&R Tech	P&R D'rctr	Total	PC	CC	AR	NM	PN			
	Appeals																																		
1	Planning Director's Decision				9.5			4.5	1.0																		15.0	Yes							
2	PC/DC to City Council				10.0			3.5	1.5																		15.0		Yes						
Annexations (Full Cost)																																			
1	Annex/PZ/Detach/SOI			30.0	34.5			6.5	0.5																		71.5	Yes	Yes			Yes			
Development Agreements (DA)																																			
1	Adoption of DA			10.0	14.0			5.0	1.5		3.0		3.5	1.0		15.0	4.0	7.0		14.0	7.0		2.0	5.0	5.5	5.0	102.5	Yes	Yes						
2	Amendment of DA			10.0	14.0			5.0	1.5	0.5	3.0	0.5	2.0			15.0	4.0	7.0	0.5	14.0	7.0		2.0	5.0	5.5	5.0	101.5	Yes	Yes						
3	Associated with Affordable Housing				10.0			2.5																			12.5	Yes	Yes						
4	Associated with Single Topic Item			9.0	10.0			2.5																			21.5	Yes	Yes						
Environmental Review																																			
1	Exemption without Initial Study	0.5			1.5																						2.0								
2	Exemption with Initial Study	0.5			4.3																						4.8								
3	Negative Declaration with No Mitigation	0.5			6.5																						7.0								
4	Tiered Negative Declaration with Mitigation	0.5			12.5			1.0																			14.0								
5	EIR Deposit			18.0	34.0			6.5	0.5	0.5	3.0	0.5					4.0		0.5	7.0	1.0	24.0	2.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	111.5	Yes	Yes			Yes			
General Plan Amendment (GPA)																																			
1	GPA 10 Acres or Less, Map/Text			18.0	26.0			5.0	0.5	0.5	3.0	0.5					10.0	4.0	0.5	5.0	4.0	8.0	2.0	6.5	7.0	7.0	107.5	Yes	Yes						
2	GPA 10+ Acres, Map/Text			20.0	34.0			6.5	0.5	0.5	3.0	0.5	1.0				15.0	6.0	0.5	7.0	4.0	12.0	2.0	6.5	7.0	7.0	133.0	Yes	Yes			Yes			
3	GPA-Text/Policy Amend			18.0	34.0			6.5	0.5	0.5	3.0	0.5					10.0	4.0	0.5	5.0	1.0	8.0	2.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	103.5	Yes	Yes			Yes			
Public Utility Easement Abandonment																																			
1	Summary Vacation				4.0			1.5	0.5	0.5		0.5	0.5		0.5				0.5	1.0	1.0	2.0			0.5		13.0				Yes				
2	General Vacation				7.5			2.5	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5		0.5	2.0			0.5	1.0	1.0	2.0		1.0	0.5		21.5	Yes							
Signs																																			
1	Standard Sign Permit	0.3	2.8																								3.0								
2	Planned Sign Permit Program (PSP)				5.0			1.0																			6.0					Yes			
3	Sign Permit/Program Public Hearing Req	4.3			7.3			1.5																			13.0					Yes			Yes
4	Administrative Permit for Sign Exception				7.0			0.5	0.3																		7.8					Yes			
5	PSP Minor Modification			1.5																							1.5								
Specific Plan Amendment (SPA)																																			
1	SPA Adoption, Map or Text			22.0	34.0			6.5	0.5	0.5	3.0	0.5	2.0			15.0	20.0	5.0	0.5	20.0	7.0		2.0	10.0	11.0	11.0	170.5	Yes	Yes			Yes			
2	SPA 10 Acres or Less			20.0	27.0			5.5	0.5	0.5	3.0	0.5	1.0			10.0	20.0			15.0	3.0	10.0	2.0				118.0	Yes	Yes			Yes			
3	SPA 10+ Acres, Map/Text			26.0	34.0			7.0	0.5	0.5	3.0	0.5	4.0		1.5	10.0	28.0	3.0		20.0	3.0	15.0	2.0	6.5	7.0	7.0	178.5	Yes	Yes			Yes			
4	SPA Text/Policy Deposit			22.0	34.5			8.0	0.5	0.5	3.0	0.5				5.0	15.0	2.0	0.5	5.0	2.0	10.0	2.0	6.5	7.0	7.0	131.0	Yes	Yes			Yes			
Subdivisions																																			
1	Grading Plan/Minor				5.0			5.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5		0.5	2.0			0.5	1.0	1.0	2.0		1.0	0.5		21.5				Yes				

A		Core Svc Area																								
B	Job Title	Planning								Police	Fire	Bldg	Alt'r'n Transportation			Engineering			Environmental Utilities				Clerk	Parks & Recreation		
		Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	C'mnty Rel. Anlyst	Fire Insp S'pvsr	Bldg Insp S'pvsr	Alt'r'n Trnsp Anlyst II	Alt'r'n Trnsp Mgr	Admin Tech	(DS) City Eng'r	Sr Eng'r	(DS) Eng'r Mgr	Dev Tech	Sr Eng'r	Eng'r Mgr	Assoc Eng'r	City Clerk Tech	P&R Plan & Dev S'pvsr	P&R Tech	P&R D'rctr
		\$23	\$33	\$42	\$42	\$46	\$53	\$61	\$73	\$34	\$52	\$49	\$48	\$59	\$28	\$66	\$56	\$74	\$33	\$56	\$74	\$46	\$30	\$53	\$30	\$87
		5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	3.24	4.29	4.66	2.92	2.92	2.92	4.22	4.22	4.22	3.25	3.25	3.25	3.25	2.50	5.31	5.31	5.31
		\$119	\$167	\$213	\$213	\$235	\$270	\$310	\$372	\$109	\$222	\$230	\$140	\$173	\$82	\$279	\$237	\$313	\$106	\$182	\$241	\$150	\$75	\$281	\$158	\$461

Estimated Cost of Service at Full Cost Recovery

|--|

A	Core Svc Area
B	Job Title
C	Base Hourly Wage Rate
D	ICR Multiplier used for Project Billing
E	Hourly Rate used for Project Billing

Estimated Cost of Service at Full Cost Recovery

Fee Description		Current Fixed Fee	Current Deposit	Fixed Fee / Deposit	Current Cost Recovery at Full ICRs	Final Cost Recovery Target	Proposed Fixed Fee	Proposed Deposit	Fixed Fee / Deposit	Proposed Cost Recovery at Full ICRs	Final Cost Recovery Target	Fixed Fee Change \$	Deposit Change \$	Fixed Fee Change %	Deposit Change %
1	Appeals														
1	Planning Director's Decision	\$1,171		Fixed	21%	30%	\$1,171		Fixed	21%	30%	\$0		0%	
2	PC/DC to City Council	\$1,096		Fixed	22%	30%	\$1,096		Fixed	22%	30%	\$0		0%	
	Annexations (Full Cost)														
1	Annex/PZ/Detach/SOI		\$20,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$20,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
	Development Agreements (DA)														
1	Adoption of DA		\$20,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$20,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
2	Amendment of DA		\$20,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$20,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
3	Associated with Affordable Housing	\$2,134		Fixed	36%	50%	\$2,134		Fixed	36%	50%	\$0		0%	
4	Associated with Single Topic Item	\$4,825		Fixed	61%	100%	\$4,825		Fixed	61%	100%	\$0		0%	
	Environmental Review														
1	Exemption without Initial Study	\$282		Fixed	74%	100%	\$282		Fixed	74%	100%	\$0		0%	
2	Exemption with Initial Study	\$712		Fixed	74%	100%	\$712		Fixed	74%	100%	\$0		0%	
3	Negative Declaration with No Mitigation	\$1,069		Fixed	74%	100%	\$1,069		Fixed	74%	100%	\$0		0%	
4	Tiered Negative Declaration with Mitigation	\$2,218		Fixed	73%	100%	\$2,218		Fixed	73%	100%	\$0		0%	
5	EIR Deposit		\$20,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$20,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
	General Plan Amendment (GPA)														
1	GPA 10 Acres or Less, Map/Text		\$10,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$10,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
2	GPA 10+ Acres, Map/Text		\$17,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$17,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
3	GPA-Text/Policy Amend		\$15,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$15,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
	Public Utility Easement Abandonment														
1	Summary Vacation	\$2,203		Fixed	59%	100%	\$2,203		Fixed	59%	100%	\$0		0%	
2	General Vacation	\$3,208		Fixed	49%	100%	\$3,208		Fixed	49%	100%	\$0		0%	
	Signs														
1	Standard Sign Permit	\$227		Fixed	47%	50%	\$227		Fixed	47%	50%	\$0		0%	
2	Planned Sign Permit Program (PSP)	\$874		Fixed	36%	50%	\$874		Fixed	36%	50%	\$0		0%	
3	Sign Permit/Program Public Hearing Req	\$1,777		Fixed	69%	100%	\$1,777		Fixed	69%	100%	\$0		0%	
4	Administrative Permit for Sign Exception	\$1,469		Fixed	52%	100%	\$1,469		Fixed	52%	100%	\$0		0%	
5	PSP Minor Modification	\$210		Fixed	66%	100%	\$210		Fixed	66%	100%	\$0		0%	
	Specific Plan Amendment (SPA)														
1	SPA Adoption, Map or Text		\$30,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$30,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
2	SPA 10 Acres or Less		\$10,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$10,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
3	SPA 10+ Acres, Map/Text		\$20,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$20,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
4	SPA Text/Policy Deposit		\$15,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$15,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
	Subdivisions														
1	Grading Plan/Minor	\$2,018		Fixed	33%	100%	\$2,018		Fixed	33%	100%	\$0		0%	

A		Core Svc Area																								
B	Job Title	Planning								Police	Fire	Bldg	Alt'rn Transportation			Engineering			Environmental Utilities				Clerk	Parks & Recreation		
		Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	C'mnty Rel. Anlyst	Fire Insp S'pvsr	Bldg Insp S'pvsr	Alt'rn Trnsp Anlyst II	Alt'rn Trnsp Mgr	Admin Tech	(DS) City Eng'r	Sr Eng'r	(DS) Eng'r Mgr	Dev Tech	Sr Eng'r	Eng'r Mgr	Assoc Eng'r	City Clerk Tech	P&R Plan & Dev S'pvsr	P&R Tech	P&R D'rctr
		\$23	\$33	\$42	\$42	\$46	\$53	\$61	\$73	\$34	\$52	\$49	\$48	\$59	\$28	\$66	\$56	\$74	\$33	\$56	\$74	\$46	\$30	\$53	\$30	\$87
		5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	3.24	4.29	4.66	2.92	2.92	2.92	4.22	4.22	4.22	3.25	3.25	3.25	3.25	2.50	5.31	5.31	5.31
		\$119	\$167	\$213	\$213	\$235	\$270	\$310	\$372	\$109	\$222	\$230	\$140	\$173	\$82	\$279	\$237	\$313	\$106	\$182	\$241	\$150	\$75	\$281	\$158	\$461

Estimated Cost of Service at Full Cost Recovery

																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																						</
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Development Services (Planning - 08200)
Cost of Service at Full Cost ICR Multiplier Rates

A		Planning								Police	Fire	Bldg	Alt'r'n Transportation			Engineering			Environmental Utilities				Clerk	Parks & Recreation		
		Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	C'mnty Rel. Anlyst	Fire Insp S'pvsr	Bldg Insp S'pvsr	Alt'r'n Trnsp Anlyst II	Alt'r'n Trnsp Mgr	Admin Tech	(DS) City Eng'r	Sr Eng'r	(DS) Eng'r Mgr	Dev Tech	Sr Eng'r	Eng'r Mgr	Assoc Eng'r	City Clerk Tech	P&R Plan & Dev S'pvsr	P&R Tech	P&R D'rctr
B	Job Title																									
C	Base Hourly Wage Rate	\$23	\$33	\$42	\$42	\$46	\$53	\$61	\$73	\$34	\$52	\$49	\$48	\$59	\$28	\$66	\$56	\$74	\$33	\$56	\$74	\$46	\$30	\$53	\$30	\$87
D	ICR Multiplier used for Project Billing	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	3.24	4.29	4.66	2.92	2.92	2.92	4.22	4.22	4.22	3.25	3.25	3.25	3.25	2.50	5.31	5.31	5.31
E	Hourly Rate used for Project Billing	\$119	\$167	\$213	\$213	\$235	\$270	\$310	\$372	\$109	\$222	\$230	\$140	\$173	\$82	\$279	\$237	\$313	\$106	\$182	\$241	\$150	\$75	\$281	\$158	\$46

Estimated Cost of Service at Full Cost Recovery

|--|

A	Core Svc Area
B	Job Title
C	Base Hourly Wage Rate
D	ICR Multiplier used for Project Billing
E	Hourly Rate used for Project Billing

Estimated Cost of Service at Full Cost Recovery

Fee Description		Current Fixed Fee	Current Deposit	Fixed Fee / Deposit	Current Cost Recovery at Full ICRs	Final Cost Recovery Target	Proposed Fixed Fee	Proposed Deposit	Fixed Fee / Deposit	Proposed Cost Recovery at Full ICRs	Final Cost Recovery Target	Fixed Fee Change \$	Deposit Change \$	Fixed Fee Change %	Deposit Change %
2	Grading Plan/Major		\$8,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$8,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
3	Lot Line Adjustment	\$2,018		Fixed	33%	100%	\$2,018		Fixed	33%	100%	\$0		0%	
4	Extension to a Tentative Map	\$2,018		Fixed	33%	100%	\$2,018		Fixed	33%	100%	\$0		0%	
5	Voluntary Merger	\$2,018		Fixed	33%	100%	\$2,018		Fixed	33%	100%	\$0		0%	
6	Reversion to Acreage	\$2,880		Fixed	32%	100%	\$2,880		Fixed	32%	100%	\$0		0%	
7	Minor Modification to a Tentative Map		\$2,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$2,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
8	Major Modification to a Tentative Map		\$10,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$10,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
9	Tentative Parcel Map with 4 or fewer lots		\$6,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$6,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
10	Tentative Map, 5 through 99 lots		\$11,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$11,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
11	Tentative Map, 100 through 499 lots		\$16,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$16,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
12	Tentative Map, 500+ lots		\$24,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$24,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
Zoning Ordinance Entitlements															
1	Administrative Permit	\$1,006		Fixed	34%	50%	\$1,006		Fixed	34%	50%	\$0		0%	
2	Conditional Use Permit		\$9,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$9,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
3	CUP Modification		\$5,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$5,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
4	CUP Extension	\$4,630		Fixed	68%	100%	\$4,630		Fixed	68%	100%	\$0		0%	
5	Design Review Permit		\$8,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$8,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
6	DRP Modification		\$5,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$5,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
7	DRP Extension	\$4,124		Fixed	63%	100%	\$4,124		Fixed	63%	100%	\$0		0%	
8	Minor DRP	\$156		Fixed	69%	100%	\$156		Fixed	69%	100%	\$0		0%	
9	DRP- Additional or New Construction (DTSP only)	\$156		Fixed		100%	\$156		Fixed		100%	\$0		0%	
10	DRP- Façade Improvements (DTSP only)	\$156		Fixed		100%	\$156		Fixed		100%	\$0		0%	
11	DRP - Predesign (DTSP only)	\$156		Fixed		100%	\$156		Fixed		100%	\$0		0%	
12	DRP/Residential Subdivision w/other Permit	\$4,481		Fixed	62%	100%	\$4,481		Fixed	62%	100%	\$0		0%	
13	Flood Encroachment Permit		\$8,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$8,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
14	MPP Stg 1 or Stages 1&2		\$20,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$20,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
15	MPP Modification		\$7,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$7,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
16	MPP Stg 2, Mod/Exten of Stage 1 &/or 2		\$7,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$7,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
17	MPP Administrative Modification	\$1,285		Fixed	74%	100%	\$1,285		Fixed	74%	100%	\$0		0%	
18	Planned Development Permit		\$11,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$11,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
19	TP Admin - Approved Public Counter	\$157		Fixed	78%	100%	\$157		Fixed	78%	100%	\$0		0%	
20	TP-Req PH for SFD or less than 10 trees	\$3,108		Fixed	69%	100%	\$3,108		Fixed	69%	100%	\$0		0%	
21	TP-Req PH for DRP/TM or 11+ trees	\$4,750		Fixed	70%	100%	\$4,750		Fixed	70%	100%	\$0		0%	
22	Administrative Variance	\$1,004		Fixed	36%	50%	\$1,004		Fixed	36%	50%	\$0		0%	
23	Variance to Develop. Standards Req PH	\$3,555		Fixed	69%	100%	\$3,555		Fixed	69%	100%	\$0		0%	
24	Variance to Parking Standards	\$4,234		Fixed	69%	100%	\$4,234		Fixed	69%	100%	\$0		0%	

A		Core Svc Area																								
B	Job Title	Planning								Police	Fire	Bldg	Alt'rn Transportation			Engineering			Environmental Utilities				Clerk	Parks & Recreation		
		Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	C'mnty Rel. Anlyst	Fire Insp S'pvsr	Bldg Insp S'pvsr	Alt'rn Trnsp Anlyst II	Alt'rn Trnsp Mgr	Admin Tech	(DS) City Eng'r	Sr Eng'r	(DS) Eng'r Mgr	Dev Tech	Sr Eng'r	Eng'r Mgr	Assoc Eng'r	City Clerk Tech	P&R Plan & Dev S'pvsr	P&R Tech	P&R D'rctr
		\$23	\$33	\$42	\$42	\$46	\$53	\$61	\$73	\$34	\$52	\$49	\$48	\$59	\$28	\$66	\$56	\$74	\$33	\$56	\$74	\$46	\$30	\$53	\$30	\$87
		5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	3.24	4.29	4.66	2.92	2.92	2.92	4.22	4.22	4.22	3.25	3.25	3.25	3.25	2.50	5.31	5.31	5.31
		\$119	\$167	\$213	\$213	\$235	\$270	\$310	\$372	\$109	\$222	\$230	\$140	\$173	\$82	\$279	\$237	\$313	\$106	\$182	\$241	\$150	\$75	\$281	\$158	\$461

Estimated Cost of Service at Full Cost Recovery

Fee Description		Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	C'mnty Rel. Anlyst	Fire Insp S'pvsr	Bldg Insp S'pvsr	Alt'r'n Trnsp Anlyst II	Alt'r'n Trnsp Mgr	Admin Tech	(DS) City Eng'r	Sr Eng'r	(DS) Eng'r Mgr	Dev Tech	Sr Eng'r	Eng'r Mgr	Assoc Eng'r	City Clerk Tech	P&R Plan & Dev S'pvsr	P&R Tech	P&R D'rctr	Total	PC	CC	AR	NM	PN
25	Zoning Clearance Approved Public Counter		1.5																								1.5					
26	Zoning Interpretation - Hearing Required				7.0			1.0	0.5																		8.5	Yes				
27	Zoning Interpretation - Non-Hearing Item (ZI/City - Zoning Ordinance Amendments				1.0			0.3																			1.3					
1	Zoning Text Amend (Zoning, Subd, Sign (Full Cost/Deposit) (OA/City)			14.0	22.0			6.5	1.0	0.5	3.0	0.5				5.0	10.0	5.0	0.5	5.0	1.0	10.0	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	94.5	Yes	Yes			
2	Zoning Map Change (RZ) 10 Acres or Less (RZ/City -			14.0	26.5			6.5	0.5	0.5	3.0	0.5	0.5		0.5	5.0	10.0		0.5				2.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	78.0	Yes	Yes			
3	Zoning Map Change (RZ) 11+ Acres (Full Other			21.0	28.0			6.5	0.5	0.5	3.0	0.5	0.5		0.5	5.0	10.0	3.0	0.5	7.0	1.0	10.0	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	108.0	Yes	Yes		Yes	
1	Pre-Application Meeting																															
2	Non-Residential Plan Check		0.3		8.0			0.5					1.0														9.8					
3	Commercial Tenant Improvement Review																															
4	Planning Dept Plot Plan Review(Bundle of 10)		1.0																								1.0					
5	Radius List Prep-Previously Developed Area		0.8																								0.8					
6	Preparation-Undeveloped Area/Mailing		2.0																								2.0					
7	Farmer's Market (Farmer)				3.5			0.5																			4.0			Yes		
8	Home Occupation Permit																															
9	Parking in Lieu Fee (DTSP Only)1																															
10	In-Lieu Tree Mitigation Fee																															
11	CUP-Vernon St. & HOT Only																															
12	Technology Fee																															

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Development Services (Planning - 08200)
Cost of Service at Full Cost ICR Multiplier Rates

A		Core Svc Area																											
B	Job Title	Planning								Police	Fire	Bldg	Alt'r'n Transportation			Engineering			Environmental Utilities				Clerk	Parks & Recreation					
		Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	C'mnty Rel. Anlyst	Fire Insp S'pvsr	Bldg Insp S'pvsr	Alt'r'n Trnsp Anlyst II	Alt'r'n Trnsp Mgr	Admin Tech	(DS) City Eng'r	Sr Eng'r	(DS) Eng'r Mgr	Dev Tech	Sr Eng'r	Eng'r Mgr	Assoc Eng'r	City Clerk Tech	P&R Plan & Dev S'pvsr	P&R Tech	P&R D'rctr			
		\$23	\$33	\$42	\$42	\$46	\$53	\$61	\$73	\$34	\$52	\$49	\$48	\$59	\$28	\$66	\$56	\$74	\$33	\$56	\$74	\$46	\$30	\$53	\$30	\$87			
C		Base Hourly Wage Rate																											
D		ICR Multiplier used for Project Billing																											
E		Hourly Rate used for Project Billing																											
		5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	3.24	4.29	4.66	2.92	2.92	2.92	4.22	4.22	4.22	3.25	3.25	3.25	3.25	2.50	5.31	5.31	5.31			
		\$119	\$167	\$213	\$213	\$235	\$270	\$310	\$372	\$109	\$222	\$230	\$140	\$173	\$82	\$279	\$237	\$313	\$106	\$182	\$241	\$150	\$75	\$281	\$158	\$461			

Estimated Cost of Service at Full Cost Recovery

		Office Asst	Plan Sys Tech	Plan Sys Anlyst	Assoc Pl'n'r	Proj Pl'n'r	Sr Pl'n'r	Prin Pl'n'r	Plan Mgr	C'mnty Rel. Anlyst	Fire Insp S'pvsr	Bldg Insp S'pvsr	Alt'r'n Trnsp Anlyst II	Alt'r'n Trnsp Mgr	Admin Tech	(DS) City Eng'r	Sr Eng'r	(DS) Eng'r Mgr	Dev Tech	Sr Eng'r	Eng'r Mgr	Assoc Eng'r	City Clerk Tech	P&R Plan & Dev S'pvsr	P&R Tech	P&R D'rctr	Total Labor Svcs		PC	CC	AR	NM	PN	Total Mtgs	=	Total Est. Cost of Svc	
25	Zoning Clearance Approved Public Counter	-	250	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 250	+	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	=	\$ 250
26	Zoning Interpretation - Hearing Required	-	-	-	1,494	-	-	310	186	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 1,990	+	\$ 1,737	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,737	=	\$ 3,727
27	Zoning Interpretation - Non-Hearing Item (ZI/City - Zoning Ordinance Amendments	-	-	-	213	-	-	78	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 291	+	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	=	\$ 291
1	Zoning Text Amend (Zoning, Subd, Sign (Full Cost/Deposit) (OA/City)	-	-	2,988	4,696	-	-	2,018	372	55	666	115	-	-	-	1,393	2,370	1,567	53	911	241	1,503	150	703	473	1,382	\$ 21,654		\$ 1,737	\$ 1,312	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,049		\$ 24,703	
2	Zoning Map Change (RZ) 10 Acres or Less (RZ/City -	-	-	2,988	5,656	-	-	2,018	186	55	666	115	70	-	41	1,393	2,370	-	-	-	-	-	150	703	473	1,382	\$ 18,265	+	\$ 1,737	\$ 1,312	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,049	=	\$ 21,314	
3	Zoning Map Change (RZ) 11+ Acres (Full Other	-	-	4,482	5,976	-	-	2,018	186	55	666	115	70	-	41	1,393	2,370	940	53	1,276	241	1,503	150	703	473	1,382	\$ 24,092	+	\$ 1,737	\$ 1,312	\$ -	\$ 1,670	\$ -	\$ 4,719	=	\$ 28,811	
1	Pre-Application Meeting	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		+	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	=	\$ -	
2	Non-Residential Plan Check	-	42	-	1,707	-	-	155	-	-	-	-	140	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 2,045	+	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	=	\$ 2,045	
3	Commercial Tenant Improvement Review	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		+	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	=	\$ -	
4	Planning Dept Plot Plan Review(Bundle of 10)	-	167	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 167	+	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	=	\$ 167	
5	Radius List Prep-Previously Developed Area	-	125	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 125	+	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	=	\$ 125	
6	Preparation-Undeveloped Area/Mailing	-	333	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 333	+	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	=	\$ 333	
7	Farmer's Market (Farmer)	-	-	-	747	-	-	155	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 902	+	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,080	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,080	=	\$ 1,982	
8	Home Occupation Permit	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		+	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	=	\$ -	
9	Parking in Lieu Fee (DTSP Only)1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		+	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	=	\$ -	
10	In-Lieu Tree Mitigation Fee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		+	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	=	\$ -	
11	CUP-Vernon St. & HOT Only	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		+	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	=	\$ -	
12	Technology Fee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		+	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	=	\$ -	

A	Core Svc Area
B	Job Title
C	Base Hourly Wage Rate
D	ICR Multiplier used for Project Billing
E	Hourly Rate used for Project Billing

Estimated Cost of Service at Full Cost Recovery

Fee Description		Current Fixed Fee	Current Deposit	Fixed Fee / Deposit	Current Cost Recovery at Full ICRs	Final Cost Recovery Target	Proposed Fixed Fee	Proposed Deposit	Fixed Fee / Deposit	Proposed Cost Recovery at Full ICRs	Final Cost Recovery Target	Fixed Fee Change \$	Deposit Change \$	Fixed Fee Change %	Deposit Change %
25	Zoning Clearance Approved Public Counter	\$119		Fixed	48%	50%	\$119		Fixed	48%	50%	\$0		0%	
26	Zoning Interpretation - Hearing Required	\$2,663		Fixed	71%	100%	\$2,663		Fixed	71%	100%	\$0		0%	
27	Zoning Interpretation - Non-Hearing Item (ZI/City - Zoning Ordinance Amendments	\$104		Fixed	36%	50%	\$104		Fixed	36%	50%	\$0		0%	
1	Zoning Text Amend (Zoning, Subd, Sign (Full Cost/Deposit) (OA/City)		\$10,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$10,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
2	Zoning Map Change (RZ) 10 Acres or Less (RZ/City -		\$10,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$10,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
3	Zoning Map Change (RZ) 11+ Acres (Full Other		\$17,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$17,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
1	Pre-Application Meeting		\$4,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$4,000	Deposit	100%	100%		\$0		0%
2	Non-Residential Plan Check	[b]		Fixed			[b]		Fixed						
3	Commercial Tenant Improvement Review	\$117		Fixed		100%	\$117		Fixed		100%	\$0		0%	
4	Planning Dept Plot Plan Review(Bundle of 10)	\$117		Fixed		100%	\$117		Fixed		100%	\$0		0%	
5	Radius List Prep-Previously Developed Area	\$109		Fixed		100%	\$109		Fixed		100%	\$0		0%	
6	Preparation-Undeveloped Area/Mailing	\$272		Fixed		100%	\$272		Fixed		100%	\$0		0%	
7	Farmer's Market (Farmer)	\$368		Fixed	19%	50%	\$368		Fixed	19%	50%	\$0		0%	
8	Home Occupation Permit	\$119		Fixed		50%	\$119		Fixed		50%	\$0		0%	
9	Parking in Lieu Fee (DTSP Only)1	\$9,680		Fixed		100%	\$9,680		Fixed		100%	\$0		0%	
10	In-Lieu Tree Mitigation Fee	\$118		per inch			\$118		per inch			\$0		0%	
11	CUP-Vernon St. & HOT Only	\$1,006		Fixed		100%	\$1,006		Fixed		100%	\$0		0%	
12	Technology Fee	3%		Fixed			3%		Fixed			\$0		0%	

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Trench Cut Fees
Cost of Service Calculation - At Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate

								Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate						
								Asst Eng'r	Assoc Eng'r	Const Insp'r	Jr Eng'r			
								\$184	\$203	\$148	\$144			
Fee Description		Est. Labor Hours					Estimated Cost of Service					Est. Pave'mt Cost		
		Asst Eng'r	Assoc Eng'r	Const Insp'r	Jr Eng'r	Total	Asst Eng'r	Assoc Eng'r	Const Insp'r	Jr Eng'r	Total			
	Trench Cuts Requiring Pmt. of Admin. Permit Fee													
1	Street scheduled for resurfacing within next fiscal year	0.50	0.25	1.50	0.50	2.75	x	\$92	\$51	\$223	\$72	\$438	+	n/a
2	Proposed excavation includes an overlay	0.50	0.25	1.50	0.50	2.75	x	\$92	\$51	\$223	\$72	\$438	+	n/a
3	Proposed excavation for a CIP	0.50	0.25	1.50	0.50	2.75	x	\$92	\$51	\$223	\$72	\$438	+	n/a
4	Street pavement quality index (PQI) 0-4	0.50	0.25	1.50	0.50	2.75	x	\$92	\$51	\$223	\$72	\$438	+	n/a
	All Other Trench Cuts													
5	Longitudinal Cut													
	a) Cut within 3' of lane line													
	i) PQI: 4.1 - 6.5	0.50	0.25	1.50	0.50	2.75	x	\$92	\$51	\$223	\$72	\$438	+	\$12.96
	ii) PQI: 6.6 - 8.4	0.50	0.25	1.50	0.50	2.75	x	\$92	\$51	\$223	\$72	\$438	+	\$17.28
	iii) PQI: 8.5 or greater	0.50	0.25	1.50	0.50	2.75	x	\$92	\$51	\$223	\$72	\$438	+	\$21.60
	b) Cut within one lane width													
	i) PQI: 4.1 - 6.5	0.50	0.25	1.50	0.50	2.75	x	\$92	\$51	\$223	\$72	\$438	+	\$9.72
	ii) PQI: 6.6 - 8.4	0.50	0.25	1.50	0.50	2.75	x	\$92	\$51	\$223	\$72	\$438	+	\$12.96
	iii) PQI: 8.5 or greater (moratorium street)	0.50	0.25	1.50	0.50	2.75	x	\$92	\$51	\$223	\$72	\$438	+	\$16.20
6	Traverse Cut													
	i) PQI: 4.1 - 6.5	0.50	0.25	1.50	0.50	2.75	x	\$92	\$51	\$223	\$72	\$438	+	\$7.90
	ii) PQI: 6.6 - 8.4	0.50	0.25	1.50	0.50	2.75	x	\$92	\$51	\$223	\$72	\$438	+	\$10.53
	iii) PQI: 8.5 or greater (moratorium street)	0.50	0.25	1.50	0.50	2.75	x	\$92	\$51	\$223	\$72	\$438	+	\$13.16
7	Cut is a Patch													
	i) PQI: 4.1 - 6.5	0.50	0.25	1.50	0.50	2.75	x	\$92	\$51	\$223	\$72	\$438	+	\$8.75
	ii) PQI: 6.6 - 8.4	0.50	0.25	1.50	0.50	2.75	x	\$92	\$51	\$223	\$72	\$438	+	\$11.66
	iii) PQI: 8.5 or greater (moratorium street)	0.50	0.25	1.50	0.50	2.75	x	\$92	\$51	\$223	\$72	\$438	+	\$14.58

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Trench Cut Fees
Cost of Service Calculation - At Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate

Fee Description		Current Permit Fee	Current Trench Cut Fee	Current Recovery Permit	Current Recovery Trench Cut	Proposed Fee Permit	Proposed Fee Trench Cut	Proposed Recovery Permit	Proposed Recovery Trench Cut	Proposed Fee Change Permit	Proposed Fee Change Trench Cut
	Trench Cuts Requiring Pmt. of Admin. Permit Fee										
1	Street scheduled for resurfacing within next fiscal year	\$100	\$0.00	23%	0%	\$300	\$0.00	69%	0%	\$200	\$0.00
2	Proposed excavation includes an overlay	\$100	\$0.00	23%	0%	\$300	\$0.00	69%	0%	\$200	\$0.00
3	Proposed excavation for a CIP	\$100	\$0.00	23%	0%	\$300	\$0.00	69%	0%	\$200	\$0.00
4	Street pavement quality index (PQI) 0-4	\$100	\$0.00	23%	0%	\$300	\$0.00	69%	0%	\$200	\$0.00
	All Other Trench Cuts										
5	Longitudinal Cut										
	a) Cut within 3' of lane line										
	i) PQI: 4.1 - 6.5	\$100	\$7.20	23%	56%	\$300	\$12.96	69%	100%	\$200	\$5.76
	ii) PQI: 6.6 - 8.4	\$100	\$9.60	23%	56%	\$300	\$17.28	69%	100%	\$200	\$7.68
	iii) PQI: 8.5 or greater	\$100	\$12.00	23%	56%	\$300	\$21.60	69%	100%	\$200	\$9.60
	b) Cut within one lane width										
	i) PQI: 4.1 - 6.5	\$100	\$5.40	23%	56%	\$300	\$9.72	69%	100%	\$200	\$4.32
	ii) PQI: 6.6 - 8.4	\$100	\$7.20	23%	56%	\$300	\$12.96	69%	100%	\$200	\$5.76
	iii) PQI: 8.5 or greater (moratorium street)	\$100	\$9.00	23%	56%	\$300	\$16.20	69%	100%	\$200	\$7.20
6	Traverse Cut										
	i) PQI: 4.1 - 6.5	\$100	\$4.39	23%	56%	\$300	\$7.90	69%	100%	\$200	\$3.51
	ii) PQI: 6.6 - 8.4	\$100	\$5.85	23%	56%	\$300	\$10.53	69%	100%	\$200	\$4.68
	iii) PQI: 8.5 or greater (moratorium street)	\$100	\$7.31	23%	56%	\$300	\$13.16	69%	100%	\$200	\$5.85
7	Cut is a Patch										
	i) PQI: 4.1 - 6.5	\$100	\$4.86	23%	56%	\$300	\$8.75	69%	100%	\$200	\$3.89
	ii) PQI: 6.6 - 8.4	\$100	\$6.48	23%	56%	\$300	\$11.66	69%	100%	\$200	\$5.18
	iii) PQI: 8.5 or greater (moratorium street)	\$100	\$8.10	23%	56%	\$300	\$14.58	69%	100%	\$200	\$6.48


City of Roseville
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Development Services (Planning - 08200)
 Fee-Related Cost Recovery

Current Hourly Rate Used for Fee Setting

A	Job Title	Office Asst	Planning Sys Tech	Planning Sys Analyst	Assoc Planner	Proj Planner	Sr Planner	Prin Planner	Planning Mgr
B	Hourly Rate	\$23	\$33	\$42	\$42	\$46	\$53	\$61	\$73
C	ICR Multiplier	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15
D	Hourly Rate for Fee Setting	\$74	\$103	\$132	\$132	\$145	\$167	\$192	\$230

Hourly Rate at Full Cost Recovery

A	Job Title	Office Asst	Planning Sys Tech	Planning Sys Analyst	Assoc Planner	Proj Planner	Sr Planner	Prin Planner	Planning Mgr
B	Hourly Rate	\$23	\$33	\$42	\$42	\$46	\$53	\$61	\$73
C	ICR Multiplier	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10
D	Hourly Rate for Fee Setting	\$119	\$167	\$213	\$213	\$235	\$270	\$310	\$372



85% of fee-related hours



13% of fee hrs



2% of fee hrs

Current Cost Recovery

A	Job Title	Office Asst	Planning Sys Tech	Planning Sys Analyst	Assoc Planner	Proj Planner	Sr Planner	Prin Planner	Planning Mgr
B	Current Hourly Rate for Fee Setting	\$74	\$103	\$132	\$132	\$145	\$167	\$192	\$230
C	Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	\$119	\$167	\$213	\$213	\$235	\$270	\$310	\$372
D	Estimated Cost Recovery	62%	62%	62%	62%	62%	62%	62%	62%

City of Roseville
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Development Services (Engineering)
 Fee-Related Cost Recovery

Current Hourly Rate Used for Fee Setting

A	Job Title	Eng'r Mgr	Prin Eng'r	Sr Eng'r	Assoc Eng'r	Asst Eng'r	Const Insp Super'vsr	Sr. Const Insp	Const Insp II
B	Hourly Rate	\$76	\$67	\$57	\$48	\$44	\$44	\$39	\$35
C	ICR Multiplier	3.13	3.13	3.13	3.13	3.13	3.13	3.13	3.13
D	Hourly Rate for Fee Setting	\$237	\$211	\$179	\$150	\$136	\$139	\$121	\$110

Hourly Rate at Full Cost Recovery

A	Job Title	Eng'r Mgr	Prin Eng'r	Sr Eng'r	Assoc Eng'r	Asst Eng'r	Const Insp Super'vsr	Sr. Const Insp	Const Insp II
B	Hourly Rate	\$76	\$67	\$57	\$48	\$44	\$44	\$39	\$35
C	ICR Multiplier	4.22	4.22	4.22	4.22	4.22	4.22	4.22	4.22
D	Hourly Rate for Fee Setting	\$320	\$284	\$242	\$203	\$184	\$188	\$163	\$148

Current Cost Recovery

A	Job Title	Eng'r Mgr	Prin Eng'r	Sr Eng'r	Assoc Eng'r	Asst Eng'r	Const Insp Super'vsr	Sr. Const Insp	Const Insp II
B	Current Hourly Rate for Fee Setting	\$237	\$211	\$179	\$150	\$136	\$139	\$121	\$110
C	Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	\$320	\$284	\$242	\$203	\$184	\$188	\$163	\$148
D	Estimated Cost Recovery	74%	74%	74%	74%	74%	74%	74%	74%

City of Roseville
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Development Services (Engineering)
 Fee-Related Cost Recovery

Current Hourly Rate Used for Fee Setting

A	Job Title	Jr Eng'r	Const Insp I	Finance Tech II	Eng'r Tech I
B	Hourly Rate	\$34	\$32	\$31	\$22
C	ICR Multiplier	3.13	3.13	3.13	3.13
D	Hourly Rate for Fee Setting	\$107	\$100	\$97	\$70

Hourly Rate at Full Cost Recovery

A	Job Title	Jr Eng'r	Const Insp I	Finance Tech II	Eng'r Tech I
B	Hourly Rate	\$34	\$32	\$31	\$22
C	ICR Multiplier	4.22	4.22	4.22	4.22
D	Hourly Rate for Fee Setting	\$144	\$135	\$131	\$94

Current Cost Recovery

A	Job Title	Jr Eng'r	Const Insp I	Finance Tech II	Eng'r Tech I
B	Current Hourly Rate for Fee Setting	\$107	\$100	\$97	\$70
C	Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	\$144	\$135	\$131	\$94
D	Estimated Cost Recovery	74%	74%	74%	74%

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Development Services (Planning - 08200)
Allocation of Annual Labor Effort

Position	Planning Mgr	Planning Mgr	Senior Planner	Senior Planner	Assoc Planner	Assoc Planner	Assoc Planner	Assoc Planner	Assoc Planner	Office Asst II	Office Asst II	Total
Calculation of Productive Hours												
Annual Hours - Standard	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	22,880
Less: Annual Leave [a]	320	320	320	320	320	320	320	320	320	320	320	3,520
Productive Hours	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	19,360
Allocation of Productive Hours												
Indirect	60%	60%	35%	35%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	80%	80%	
Direct	40%	40%	65%	65%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	20%	20%	
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Indirect Activities and Services	1,056	1,056	616	616	352	352	352	352	352	1,408	1,408	7,920
Direct Activities	704	704	1,144	1,144	1,408	1,408	1,408	1,408	1,408	352	352	11,440
Total Productive Hours	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	19,360
Salary	\$ 154,753	\$ 147,384	\$ 112,418	\$ 107,065	\$ 88,868	\$ 88,868	\$ 88,868	\$ 88,868	\$ 88,868	\$ 49,628	\$ 45,014	\$ 1,060,602
Weighted Allocation - Productive Hrs												
Indirect Activities and Services	60%	60%	35%	35%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	80%	80%	40%
Direct Activities	40%	40%	65%	65%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	20%	20%	60%

[a] Annual leave assumes the following: Holiday - 12 days; Vacation - 14 days; Sick - 12 days; Mgmt/Jury/Other - 2 days

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Development Services (Bldg & Techs)
Allocation of Annual Labor Effort

Position	Bldg Official	Bldg Insp Suprvsr	Senior Bldg Plan Examiner	Bldg Plan Examiner II	Bldg Plan Examiner II	Bldg Plan Examiner II	Bldg Plan Examiner II	Senior Bldg Insp	Bldg Insp II	Bldg Insp II	Bldg Insp II
Calculation of Productive Hours											
Annual Hours - Standard	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080
Less: Annual Leave [a]	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>
Productive Hours	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760
Allocation of Productive Hours											
Indirect	95%	80%	40%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	20%	20%	20%
Direct	<u>5%</u>	<u>20%</u>	<u>60%</u>	<u>70%</u>	<u>70%</u>	<u>70%</u>	<u>70%</u>	<u>70%</u>	<u>80%</u>	<u>80%</u>	<u>80%</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Indirect Activities and Services	1,672	1,408	704	528	528	528	528	528	352	352	352
Direct Activities	<u>88</u>	<u>352</u>	<u>1,056</u>	<u>1,232</u>	<u>1,232</u>	<u>1,232</u>	<u>1,232</u>	<u>1,232</u>	<u>1,408</u>	<u>1,408</u>	<u>1,408</u>
Total Productive Hours	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760
Salary	\$ 139,298	\$ 112,418	\$ 86,841	\$ 78,947	\$ 78,947	\$ 78,947	\$ 75,187	\$ 85,053	\$ 77,607	\$ 77,607	\$ 77,607
Weighted Allocation - Productive Hrs											
Indirect Activities and Services	95%	80%	40%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	20%	20%	20%
Direct Activities	5%	20%	60%	70%	70%	70%	70%	70%	80%	80%	80%

[a] Annual leave assumes the following:

Holiday - 12 days;

Vacation - 14 days; Sick - 12 days;

Mgmt/Jury/Other - 2 days

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Development Services (Bldg & Techs)
Allocation of Annual Labor Effort

Position	Bldg Insp I	Dev Tech II	Dev Tech II	Office Asst II	Permit Analyst	Permit Tech II	Permit Tech II	Permit Tech II	Permit Tech II	Total
Calculation of Productive Hours										
Annual Hours - Standard	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	41,600
Less: Annual Leave [a]	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>6,400</u>
Productive Hours	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	35,200
Allocation of Productive Hours										
Indirect	20%	30%	30%	95%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	
Direct	<u>80%</u>	<u>70%</u>	<u>70%</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>70%</u>	<u>70%</u>	<u>70%</u>	<u>70%</u>	<u>70%</u>	
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Indirect Activities and Services	352	528	528	1,672	528	528	528	528	528	13,200
Direct Activities	<u>1,408</u>	<u>1,232</u>	<u>1,232</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>1,232</u>	<u>1,232</u>	<u>1,232</u>	<u>1,232</u>	<u>1,232</u>	<u>22,000</u>
Total Productive Hours	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	35,200
Salary	\$ 70,551	\$ 69,338	\$ 57,045	\$ 45,014	\$ 88,868	\$ 69,338	\$ 69,338	\$ 69,338	\$ 66,036	\$ 1,573,325
Weighted Allocation - Productive Hrs										
Indirect Activities and Services	20%	30%	30%	95%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	40%
Direct Activities	80%	70%	70%	5%	70%	70%	70%	70%	70%	60%

[a] Annual leave assumes the following:

Holiday - 12 days;

Vacation - 14 days; Sick - 12 days;

Mgmt/Jury/Other - 2 days

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Development Services (Dev Svcs Eng)
Allocation of Annual Labor Effort

Position	Engr Mgr	Prin Engineer	Sr Engineer	Sr Engineer	Assoc Engineer	Asst Engineer	Asst Engineer	Jr Engineer	Const Insp Sprvsr	Sr Const Insp	Sr Const Insp
Calculation of Productive Hours											
Annual Hours - Standard	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080
Less: Annual Leave [a]	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>
Productive Hours	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760
Allocation of Productive Hours											
Indirect	95%	50%	40%	40%	30%	30%	30%	30%	20%	20%	20%
Direct	<u>5%</u>	<u>50%</u>	<u>60%</u>	<u>60%</u>	<u>70%</u>	<u>70%</u>	<u>70%</u>	<u>70%</u>	<u>80%</u>	<u>80%</u>	<u>80%</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Indirect Activities and Services	1,672	880	704	704	528	528	528	528	352	352	352
Direct Activities	<u>88</u>	<u>880</u>	<u>1,056</u>	<u>1,056</u>	<u>1,232</u>	<u>1,232</u>	<u>1,232</u>	<u>1,232</u>	<u>1,408</u>	<u>1,408</u>	<u>1,408</u>
Total Productive Hours	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760
Salary	\$ 157,491	\$ 139,988	\$ 119,091	\$ 119,091	\$ 99,908	\$ 90,594	\$ 90,594	\$ 71,144	\$ 92,488	\$ 80,424	\$ 80,424
Weighted Allocation - Productive Hrs											
Indirect Activities and Services	95%	50%	40%	40%	30%	30%	30%	30%	20%	20%	20%
Direct Activities	5%	50%	60%	60%	70%	70%	70%	70%	80%	80%	80%

[a] Annual leave assumes the following:

Holiday - 12 days;

Vacation - 14 days; Sick - 12 days;

Mgmt/Jury/Other - 2 days

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Development Services (Dev Svcs Eng)
Allocation of Annual Labor Effort

Position	Const Insp II	Const Insp II	Const Insp I	Finance Tech II	Engr Tech I	Total
Calculation of Productive Hours						
Annual Hours - Standard	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	33,280
Less: Annual Leave [a]	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>5,120</u>
Productive Hours	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	28,160
Allocation of Productive Hours						
Indirect	20%	20%	20%	95%	20%	
Direct	<u>80%</u>	<u>80%</u>	<u>80%</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>80%</u>	
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Indirect Activities and Services	352	352	352	1,672	352	10,208
Direct Activities	<u>1,408</u>	<u>1,408</u>	<u>1,408</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>1,408</u>	<u>17,952</u>
Total Productive Hours	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	28,160
Salary	\$ 73,113	\$ 73,113	\$ 66,463	\$ 64,445	\$ 46,483	\$ 1,464,854
Weighted Allocation - Productive Hrs						
Indirect Activities and Services	20%	20%	20%	95%	20%	40%
Direct Activities	80%	80%	80%	5%	80%	60%

[a] Annual leave assumes the following:

Holiday - 12 days;

Vacation - 14 days; Sick - 12 days;

Mgmt/Jury/Other - 2 days

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Development Services (Code Enforcement)
Allocation of Annual Labor Effort

Position	Sr Code Enforcem't Inspector	Code Enforcem't Inspector	Code Enforcem't Inspector	Building Inspector I	Building Inspector I	Total
Calculation of Productive Hours						
Annual Hours - Standard	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	10,400
Less: Annual Leave [a]	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>1,600</u>
Productive Hours	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	8,800
Allocation of Productive Hours						
Indirect	40%	20%	20%	20%	20%	
Direct	<u>60%</u>	<u>80%</u>	<u>80%</u>	<u>80%</u>	<u>80%</u>	
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Indirect Activities and Services	704	352	352	352	352	2,112
Direct Activities	<u>1,056</u>	<u>1,408</u>	<u>1,408</u>	<u>1,408</u>	<u>1,408</u>	<u>6,688</u>
Total Productive Hours	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	8,800
Salary	\$ 85,053	\$ 66,434	\$ 66,434	\$ 60,945	\$ 58,042	\$ 336,908
Weighted Allocation - Productive Hrs						
Indirect Activities and Services	40%	20%	20%	20%	20%	25%
Direct Activities	60%	80%	80%	80%	80%	75%

[a] Annual leave assumes the following: Holiday - 12 days; Vacation - 14 days; Sick - 12 days; Mgmt/Jury/Other - 2 days

Fee-Related Cost of Service Analysis

- *Development Impact Fee Deferral Fees* -

City of Roseville
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Calculation of Cost of Service for Development Impact Fee Deferral

Statistical Information

Description	Total	Notes
Estimated Citywide Overhead as a Percent of Salaries for Fee-Related Services Hourly Rate Calculation	15%	[a]

Labor Allocation Statistics

Direct Service Units (functional units for fee-setting purposes)	Est. FTE	Notes
Economic Development	3.00	
Total	3.00	

Calculation of Estimated Expenditures for Direct Services Units

Direct Service Units (Functional Units)

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Adjustments	Adjusted Est. Recurring Expenses	Notes
08123	Economic Development	3.00	\$ 410,963	\$ 198,623	\$ 238,408	\$ 61,645	\$ 909,639	\$ (205,210)	\$ 704,429	[b]
Total		3.00	\$ 410,963	\$ 198,623	\$ 238,408	\$ 61,645	\$ 909,639	\$ (205,210)	\$ 704,429	

Calculation of Targeted Hourly Rate

Direct Services for Fee-Related Cost of Service (Functional Units)

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Est. Annual Leave Hours Per FTE [c]	Est. Productive Hours Per FTE	Est % of Time Spent on Indirect Activities [d]	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours (All FTE)	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	Notes
08123	Economic Development	3.00	\$ 704,429	2,080	320	1,760	25%	1,320	3,960	\$ 178	[c],[d]
Total		3.00	\$ 704,429	2,080	320	1,760	25%	1,320	3,960	\$ 178	

Calculation of Estimated ICR Multiplier

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Total Est. Annual Hours	Hourly Wage Rate Only Assuming 2,080 Hours	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	ICR Multiplier	Straight Hourly Rate * ICR Multiplier * Direct Hours	Notes
08123	Economic Development	3.00	\$ 410,963	2,080	6,240	\$ 66	\$ 178	2.70	\$ 704,429	

Source: Estimated labor and FTE information based on FY 16/17 position budgeting data. Estimated recurring non-labor expenditures based on FY 16/17 adopted budget. Estimated citywide overhead based on conservative estimates developed for purposes of this analysis only (see footnote [a] for additional details regarding estimates for citywide overhead).

[a] Amount is intended to serve as a reasonable, conservative, estimate of central service support received by the Economic Development Department from other central service units, such as finance, attorney, city manager, etc. The City's existing overhead cost allocation plan allocates central service costs to direct service units. Consequently, there is no formal allocation of citywide overhead to the Economic Development Department. While, the Department primarily operates as a central service unit, for certain fee-related services the department provides direct services. The overhead allocation is intended to provide an estimate of support received by the Department that enables staff to perform direct services, when requested.

[b] Adjustment to exclude FY 16/17 budgeted expenditures for: Acct #5101 - Professional Services; Acct #5505 - Travel; Acct #5515 - Memberships. Adjustments were made to calculate a conservative estimate of expenditures typically associated with processing development impact fee deferrals (i.e. include labor costs and indirect labor support costs.).

[c] Annual leave assumes the following: Holiday - 12 days; Vacation - 14 days; Sick - 12 days; Mgmt/Jury/Other - 2 days. Actual amounts may vary based on employee length of service and job title. Amounts shown are intended to serve as reasonable for purposes of estimation.

[d] Indirect activities and services may include mandatory rest periods, meetings, training, and other administrative activities, public information and assistance, etc.

City of Roseville
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Development Impact Fee Deferral
 Cost of Service Calculation - At Targeted Hourly Rate

Fee Description		Cost of Service				Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee Change (\$)	Proposed Fee Change (%)
		Est. Labor Hours	x	Fully-Burdened Hourly	= Est. Cost of Service						
1	Development Impact Fee Deferral										
	a) Residential	2.50	x	\$178	= \$445	\$250	56%	\$250	56%	\$0	0%
	b) Non-Residential										
	i) Administrative Fee	7.00	x	\$178	= \$1,245	\$0	0%	\$625	50%	\$625	
	ii) Interest Charge on Deferred Fees				= equal to unearned interest based on City's 10-yr avg pooled interest rate	equal to unearned interest based on City's 10-yr avg pooled interest rate	100%	equal to unearned interest based on City's 10-yr avg pooled interest rate	100%		

Fee-Related Cost of Service Analysis

- *Electric Fees* -

Statistical Information

Description	Total	Notes
Estimated Recurring Dept. Non-Labor as a Percent of Salaries for Fee-Related Services Hourly Rate Calculation	10%	[a]
Estimated Citywide Overhead as a Percent of Salaries for Fee-Related Services Hourly Rate Calculation	15%	[a]

Labor Allocation Statistics

Overhead Units		Est. FTE	Notes
08600	Electric - Administration	16.00	
08605	Electric - Regulatory/Legislative	5.00	
Total		21.00	

Direct Service Units (functional units for fee-setting purposes)		Est. FTE	Notes
Engineering		81.00	[b]
Maintenance and Supply		36.00	[b]
Retail Services		12.00	[b]
Total		129.00	

Entire Department		Est. FTE	Notes
Total		150.00	

Calculation of Estimated Expenditures for Departmental Overhead and Direct Services Units**Department Overhead**

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages [c]	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Notes
08600	Electric - Administration	16.00	\$ 1,963,224	\$ 965,494	\$ 196,322	\$ 294,484	\$ 3,419,523	
08605	Electric - Reg/Legislative	5.00	\$ 612,767	\$ 276,870	\$ 61,277	\$ 91,915	\$ 1,042,829	
Total		21.00	\$ 2,575,991	\$ 1,242,364	\$ 257,599	\$ 386,399	\$ 4,462,353	

Direct Service Units (Functional Units) - Engineering & Construction

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages [c]	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Est. Alloc. of Dept. Overhead Based on Direct Svc Unit FTE	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Notes
08611	Electric Engineering	19.00	\$ 2,202,325	\$ 1,115,181	\$ 220,232	\$ 330,349	\$ 657,246	\$ 4,525,333	
08614	Elect Const & Maint	62.00	\$ 8,045,320	\$ 4,253,126	\$ 804,532	\$ 1,206,798	\$ 2,144,697	\$ 16,454,473	
Total		81.00	\$ 10,247,645	\$ 5,368,307	\$ 1,024,764	\$ 1,537,147	\$ 2,801,942	\$ 20,979,806	

Direct Service Units (Functional Units) - Power Plant and Supply

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages [c]	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Est. Alloc. of Dept. Overhead Based on Direct Svc Unit FTE	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Notes
08616	Electric Power Plant	25.00	\$ 3,266,977	\$ 1,744,828	\$ 326,698	\$ 490,047	\$ 864,797	\$ 6,693,347	
08621	Power Supply	11.00	\$ 1,429,845	\$ 691,249	\$ 142,984	\$ 214,477	\$ 380,511	\$ 2,859,065	
Total		36.00	\$ 4,696,822	\$ 2,436,076	\$ 469,682	\$ 704,523	\$ 1,245,308	\$ 9,552,412	

Direct Service Units (Functional Units) - Retail Services

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages [c]	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Est. Alloc. of Dept. Overhead Based on Direct Svc Unit FTE	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Notes
08623	Retail Serv/Pub Benefits	12.00	\$ 1,109,940	\$ 591,975	\$ 110,994	\$ 166,491	\$ 415,103	\$ 2,394,503	
Total		12.00	\$ 1,109,940	\$ 591,975	\$ 110,994	\$ 166,491	\$ 415,103	\$ 2,394,503	

Calculation of Estimated Fully-Burdened Hourly Rates**Direct Services for Fee-Related Cost of Service (Functional Units)****Engineering, Construction, and Maintenance**

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Est. Annual Leave Hours Per FTE [d]	Est. Productive Hours Per FTE	Est % of Time Spent on Indirect Activities [e]	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours (All FTE)	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	Notes
08611	Electric Engineering	19.00	\$ 4,525,333	2,080	320	1,760	30%	1,232	23,408	\$ 193	
08614	Elect Const & Maint	62.00	\$ 16,454,473	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	95,480	\$ 172	
Total		81.00	\$ 20,979,806	2,080	320	1,760	17%	1,468	118,888	\$ 176	

Plant and Power Supply

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Est. Annual Leave Hours Per FTE [d]	Est. Productive Hours Per FTE	Est % of Time Spent on Indirect Activities [e]	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours (All FTE)	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	Notes
08616	Electric Power Plant	25.00	\$ 6,693,347	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	38,500	\$ 174	
08621	Power Supply	11.00	\$ 2,859,065	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	16,940	\$ 169	
Total		36.00	\$ 9,552,412	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	55,440	\$ 172	

Retail Services

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Est. Annual Leave Hours Per FTE [d]	Est. Productive Hours Per FTE	Est % of Time Spent on Indirect Activities [e]	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours (All FTE)	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	Notes
08623	Retail Serv/Pub Benefits	12.00	\$ 2,394,503	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	18,480	\$ 130	
Total		12.00	\$ 2,394,503	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	18,480	\$ 130	

Calculation of Estimated ICR Multiplier

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Total Est. Annual Hours	Hourly Wage Rate Only Assuming 2,080 Hours	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	ICR Multiplier	Straight Hourly Rate * ICR Multiplier * Direct Hours	Notes
086XX	Eng; Construction; Maint	81.00	\$ 10,247,645	2,080	168,480	\$ 61	\$ 176	2.90	\$ 20,979,806	
086XX	Plant and Power Supply	36.00	\$ 4,696,822	2,080	74,880	\$ 63	\$ 172	2.75	\$ 9,552,412	
08623	Retail Services	12.00	\$ 1,109,940	2,080	24,960	\$ 44	\$ 130	2.91	\$ 2,394,503	

City of Roseville

User and Regulatory Fee Study

Electric Department - Calculation of Fully-Burdened Hourly Rates and Indirect Cost Rate Multipliers (For User and Regulatory Fee Use Only)

Source: Estimated labor and FTE information based on FY 16/17 position budgeting data. Estimated recurring non-labor expenditures and estimated citywide overhead based on conservative estimates developed for purposes of this analysis only (see footnote [a] for additional details regarding estimates for recurring non-labor and citywide overhead expenditures.

[a] Amounts are intended to serve as reasonable estimates. It is difficult to capture only fee-related non-labor expenditures and citywide overhead since many of these expenditures are linked to significant costs that are primarily utility rate-related.

[b] Estimates developed for this fee analysis only. For operational purposes, City staff may view allocation of resources differently.

[c] Amounts exclude estimated overtime and temporary help wages.

[d] Annual leave assumes the following: Holiday - 12 days; Vacation - 14 days; Sick - 12 days; Mgmt/Jury/Other - 2 days. Actual amounts may vary based on employee length of service and job title. Amounts shown are intended to serve as reasonable for purposes of estimation.

[e] Amounts shown are intended to serve as conservative estimates. Indirect activities and services may include mandatory rest periods, meetings, training, public information and assistance, and other administrative activities.

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Electric Fees
Calculation of the Estimated Costs of Providing Fee Related Services

Fee Description		Cost of Service										Current Fee	Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee Change (\$)	Proposed Fee Change (%)
		Meter								Notes							
		Est. Labor Time	x	Hrly Rate	=	Est. Labor Cost	+	Meter Cost (Net of Credit)	=		Est. Cost of Service						
Solar Energy Program - Meter Upgrade Charges																	
1	Residential PV Net-Meter	3.00	x	\$177.44	=	\$532.32	+	\$64.32	=	\$596.64		\$596.64	100%	\$596.64	100%	\$0.00	0%
2	Business PV Net-Meter (<10kW system size)	7.50	x	\$177.44	=	\$1,330.80	+	\$131.76	=	\$1,462.56		\$1,462.56	100%	\$1,462.56	100%	\$0.00	0%
3	Business PV Net & PBI Meter (10-100kW system size, up to 200amp PBI panel)	11.75	x	\$177.44	=	\$2,084.92	+	\$1,047.31	=	\$3,132.23		\$3,132.23	100%	\$3,132.23	100%	\$0.00	0%
4	Business PV Net & PBI Meter (10-100kW system size, >200amp PBI panel)	20.50	x	\$177.44	=	\$3,637.52	+	\$1,590.01	=	\$5,227.53		\$5,227.53	100%	\$5,227.53	100%	\$0.00	0%
5	Variance Review Request	1.00	x	\$177.44	=	\$177.44	+	\$0.00	=	\$177.44		\$177.44	100%	\$177.44	100%	\$0.00	0%
6	Plan Reviews or Field Meets Exceeding the Initial and Subsequent Submittal Limit	1.00	x	\$177.44	=	\$177.44	+	\$0.00	=	\$177.44		\$177.44	100%	\$177.44	100%	\$0.00	0%
7	PBI Meter Installations Requiring a Phone Switcher		x	\$177.44	=	\$0.00	+	\$290.34	=	\$290.34		\$290.34	100%	\$290.34	100%	\$0.00	0%
Other Service Fees																	
8	Pedestal Meter Fee		x	\$177.44	=	\$0.00	+	\$0.00	=			\$324.28		\$324.28		\$0.00	0%
9	Temporary Power Meter Set																
	a) Temp Power Meter Set Fee - Residential		x	\$177.44	=	\$0.00	+	\$0.00	=			\$391.66		\$391.66		\$0.00	0%
	b) Temp Power Meter Set Fee - Commercial	varies	x	\$177.44	=	varies	+		=	varies		Actual Cost	100%	Actual Cost	100%	\$0.00	0%
10	Extension of Facilities	varies	x	\$177.44	=	varies	+		=	varies		Actual Cost	100%	Actual Cost	100%	\$0.00	0%
11	Svc Connections and Facilities on Customer's Premises	varies	x	\$177.44	=	varies	+		=	varies		Actual Cost	100%	Actual Cost	100%	\$0.00	0%
12	Meter Test																
	a) More than six-months since prior test	1.00	x	\$177.44	=	\$177.44	+		=	\$177.44		\$0.00	0%	\$0.00	0%	\$0.00	0%
	b) Within six-months of meter install or prior test	1.00	x	\$177.44	=	\$177.44	+		=	\$177.44		Actual Cost	100%	Actual Cost	100%	\$0.00	0%
13	Overhead-to-Underground Conversion of Overhead Utilities	varies	x	\$177.44	=	varies	+		=	varies		Actual Cost	100%	Actual Cost	100%	\$0.00	0%

Fee-Related Cost of Service Analysis

- *Environmental Utilities Fees* -

Statistical Information

Description	Total	Notes
Estimated Recurring Dept. Non-Labor as a Percent of Salaries for Fee-Related Services Hourly Rate Calculation	10%	[a]
Estimated Citywide Overhead as a Percent of Salaries for Fee-Related Services Hourly Rate Calculation	15%	[a]

Labor Allocation Statistics

Overhead Units	Est. FTE	Notes
Department Overhead	12.40	[b]
Divisional Overhead - Solid Waste	6.00	[b]
Divisional Overhead - Water and Wastewater	4.00	[b]
Total	22.40	

Direct Service Units (functional units for fee-setting purposes)	Est. FTE	Notes
Technical Services	20.75	[b]
Storm Water Mgmt	4.00	[b]
Solid Waste	47.00	[b]
Water and Wastewater	126.75	[b]
Total	198.50	

Entire Department	Est. FTE	Notes
Total	220.90	

Calculation of Estimated Expenditures for Departmental Overhead and Direct Services Units**Department Overhead**

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages [c]	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Notes
08400	Env Util - Administration	9.90	\$ 1,097,724	\$ 612,032	\$ 109,772	\$ 164,659	\$ 1,984,187	
08402	Env Util - Asset Mgmt	2.50	\$ 229,150	\$ 140,986	\$ 22,915	\$ 34,372	\$ 427,423	
Total		12.40	\$ 1,326,873	\$ 753,018	\$ 132,687	\$ 199,031	\$ 2,411,610	

Divisional Overhead - Solid Waste

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages [c]	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Notes
08410	Solid Waste - Admin	6.00	\$ 433,350	\$ 263,873	\$ 43,335	\$ 65,002	\$ 805,560	
Total		6.00	\$ 433,350	\$ 263,873	\$ 43,335	\$ 65,002	\$ 805,560	

Divisional Overhead - Water and Wastewater

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages [c]	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Notes
08420	Wastewater - Admin	3.00	\$ 420,523	\$ 213,505	\$ 42,052	\$ 63,078	\$ 739,159	
08430	Water - Admin	1.00	\$ 161,277	\$ 85,429	\$ 16,128	\$ 24,192	\$ 287,025	
Total		4.00	\$ 581,800	\$ 298,934	\$ 58,180	\$ 87,270	\$ 1,026,183	

Direct Service Units (Functional Units) - Engineering / Storm Water Management

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages [c]	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Est. Alloc. of Dept. Overhead Based on Direct Svc Unit FTE	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Notes
08405	EU - Technical Services	20.75	\$ 2,018,882	\$ 1,108,017	\$ 201,888	\$ 302,832	\$ 252,095	\$ 3,883,715	
08450	EU - Storm Water Mgmt	4.00	\$ 311,790	\$ 171,772	\$ 31,179	\$ 46,768	\$ 48,597	\$ 610,106	
Total		24.75	\$ 2,330,672	\$ 1,279,789	\$ 233,067	\$ 349,601	\$ 300,692	\$ 4,493,821	

Direct Service Units (Functional Units) - Solid Waste

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages [c]	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Est. Alloc. of Dept. Overhead Based on Direct Svc Unit FTE	Est. Alloc. of Divisional Overhead Based on FTE	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Notes
08411	Resid. Solid Waste Pickup	14.00	\$ 911,022	\$ 562,886	\$ 91,102	\$ 136,653	\$ 170,088	\$ 239,954	\$ 2,111,707	
08412	Comm. SW Pickup	20.00	\$ 1,294,879	\$ 853,938	\$ 129,488	\$ 194,232	\$ 242,983	\$ 342,792	\$ 3,058,311	
08413	Solid Waste Maint.	5.00	\$ 292,265	\$ 198,189	\$ 29,226	\$ 43,840	\$ 60,746	\$ 85,698	\$ 709,964	
08415	Recycling	3.00	\$ 189,253	\$ 133,243	\$ 18,925	\$ 28,388	\$ 36,448	\$ 51,419	\$ 457,675	
08416	Green Waste Program	5.00	\$ 310,986	\$ 220,527	\$ 31,099	\$ 46,648	\$ 60,746	\$ 85,698	\$ 755,703	
Total		47.00	\$ 2,998,405	\$ 1,968,783	\$ 299,840	\$ 449,761	\$ 571,011	\$ 805,560	\$ 7,093,360	

Direct Service Units (Functional Units) - Water and Wastewater

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages [c]	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Est. Alloc. of Dept. Overhead Based on FTE	Est. Alloc. of Divisional Overhead Based on FTE	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Notes
08421	Water Tr'tmt/St'rge Plant	6.00	\$ 502,136	\$ 303,986	\$ 50,214	\$ 75,320	\$ 72,895	\$ 48,577	\$ 1,053,127	
08422	Dry Creek WWTP	8.00	\$ 626,715	\$ 348,753	\$ 62,671	\$ 94,007	\$ 97,193	\$ 64,769	\$ 1,294,109	
08424	Env Util - Maintenance	26.00	\$ 2,535,501	\$ 1,524,049	\$ 253,550	\$ 380,325	\$ 315,878	\$ 210,499	\$ 5,219,803	
08425	Industrial Treatment	3.00	\$ 213,406	\$ 132,081	\$ 21,341	\$ 32,011	\$ 36,448	\$ 24,288	\$ 459,574	
08426	Env. Treatment Lab	7.00	\$ 548,022	\$ 346,640	\$ 54,802	\$ 82,203	\$ 85,044	\$ 56,673	\$ 1,173,384	
08427	Pleasant Grove WWTP	6.00	\$ 519,360	\$ 292,852	\$ 51,936	\$ 77,904	\$ 72,895	\$ 48,577	\$ 1,063,525	
08431	Water Distribution	32.00	\$ 2,483,858	\$ 1,691,758	\$ 248,386	\$ 372,579	\$ 388,773	\$ 259,076	\$ 5,444,429	
08432	Wastewater Collection	29.00	\$ 2,206,144	\$ 1,575,274	\$ 220,614	\$ 330,922	\$ 352,326	\$ 234,788	\$ 4,920,067	
08433	Water Efficiency	8.75	\$ 540,014	\$ 363,532	\$ 54,001	\$ 81,002	\$ 106,305	\$ 70,841	\$ 1,215,696	
08441	Recycled Water	1.00	\$ 74,883	\$ 49,487	\$ 7,488	\$ 11,232	\$ 12,149	\$ 8,096	\$ 163,336	
Total		126.75	\$ 10,250,037	\$ 6,628,411	\$ 1,025,004	\$ 1,537,506	\$ 1,539,907	\$ 1,026,183	\$ 22,007,049	

Calculation of Estimated Fully-Burdened Hourly Rates**Direct Services for Fee-Related Cost of Service (Functional Units)****Engineering / Storm Water Management**

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Est. Annual Leave Hours Per FTE [d]	Est. Productive Hours Per FTE	Est % of Time Spent on Indirect Activities [e]	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours (All FTE)	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	Notes
08405	EU - Technical Services	20.75	\$ 3,883,715	2,080	320	1,760	30%	1,232	25,564	\$ 152	
08450	EU - Storm Water Mgmt	4.00	\$ 610,106	2,080	320	1,760	30%	1,232	4,928	\$ 124	
Total		24.75	\$ 4,493,821	2,080	320	1,760	30%	1,232	30,492	\$ 147	

Solid Waste

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Est. Annual Leave Hours Per FTE [d]	Est. Productive Hours Per FTE	Est % of Time Spent on Indirect Activities [e]	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours (All FTE)	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	Notes
08411	Resid. Solid Waste Pickup	14.00	\$ 2,111,707	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	21,560	\$ 98	
08412	Comm. SW Pickup	20.00	\$ 3,058,311	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	30,800	\$ 99	
08413	Solid Waste Maint.	5.00	\$ 709,964	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	7,700	\$ 92	
08415	Recycling	3.00	\$ 457,675	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	4,620	\$ 99	
08416	Green Waste Program	5.00	\$ 755,703	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	7,700	\$ 98	
Total		47.00	\$ 7,093,360	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	72,380	\$ 98	

Water and Wastewater

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Est. Annual Leave Hours Per FTE [d]	Est. Productive Hours Per FTE	Est % of Time Spent on Indirect Activities [e]	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours (All FTE)	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	Notes
08421	Water Tr'tmt/St'rge Plant	6.00	\$ 1,053,127	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	9,240	\$ 114	
08422	Dry Creek WWTP	8.00	\$ 1,294,109	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	12,320	\$ 105	
08424	Env Util - Maintenance	26.00	\$ 5,219,803	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	40,040	\$ 130	
08425	Industrial Treatment	3.00	\$ 459,574	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	4,620	\$ 99	
08426	Env. Treatment Lab	7.00	\$ 1,173,384	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	10,780	\$ 109	
08427	Pleasant Grove WWTP	6.00	\$ 1,063,525	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	9,240	\$ 115	
08431	Water Distribution	32.00	\$ 5,444,429	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	49,280	\$ 110	
08432	Wastewater Collection	29.00	\$ 4,920,067	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	44,660	\$ 110	
08433	Water Efficiency	8.75	\$ 1,215,696	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	13,475	\$ 90	
08441	Recycled Water	1.00	\$ 163,336	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	1,540	\$ 106	
Total		126.75	\$ 22,007,049	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	195,195	\$ 113	

Calculation of Estimated ICR Multiplier

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Total Est. Annual Hours	Hourly Wage Rate Only Assuming 2,080 Hours	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	ICR Multiplier	Straight Hourly Rate * ICR Multiplier * Direct Hours	Notes
08405	EU - Technical Services	20.75	\$ 2,018,882	2,080	43,160	\$ 47	\$ 152	3.25	\$ 3,883,715	
08450	EU - Storm Water Mgmt	4.00	\$ 311,790	2,080	8,320	\$ 37	\$ 124	3.30	\$ 610,106	
084xx	Solid Waste	47.00	\$ 2,998,405	2,080	97,760	\$ 31	\$ 98	3.20	\$ 7,093,360	
084xx	Water and Wastewater	126.75	\$ 10,250,037	2,080	263,640	\$ 39	\$ 113	2.90	\$ 22,007,049	

Source: Estimated labor and FTE information based on FY 16/17 position budgeting data. Estimated recurring non-labor expenditures and estimated citywide overhead based on conservative estimates developed for purposes of this analysis only (see footnote [a] for additional details regarding estimates for recurring non-labor and citywide overhead expenditures).

[a] Amounts are intended to serve as reasonable estimates. It is difficult to capture only fee-related non-labor expenditures and citywide overhead since many of these expenditures are linked to significant electricity, chemical, and maintenance costs that are primarily utility rate-related.

[b] Estimates developed for this fee analysis only. For operational purposes, City staff may view allocation of resources differently (e.g. creating clear distinctions between water and wastewater).

[c] Amounts exclude estimated overtime and temporary help wages.

[d] Annual leave assumes the following: Holiday - 12 days; Vacation - 14 days; Sick - 12 days; Mgmt/Jury/Other - 2 days. Actual amounts may vary based on employee length of service and job title. Amounts shown are intended to serve as reasonable for purposes of estimation.

[e] Amounts shown are intended to serve as conservative estimates. Indirect activities and services may include mandatory rest periods, meetings, training, public information and assistance, and other administrative activities.

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Environmental Utilities Fees
Calculation of the Estimated Costs of Providing Fee Related Services

Fee Description		Cost of Service						Current Fee	Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee Change (\$)	Proposed Fee Change (%)
		Est. Labor Time	x	Hrly Rate	=	Est. Labor Cost	Meter Cost (Net of Credit) +	Est. Cost of Service =					
1	Water Construction Water	Fees and billing rates established by Environmental Utilities Department as part of a separate analysis						\$100.00		\$225.00		\$125.00	125%
	a) Fire Hydrant Application Fee							\$0.40		Current rate			
	b) Usage Rate												
	c) Meter and Backflow Rental							\$50.00		\$100.00		\$50.00	100%
	i) Monthly Rental Charge							\$500.00		\$1,500.00		n/a	n/a
	ii) Initial Deposit												
2	Meter Installation for New Residential Construction												
	a) Labor Charge							\$75.00		\$125.00		\$50.00	67%
	b) Meter and Meter Appurtenance Charge							Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
	c) Quantity Charge							\$75.00		\$75.00		\$0.00	0%
3	Meter Installation - All Other							Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
4	Service Connections							Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
5	Tap							Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
6	Abandon Water Service Line							Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
7	Installation of Facilities in Subdivisions/Other							Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
	Water Conservation												
8	Water - Water Efficient Landscape Review							Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
	Backflow Prevention Inspection and Cross-												
9	Backflow Prevention Assembly - Installation, Repair,							Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
10	Backflow Prevention Assembly - Reinspection Fee							\$30.00		\$60.00		\$30.00	100%
	Well Water												
11	Well Permit												
	a) First Well							\$250.00		\$250.00		\$0.00	0%
	b) Each Additional Well							\$125.00		\$125.00		\$0.00	0%
	c) Soil Boring (no well)							\$250.00		\$250.00		\$0.00	0%
	Sewer												
12	Private Sewage Disposal System - Plan Review and							Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
13	Building Sewers and Connections												
	a) Residential and Commercial Service							Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
	b) Service Establishments Producing Industrial							Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
14	Review of Grease, Oil, and Grit Interceptors							Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
15	Rate-of-Flow Controller Facility												

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Environmental Utilities Fees
Calculation of the Estimated Costs of Providing Fee Related Services

Fee Description		Cost of Service							Current Fee	Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee Change (\$)	Proposed Fee Change (%)
		Meter						Notes						
		Est. Labor Time	x	Hrly Rate	=	Est. Labor Cost	Meter Cost (Net of Credit) +							
16	a) Installation								Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
	b) Re-inspection								Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
16	Industrial Waste Manhole - Plan Review and								Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
17	Closed Circuit TV for Inspection and Warranty								Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
18	Vactor Service for Cleaning of New Infrastructure for								Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
19	Fabrication of Special Fittings								Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
20	Fats, Oils, and Grease Program (FOG) - Costs								Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
21	FOG Program Violation Appeal Cost Reimbursement													
	a) Public Utilities Commission								Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
	b) City Council								Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
	Recycled Water													
22	Recycled Water - Cost of Meter and Installation													
	a) 3/4"								\$469.23		\$469.23		\$0.00	0%
	b) 1"								\$530.32		\$530.32		\$0.00	0%
	c) 1 1/2"								\$1,223.66		\$1,223.66		\$0.00	0%
	d) 2"								\$1,385.06		\$1,385.06		\$0.00	0%
	e) 3"								\$1,872.40		\$1,872.40		\$0.00	0%
	f) 4"								\$3,133.49		\$3,133.49		\$0.00	0%
	g) 6"								\$5,265.56		\$5,265.56		\$0.00	0%
	h) 8"								\$8,389.14		\$8,389.14		\$0.00	0%
	i) 10"								\$10,697.23		\$10,697.23		\$0.00	0%
23	Recycled Water - Plan Review and Inspection								Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
	Industrial Wastewater													
24	On-Site Sampling								Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
	Other Fees													
25	Plan Review								Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
26	On-site Inspections								Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
27	Water Warranty Inspections								Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
28	Wastewater Warranty Inspections								Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
29	Cross Connection Testing								Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
30	Cross Connection Testing for Backflows								Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
31	Water Continuity Testing								Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
32	Spark Testing								Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%

City of Roseville
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Environmental Utilities Fees
 Calculation of the Estimated Costs of Providing Fee Related Services

Fee Description		Cost of Service										Current Fee	Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee Change (\$)	Proposed Fee Change (%)	
																		Notes
		Est. Labor Time	x	Hrly Rate	=	Est. Labor Cost	Meter Cost (Net of Credit)	+	Est. Cost of Service	=								
33	Mapping												Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
34	Standby												Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
35	Disposal of Chlorinated or Contaminated Water												Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
36	Tee Installation												Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
37	401 Transition Pipe												Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%
38	Pipe Coating												Actual Cost		Actual Cost		\$0.00	0%

Fee-Related Cost of Service Analysis

- Fire Prevention Fees -

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Fire Prevention - Calculation of Fully-Burdened Hourly Rates and Indirect Cost Rate Multipliers

Calculation of Estimated Expenditures for Departmental Overhead and Direct Services Units

Department Overhead

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages [a]	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Notes
06000	Fire - Administration	4.00	\$ 411,647	\$ 239,417	\$ 41,985	\$ 771,874	\$ 1,464,923	
06022	Fire - Training	2.00	\$ 256,408	\$ 154,737	\$ 151,245	\$ 56,216	\$ 618,607	
06025	Fire - Logistics	3.00	\$ 347,602	\$ 202,093	\$ 1,788,883	\$ -	\$ 2,338,578	
06040	Emergency Preparedness	1.00	\$ 149,257	\$ 83,651	\$ 64,600	\$ 35,013	\$ 332,522	
06XXX	Public Info. Officer	1.00	\$ 106,818	\$ 64,091	\$ 13,787	\$ 18,525	\$ 203,220	[b]
Total		11.00	\$ 1,271,732	\$ 743,990	\$ 2,060,500	\$ 881,628	\$ 4,957,849	

Direct Services for Fee-Related Cost of Service (Functional Units)

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages [a]	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Est. Alloc. of Dept. Overhead Based on FTE	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Notes
06011	Fire Prevention	7.00	\$ 789,969	\$ 530,310	\$ 96,512	\$ 129,672	\$ 321,342	\$ 1,867,804	[b],[c]
06021	Fire Operations	101.00	\$ 12,848,169	\$ 8,050,215	\$ 344,989	\$ 1,966,615	\$ 4,636,507	\$ 27,846,496	[c]
Total		108.00	\$ 13,638,138	\$ 8,580,525	\$ 441,501	\$ 2,096,287	\$ 4,957,849	\$ 29,714,300	

Calculation of Estimated Fully-Burdened Hourly Rates

Direct Services for Fee-Related Cost of Service (Functional Units)

Org Key	Description	Total Est. Share of Recurring Expenses	Est Direct Svcs Ratio	Est Hours Available to Recover Costs	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	Notes
06011	Fire Prevention	\$ 1,867,804	65%	8,536	\$ 219	[d]

Calculation of Estimated ICR Multiplier

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Total Est. Annual Hours	Hourly Wage Rate Only Assuming Total Annual Hours	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	ICR Multiplier	Straight Hourly Rate * ICR Multiplier * Direct Hours	Notes
06011	Fire Prevention	7.00	\$ 742,387	2,080	14,560	\$ 51	\$ 219	4.29	\$ 1,867,804	

Cost Recovery Analysis and Potential Revenue Impact of Various Scenarios

Revenue Impact of Charging Fees at Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate

Org Key	Description	Current Hourly Rate Used for Fee Setting Purposes	Calculated Fully Burdened Hourly Rate	Est Cost Recovery Rate for Fee Services
06011	Fire Prevention	\$ 146	\$ 219	67%

Current Revenue from Fee-Related Services	Est. Revenue at Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	Est Revenue Increase Assuming Full Cost Recovery	% Increase Required to Achieve Target	Est Cost Recovery
\$ 804,066	\$ 1,205,079	\$ 401,013	50%	100%

Fee Change Based on CPI Increase from Prior Change

Org Key	Description	Est CPI Change from June '15 to June '16	Current Hourly Rate Used for Fee Setting Purposes	Hourly Rate Adjustment Based on Est. CPI Increase
06011	Fire Prevention	3%	\$ 146	\$ 150

Current Revenue from Fee-Related Services	Targeted Recovery from Fees	Est Revenue Increase Assuming Targeted Recovery	% Increase Required to Achieve Target	Est Cost Recovery
\$ 804,066	\$ 825,535	\$ 21,469	3%	69%

Estimated Share of Divisional Expenditures Recovered from Fees

Org Key	Description	Estimated Share of Recurring Expenses	Current Revenue from Fee-Related Services	Divisional Cost Recovery from Fees
06011	Fire Prevention	\$ 1,867,804	\$ 804,066	43%

* Note: For purposes of this analysis, annual revenues include expenditure offsets and annual expenditures exclude expenditure offsets.

Source: Estimated labor and FTE information based on FY 16/17 position budgeting data. Estimated recurring non-labor expenditures based on FY 16/17 adopted budget. Estimated citywide overhead based on citywide overhead cost allocation plan.

[a] Amounts exclude estimated overtime and temporary help wages.

[b] Public Information Officer position is budgeted to Fire Prevention Division (06011). However, for purposes of this analysis, the position is considered departmental administration and allocated amongst Fire Prevention and Fire Operations divisions. Amounts have been separated for allocation purposes and to avoid double counting of expenditures.

[c] Estimated departmental overhead allocated based on FTE count of functional units developed for this analysis.

[d] See accompanying worksheet for estimate of direct service ratio and estimated direct service hours.

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Fire (Fire Prevention - 06011)
Allocation of Annual Labor Effort

Position	Fire Div Chief	Fire Insp Sup	Fire Insp Sup	Haz Mat Insp	Fire Insp II	Fire and Safety Insp	Fire and Safety Insp	Total
Calculation of Productive Hours								
Annual Hours - Standard	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	14,560
Less: Annual Leave [a]	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>2,240</u>
Productive Hours	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	12,320
Allocation of Productive Hours								
Indirect	85%	25%	25%	20%	20%	20%	20%	
Direct	<u>15%</u>	<u>75%</u>	<u>75%</u>	<u>80%</u>	<u>80%</u>	<u>80%</u>	<u>80%</u>	
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Indirect Activities and Services	1,496	440	440	352	352	352	352	3,784
Direct Activities	<u>264</u>	<u>1,320</u>	<u>1,320</u>	<u>1,408</u>	<u>1,408</u>	<u>1,408</u>	<u>1,408</u>	<u>8,536</u>
Total Productive Hours	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	1,760	12,320
Salary	\$ 155,231	\$ 109,818	\$ 109,818	\$ 109,819	\$ 94,477	\$ 81,612	\$ 81,612	\$ 742,387
Weighted Allocation - Productive Hrs								
Indirect Activities and Services	85%	25%	25%	20%	20%	20%	20%	35%
Direct Activities	15%	75%	75%	80%	80%	80%	80%	65%

[a] Annual leave assumes the following: Holiday - 12 days; Vacation - 14 days; Sick - 12 days; Mgmt/Jury/Other - 2 days

City of Roseville

User and Regulatory Fee Study

Fire Prevention Fees

Cost of Service Calculation - At Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate

Fee Description		Cost of Service				Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee Change (\$)	Proposed Fee Change (%)
		Est. Labor Hours	x	Fully-Burdened Hourly	= Est. Cost of Service						
1	Permits to Operate (Type of Permit Activity)										
1	Amusement Building	2.00	x	\$219	= \$438	\$292.60	67%	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
2	Carnivals and Fairs	2.00	x	\$219	= \$438	\$292.60	67%	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
3	Combustible Dust Operations	2.00	x	\$219	= \$438	\$292.60	67%	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
4	Covered Mall Buildings	2.00	x	\$219	= \$438	\$292.60	67%	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
5	Exhibits and Trade Shows	2.00	x	\$219	= \$438	\$292.60	67%	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
6	Explosives or Blasting Agents	5.00	x	\$219	= \$1,094	\$731.50	67%	\$731.50	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
7	Recreational or Bon Fire	1.00	x	\$219	= \$219	\$146.30	67%	\$146.30	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
8	Theatrical Fire Performance	2.00	x	\$219	= \$438	\$292.60	67%	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
9	High Pile Storage	2.00	x	\$219	= \$438	\$292.60	67%	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
10	Hot Work Operations	2.00	x	\$219	= \$438	\$292.60	67%	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
11	Industrial Ovens	2.00	x	\$219	= \$438	\$292.60	67%	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
12	Lumber Yards	2.00	x	\$219	= \$438	\$292.60	67%	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
13	Misc. Combustible Storage	2.00	x	\$219	= \$438	\$292.60	67%	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
14	Places of Assembly										
	a) Less than 300 occupant load	2.00	x	\$219	= \$438	\$292.60	67%	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	b) 300 - 999 occupant load	3.00	x	\$219	= \$656	\$438.90	67%	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	c) 1,000 or more occupant load	4.00	x	\$219	= \$875	\$585.20	67%	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
15	Commercial Day Care Facility										
	a) 7 - 49 persons	2.00	x	\$219	= \$438	\$292.60	67%	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	b) 50 - 149 persons	3.00	x	\$219	= \$656	\$438.90	67%	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	c) 150 or more persons	4.00	x	\$219	= \$875	\$585.20	67%	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
16	Institutional										
	a) Less than 6 patients	2.00	x	\$219	= \$438	\$292.60	67%	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	b) 6 or more patients	3.00	x	\$219	= \$656	\$438.90	67%	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	c) Detention facilities	4.00	x	\$219	= \$875	\$585.20	67%	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
17	Apartments/Hotels/Motels										
	a) 3 - 16 units	1.50	x	\$219	= \$328	\$219.45	67%	\$219.45	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	b) 17 - 32 units	2.00	x	\$219	= \$438	\$292.60	67%	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	c) 33 or more units	3.00	x	\$219	= \$656	\$438.90	67%	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
18	Large Family Day Care	2.00	x	\$219	= \$438	\$292.60	67%	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
19	Residential Care Facilities										
	a) 7 or more residents	3.00	x	\$219	= \$656	\$438.90	67%	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	0.0%

City of Roseville

User and Regulatory Fee Study

Fire Prevention Fees

Cost of Service Calculation - At Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate

Fee Description		Cost of Service				Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee Change (\$)	Proposed Fee Change (%)
		Est. Labor Hours	x	Fully-Burdened Hourly	= Est. Cost of Service						
20	b) Pre-inspection (at hourly rate)	1.00	x	\$219	= \$219	\$146.30	67%	\$146.30	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	Temporary Membrane Structures (Tents/Canopies)										
	a) 401 - 1,499 SF	1.50	x	\$219	= \$328	\$219.45	67%	\$219.45	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	b) 1,500 - 2,999 SF	2.00	x	\$219	= \$438	\$292.60	67%	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	c) 3,000 - 5,999 SF	3.00	x	\$219	= \$656	\$438.90	67%	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	d) 6,000 or more SF	4.00	x	\$219	= \$875	\$585.20	67%	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	Plan Review (Including Inspection Service)										
21	Fire Alarm System										
	a) New Installation	9.00	x	\$219	= \$1,969	\$1,316.17	67%	\$1,316.17	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	b) Tenant Improvement	4.00	x	\$219	= \$875	\$585.20	67%	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	c) Large Project > 50 Notification Devices	24.00	x	\$219	= \$5,252	\$3,511.20	67%	\$3,511.20	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	d) High Rise	36.00	x	\$219	= \$7,877	\$5,266.80	67%	\$5,266.80	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
22	Fire Sprinkler System - New Installation										
	a) 1 - 99 heads	12.00	x	\$219	= \$2,626	\$1,755.60	67%	\$1,755.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	b) 100 - 199 heads	15.00	x	\$219	= \$3,282	\$2,194.50	67%	\$2,194.50	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	c) 200 or more heads	20.00	x	\$219	= \$4,376	\$2,926.00	67%	\$2,926.00	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
23	Fire Sprinkler System - Tenant Improvement										
	a) 1 - 50 heads	4.00	x	\$219	= \$875	\$585.20	67%	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	b) 51 or more heads	8.00	x	\$219	= \$1,751	\$1,170.40	67%	\$1,170.40	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
24	Fire Stand Pipe System	8.00	x	\$219	= \$1,751	\$1,170.40	67%	\$1,170.40	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
25	Fire Pump System	15.00	x	\$219	= \$3,282	\$2,194.50	67%	\$2,194.50	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
26	Hood and Duct System	7.00	x	\$219	= \$1,532	\$1,024.10	67%	\$1,024.10	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
27	Special Suppression System (Clean agent, Co2, etc.)	10.00	x	\$219	= \$2,188	\$1,463.00	67%	\$1,463.00	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
28	Compressed Gas System										
	a) Hazardous Material	4.00	x	\$219	= \$875	\$585.20	67%	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	b) Medical Gas	4.00	x	\$219	= \$875	\$585.20	67%	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
29	Smoke Management Systems	24.00	x	\$219	= \$5,252	\$3,511.20	67%	\$3,511.20	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
30	Spray Booths (Includes fire protection system)	8.00	x	\$219	= \$1,751	\$1,170.40	67%	\$1,170.40	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
31	Radio Amplification System	24.00	x	\$219	= \$5,252	\$3,511.20	67%	\$3,511.20	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	Fireworks										
32	Fireworks - Public Display (High/Low Level & Ground Devices)										
	a) 200 or less devices	6.00	x	\$219	= \$1,313	\$877.80	67%	\$877.80	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	b) 201 or more devices	7.00	x	\$219	= \$1,532	\$1,024.10	67%	\$1,024.10	67%	\$0.00	0.0%

City of Roseville

User and Regulatory Fee Study

Fire Prevention Fees

Cost of Service Calculation - At Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate

Fee Description		Cost of Service					Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee Change (\$)	Proposed Fee Change (%)
		Est. Labor Hours	x	Fully-Burdened Hourly	=	Est. Cost of Service						
33	Fireworks - Retail Stand	2.00	x	\$219	=	\$438	\$292.60	67%	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
34	Fireworks - Special Pyrotechnic Effects	4.00	x	\$219	=	\$875	\$585.20	67%	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	Hazardous Materials											
35	Flammable or Combustible Liquids											
	a) Class I, II, or IIIA ≥ 25 gallons inside storage	3.00	x	\$219	=	\$656	\$438.90	67%	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	b) Class I, II, or IIIA ≥ 60 gallons outside storage	3.00	x	\$219	=	\$656	\$438.90	67%	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	c) Class IIIB ≥ 110 gallons	3.00	x	\$219	=	\$656	\$438.90	67%	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
36	Hazardous Materials Storage, Use, or Handling											
	a) Carbon Dioxide System	2.00	x	\$219	=	\$438	\$292.60	67%	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	b) 1 - 10 chemicals	3.00	x	\$219	=	\$656	\$438.90	67%	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	c) 11 - 20 chemicals	6.00	x	\$219	=	\$1,313	\$877.80	67%	\$877.80	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	d) 21 or more chemicals	12.00	x	\$219	=	\$2,626	\$1,755.60	67%	\$1,755.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
37	Hazardous Waste Generator											
	a) Hazardous Waste Generator Fee < 55 gal	2.00	x	\$219	=	\$438	\$292.60	67%	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	b) Hazardous Waste Generator Fee 55 - 500 gal	3.00	x	\$219	=	\$656	\$438.90	67%	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	c) Hazardous Waste Generator Fee 501 - 2,500 gal	4.00	x	\$219	=	\$875	\$585.20	67%	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	d) Hazardous Waste Generator Fee > 2,500 gal	6.00	x	\$219	=	\$1,313	\$877.80	67%	\$877.80	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
38	Tiered Permitting											
	a) Permit by Rule (PBR)	6.00	x	\$219	=	\$1,313	\$877.80	67%	\$877.80	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	b) Conditionally Authorized	3.00	x	\$219	=	\$656	\$438.90	67%	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	c) Conditionally Exempt	3.00	x	\$219	=	\$656	\$438.90	67%	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
39	Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG)											
	a) Annual tank > 125 gal	2.00	x	\$219	=	\$438	\$292.60	67%	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	b) Tank installation (plan review and inspection)	4.00	x	\$219	=	\$875	\$585.20	67%	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
40	State of California Surcharge CALARP	n/a	x	n/a	=	n/a	\$270.00	n/a	\$270.00	n/a	\$0.00	0.0%
41	State of California Surcharge Hazardous Materials	n/a	x	n/a	=	n/a	\$35.00	n/a	\$35.00	n/a	\$0.00	0.0%
42	Review of Hazardous Materials Risk Management Plans	1.00	x	\$219	=	\$219	\$146.30	67%	\$146.30	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
43	Review of Hazardous Materials Emergency Response Plans	1.00	x	\$219	=	\$219	\$146.30	67%	\$146.30	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
44	Hazardous Materials Emergency Spill Response	varies	x	varies	=	varies	Actual Cost	100%	Actual Cost	100%		
45	Hazardous Materials Oversight of Remediation	1.00	x	\$219	=	\$219	\$146.30	67%	\$146.30	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	Underground Storage Tanks											
46	Annual Permit	10.00	x	\$219	=	\$2,188	\$1,463.00	67%	\$1,463.00	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
47	Tank Installation (plan review and inspection)											

City of Roseville

User and Regulatory Fee Study

Fire Prevention Fees

Cost of Service Calculation - At Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate

Fee Description		Cost of Service				Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee Change (\$)	Proposed Fee Change (%)
		Est. Labor Hours	x	Fully-Burdened Hourly	= Est. Cost of Service						
	a) First tank	20.00	x	\$219	= \$4,376	\$2,926.00	67%	\$2,926.00	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	b) Each additional tank	3.00	x	\$219	= \$656	\$438.90	67%	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
48	Transfer of Ownership	2.00	x	\$219	= \$438	\$292.60	67%	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
49	Tank Removal or Abandonment	10.00	x	\$219	= \$2,188	\$1,463.00	67%	\$1,463.00	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
50	System Modification	4.00	x	\$219	= \$875	\$585.20	67%	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
51	UST Piping Upgrade	8.00	x	\$219	= \$1,751	\$1,170.40	67%	\$1,170.40	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
52	State of California UST Surcharge (per tank)	n/a	x	n/a	= n/a	\$15.00	n/a	\$15.00	n/a	\$0.00	0.0%
	Aboveground Storage Tanks										
53	Annual Permit										
	a) Annual Permit ≥ 1,320 gal & < 10,000 gal	2.00	x	\$219	= \$438	\$292.60	67%	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	b) Annual Permit ≥ 10,000 gal & < 100,000 gal	3.00	x	\$219	= \$656	\$438.90	67%	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	c) Annual Permit ≥ 100,000 gal & < 1,000,000 gal	4.00	x	\$219	= \$875	\$585.20	67%	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	d) Annual Permit > 1,000,000 gal	6.00	x	\$219	= \$1,313	\$877.80	67%	\$877.80	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
54	Tank Installation (plan review and inspection)										
	a) First tank	4.00	x	\$219	= \$875	\$585.20	67%	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
	b) Each additional tank	1.00	x	\$219	= \$219	\$146.30	67%	\$146.30	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
55	Transfer of Ownership	2.00	x	\$219	= \$438	\$292.90	67%	\$292.90	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
56	Tank Removal or Abandonment	4.00	x	\$219	= \$875	\$585.20	67%	\$585.20	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
57	System Modification	3.00	x	\$219	= \$656	\$438.90	67%	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
58	State of California APSA Surcharge	n/a	x	n/a	= n/a	\$26.00	n/a	\$26.00	n/a	\$0.00	0.0%
	Administrative Fees										
59	Copy of Incident Report (per incident)	varies	x	varies	= varies	\$10.00		\$10.00			
60	Media Reproduction (audio, video, photographic)	varies	x	varies	= varies	Actual Cost		Actual Cost			
61	Emergency Response Caused by DUI	varies	x	varies	= varies	Actual Cost		Actual Cost			
62	Weed Abatement Administrative Parcel Fee	2.00	x	\$219	= \$438	\$292.60	67%	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
63	Code Appeal	5.00	x	\$219	= \$1,094	\$731.50	67%	\$731.50	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
64	Fire Flow / Hydrant Test	3.00	x	\$219	= \$656	\$438.90	67%	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
65	Fire & Life Safety Division Hourly Rate	1.00	x	\$219	= \$219	\$146.30	67%	\$146.30	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
66	Minimum Intake Fee	1.00	x	\$219	= \$219	\$146.30	67%	\$146.30	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
67	Voluntary Inspection	2.00	x	\$219	= \$438	\$292.60	67%	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
68	Technical Report (alternate material or method request)	8.00	x	\$219	= \$1,751	\$1,170.40	67%	\$1,170.40	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
69	Inspection Requests (after normal business hours)	3.00	x	\$219	= \$656	\$438.90	67%	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
70	Administrative Fee (excessive resubmittals and inspections)	2.50	x	\$219	= \$547	\$365.75	67%	\$365.75	67%	\$0.00	0.0%

City of Roseville

User and Regulatory Fee Study

Fire Prevention Fees

Cost of Service Calculation - At Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate

Fee Description		Cost of Service					Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee Change (\$)	Proposed Fee Change (%)
		Est. Labor Hours	x	Fully-Burdened Hourly	=	Est. Cost of Service						
71	Expedited Plan Review Fee (per hour)	1.25	x	\$219	=	\$274	\$172.00	63%	\$172.00	63%	\$0.00	0.0%
72	Re-inspection Fee	2.00	x	\$219	=	\$438	\$292.60	67%	\$292.60	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
73	Administrative Fee (work without a permit)	3.00	x	\$219	=	\$656	\$438.90	67%	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
74	Code Review or Design Consultation (per hour)	1.00	x	\$219	=	\$219	\$146.30	67%	\$146.30	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
75	False Alarm Fee	2.50	x	\$219	=	\$547	\$365.75	67%	\$365.75	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
76	Fire Extinguisher Training	3.00	x	\$219	=	\$656	\$438.90	67%	\$438.90	67%	\$0.00	0.0%
77	Late Payment Penalty for Permits											
	a) 30 days past due	n/a	x	n/a	=	n/a	\$50.00	n/a	\$50.00	n/a	\$0.00	0.0%
	b) 60 days past due	n/a	x	n/a	=	n/a	\$100.00	n/a	\$100.00	n/a	\$0.00	0.0%
	c) 90 days past due	n/a	x	n/a	=	n/a	\$200.00	n/a	\$200.00	n/a	\$0.00	0.0%

[a] Hazardous Materials Storage, Use, or Handling fee includes Hazardous Waste Generator < 55 gal.

Fee-Related Cost of Service Analysis

- *Police Fees* -

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Police Department - Calculation of Fully-Burdened Hourly Rates and Indirect Cost Rate Multipliers

Calculation of Estimated Expenditures for Departmental Overhead and Direct Services Units

Department Overhead

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages [a]	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Notes
05500	Police - Administration	10.00	\$ 1,306,043	\$ 890,807	\$ 824,598	\$ 2,844,033	\$ 5,865,481	
05513	Police Communications	23.50	\$ 1,814,051	\$ 1,003,212	\$ 105,976	\$ 145,242	\$ 3,068,482	
Total		33.50	\$ 3,120,094	\$ 1,894,019	\$ 930,574	\$ 2,989,275	\$ 8,933,963	

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages [a]	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Notes
05540	Police - Vehicles	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,939,481	\$ 36,055	\$ 1,975,536	
Total		-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,939,481	\$ 36,055	\$ 1,975,536	

Direct Services for Fee-Related Cost of Service (Functional Units)

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages [a]	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Est. Alloc. of Dept. Overhead Based on FTE	Est. Alloc. of Police Vehicles Budget (05540) Based on FTE of Units Using Vehicles	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Notes
05511	Records - Property	18.00	\$ 1,080,648	\$ 613,930	\$ 108,781	\$ 109,992	\$ 980,557	n/a	\$ 2,893,908	[b]
05514	Community Services	12.00	\$ 1,134,846	\$ 671,991	\$ 32,954	\$ 68,244	\$ 653,705	\$ 162,373	\$ 2,724,112	
05531	Patrol	97.00	\$ 8,962,907	\$ 6,133,627	\$ 1,086,836	\$ 750,359	\$ 5,284,112	\$ 1,312,514	\$ 23,530,355	
05532	Investigations	26.00	\$ 2,503,042	\$ 1,542,460	\$ 114,596	\$ 180,523	\$ 1,416,360	\$ 351,808	\$ 6,108,789	
05533	Animal Control	3.00	\$ 199,093	\$ 103,578	\$ 8,932	\$ 35,740	\$ 163,426	\$ 40,593	\$ 551,363	
05535	Police Traffic	8.00	\$ 807,017	\$ 514,464	\$ 45,144	\$ 77,130	\$ 435,803	\$ 108,249	\$ 1,987,806	
Total		164.00	\$ 14,687,554	\$ 9,580,050	\$ 1,397,243	\$ 1,221,988	\$ 8,933,963	\$ 1,975,536	\$ 37,796,333	

Calculation of Estimated Fully-Burdened Hourly Rates

Direct Services for Fee-Related Cost of Service (Functional Units)

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Est. Annual Leave Hours Per FTE [c]	Est. Productive Hours Per FTE	Est % of Time Spent on Indirect Activities [d][e]	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours (All FTE)	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	Notes
05511	Records - Property	18.00	\$ 2,893,908	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	27,720	\$ 104	
05514	Community Services	12.00	\$ 2,724,112	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	18,480	\$ 147	
05531	Patrol	97.00	\$ 23,530,355	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	149,380	\$ 158	
05532	Investigations	26.00	\$ 6,108,789	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	40,040	\$ 153	
05533	Animal Control	3.00	\$ 551,363	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	4,620	\$ 119	
05535	Police Traffic	8.00	\$ 1,987,806	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	12,320	\$ 161	
Total		164.00	\$ 37,796,333	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	252,560	\$ 150	

Calculation of Estimated ICR Multiplier

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Total Est. Annual Hours	Hourly Wage Rate Only Assuming 2,080 Hours	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	ICR Multiplier	Straight Hourly Rate * ICR Multiplier * Direct Hours	Notes
05511	Records - Property	18.00	\$ 1,080,648	2,080	37,440	\$ 29	\$ 104	3.62	\$ 2,893,908	
05514	Community Services	12.00	\$ 1,134,846	2,080	24,960	\$ 45	\$ 147	3.24	\$ 2,724,112	
05531	Patrol	97.00	\$ 8,962,907	2,080	201,760	\$ 44	\$ 158	3.55	\$ 23,530,355	
05532	Investigations	26.00	\$ 2,503,042	2,080	54,080	\$ 46	\$ 153	3.30	\$ 6,108,789	
05533	Animal Control	3.00	\$ 199,093	2,080	6,240	\$ 32	\$ 119	3.74	\$ 551,363	
05535	Police Traffic	8.00	\$ 807,017	2,080	16,640	\$ 48	\$ 161	3.33	\$ 1,987,806	
Total		164.00	\$ 14,687,554	2,080	341,120	\$ 43	\$ 150	3.48	\$ 37,796,333	

Calculation of Estimated Fully-Burdened Hourly Rates for Various Staff Positions

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Total Est. Annual Hours	Hourly Wage Rate Only Assuming 2,080 Hours	ICR Multiplier	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	Notes
	CSO II	1.00	\$ 58,715	2,080	2,080	\$ 28	3.30	\$ 93	
	Officer	1.00	\$ 90,454	2,080	2,080	\$ 43	3.30	\$ 143	
	Sergeant	1.00	\$ 107,209	2,080	2,080	\$ 52	3.30	\$ 170	
	Lieutenant	1.00	\$ 147,380	2,080	2,080	\$ 71	3.30	\$ 234	

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Police Department - Calculation of Fully-Burdened Hourly Rates and Indirect Cost Rate Multipliers

Source: Estimated labor and FTE information based on FY 16/17 position budgeting data. Estimated recurring non-labor expenditures based on FY 16/17 adopted budget. Estimated citywide overhead based on Citywide overhead cost allocation plan.

[a] Amounts exclude estimated overtime and temporary help wages.

[b] Estimated recurring expenditures for Animal Control exclude roughly \$787,800 in FY 16/17 budgeted contract/professional services expenditures for contract animal control services.

[c] Annual leave assumes the following: Holiday - 12 days; Vacation - 14 days; Sick - 12 days; Mgmt/Jury/Other - 2 days. Actual amounts may vary based on employee length of service and job title. Amounts shown are intended to serve as reasonable for purposes of estimation.

[d] Amounts shown are intended to serve as conservative estimates. Indirect activities and services may include mandatory rest periods, meetings, training, public information and assistance, and other administrative activities.

[e] Indirect ratio assumes roughly 1 hour out of every eight hour day spent on indirect activities.

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Police Department Fees
Cost of Service Calculation - At Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate

		Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate												
		CSO	Officer	Ltnt	Total									
		\$ 93	\$ 143	\$ 234	n/a									
Fee Description		Est. Labor Hours				Estimated Cost of Service				Current Fee	Current Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Recovery	Proposed Fee Change
		Clerk / CSO	Officer	Ltnt	Total	Clerk / CSO	Officer	Ltnt	Total					
1	Alarm Permit Application	Alarm permit fees not examined in this study				Alarm permit fees not examined in this study				\$35		\$35		\$0
	a) Initial permit application									\$15		\$15		\$0
	b) Renewal permit application													
	c) Late Filing Fees													
	i) Less than 30 days late									\$5		\$5		\$0
	ii) 30 Days									\$20		\$20		\$0
	iii) 60 Days									\$40		\$40		\$0
	iv) 90 Days									\$80		\$80		\$0
	v) 91+ Days													
	a) Base Fee									\$80		\$80		\$0
	b) Administrative Citation									TBD		TBD		\$0
	c) Fine									\$100		\$100		\$0
2	Excessive False Alarms:													
	a) First false alarm													
	i) Burglary									\$0		\$0		\$0
	ii) Duress/robbery									\$0		\$0		\$0
	b) Second false alarm													
	i) Burglary									\$60		\$60		\$0
	ii) Duress/robbery									\$60		\$60		\$0
	c) Third false alarm													
	i) Burglary									\$85		\$85		\$0
	ii) Duress/robbery									\$85		\$85		\$0
	d) Fourth false alarm													
	i) Burglary									\$100		\$100		\$0
	ii) Duress/robbery									\$150		\$150		\$0
	e) Fifth and subsequent false alarms													
	i) Burglary									\$150		\$150		\$0
	ii) Duress/robbery									\$200		\$200		\$0

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Police Department Fees
Cost of Service Calculation - At Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate

						Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate									
		CSO		Officer	Ltnt	Total									
		\$ 93	\$ 143	\$ 234	n/a										
Fee Description		Est. Labor Hours				Estimated Cost of Service				Current Fee	Current Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Recovery	Proposed Fee Change	
		Clerk / CSO	Officer	Ltnt	Total	Clerk / CSO	Officer	Ltnt	Total						
3	Appeal of Decision to Deny, Suspend, or Revoke an Alarm Permit									\$75		\$75		\$0	
4	Traffic Collision Report	0.13	0.00	0.00	0.13	x	\$12	\$0	\$0	\$12	\$0	0%	\$10	86%	\$10
5	Impounded Vehicle Release Fee	1.00	0.50	0.00	1.50	x	\$93	\$72	\$0	\$165	\$98	59%	\$150	91%	\$52
6	Vehicle Tow Hearing	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.50	x	\$0	\$0	\$117	\$117	\$0	0%	\$75	64%	\$75
7	Criminal Background / Good Conduct Letter	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.50	x	\$47	\$0	\$0	\$47	\$20	43%	\$20	43%	\$0
8	Commercial Indoor Firing Range Permit	0.50	0.00	0.25	0.75	x	\$47	\$0	\$58	\$105	\$50	48%	\$100	95%	\$50
9	Retail Firearms Dealer License														
	a) Initial permit application	0.50	0.00	0.25	0.75	x	\$47	\$0	\$58	\$105	\$25	24%	\$100	95%	\$75
	b) Renewal permit application	0.50	0.00	0.25	0.75	x	\$47	\$0	\$58	\$105	\$25	24%	\$100	95%	\$75
10	Adult-oriented Business														
	a) Initial permit application														
	i) Permit fee	1.00	0.00	1.00	2.00	x	\$93	\$0	\$234	\$327	\$188	58%	\$250	77%	\$62
	ii) Dept of Justice fee	pass-through of third party fee					pass-through of third party fee				\$32		\$32		\$0
	iii) LiveScan fingerprint processing fee										\$15		\$15		\$0
	iv) Additional FBI fingerprinting fee, if										\$17		\$17		\$0
	b) Renewal permit application														
	i) Permit fee	1.00	0.00	1.00	2.00	x	\$93	\$0	\$234	\$327	\$188	58%	\$250	77%	\$62
11	Dance Permit Application	0.50	0.00	0.25	0.75	x	\$47	\$0	\$58	\$105	\$94	90%	\$100	95%	\$6
12	Entertainment Permit														
	a) Initial permit application														
	i) Permit fee	1.00	0.00	0.50	1.50	x	\$93	\$0	\$117	\$210	\$188	90%	\$200	95%	\$12
	ii) Dept of Justice fee	pass-through of third party fee					pass-through of third party fee				\$32		\$32		\$0
	iii) LiveScan fingerprint processing fee										\$15		\$15		\$0
	iv) Additional FBI fingerprinting fee, if										\$17		\$17		\$0
	b) Renewal permit application														
	i) Permit fee	1.00	0.00	0.50	1.50	x	\$93	\$0	\$117	\$210	\$188	90%	\$200	95%	\$12
13	Ice Cream Vendor Permit Application														

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Police Department Fees
Cost of Service Calculation - At Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate

		Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate													
		CSO	Officer	Ltnt	Total										
		\$ 93	\$ 143	\$ 234	n/a										
		Est. Labor Hours				Estimated Cost of Service									
Fee Description		Clerk / CSO	Officer	Ltnt	Total	Clerk / CSO	Officer	Ltnt	Total	Current Fee	Current Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Recovery	Proposed Fee Change	
14	a) Initial permit application														
	i) Permit fee	0.50	0.00	0.25	0.75	x	\$47	\$0	\$58	\$105	\$25	24%	\$35	33%	\$10
	ii) Dept of Justice fee	pass-through of third party fee					pass-through of third party fee				\$32		\$32		\$0
	iii) LiveScan fingerprint processing fee										\$15		\$15		\$0
	iv) Additional FBI fingerprinting fee, if										\$17		\$17		\$0
	b) Renewal permit application														
	i) Permit fee	0.25	0.00	0.17	0.42	x	\$23	\$0	\$39	\$62	\$25	40%	\$35	56%	\$10
	Message Therapist Permit Application														
	a) Initial permit application														
	i) Permit fee	0.50	0.00	0.25	0.75	x	\$47	\$0	\$58	\$105	\$28	27%	\$28	27%	\$0
15	ii) Dept of Justice fee	pass-through of third party fee					pass-through of third party fee				\$32		\$32		\$0
	iii) LiveScan fingerprint processing fee										\$15		\$15		\$0
	iv) Additional FBI fingerprinting fee, if										\$17		\$17		\$0
	b) Renewal permit application														
	i) Permit fee	0.25	0.00	0.17	0.42	x	\$23	\$0	\$39	\$62	\$25	40%	\$25	40%	\$0
	Pawnbroker/Secondhand Dealer														
	a) Initial permit application														
	i) Permit fee	0.50	0.00	0.25	0.75	x	\$47	\$0	\$58	\$105	\$100	95%	\$100	95%	\$0
	ii) Dept of Justice fee	pass-through of third party fee					pass-through of third party fee				\$32		\$32		\$0
	iii) LiveScan fingerprint processing fee										\$15		\$15		\$0
16	iv) Additional FBI fingerprinting fee, if										\$17		\$17		\$0
	b) Renewal permit application														
	i) Permit fee	0.50	0.00	0.25	0.75	x	\$47	\$0	\$58	\$105	\$50	48%	\$60	57%	\$10
	Taxicab Driver Permit Application														
	a) Initial permit application														
	i) Permit fee	0.50	0.00	0.25	0.75	x	\$47	\$0	\$58	\$105	\$50	48%	\$50	48%	\$0
	ii) Dept of Justice fee	pass-through of third party fee					pass-through of third party fee				\$32		\$32		\$0
iii) LiveScan fingerprint processing fee										\$15		\$15		\$0	

City of Roseville
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Police Department Fees
 Cost of Service Calculation - At Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate

		Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate													
		CSO		Officer	Ltnt	Total									
		\$ 93	\$ 143	\$ 234	n/a										
Fee Description		Est. Labor Hours				Estimated Cost of Service				Current Fee	Current Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Recovery	Proposed Fee Change	
		Clerk / CSO	Officer	Ltnt	Total	Clerk / CSO	Officer	Ltnt	Total						
17	iv) Additional FBI fingerprinting fee, if					x					\$17		\$17		\$0
	b) Renewal permit application														
	i) Permit fee	0.25	0.00	0.17	0.42		\$23	\$0	\$39	\$62	\$50	80%	\$50	80%	\$0
	Noise Violation									varies	actual cost	100%	actual cost	100%	\$0
	Extraordinary Law Enforcement Services									varies	actual cost	100%	actual cost	100%	\$0
	Supplemental Law Enforcement Services														
	a) Hourly Rates for Police Dept Personnel														
	i) Community Service Officers	Overtime at top step				x	Overtime at top step			\$42	\$38	90%	\$42	100%	\$4
	ii) Police Officers	Overtime at top step				x	Overtime at top step			\$65	\$60	92%	\$65	100%	\$5
	iii) Sergeants	Overtime at top step				x	Overtime at top step			\$77	\$80	103%	\$77	100%	(\$3)
18	iv) Dispatchers	Overtime at top step				x	Overtime at top step			\$53	\$45	85%	\$53	100%	\$8
	b) Hourly Rates for Marked Vehicles														
	i) Base Rate									\$25		\$25		\$0	
	ii) Per mile rate, for each mile over 50									\$0.50		\$0.50		\$0	
	Concealed Weapon License	See Placer Co.					See Placer Co.			n/a - issued by Placer County Sheriff		n/a - issued by Placer County Sheriff			

Fee-Related Cost of Service Analysis

- *Animal Licensing Fees* -

Calculation of Estimated Expenditures for Departmental Overhead and Direct Services Units**Department Overhead**

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages [a]	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Notes
05500	Police - Administration	10.00	\$ 1,306,043	\$ 890,807	\$ 824,598	\$ 2,844,033	\$ 5,865,481	
05513	Police Communications	23.50	\$ 1,814,051	\$ 1,003,212	\$ 105,976	\$ 145,242	\$ 3,068,482	
Total		33.50	\$ 3,120,094	\$ 1,894,019	\$ 930,574	\$ 2,989,275	\$ 8,933,963	

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages [a]	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Notes
05540	Police - Vehicles	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,939,481	\$ 36,055	\$ 1,975,536	
Total		-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,939,481	\$ 36,055	\$ 1,975,536	

Direct Services for Fee-Related Cost of Service (Functional Units)

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages [a]	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Est. Alloc. of Dept. Overhead Based on FTE	Est. Alloc. of Vehicles Budget (05540) Based on FTE Using Vehicles	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Adjustments	Recurring Exp for Hrlly Labor Rate Calculation	Notes
05511	Records - Property	18.00					\$ 980,557	n/a				
05514	Community Services	12.00					\$ 653,705	\$ 162,373				
05531	Patrol	97.00					\$ 5,284,112	\$ 1,312,514				
05532	Investigations	26.00					\$ 1,416,360	\$ 351,808				
05533	Animal Control	3.00	\$ 200,676	\$ 103,578	\$ 796,732	\$ 35,740	\$ 163,426	\$ 40,593	\$ 1,340,745	\$ (787,800)	\$ 552,945	[b]
05535	Police Traffic	8.00					\$ 435,803	\$ 108,249				
Total		164.00					\$ 8,933,963	\$ 1,975,536				

Calculation of Estimated Fully-Burdened Hourly Rates

Direct Services for Fee-Related Cost of Service (Functional Units)

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Est. Annual Leave Hours Per FTE [c]	Est. Productive Hours Per FTE	Est % of Time Spent on Indirect Activities [d]	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours (All FTE)	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	Notes
05533	Animal Control	3.00	\$ 552,945	2,080	320	1,760	15%	1,496	4,488	\$ 123	

Calculation of Estimated ICR Multiplier

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Total Est. Annual Hours	Hourly Wage Rate Only Assuming 2,080 Hours	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	ICR Multiplier	Straight Hourly Rate * ICR Multiplier * Direct Hours	Notes
05533	Animal Control	3.00	\$ 200,676	2,080	6,240	\$ 32	\$ 123	3.83	\$ 552,945	

Source: Estimated labor and FTE information based on FY 16/17 position budgeting data. Estimated recurring non-labor expenditures based on FY 16/17 adopted budget. Estimated citywide overhead based on Citywide overhead cost allocation plan.

[a] Amounts exclude estimated overtime and temporary help wages.

[b] For purposes of the hourly labor rate calculation, the estimated recurring expenditures for Animal Control exclude roughly \$787,800 in FY 16/17 budgeted contract/professional services expenditures for contract animal control services.

[c] Annual leave assumes the following: Holiday - 12 days; Vacation - 14 days; Sick - 12 days; Mgmt/Jury/Other - 2 days. Actual amounts may vary based on employee length of service and job title. Amounts shown are intended to serve as reasonable for purposes of estimation.

[d] Amounts shown are intended to serve as conservative estimates. Indirect activities and services may include mandatory rest periods, meetings, training, public information and assistance, and other administrative activities.

Estimated Share of Divisional Expenditures Recovered from Fees and Licensing

Description	Total	Notes
Revenues		
Animal Licenses	\$ 70,000	[a]
Subtotal	\$ 70,000	
Expenditures		
Labor	\$ 304,253	
Recurring Non-Labor (Including Contract Svcs)	\$ 796,732	[b]
Citywide Overhead	\$ 35,740	
Departmental Overhead	\$ 204,019	
Subtotal	\$ 1,340,745	
Est. Divisional Cost Recovery	5%	

Estimated Animal Control Expense Per Dog In Roseville

Description	Total	Notes
Estimated Percentage of Dogs Licensed		
Percent of Dogs Licensed	16%	[c]
Active Dog Licenses in City of Roseville Licensing System		
Number of Active Dog Licenses in System	5,400	[d]
Estimated Number of Dogs in Roseville		
Number of Active Dog Licenses in System	33,750	[d]
Animal Control Costs Per Animal		
Total Estimated Annual Expenditures	1,340,745	[d]
Estimated Number of Dogs in Roseville	<u>33,750</u>	
Estimated Cost per Animal Per Year	\$40	

[a] Estimate based on FY 16/17 adopted budget.

[b] Includes contract with Placer County SPCA.

[c] Source: Sacramento Bee: October 2, 2011 "California bill aims to boost dog licensing"

[d] Source: FY 16/17 adopted budget (FY 15/16 Dept Est.)

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Animal Control Division of Police Department
Cost of Service Calculation - At Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate

Fee Description		Cost of Service			Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee Change (\$)	Proposed Fee Change (%)
		Est. Labor Hours	x	Fully-Burdened Hourly = Est. Cost of Service						
1	Dog License									
	a) 1 Year									
	i) Certified altered dogs	see accompanying worksheet		\$40	\$15	38%	\$20	50%	\$5	33%
	ii) Non-altered dogs	for cost per year		\$40	\$30	76%	\$40	101%	\$10	33%
	iii) Senior Discount			n/a	\$5 off standard fee		\$5 off standard fee		\$0	0%
	b) 2 Years									
	i) Certified altered dogs			\$79	\$29	37%	\$39	49%	\$10	34%
	ii) Non-altered dogs			\$79	\$57	72%	\$79	99%	\$22	39%
	iii) Senior Discount			n/a	\$5 off standard fee		\$5 off standard fee		\$0	0%
	c) 3 Years									
	i) Certified altered dogs			\$119	\$43	36%	\$58	49%	\$15	35%
	ii) Non-altered dogs			\$119	\$86	72%	\$118	99%	\$32	37%
	iii) Senior Discount			n/a	\$5 off standard fee		\$5 off standard fee		\$0	0%
	d) Transfer of active license from other jurisdiction			\$40	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	
2	Delinquent Penalty for Failure to Renew License within 15 days									
	a) Altered dog			n/a	\$5	n/a	\$5	n/a	\$0	0%
	b) Unaltered dog			n/a	\$10	n/a	\$10	n/a	\$0	0%
3	Lost License or Tag				\$5		\$5		\$0	0%
4	Kennel License	2.00	x	\$123	\$10	4%	\$10	4%	\$0	0%
5	Special Animal Permit	2.00	x	\$123	\$25	10%	\$35	14%	\$10	40%
6	Voluntary Disposal Fee									
	a) Dogs and Other Animals Commonly Considered Pets	0.50	x	\$123	\$2	3%	\$0	0%	(\$2)	-100%
	b) Livestock and Wild Animals	0.50	x	\$123	\$25	41%	\$0	0%	(\$25)	-100%
7	Appeal of Decision to Destroy Vicious Animal	varies	x	\$123	varies		\$75	varies	\$0	0%

Fee-Related Cost of Service Analysis

- *Parking Permits and Other Vehicle/Moving Permits (e.g. Oversize Loads)* -

City of Roseville

User and Regulatory Fee Study

Calculation of Cost of Service for Parking Permit Issuance

Labor Allocation Statistics

Direct Service Units (functional units for fee-setting purposes)	Est. FTE	Notes
Permit Center	10.00	
Total	10.00	

Calculation of Estimated Expenditures for Direct Services Units

Direct Service Units (Functional Units)

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Notes
08801	Dev Svcs - Permit Ctr	10.00	\$ 867,414	\$ 456,328	\$ 76,720	\$ 64,133	\$ 1,464,595	
Total		10.00	\$ 867,414	\$ 456,328	\$ 76,720	\$ 64,133	\$ 1,464,595	

Calculation of Targeted Hourly Rate

Direct Services for Fee-Related Cost of Service (Functional Units)

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Est. Annual Leave Hours Per FTE [b]	Est. Productive Hours Per FTE	Est % of Time Spent on Indirect Activities [c]	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours (All FTE)	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	Notes
08801	Dev Svcs - Permit Ctr	10.00	\$ 1,464,595	2,080	320	1,760	15%	1,496	14,960	\$ 98	[b],[c]
Total		10.00	\$ 1,464,595	2,080	320	1,760	15%	1,496	14,960	\$ 98	

City of Roseville
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Calculation of Cost of Service for Parking Permit Issuance

Calculation of Estimated ICR Multiplier

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Total Est. Annual Hours	Hourly Wage Rate Only Assuming 2,080 Hours	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	ICR Multiplier	Straight Hourly Rate * ICR Multiplier * Direct Hours	Notes
08801	Dev Svcs - Permit Ctr	10.00	\$ 867,414	2,080	20,800	\$ 42	\$ 98	2.35	\$ 1,464,595	

Source: Estimated labor and FTE information based on FY 16/17 position budgeting data. Estimated recurring non-labor expenditures based on FY 16/17 adopted budget. Estimated citywide overhead based on citywide overhead cost allocation plan.

[a] Although the Permit Center primarily acts in a support function to development services departments, it also provides a limited number of parking permits per year. This worksheet calculates a conservative estimate of the costs of providing parking permits. This worksheet is not intended to be used for any fees other than parking permit fees.

[b] Annual leave assumes the following: Holiday - 12 days; Vacation - 14 days; Sick - 12 days; Mgmt/Jury/Other - 2 days. Actual amounts may vary based on employee length of service and job title. Amounts shown are intended to serve as reasonable for purposes of estimation.

[c] Indirect activities and services may include mandatory rest periods, meetings, training, and other administrative activities.

City of Roseville
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Parking Permit Fees
 Calculation of the Estimated Costs of Providing Fee Related Services

Fee Description		Cost of Service					Current Fee	Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee Change (\$)	Proposed Fee Change (%)
		Estimated Labor Cost	+	Use / Rental of City Property	=	Est. Cost of Service						
1	Residential Parking Permit	\$20.40	+	not COS-based	=	n/a	\$0	n/a	\$0	n/a	\$0	
2	Merchant Parking Permit											
	a) January 1st through December 31st	\$20.40	+	not COS-based	=	n/a	\$20	n/a	\$20	n/a	\$0	0%
	b) July 1st through December 31st	\$20.40	+	not COS-based	=	n/a	\$10	n/a	\$10	n/a	\$0	0%

[a] Fee for use of City property is not limited to the cost of permit issuance, since the permit also provides limited, exclusive, access to public facilities.

[b] Estimated labor time assumes 12.5 minutes permit processing time (avg of 10 to 15 minutes).

City of Roseville

User and Regulatory Fee Study

Oversize Vehicle Permit Fees and Building Moving Permit Fees

Cost of Service Calculation - At Targeted Hourly Rate

Fee Description		Cost of Service			Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee Change (\$)	Proposed Fee Change (%)
		Est. Labor Hours	Fully-Burdened x Hourly	Est. Cost of Service =						
1	Oversize Vehicle Permit									
	a) Single trip permit				\$16	n/a	\$16	n/a	\$0	0%
	b) Annual permit				\$90	n/a	\$90	n/a	\$0	0%
2	Building Moving Permit									
	a) Base Fee	varies	x	\$98 = varies	\$25	varies	\$25	varies	\$0	0%
	b) Costs of plan review, utility and street light moving, tree trimming, traffic directing, etc.	varies	x	varies = varies	actual costs		actual costs		\$0	0%

Fee-Related Cost of Service Analysis

- *Special Event, Film, and Banner Permit Fees* -

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Parks, Recreation, and Libraries Department - Calculation of Fully-Burdened Hourly Rates and Indirect Cost Rate Multipliers

Statistical Information

Description	Total	Notes
Estimated Recurring Dept. Non-Labor as a Percent of Salaries for Fee-Related Services Hourly Rate Calculation	15%	[a]

Calculation of Estimated Expenditures for Departmental Overhead and Direct Services Units

Labor Allocation Statistics

Department Overhead		Est. FTE	Notes
08500	Parks & Rec - Admin	7.71	
Total		7.71	

Direct Service Units (Assigned for this Analysis Only)		Est. FTE	Share	Notes
08501	Park Development	3.00	2%	[a]
08519	Community Special Events	1.08	1%	[a]
085xx	All Other Functional Units	116.70	97%	[a]
Total		120.78	100%	

Entire Department		Est. FTE	Notes
Total		128.48	

Department Overhead

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Notes
08500	Parks & Rec - Admin	7.71	\$ 681,739	\$ 411,198	\$ 102,261	n/a	\$ 1,195,198	[b]
Total		7.71	\$ 681,739	\$ 411,198	\$ 102,261	n/a	\$ 1,195,198	

Direct Services for Fee-Related Cost of Service (Functional Units)

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Est. Alloc. of Dept. Overhead Based on Direct Svc Unit FTE	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Notes
08501	Park Development	3.00	\$ 262,665	\$ 177,792	\$ 39,400	\$ 315,906	\$ 29,688	\$ 825,451	
08519	Community Special Events	1.08	\$ 84,644	\$ 45,562	\$ 12,697	\$ 127,646	\$ 10,658	\$ 281,206	
Total		4.08	\$ 347,309	\$ 223,354	\$ 52,096	\$ 443,552	\$ 40,346	\$ 1,106,657	

Calculation of Estimated Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate

Direct Services for Fee-Related Cost of Service (Functional Units)

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Est. Annual Leave Hours Per FTE [c]	Est. Productive Hours Per FTE	Est % of Time Spent on Indirect Activities [d]	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours (All FTE)	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	Notes
08501	Park Development	3.00	\$ 825,451	2,080	320	1,760	30%	1,232	3,696	\$ 223	
08519	Community Special Events	1.08	\$ 281,206	2,080	320	1,760	13%	1,540	1,659	\$ 170	

Calculation of Estimated ICR Multiplier

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Total Est. Annual Hours	Hourly Wage Rate Only Assuming 2,080 Hours	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	ICR Multiplier	Straight Hourly Rate * ICR Multiplier * Direct Hours	Notes
08501	Park Development	3.00	\$ 262,665	2,080	6,240	\$ 42	\$ 223	5.31	\$ 825,451	
08519	Community Special Events	1.08	\$ 84,644	2,080	2,240	\$ 38	\$ 170	4.49	\$ 281,206	

Source: Estimated labor and FTE information based on FY 16/17 position budgeting data. Estimated recurring non-labor expenditures based on FY 16/17 adopted budget. Estimated citywide overhead based on Citywide overhead cost allocation plan.

[a] Estimates developed for this fee analysis only. For operational purposes, City staff may view allocation of resources differently.

[b] This analysis assumes that any citywide overhead costs allocable to the Parks Administration Division (Div #85500) have been allocated to the direct service units of the department (i.e. the citywide overhead assigned to Parks Development (Div #08501 includes a share of any overhead allocated to the Parks Administration Division and re-allocated to the Parks direct service units).

[c] Annual leave assumes the following: Holiday - 12 days; Vacation - 14 days; Sick - 12 days; Mgmt/Jury/Other - 2 days. Actual amounts may vary based on employee length of service and job title. Amounts shown are intended to serve as reasonable for purposes of estimation.

[d] Amounts shown are intended to serve as conservative estimates. Indirect activities and services may include mandatory rest periods, meetings, training, public information and assistance, and other administrative activities.

City of Roseville

User and Regulatory Fee Study

Special Event, Film, and Banner Permit Fees

Cost of Service Calculation - At Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate

Fee Description		Cost of Service				Current Fee	Current Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee Change (\$)	Proposed Fee Change (%)
		Est. Labor Hours	x	Fully-Burdened Hourly	= Est. Cost of Service						
1	Special Event Permit										
	a) Application Fee										
	i) Event that requires limited site/plan review, no closures, etc. (i.e. park rentals/activities, misc. events, etc.)	2.00	x	\$170	= \$339	\$75.00	22%	\$75.00	22%	\$0.00	0.0%
	ii) Event that requires, but not limited to, street/parking lot closures, site/plan review, trail use, etc. (i.e. fun runs, festivals, parking garage, etc.)	8.00	x	\$170	= \$1,356	\$150.00	11%	\$150.00	11%	\$0.00	0.0%
	b) Service Charges	varies	x	varies	= varies	actual costs		actual costs		\$0.00	0.0%
	c) Insurance fee, if applicable					\$50.00		\$50.00		\$0.00	0.0%
	d) Park/facility rental fee	varies	x	varies	= varies	varies		varies		\$0.00	0.0%
	e) Cancellation fee					\$125.00		\$125.00		\$0.00	0.0%
2	Photography and Filming Permit										
	a) Application Fee	2.00	x	\$170	= \$339	\$0.00	0%	\$0.00	0%	\$0.00	0.0%
	b) Service Charges	varies	x	varies	= varies	actual costs		actual costs		\$0.00	0.0%
3	Banner Permit	2.00	x	\$170	= \$339	\$30.00	9%	\$30.00	9%	\$0.00	0.0%

City of Roseville
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Capital Replacement Fee
 Cost of Service Calculation

Description		Total	Notes
1	Annual Need	\$1,500,000	[a]
2	Fee-related Revenues Eligible for Surcharge	\$9,000,000	[b]
3	Target Annual Revenue from Capital Replacement Fee	\$200,000	[c]
4	Surcharge Required if Applied to All Eligible Programs	2%	[d]
5	Share of Total Annual Need Funded by Surcharge	13%	[e]

[a] Source: Parks CIP Rehab Summary (Draft document). The annual need amount is intended to represent a conservative estimate of the annual rehabilitation needs for the next ten years. The amount has been rounded for illustrative purposes. The amount excludes turf conversions and several new programs that could add an average of \$200,000 per year in required rehabilitation over the next five years. This amount should be used for estimation purposes only. The actual amount changes annually as amounts are continued to be deferred or other rehabilitation needs are identified.

[b] Source: Parks, Recreation, & Libraries Department initial analysis of annual revenues and program areas potentially eligible for application of capital replacement fee (e.g. amount excludes donations/gifts, grants and other amounts received from other agencies).

[c] Conservative estimate that assumes the fee will not exceed 10% of any program fees and will not be applied to all programs (e.g. if the additional fee is anticipated to have a negative effect on consumer demand or if the City already collects program fees at the upper end of the spectrum of fees collected by other agencies, the fee may not be applied).

[d] This is an estimate that assumes targeted recovery amount was collected from all eligible programs, in practice the fee may fluctuate between 0% and 10% depending on the program area.

[e] The remaining need would require alternative funding sources, such as unobligated General Fund revenues, grant funding, donations, etc.

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Parks, Recreation, & Libraries Department
Program Cost Recovery Analysis

FY 14/15 Actual Expenditures

Revenue Category / Description			Total Expenses Assigned to Dept Budget	Total Revenues Assigned to Division	Cost Recovery w/out Allocation of C'wide OH
Admin & Parks					
1	08500	Parks & Rec - Administration	\$ 1,440,255	\$ 106,279	7%
2	08501	Park Development	\$ 355,542	\$ 16,749	5%
3	08550	Park Operations - Admin	\$ 624,515	\$ 345,145	55%
4	08551	Open Space/Tree Maintenance	\$ 1,295,681	\$ 102,296	8%
5	08555	Parks - Maintenance	\$ 5,531,028	\$ 351,103	6%
Subtotal			\$ 9,247,021	\$ 921,572	10%
Recreation					
1	08511	Adult Sports	\$ 372,752	\$ 418,441	112%
2	08514	Adult & Senior Activities	\$ 136,440	\$ 66,695	49%
3	08515	Cultural Arts & Entertainment	\$ 36,960	\$ -	0%
4	08517	Youth & Teen Services	\$ 230,890	\$ 162,244	70%
5	08518	Youth Classes	\$ 511,187	\$ 547,454	107%
6	08519	Community Special Events	\$ 317,044	\$ 142,524	45%
7	08520	Maidu Park	\$ 336,849	\$ 263,398	78%
8	08525	Mahany Park	\$ 753,768	\$ 706,396	94%
9	08526	Town Square	\$ 298,767	\$ 65,354	22%
10	08530	Aquatics	\$ 1,851,965	\$ 1,371,183	74%
11	08545	After School Education - Safety	\$ 421,847	\$ 253,282	60%
12	08546	CDE-Child Development Program	\$ 622,011	\$ 672,421	108%
Subtotal			\$ 5,890,480	\$ 4,669,392	79%
Total - Parks & Recreation			\$ 15,137,501	\$ 5,590,964	37%
Library					
1	06500	Library - Admin/Tech Services	\$ 3,472,447	\$ 215,761	6%
2	08521	Maidu Museum-Historic Site	\$ 472,596	\$ 175,283	37%
Total - Library			\$ 3,945,043	\$ 391,044	10%
Total - General Fund			\$ 19,082,544	\$ 5,982,008	31%

Total Expenses Assigned to Dept Budget	Total Allocated C'wide OH	Total Revenues Assigned to Division	Cost Recovery with Allocation of C'wide OH
\$ 1,440,255		\$ 106,279	7%
\$ 355,542	\$ 315,906	\$ 16,749	2%
\$ 624,515	\$ 181,991	\$ 345,145	43%
\$ 1,295,681	\$ 283,607	\$ 102,296	6%
\$ 5,531,028	\$ 867,680	\$ 351,103	5%
\$ 9,247,021	\$ 1,649,184	\$ 921,572	8%
\$ 372,752	\$ 95,797	\$ 418,441	89%
\$ 136,440	\$ 85,783	\$ 66,695	30%
\$ 36,960	\$ 99,746	\$ -	0%
\$ 230,890	\$ 92,365	\$ 162,244	50%
\$ 511,187	\$ 95,807	\$ 547,454	90%
\$ 317,044	\$ 116,107	\$ 142,524	33%
\$ 336,849	\$ 409,877	\$ 263,398	35%
\$ 753,768	\$ 267,177	\$ 706,396	69%
\$ 298,767	\$ 212,818	\$ 65,354	13%
\$ 1,851,965	\$ 406,586	\$ 1,371,183	61%
\$ 421,847	\$ 30,900	\$ 253,282	56%
\$ 622,011	\$ 33,088	\$ 672,421	103%
\$ 5,890,480	\$ 1,946,051	\$ 4,669,392	60%
\$ 15,137,501	\$ 3,595,235	\$ 5,590,964	30%
\$ 3,472,447	\$ 257,885	\$ 215,761	6%
\$ 472,596	\$ 48,064	\$ 175,283	34%
\$ 3,945,043	\$ 305,949	\$ 391,044	9%
\$ 19,082,544	\$ 3,901,184	\$ 5,982,008	26%

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Parks, Recreation, & Libraries Department
Program Cost Recovery Analysis

FY 14/15 Actual Expenditures

Revenue Category / Description		Total Expenses Assigned to Dept Budget	Total Revenues Assigned to Division	Cost Recovery w/out Allocation of C'wide OH
Child Care				
1	08541 Adventure Clubs	\$ 3,246,835	\$ 3,639,555	112%
2	08542 Preschool Education	\$ 401,848	\$ 629,980	157%
Subtotal		\$ 3,648,683	\$ 4,269,535	117%
Golf				
1	08571 Diamond Oaks	\$ 922,003	\$ 1,130,408	123%
2	08572 Woodcreek Golf Club	\$ 1,105,518	\$ 1,255,780	114%
Subtotal		\$ 2,027,521	\$ 2,386,188	118%
Total - Parks, Recreation, & Libraries Department		\$ 24,758,748	\$ 12,637,731	51%

Total Expenses Assigned to Dept Budget	Total Allocated C'wide OH	Total Revenues Assigned to Division	Cost Recovery with Allocation of C'wide OH
\$ 3,246,835		\$ 3,639,555	112%
\$ 401,848		\$ 629,980	157%
\$ 3,648,683	\$ 224,984	\$ 4,269,535	110%
\$ 922,003		\$ 1,130,408	123%
\$ 1,105,518		\$ 1,255,780	114%
\$ 2,027,521	\$ 127,744	\$ 2,386,188	111%
\$ 24,758,748	\$ 4,253,912	\$ 12,637,731	44%

Fee-Related Cost of Service Analysis
- *Alternative Transportation Divisions* -

Statistical Information

Description	Total	Notes
Estimated Recurring Dept. Non-Labor as a Percent of Salaries for Fee-Related Services Hourly Rate Calculation	10%	[a]
Estimated Citywide Overhead as a Percent of Salaries for Fee-Related Services Hourly Rate Calculation	15%	[a]

Labor Allocation Statistics

Direct Service Units (functional units for fee-setting purposes)		Est. FTE	Notes
08350	Transportation - Administration	4.28	
08352	Transportation	5.93	
08354	CTSA	0.64	
Total		10.85	

Entire Department		Est. FTE	Notes
Total		10.85	

Calculation of Estimated Expenditures for Direct Services Units**Direct Service Units (Functional Units) - Alternative Transportation**

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages	Est. Benefits	Est. Recurring Non-Labor	Est. C'wide Overhead	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Notes
08350	Transportation - Admin	4.28	\$ 370,546	\$ 178,066	\$ 37,055	\$ 55,582	\$ 641,248	
08352	Transportation	5.93	\$ 563,288	\$ 275,147	\$ 56,329	\$ 84,493	\$ 979,257	
08354	CTSA	0.64	\$ 113,457	\$ 29,652	\$ 11,346	\$ 17,018	\$ 171,473	
Total		4.28	\$ 1,047,290	\$ 482,865	\$ 104,729	\$ 157,094	\$ 1,791,978	

Calculation of Estimated Fully-Burdened Hourly Rates**Direct Services for Fee-Related Cost of Service (Functional Units)****Alternative Transportation**

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Total Est. Recurring Expenses	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Est. Annual Leave Hours Per FTE [b]	Est. Productive Hours Per FTE	Est % of Time Spent on Indirect Activities [c]	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours	Total Est. Direct Svc Hours (All FTE)	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	Notes
08350	Transportation - Admin	4.28	\$ 641,248	2,080	320	1,760	30%	1,232	5,273	\$ 122	
08352	Transportation	5.93	\$ 979,257	2,080	320	1,760	30%	1,232	7,301	\$ 134	
08354	CTSA	0.64	\$ 171,473	2,080	320	1,760	0%	1,760	1,126	\$ 152	
Total		10.85	\$ 1,791,978	6,240	960	5,280	30%	4,224	13,700	\$ 131	

Calculation of Estimated ICR Multiplier

Org Key	Description	Est. FTE	Est. Salaries and Wages	Total Annual Hours Per FTE	Total Est. Annual Hours	Hourly Wage Rate Only Assuming 2,080 Hours	Est. Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	ICR Multiplier	Straight Hourly Rate * ICR Multiplier * Direct Hours	Notes
08350	Transportation - Admin	4.28	\$ 370,546	2,080	8,902	\$ 42	\$ 122	2.92	\$ 641,248	
08352	Transportation	5.93	\$ 563,288	2,080	12,326	\$ 46	\$ 134	2.94	\$ 979,257	
08354	CTSA	0.64	\$ 113,457	2,080	1,331	\$ 85	\$ 152	1.79	\$ 171,473	

Source: Estimated labor and FTE information based on FY 16/17 position budgeting data. Estimated recurring non-labor expenditures and estimated citywide overhead based on conservative estimates developed for purposes of this analysis only (see footnote [a] for additional details regarding estimates for recurring non-labor and citywide overhead expenditures.

[a] Amounts are intended to serve as reasonable estimates. It is difficult to capture only fee-related non-labor expenditures and citywide overhead since many of these expenditures are linked to significant vehicle repair, fuel, and contract services expenditures.

[b] Annual leave assumes the following: Holiday - 12 days; Vacation - 14 days; Sick - 12 days; Mgmt/Jury/Other - 2 days. Actual amounts may vary based on employee length of service and job title. Amounts shown are intended to serve as reasonable for purposes of estimation.

[c] Amounts shown are intended to serve as reasonable for purposes of estimation. Indirect activities and services may include mandatory rest periods, meetings, training, and other administrative activities.

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Fiscal Impact Analysis of Proposed Fee Changes

Revenue Impact FY 16/17

Revenue Category / Description		FY 16/17 Original Budget	Anticipated Increase in FY 16/17 Revenues from Fee Changes	FY 16/17 Revenue After Fee Changes	FY 16/17 Revenue Impact	Notes
Licenses and Permits						
1	Animal Licenses	\$ 70,000	0%	\$ 70,000	\$ -	[a]
2	Building Permits	\$ 1,888,300	0%	\$ 1,888,300	\$ -	
3	Fire Permits	\$ 387,500	0%	\$ 387,500	\$ -	
4	Other Permits	\$ 88,800	0%	\$ 88,800	\$ -	
Charges for Current Services					\$ -	
					\$ -	
1	Inspection Fees	\$ 48,285	0%	\$ 48,285	\$ -	
2	Plan Check	\$ 1,581,800	0%	\$ 1,581,800	\$ -	
3	Map Check	\$ 25,000	0%	\$ 25,000	\$ -	
4	Planning Fees	\$ 183,300	0%	\$ 183,300	\$ -	
5	Engineering Inspections	\$ 40,000	0%	\$ 40,000	\$ -	
6	Development Services	\$ 7,500	0%	\$ 7,500	\$ -	
7	Development Reimbursement	\$ 520,536	0%	\$ 520,536	\$ -	
8	Police Services	\$ 48,270	0%	\$ 48,270	\$ -	[a]
9	Fire Services	\$ 321,724	0%	\$ 321,724	\$ -	
10	Street Services	\$ 73,000	0%	\$ 73,000	\$ -	
11	Recreation Program - Capital Replacement	\$ -	0%	\$ -	\$ -	[a]
Total Revenues Impacted by Fee Study		\$ 5,284,015		\$ 5,284,015	\$ -	

[a] Although changes are proposed to this category of fees for FY 2016/17 , for purposes of estimation it is anticipated that the revenue effect of the changes will be immaterial.

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Fiscal Impact Analysis of Proposed Fee Changes

Revenue Impact FY 17/18

Revenue Category / Description		FY 16/17 Revenue After Fee Changes	Anticipated Increase in FY 17/18 Revenues from Fee Changes	FY 17/18 Revenue After Fee Changes	FY 17/18 Revenue Impact	Notes
Licenses and Permits						
1	Animal Licenses	\$ 70,000	33%	\$ 93,100	\$ 23,100	[b]
2	Building Permits	\$ 1,888,300	2%	\$ 1,926,066	\$ 37,766	
3	Fire Permits	\$ 387,500	2%	\$ 395,250	\$ 7,750	
4	Other Permits	\$ 88,800	2%	\$ 90,576	\$ 1,776	
Charges for Current Services						
1	Inspection Fees	\$ 48,285	2%	\$ 49,251	\$ 966	
2	Plan Check	\$ 1,581,800	2%	\$ 1,613,436	\$ 31,636	
3	Map Check	\$ 25,000	2%	\$ 25,500	\$ 500	
4	Planning Fees	\$ 183,300	2%	\$ 186,966	\$ 3,666	
5	Engineering Inspections	\$ 40,000	2%	\$ 40,800	\$ 800	
6	Development Services	\$ 7,500	2%	\$ 7,650	\$ 150	
7	Development Reimbursement	\$ 520,536	2%	\$ 530,947	\$ 10,411	
8	Police Services	\$ 48,270	\$ 20,000	\$ 68,270	\$ 20,000	[c]
9	Fire Services	\$ 321,724	2%	\$ 328,158	\$ 6,434	
10	Street Services	\$ 73,000	2%	\$ 74,460	\$ 1,460	
11	Recreation Program - Capital Replacement	\$ -	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	[d]
Total Revenues Impacted by Fee Study		\$ 5,284,015		\$ 5,630,430	\$ 346,415	

[b] The anticipated revenue increase is the result of raising animal license fees by roughly \$5 per year for altered animals and \$10 per year for non-altered animals.

[c] The anticipated revenue increase is the result of increasing vehicle impound fees and providing traffic collision reports.

[d] The anticipated revenue increase is the result of fully-implementing collection of the capital replacement fee.

City of Roseville
User and Regulatory Fee Study
Fiscal Impact Analysis of Proposed Fee Changes

Revenue Impact FY 18/19

Revenue Category / Description		FY 17/18 Revenue After Fee Changes	Anticipated Increase in FY 18/19 Revenues from Fee Changes	FY 18/19 Revenue After Fee Changes	FY 18/19 Revenue Impact	Notes
Licenses and Permits						
1	Animal Licenses	\$ 93,100	3%	\$ 95,893	\$ 2,793	
2	Building Permits	\$ 1,926,066	3%	\$ 1,983,848	\$ 57,782	
3	Fire Permits	\$ 395,250	3%	\$ 407,108	\$ 11,858	
4	Other Permits	\$ 90,576	3%	\$ 93,293	\$ 2,717	
Charges for Current Services						
1	Inspection Fees	\$ 49,251	3%	\$ 50,728	\$ 1,478	
2	Plan Check	\$ 1,613,436	3%	\$ 1,661,839	\$ 48,403	
3	Map Check	\$ 25,500	3%	\$ 26,265	\$ 765	
4	Planning Fees	\$ 186,966	3%	\$ 192,575	\$ 5,609	
5	Engineering Inspections	\$ 40,800	3%	\$ 42,024	\$ 1,224	
6	Development Services	\$ 7,650	3%	\$ 7,880	\$ 230	
7	Development Reimbursement	\$ 530,947	3%	\$ 546,875	\$ 15,928	
8	Police Services	\$ 68,270	3%	\$ 70,318	\$ 2,048	
9	Fire Services	\$ 328,158	3%	\$ 338,003	\$ 9,845	
10	Street Services	\$ 74,460	3%	\$ 76,694	\$ 2,234	
11	Recreation Program - Capital Replacement	\$ 200,000	3%	\$ 206,000	\$ 6,000	[e]
Total Revenues Impacted by Fee Study		\$ 5,630,430		\$ 5,799,343	\$ 168,913	

* 3% annual increase is based on estimated CPI change. Actual CPI change may vary from estimate shown.

[e] Capital replacement revenues are anticipated to track changes in underlying recreation program fees. As program fees increase, capital replacement revenue will increase.

Appendix C – Parks, Recreation, & Libraries Department Pricing Policy



**PARKS, RECREATION & LIBRARIES
DEPARTMENT**

Pricing Policy

March 2013

Table of Contents

Why set a pricing policy.....	2
Statement of Philosophy.....	2
Pricing Policy.....	2
Pricing Objective.....	2
Pricing Strategy.....	3
Core Services.....	3
Type of Use.....	3
Cost Recovery.....	6
Facilities.....	8
Capital Expenditures.....	9
Direct/Indirect Costs.....	9
Pricing Methods.....	9
Types of Fees.....	11
Setting the Price.....	12
Scholarships.....	13
Discounts.....	13
Partnerships.....	14
Summary.....	14
Attachment A: Pre-Program Analysis.....	16
Attachment B: Post Program Analysis.....	17

Why set a pricing policy

Setting a pricing policy serves as a tool for evaluating services and establishing appropriate fees. Standardizing how we set prices ensures that the resulting price meets Department goals and provides the framework to ensure consistency for all Roseville residents for the value received. A pricing policy creates transparency and consistency in fees and charges for programs and services.

Establishing a pricing policy yields lasting benefits including:

- Stretching taxpayer investment to realize the optimal return
- Allowing prices to reflect users' investment in themselves based on individual benefit
- Promoting program respect or ownership
- Developing deeper commitment to the programs users help support

The dollars customers invest in their parks, recreation and libraries experiences will come back to them in better quality services and facilities.

Statement of Philosophy

The City of Roseville Parks, Recreation & Libraries Department is dedicated to fostering healthy lifestyles and helping the community thrive. Our Mission is to enhance lives and the community by providing exceptional experiences. As the City continues to grow and facilities age, the Department must be prepared to maintain this high level of service and develop a financial system to continue this community investment.

The Department offers a variety of programs, which benefit the residents and visitors of Roseville. While the community as a whole benefits, different levels of community investment are appropriate based on level of benefit. The goal of this policy is to create a balance between user fees and taxpayer investment for our programs, services and facilities, ensuring that all citizens have equal access and choice in participation.

Pricing Policy

The Parks, Recreation & Libraries Department strives to efficiently offer the most diversified services ensuring that all have equal access and ability to participate in a wide variety of programs and services. The Department prices programs, services and facilities in a manner that balances user fees and taxpayer investment. Pricing takes into consideration the public benefit, users' ability to pay, level of benefit and exclusivity the user receives above what a general taxpayer receives. Pricing ensures equity; those who benefit the most should pay the most. Pricing ensures that users pay appropriate fees and available taxpayer funds are used to achieve the optimal return on investment and ensure access to parks and programs.

Pricing Objectives

This formal pricing policy establishes a comprehensive long-term strategy to address current and future needs of the Roseville community. The objectives of effective pricing are:

Equity – Those who benefit from the service should pay for it. Those who benefit the most should pay the most.

Value – Provide the customer with a benefit in relation to or exceeding the relative monetary worth.

Revenue Production – Producing revenue assists in the overall operations of the Department. It provides flexibility to offer programs which may not otherwise be possible if they are not funded through tax dollars.

Efficiency – Expenditures are made with the most efficient use of our resources so the right mix of programs, facilities and events are offered. Priorities are made to enhance the customer's experience.

Revenue Distribution – Revenues are distributed to the cost center providing expenditures. This pays for direct costs, indirect costs and in some situations future improvement and/or equipment replacement.

Assistance – Not all customers have the same ability to pay and opportunities must exist to waive, reduce or provide scholarship opportunities where appropriate.

Pricing Strategy

To successfully determine price, the Department takes the following steps:

- Identify/classify programs/services/facilities
- Identify core services
- Identify direct and indirect costs
- Establish cost recovery goals/recovery range
- Identify pricing methods
- Determine price
- Determine market value/benchmarking

Core Services


Core services are those which are central and vital to fulfilling our mission. The Department has identified the following core services:

- Access to recreation and cultural experiences for all ages, abilities and demographics
- Existing facilities open, programmed and maintained
- Existing parks maintained and available for community use
- Youth beginning skill development
- Community problem solving
- Community wellness and fitness
- Safe and healthy community
- Access to information
- Literacy
- Parks and facility development
- Preservation of natural resources/open space

The Department concentrates on providing and growing core services and continually evaluates the need for non-core services.

Type of Use

Parks, Recreation & Library services are classified into five different categories. The type of service directly determines the cost recovery strategy or pricing methods to be used in the pricing of services and products. The five categories are listed in the pyramid figure that follows.



Conceptually, the base level of the pyramid represents the mainstay of public parks, recreation and library programs. Programs appropriate to higher levels of the pyramid should only be offered when the preceding levels below are full enough to provide a foundation for the next level. This foundation and upward progression is intended to represent the parks, recreation and library's core services, while also reflecting the growth and maturity of an organization as it enhances its program and facility offerings.

Parks, recreation and library programs are built with a broad supporting base of core service, enhanced with more specialized services as resources allow.

COMMUNITY Benefit

The foundational level of the pyramid is the largest and includes those programs, facilities and services that benefit the COMMUNITY as a whole. These programs, facilities and services may increase property values, provide safety, address social needs, and enhance quality of life for residents. The community generally expects the City to offer these services and supports paying for these services and facilities through taxes. These services are offered to residents at a minimal fee or no fee and support the core services of the Department. A large percentage of the tax support of the agency would fund this level of the pyramid.

COMMUNITY/Individual Benefit

The second and a smaller level of the pyramid represents programs, facilities and services which promote individual physical and mental well-being, and provide recreation skill development. They may have a community benefit but to a smaller group of the community. They are generally the more traditional, expected services and beginner instructional levels. These programs, services and facilities are typically assigned fees based on a specific percentage of direct and indirect costs. Costs are partially offset by both a tax subsidy to account for the COMMUNITY benefit and participant fees to account for the INDIVIDUAL benefit.

INDIVIDUAL/Community Benefit

The third and even smaller level of the pyramid represents services with less of a community benefit which promote individual, physical and mental well-being and provide an intermediate level of recreational skill development. This level provides more INDIVIDUAL benefit and less COMMUNITY benefit and is priced to reflect this. The individual fee recovers more costs or has a higher cost recovery goal than programs and services that fall within the lower levels of the pyramid.

Mostly INDIVIDUAL Benefit

The fourth level of the pyramid represents specialized services generally for specific groups and may have a competitive focus. In this level, programs and services may be priced to recover full cost including all direct and department indirect costs.

Highly INDIVIDUAL Benefit

The top level of the pyramid represents activities that are highly individualized and may even fall outside our core services. In this level, programs and services should be priced to recover full cost including all direct and department and city-wide indirect costs.

Cost Recovery

The Parks, Recreation & Libraries Department sets revenue and expenditure goals annually using criteria set forth in this policy through the budget process approved by the City Council. Programs and services are assigned a cost recovery percentage based on the characteristics outlined below. Programs are evaluated to ensure they fall within the appropriate cost recovery goals.

The Department has identified five cost recovery ranges – Very Low, Low, Medium, High and High+ and each service provided by the Department is assigned to one of these ranges based on type of use. It is important to note the cost recovery percentages assigned to each service represents what the Department would expect to recover under optimal conditions. However, the Department's ability to realize these cost recovery percentages may be constrained by a variety of internal and external factors. These include:

- Market rates and/or competition with other service providers
- Equity in opportunity and the ability to pay
- Community sentiment and expectations
- Political and social will
- Negotiations with external parties
- Program/service viability with decreased participation
- Time and demand of facilities and programs
- Sponsorships/partnerships

The difference between the cost and the revenue recovered represents the public investment in providing the service.

COMMUNITY Benefit (0%-10%) Very Low-Range Cost Recovery Activities

Services in this range have one or more of the following characteristics:

- Community generally and reasonably expects and supports the City to provide these services
- Engage the community as a whole to help the community thrive
- Primarily benefit the community as a whole, though individuals may also benefit
- High levels of resident participation are desirable, regardless of finance status
- Engage children and teens in safe, constructive activities
- Solve a community problem
- Engage seniors in enjoyable, life enhancing activities
- Celebrate the City's history and cultural diversity
- Have offsetting revenue sources to offer program at little or no cost

Services in this range include, but are not limited to:

- Ability to visit and enjoy facilities on an informal basis
- Parks and facility planning and design
- Parks maintenance
- Senior activities/games (cards, chess, knitting, crafts)
- Senior support groups
- Community special events (holidays, tree lighting)
- Veterans Ceremonies
- Free family night swim at Johnson Pool
- Storytime
- Literacy programs for all ages
- Lending library materials/access to online resources
- Homework help
- Public Art

COMMUNITY/Individual Benefit (10%-40%) Low-Range Cost Recovery Activities

Services in this range have one or more of the following characteristics:

- Both individuals (or private parties) and the community as a whole receive benefits from the service
- Primarily for youth, but some alternative opportunities are available
- For youth at-risk or senior services
- Cost recovery is of secondary importance to high participation levels, particularly in the case of core services
- Provided for special populations, which would not, or are unable to, participate in other services

Services in this range include, but are not limited to:

- City sponsored special events
- Adaptive programs
- Neighborhood park program
- Nature centers/interpretive centers/museums
- Public swim
- Youth arts programs

INDIVIDUAL/Community Benefit (40%-70%) Medium-Range Cost Recovery Services

Services in this range have one or more of the following characteristics:

- Individuals (or private parties) are the primary beneficiaries of the service, but the community as a whole receives some benefits
- Comparable "market" rates for similar services affect ability to recover a greater percentage of the costs
- Services are for youth, but are highly specialized and/or similar to those in the private sector
- Services are for adults addressing a need or problem, but full-cost recovery would adversely impact participation rates
- Contribute to improved health & wellness or other overarching Council goals

Services in this range include, but are not limited to:

- Cultural arts programs
- Entry level instructional programs
- Lifeguard training
- Group swim lessons
- Adaptive pool party
- Tot read, take & make

Mostly INDIVIDUAL Benefit (70% to 100%) High-Range Cost Recovery Services

Services in this range have one or more of the following characteristics:

- Individuals (or private parties) benefit significantly more than the community as a whole
- Similar services are offered by the private sector or other public agencies
- Adults are the primary beneficiaries
- Demand for service, facility or program exceeds capacity
- Need to recover most of direct and indirect costs

Services in this range include, but are not limited to:

- Day Camps
- Youth sports (flag football, soccer, basketball)
- Youth special interest programs (babysitting, dance, Lego, chef, math)
- Adult/Senior classes (trips, cooking, Spanish)
- Birthday Parties

- Semiprivate swim lessons – stroke development
- Competitive swim teams
- Fitness memberships

Highly INDIVIDUAL Benefit (100%+) High+ Range Cost Recovery Services

Services in this range have one or more of the following characteristics:

- High individual benefit
- Similar services are offered by the private sector or other public agencies
- Adults are the primary beneficiaries
- Services have a commercial nature
- Demand for service, facility or program exceeds capacity
- Enterprise funds – services operated as a business where no taxpayer support is provided
- Need to recover direct and indirect costs

Services in this range include, but are not limited to:

- Adventure Club
- Preschool
- Golf
- Adult sports (basketball, volleyball, softball)
- Facility rentals
- Commercial recreation
- Personal Training
- Private swim lessons

Facilities

The City maintains a significant inventory of buildings, parks, fields and other facilities. **Basic services** such as the maintenance of safe, clean, attractive parks and buildings, the provision of recreation and library services for the general public, and the preservation and promotion of physical and mental well-being will continue to be supported by taxpayer resources. However, the Department shall prepare and maintain a schedule of fees and charges for **special use of facilities**, those where revenues are necessary to support continued use and individuals pay a fee for the privilege of using the facility to the exclusion of others and without interference.

Basic facilities and services for informal/self-directed recreation include but are not limited to:

- Unscheduled, unlighted, unmarked outdoor athletic facilities and sports courts
- Unreserved picnic tables and shelters
- Parks, playgrounds & town squares
- Parking lots for general facility use
- Trails, paths and restrooms
- Open space

Special uses of facilities include:

- Scheduled/reserved use of indoor or enclosed facilities (gyms, meeting rooms, all weather fields, batting cages, courts, etc.)
- Scheduled use of tennis courts
- Formal, directed, or lighted baseball, soccer, softball, football or other sports specific facilities
- Golf courses
- Maintenance necessary for sports programs
- Swimming pools with lifeguards

- Outdoor theater facilities
- Use of parks for special events
- Reserved picnic tables and shelters

The City has a variety of facilities available for rent including picnic areas, athletic fields, meeting rooms, pools and community centers. Differential pricing is established for these rentals based on the facility and type of use (i.e. resident, non-profit, non-resident, commercial).

Capital Expenditures

Capital expenditures are those costs incurred in constructing a facility and in its later modification, renovation or improvement. For example, a swimming pool may be built, resurfaced, or striped to delineate lanes. Investments in this type of capital have historically been recognized as a benefit to the community as a whole and are borne by the general tax base. In some cases, a portion of fees may be reinvested back into facilities.

Direct/Indirect Costs

Direct costs are those costs which are easily and clearly identifiable to the cost objective (program, service or facility). Indirect costs benefit more than one cost objective and must be allocated proportionally. For example the instructor fee for a class is a direct cost but the electricity for the building benefits all classes and is an indirect cost. (e.g. it must be allocated among the classes proportionately)

Each department operational division records the total costs of operations including both direct and indirect costs. In general, these costs can be identified as follows:

Direct

Instructor salaries & benefits
Part-time employees salaries & benefits
Service contracts
Materials/supplies/equipment
Field lighting

Indirect

Indirect staffing (administration/supervision)
Maintenance
Capital replacement
Facility use
Marketing – advertising & promotion
Utilities

The specific direct costs and estimates of indirect costs are recorded on evaluation sheets for each program and service.

In addition to the department indirect costs listed above, citywide indirect costs (such as human resources, finance and IT) are recovered from enterprise fund operations.

Pricing Methods

The Department recognizes that not all cases are “one price fits all” and the pricing policy must be built to recognize the Department’s priorities and provide the highest amount of flexibility. Use of differential pricing accomplishes these goals by permitting the price to fluctuate based on predetermined factors such as optimal conditions or target user group. By incorporating differential pricing methods when appropriate, the policy also allows users to choose what level of service quality or quantity they want and pay accordingly. The Department implements differential pricing by utilizing the following pricing methods:

Primetime & non-primetime – Pricing premiums for primetime versus non-primetime use assists in allocating the high demand primetime usage and optimizing the non-primetime usage.

Full-time & part-time – Pricing based on amount of time a participant is committed to the use of the program while recognizing priority of full-time.

Season & off-season – Pricing based on season versus off-season permits the usage of service year-round while recognizing priority in specific time periods.

Location – Pricing based on one location versus another provides flexibility in recognizing that not all fields/facilities are the same size nor provide identical amenities.

Age segment – Pricing based on target age segment (i.e. adult, senior, teen, youth) provides flexibility to recognize service priorities and permits variable recovery percentages.

Economic gain – Pricing based on economic gain ensures that when Department property is used by private or closed membership groups for private economic gain, user fees charged are comparable to commercial rates. (Commercial rates for commercial purposes)

Exclusive use – Pricing based on private exclusive use of public property.

Incentives – Pricing which provides incentives for such preferences as early trip registration, season passes, group admissions, annual passes/memberships or frequent use encourages enrollment and return customers.

Move demand – Pricing based on the desire to move participants to another location, time or program.

Resident status – The Department's services historically attract and are open to residents of neighboring communities. While the Department welcomes these customers, we must also be mindful of the impact to our Roseville residents. Although non-resident customers may pay some sales taxes in the City, they do not pay property taxes or neighborhood or community park fees. In an attempt to mitigate this disparity, the Department includes a non-resident surcharge in its pricing strategy. The rate of surcharge varies between zero and 50% based on market demand which considers the following factors:

- The demand from City residents for the program
- The supply/availability of program openings
- The degree of subsidy from the taxpayer for the particular program
- The demand from non-residents for the program
- The viability of the program without non-resident participation
- Recovery goals

These factors directly influence the surcharge. For instance, when there is a demand from City residents for the program and/or low supply or availability of program openings, the surcharge is higher.

Additionally, the greater the taxpayer support for the program, the higher non-resident surcharge.

When a market condition exists where a high supply of program offerings exist and/or a lower demand by residents, the Department may elect to charge the same fee for residents and non-residents alike or assess a low non-resident surcharge. If non-resident participation was essential or the program would be marginally successful without additional participation, a no or low non-resident surcharge would be appropriate.

There are a number of program areas that the City does not assess a non-resident surcharge. The City does not charge a non-resident surcharge at our golf courses or at Adventure Clubs. Both of these programs are enterprise funds that do not receive taxpayer support. Additionally, the City does not charge a different non-resident fee for fitness memberships or admission at our pools, batting cages and other facilities where it would be impractical to collect such a fee.

This pricing method is communicated to our customers as a resident discount rather than a non-resident surcharge.

Types of Fees

Admission Fees (public swim, drop in fitness & soccer, climbing wall, etc.)

Admission fees are described as one-time (single entry) charges made to enter a facility, structure or special program. Access is controlled and attendance is regulated. Objectives include:

1. To generate funds for the operation and maintenance
2. To produce revenue to offset the cost of programs

User Fees (classes, programs, fitness, etc.)

These fees shall be charged for use of a facility, program or access to a controlled area to recover program costs. Objectives include:

1. To pay for or augment the operation and maintenance of a program or facility
2. To recover cost for material fees such as books, supplies, entrance fees
3. To control use of the facility
4. To assess a portion of the costs to users who may not be taxpayers
5. To enable the Department to provide facilities or programs which might not otherwise be available

Security Deposit (rentals, etc.)

Security deposit fees are charged to secure contracted use of a facility. The objective for this fee is to secure a funding source for unanticipated repair for damages, cleanup or extended time for rental.

Rental Fees (facility, picnic or field rental, etc.)

Rental fees are incurred for the privilege of exclusive use of the facility. This fee gives the user the right to enjoy the advantages of the facility, program or equipment. Rental fees should be sufficient to pay for the replacement of the equipment and the cost of operating the rental service which includes direct staff costs plus a portion of indirect costs. These fees may also be referred to as extra fees. Objectives include:

1. To establish the benefit of exclusive use and secure use for a specific time
2. To provide for the equipment which visitors may not have supplied

Sales Fees (gift shop, concession, etc.)

Payment may be obtained from operation of gift shops and concessions which includes the sale of merchandise. Objectives include:

1. To provide needed supplies
2. To provide merchandise that adds to the visitor's enjoyment of the area
3. To provide revenue to offset indirect costs

Permit Fees (metal detector, model airplanes, commercial use of facility, etc.)

These fees are charged for any permit (written permission) issued by or under the authority of the Parks, Recreation & Libraries Department. Objectives include:

1. To control the conduct of the activity
2. To grant special privilege to the applicant
3. To provide revenue to offset costs of control and operations as well as indirect costs

Additional Service Fees (extra staff, trash removal, road closures, etc.)

Fees may be charged for supplying extraordinary activities or services as an accommodation to the user. These fees may also be referred to as extra fees. Objectives include:

1. To enable special services to be rendered by the Department
2. To provide revenue to offset costs of the special service (additional staff, overtime for staff or contracting for services)
3. To improve the quality of the recreation program by adding value, service or variety
4. Surcharge for enhanced maintenance or fee for marketing programs

Advertising Fees & Sponsorships

Fees may be charged for brochures, signs, banners or other forms of advertising or promotion. Funding may also be paid for support of special events or programs.

Administration Fees (Non-Sufficient Fund fee, returned payment, pay arrangements, etc.)

Fees may be charged for direct and indirect costs associated with administration and oversight of a program or service.

Registration Fees

Registration fees are a type of administrative fee charged specifically in the area of child care and preschool. Such fees cover administrative costs, facility repairs, materials fees and annual child care licensing fees.

Library Materials Fees

Fees are charged to borrowers who do not return library materials by the designated due date. These fees vary depending on the item type and length of time overdue. Additional fees may be charged for lost or damaged items and processing fees.

Reinvestment Fees

Fees may be charged to set aside funds for replacement of existing facilities, amenities or technology.

Setting the Price

While not quite as simple as determining the costs and applying the recovery goal, this is the basic concept behind determining the price. The pricing pyramid assists us in establishing the base level of cost recovery and where the program fits. We then look at our revenue goals and other pricing factors to establish the price for the program. This can be done with the use of a multiplier for each program or through individual analysis. Just as the expenditures and recovery goals vary for each program/service/facility, so does the pricing methods and actual determination of the price. A pricing model is developed for each program/service/facility and assists staff in determining the price.

Pricing model development:

Step 1: Identify the program, service or facility.

Is this a core service? Do any special circumstances exist?

Step 2: Determine the actual cost and include direct and indirect costs.

Step 3: Review the cost recovery range and cost recovery goals to identify the percentage recovery.

Step 4: Multiply the recover percentage by the total cost to arrive at the recovery amount.

Step 5: Divide the recovery amount by the minimum number of people required to hold the class or activity.

Step 6: Adjust the price in accordance with the appropriate pricing methods to establish differential pricing.

Step 7: Review the price against industry standards, customer expectations and previous experiences.

Step 8: Set final price.

The pricing of services is a very conscious procedure that requires continual investigation and review by staff. Fees may be adjusted for market conditions and targeted customers as described in the policy. Services may be provided at a discount to stimulate demand or may be waived to accommodate the disadvantaged or non-profit organizations.

Note: Our Child Care programs are required to give 30 calendar days prior written notice of any basic rate change per State of California, Child Care Center General Licensing Requirements Regulation #101219(4).

Staff use the Pre-Program Analysis worksheet (Attachment A) to assist with fee development. Seasonally the Post-Program Analysis worksheet (Attachment B) is used to evaluate the financial aspects of a program. This analysis helps determine the program success and if it should be continued.

Scholarships

The City of Roseville wants every resident youth to have an opportunity to participate in parks, recreation and library programs. The Department recognizes that not all customers possess the same ability to pay for our programs, services and facilities. The community benefits from the active participation of targeted demographic groups (youth & seniors) as we foster healthy lifestyles. The Department offers a variety of fee and free programs and services to help meet this need.

The Department has several scholarship/grant opportunities available to encourage program participation by reducing, waiving or subsidizing fees. Examples of these program include Youth Program Passport, Sparks program assistance, Child Care subsidies, Operation Swim swim lessons, RPAL, teen and senior fitness membership discounts.

Discounts

The Department recognizes discounts encourage participation in fee-based programs and are a valuable marketing tool. Discounts may be used to:

- Increase program/event enrollment or rentals
- Reward continuing/frequent customers and partners
- Encourage customers to try something new
- Facilitate early registration
- Promote registration for multiple sessions of a whole program
- Promote memberships or multiple visit passes

- Provide reduced rates for residents

All discounts are tracked and evaluated for their success. New discounts must be approved by the Parks, Recreation & Libraries Director.

Partnerships

Partnerships bring together at least two entities to jointly develop, operate or maintain parks, recreation and library programs, events and facilities and share risk, operational costs, responsibilities and asset management based on the strengths and weaknesses of each partner. The Department may partner with an organization, individual or business to provide a community benefit, create social interaction, raise awareness or raise money to support a core service. The Department evaluates each partnership opportunity in terms of potential benefits, challenges and drawbacks. When new partnerships are developed, the functions and services of the partnering organizations are recognized and the Department's and the partner's vision, mission and activities are communicated. Additionally, the level of equity commitment required by each partner is identified and agreed to and measureable outcomes for both partners are tracked annually.

The Department has numerous partnerships with local school districts, governmental agencies and both not-for-profit organizations and commercial businesses and will continue to explore new opportunities to create partnerships. Examples of some of these partnerships are outlined below.

Providing high quality athletic facilities for youth compliments the City's overarching goal of creating a safe and healthy community. A component of this effort is to work with not-for-profit organizations within the City to reach this goal while balancing the needs for informal self-directed recreation. Youth league organizations partner with the City to provide athletic opportunities for the community. Organizations must recognize that sports fields require significantly more attention and maintenance and therefore, significantly more resources than basic park facilities. Organizations must invest in this teamwork approach by partnering with the City to ensure our youth have ample opportunity to participate in athletics at various ability levels and to ensure our fields remain safe and of high quality. City personnel allocate fields between these partnering organizations based on resident requirements and the specific seasons. Field allocation policies specifically address this program. Opportunity exists to strengthen these partnerships and invite other organizations to become partners with us. The goal is to be more than a provider of fields but a true partner in the provision of youth athletics in a safe and healthy environment.

Placer Valley Tourism partners with the City to attract tournaments and events that require overnight stays in local hotels. These types of sporting and social events benefit the City overall with tax dollars received from hotel stays, restaurant visits and time spent at Roseville entertainment establishments such as water parks and movie theaters. In these cases, the Parks, Recreation and Libraries Department's goal is to receive 100% of direct costs and a negotiated portion of the indirect costs.

Library materials, programming and technology support are provided by non-profit organizations and help to supplement needed services. For example, the Friends of the Roseville Public Library fund some library programming through book sales, and the Library Foundation helps support mobile library technology.

Summary

The City of Roseville Parks, Recreation & Libraries Department is dedicated to fostering healthy lifestyles and helping the community thrive. The Department strives to maintain its reputation for providing exceptional parks, places, programs and services at a good value to our taxpayers and customers and for preserving and protecting our City's natural resources. Our community size and population is expected to double over the next twenty years and our Department must be prepared to grow accordingly. The formalization of our pricing policy provides us with a comprehensive long-term strategy to address current and future needs of the Roseville community and demands upon the Department.

Attachment A

Parks & Recreation Department									
Pre-Program Analysis									
Class Name:				Session/Season:					
Instructor Name:				Budget Org Key:					
Information Available									
Maximum class capacity:				Number Meetings:		Hours Per Meeting:			
Minimum enrollment:				Location:					
Proposed cost per resident:				Park/School		0			
Proposed cost per nonresident				Signature Facility		0			
Nonresident differential				Contractor's Facility		0			
Proposed Instructor Costs					Overview of Proposed Fees				
		@ Max	@ Min		@ Max	@ Min			
Per participant:	0.00	0.00	0.00	Instructor pay per hour:	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!			
Percentage:	0.0%	0.00	0.00	City cost per hour per person:	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!			
Per class:	0.00	0.00	0.00						
Per hour:	0.00	0.00	0.00						
		\$0.00	\$0.00	Participant cost per hour:	Res	Non			
					#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!			
Revenue									
		@ Max	@ Min		@ Max	@ Min			
Gross Revenue:		\$0.00	\$0.00	Differential NR Revenue	0	0			
Expenses									
Direct Costs:		@ Max	@ Minimum						
Instructors		0.00	0.00	Include employee pmts by % or per hour					
Additional Costs		0.00	0.00	Include materials, books, t-shirts					
Marketing		0.00	0.00	Include mailers & activity guide (\$650 pp summer used for est)					
Indirect Costs:									
Facility		0.00	0.00						
Indirect Staffing		0.00	0.00	0.1					
Total Costs		\$0.00	\$0.00						
Financial Analysis									
Recovery goal		115%							
Recovery % @ max & 23% Non Res		#DIV/0!		Net revenue @ max & 23% Non Res			\$0.00		
Recovery % @ min & 23% Non Res		#DIV/0!		Net revenue @ min & 23% Non Res			\$0.00		
		#DIV/0!							
Enrollment needed for 100% recovery		aka "Break Even Point"							
-	-	-	-				Based on 23% Nonresidents		
Enrollment needed for recovery goal		aka "Meets Goal"							
-	-	-	-				Based on 23% Nonresidents		
Comments									
Other Considerations									
revised 2/09									

Attachment B

Parks & Recreation Department - Post Program Analysis									
Class Name:				Session/Season:					
Budget:									
Number classes offered:				Hours per course:					
Number classes cancelled:				Hours of experience:		0			
Percentage of Classes Held:		#DIV/0!		Class held vs. offered goal:		80%			
Participation									
	Participants		Rates		Wait List		Capacity		
Residents			\$0						
Nonresidents			\$0						
Total	0				0				
	Boys			Comments					
	Girls								
Revenue									
Total Revenue				Info from CLASS		Differential NR Revenue		\$0	
Instructor pay rate:				indicate if per person, per hour, per course or percentage					
Expenses									
Direct Costs:									
Instructors/Staff			Include pmts by %, per hour or per course				Prep hrs		
Additional Costs			Include materials, books, t-shirts						
Marketing			Include mailers & activity guide (\$650 pp summer; \$425 pp all other)						
Subtotal Direct Costs:	\$0.00								
Indirect Costs:									
Facility			Park/Library \$5/hr; Facility \$20/hr						
Indirect Staffing	\$0.00		.15						
Total Costs	\$0.00								
Financial Analysis									
Recovery goal (compared to direct recovery)				Instructor pay per hour		#DIV/0!			
Direct recovery percentage		#DIV/0!		City cost per person/hour:		#DIV/0!			
Total recovery percentage		#DIV/0!		Program capacity realized:		#DIV/0!			
Net Revenue:		\$0.00		Program capacity goal:		85%			
Administrative Analysis									
	Cost/ Revenue	Attendance	Customer Satisfaction	Core Value	Level of Simplicity		Average score	Weighted score	
Weight	20%	15%	15%	30%	20%				
Rating 1 to 5							#DIV/0!	0	
Rating from 1 to 5 where 1 is substandard, 3 is standard, and 5 is exceptional.									
Comments									
Other Considerations									
Location:				Customer satisfaction:					
Program offering:		☐ New ☐ Spinoff ☐ Seasonal ☐ Year Round		Customer satisfaction goal:		95%			
How was data gathered?		☐ Grouped/Avg ☐ Excruciating Detail		Recommendation		☐ Nurture/Grow ☐ Kill It!			
Program curriculum required:		☐ Annually ☐ Seasonally ☐ Daily		Provided?		☐ Yes ☐ No			
Updated January 2010									

RESOLUTION NO. 17-02

ADOPTING A MASTER SCHEDULE OF USER AND REGULATORY FEES,
EFFECTIVE MARCH 20, 2017 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2017

WHEREAS, user and regulatory fees are established by the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the City recently completed a study to identify the cost of providing various user and regulatory fee-related services; and

WHEREAS, while the majority of the City's fees have been adjusted during the last several years, many of the fees proposed for adjustment have not been adjusted for many years; and

WHEREAS, adopting a master schedule of user and regulatory fees will allow for consolidation of the schedule of fees and help formally establish a pattern for annual review and update, including annual inflationary adjustments; and

WHEREAS, staff recommends adopting the Schedule of User and Regulatory Fees, effective March 20, 2017 through June 30, 2017, attached hereto as Exhibit "A"; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that said Schedule of User and Regulatory Fees, effective March 20, 2017 through June 30, 2017 is hereby adopted.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk



Schedule of User and Regulatory Fees
Effective March 20, 2017 through June 30, 2017

Fee Category		Page(s)
1	Administrative Fees	3 - 4
2	Utility Customer Billing, Accounting, and Service Fees	5
3	Planning (Entitlement) Fees	6 - 9
4	Development Services Engineering and Encroachment Permit Fees	10 - 11
5	Trench Cut Recovery Fees	12
6	Building Fees	13 - 22
7	Development Impact Fee Deferral Fees	23
8	Electric Fees	24
9	Environmental Utilities Fees	25 - 26
10	Fire Prevention Fees	27 - 30
11	Police Department Fees	31 - 33
12	Animal Licensing and Permit Fees	34

City of Roseville
Schedule of User and Regulatory Fees



13	Oversize Vehicle Permit Fees and Building Moving Permit Fees	35
14	Parking Permit Fees	36
15	Special Event, Film, and Banner Permit Fees	37
16	Parks, Recreation, & Libraries Department Fees	38

Administrative Fees

Fee Description		Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
	City-Wide Records				
1	Documents				
	a) 8.5 x 11 - Black and White				
	i) 0 - 9 Copies	No Charge			N
	ii) 10+ Copies	\$0.10	per page		N
	b) 8.5 x 14 and 11 x 17 - Black and White	\$0.20	per page		N
	c) Color Copies				
	i) 8.5 x 11	\$0.50	per page		N
	ii) 11 x 17	\$1.00	per page		N
	iii) 18 x 24	\$2.00	per page		N
	iv) 24 x 36	\$3.00	per page		N
2	Photos	\$0.50	per copy		N
3	Recordings	\$6	each		N
4	Agenda Subscription				
	a) 6 Months	\$20			N
	b) 12 Months	\$40			N
5	Budget Book				
	a) Available on City website	No charge			N
	b) Hardcopy	Actual cost or per page fee			N
6	Requests Requiring Special Programming or Formatting	Actual cost		[a]	N
	Passport				
7	Passport Processing Fee	\$25		[b]	N

City of Roseville
Schedule of User and Regulatory Fees

8	Passport Photo Fee	\$10			Y
9	Passport Express Postage	Actual postage cost			N
	Notary				
10	Notary Charge	\$10	each		N
	Subpoena				
11	Subpoena Fees	Fees Vary - See Note		[b]	N
	Election				
11	Candidate Nomination Filing Fee	\$25	per filing	[b]	N
12	Fee for Late Filing of Reports of Campaign Contributions and Expenditures	See Note		[c]	N

Administrative Fees

Fee Description		Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
	Amplified Sound				
13	Sound Permit	\$20			Y
	Franchise Application				
14	Franchise Application Fee				
	a) Refuse Hauler	\$260	two-year term		N
	b) Community Antenna Television System	\$100			N
	c) All Others	\$150			N

[a] Fee for preparation of reports/formats that need to be generated by the City because they are not typically maintained. Amounts charged will include a pass-through of any vendor costs incurred.

[b] Maximum fees established by State/Federal agencies.

[c] See Roseville Municipal Code Fine Schedule and/or Roseville Municipal Bail Schedule.

Utility Customer Billing, Accounting, and Service Fees

Fee Description		Fee	Y'rly In'fltr
1	Reestablishment Fee - Residential Electric		
	a) During Normal Hours	\$40	N
	b) After Hours	\$85	N
2	Reestablishment Fee - Commercial Electric		
	a) During Normal Hours	\$150	N
	b) After Hours	\$175	N
3	Reestablishment Fee - Water	\$150	N
4	Returned Check/ABD/ACH Fee	\$25	N
5	On-Line American Express Fee	2% of payment amount	N
6	Late Payment Fee	5% of late balance	N
7	Unauthorized Service Reconnect Fee	\$50	N
8	Utility Bill Reprint Fee	\$1	N
9	Access Fee	\$50	N
10	Same Day Service	Equal to Reestablishment Fee	N

Planning (Entitlement) Fees

Fee Description		Fixed Fee	Deposit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
	Appeals				
1	Planning Director's Decision	\$1,171			Y
2	PC/DC Decision to City Council	\$1,096			Y
	Annexations				
1	Annex/PZ/Detach/SOI		\$20,000		Y
	Development Agreements (DA)				
1	Adoption of DA		\$20,000		Y
2	Amendment of DA		\$20,000		Y
3	Associated with Affordable Housing	\$2,134			Y
4	Associated with Single Topic Item	\$4,825			Y
	Environmental Review				
1	Exemption Without Initial Study	\$282			Y
2	Exemption With Initial Study	\$712			Y
3	Negative Declaration with No Mitigation	\$1,069			Y
4	Tiered Negative Declaration with Mitigation	\$2,218			Y
5	EIR Deposit		\$20,000		Y
	General Plan Amendment (GPA)				
1	GPA 10 Acres or Less, Map/Text		\$10,000		Y
2	GPA 10+ Acres, Map/Text		\$17,000		Y
3	GPA - Text Policy Amend		\$15,000		Y
	Public Utility Easement Abandonment				
1	Summary Vacation	\$2,203			Y
2	General Vacation	\$3,208			Y
	Signs				
1	Standard Sign Permit	\$227			Y
2	Planned Sign Permit Program	\$874			Y
3	Sign Permit/Program - Public Hearing Required	\$1,777			Y
4	Administrative Permit for Sign Exception (Variance)	\$1,469			Y

5	PSP Minor Modification	\$210		Y
	Specific Plan Amendment (SPA)			
1	SPA Adoption, Map/Text		\$30,000	Y
2	SPA 10 Acres or Less, Map/Text		\$10,000	Y
3	SPA 10+ Acres, Map/Text		\$20,000	Y
4	SPA Text/Policy Deposit		\$15,000	Y
	Subdivisions/Condominiums			
1	Grading Plan - Minor	\$2,018		Y
2	Grading Plan - Major		\$8,000	Y
3	Lot Line Adjustment	\$2,018		Y
4	Extension to a Tentative Map	\$2,018		Y

Planning (Entitlement) Fees

Fee Description		Fixed Fee	Deposit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
5	Voluntary Merger	\$2,018			Y
6	Reversion to Acreage	\$2,880			Y
7	Minor Modification to a Tentative Map		\$2,000		Y
8	Major Modification to a Tentative Map		\$10,000		Y
9	Tentative Parcel Map, 4 or Fewer Lots		\$6,000		Y
10	Tentative Parcel Map, 5 - 99 Lots		\$11,000		Y
11	Tentative Parcel Map, 100 - 499 Lots		\$16,000		Y
12	Tentative Parcel Map, 500+ Lots		\$24,000		Y
Zoning Ordinance Entitlements					
1	Administrative Permit	\$1,006			Y
2	Conditional Use Permit		\$9,000		Y
3	CUP Modification		\$5,000		Y
4	CUP Extension	\$4,630			Y
5	Design Review Permit (DRP)		\$8,000		Y
6	DRP - Modification		\$5,000		Y
7	DRP - Extension	\$4,124			Y
8	DRP - Minor	\$156			Y
9	DRP - Additions or New Construction (DTSP Only)	\$156			Y
10	DRP - Façade Improvements (DTSP Only)	\$156			Y
11	DRP - Predesign (DTSP Only)	\$156			Y
12	DRP - Residential Subdivision with Other Permit	\$4,481			Y
13	Flood Encroachment Permit		\$8,000		Y
14	MPP Stage 1 or Stages 1 & 2		\$20,000		Y
15	MPP Modification		\$7,000		Y
16	MPP Stage 2, Extend of Stage 1 and/or 2		\$7,000		Y
17	MPP Administrative Modification	\$1,285			Y

Planning (Entitlement) Fees

18	Planned Development Permit		\$11,000		Y
19	TP Admin - Approved at Public Counter	\$157			Y
20	TP - Req. Public Hearing for SFD or 10 Trees or Less	\$3,108			Y
21	TP - Req. Public Hearing for DRP/TM or 11+ Trees	\$4,750			Y
22	Administrative Variance	\$1,004			Y
23	Variance to Develop Standards - Req. Public Hearing	\$3,555			Y
24	Variance to Parking Standards	\$4,234			Y
25	Zoning Clearance	\$119			Y
26	Zoning Interpretation - Hearing Required	\$2,663			Y
27	Zoning Interpretation - Non Hearing Item	\$104			Y
Zoning Ordinance Amendments					
1	Ordinance Text Amend (Zoning, Subdivision, Sign)		\$10,000		Y
2	Zoning Map Change (RZ) 10 Acres or Less		\$10,000		Y
3	Zoning Map Change (RZ) 10+ Acres		\$17,000		Y
Fee Description		Fixed Fee	Deposit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
Other					
1	Pre-Application Meetings		\$4,000	[a]	Y
2	New Non-Residential Plan Check	15% of Bldg PC		[b]	N
3	Commercial Plan Check - TI	\$117		[b]	Y
4	Planning Department Plot Plan Review (Bundles of 10)	\$117			Y
5	Radius List Prep-Previously Developed Area	\$109			Y
6	Preparation Undeveloped Area/Mailing	\$272			Y
7	Farmer's Market Permit	\$368			Y
8	Home Occupation Permit	\$119			Y
9	Parking In-Lieu Fee (DTSP Only)	\$9,680		[c]	N
10	In-Lieu Tree Mitigation Fee (Per Inch)	\$118		[d]	N
11	CUP - Vernon St. and Historical District Only	\$1,006			Y
12	Technology Fee	3%			N

Planning (Entitlement) Fees

Full Cost Deposits and Deposit Replenishment

Refund Policy

Applicants for Full Cost Entitlement Applications shall pay for all City staff time required to process the application. A full cost reimbursement agreement shall be included with the project application submittal package. Projects outside the scope of this fee schedule (as determined by the Development Services Director) will be subject to a full cost reimbursement agreement to be approved by the City Council. This reimbursement agreement will include the identification of a work program and will include cost estimates for both City staff time and consultant services based on a defined scope of work.

Initial deposits as shown on the fee schedule will be collected and held by the City in a deposit account at the time the application is submitted. The cost of staff time will be drawn from the deposit account. A positive account balance shall be maintained at all times during the review process. No work will be performed on a project with a negative fund balance. If the deposit is reduced to below 20% of the initial deposit amount, the applicant will be notified and required to supplement the deposit account with an additional amount no less than 50% of the original deposit.

When more than one Full Cost application is submitted, the sum total of the initial full cost deposit amount can be reduced by 20%.

Funds expended for staff time shall not be dependent upon the City's approval or disapproval of the application request. The deposit account will be held open for 90 days after project approval for City to complete any miscellaneous clean up items and to account for all project related costs. Any deposit amounts remaining after final project close out will be returned to applicant. In the event that the deposit account is exhausted prior to final close out, the balance owed to the City will be credited against the plan check and inspection fee deposit at time of improvement plan review.

As may be required by the Development Services Department for project evaluation or environmental review, all payment for consultant work shall be the responsibility of the applicant.

** Note regarding annual inflationary adjustment: The Initial deposit amounts will not be inflated annually, but the underlying hourly billing rates should inflate annually by the change in hourly labor rates and/or indirect cost rate multipliers.*

[a] Pre Application Meetings – The City will provide up to 2 meetings with staff to discuss the initial project review and City policies relative to the proposed project. Additional meetings and staff review prior to a formal application shall be billed on a time and material basis. The project proponent will be asked to submit the pre application deposit and a full cost reimbursement agreement. Staff will record all time against the deposit account. Balances remaining in the deposit account will be applied to the application deposit account or refunded within 60 days. Negative balances will be due in full along with the application deposit or fee at time of Entitlement Application submittal.

Planning (Entitlement) Fees

Application fees are not refundable except as follows:

- A. Refund of 100% shall be made if a determination is made by the Development Services Director that the permit and associated fee are not required by the City of Roseville Municipal Code or adopted City Resolution.
- B. If an applicant requests to withdraw a fixed fee application prior to the PEM, refund of 50% of the applicable fee shall be refunded.
- C. No refund of application fees shall be made after a Project Evaluation Meeting has been held, unless a fee waiver is approved by the Roseville City Council.

Fee Description	Fixed Fee	Deposit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
[b] Non-Residential - Per Building Code, this includes Commercial and Multi-family developments. Plan Check Fees to be assessed as part of Building Department Plan Check Fee. This fee shall be 15% of the building Plan Check Fee for New NonResidential construction (Commercial and Multi-family). Fee to be collected with Building's Plan Check Fee.				
[c] Parking In-Lieu Fee is an optional fee that non-residential uses in the Downtown Specific Plan Area can utilize instead of providing required parking on-site. Fees for the 1st stall will be 10% of the parking in-lieu fee, 2nd stall 25%, 3rd Stall 50%, 4th stall 75% and 5 or more stalls 100% of the in-lieu fee.				
[d] In-Lieu Tree Mitigation Fee for the removal of protected trees is calculated per inch of the diameter at breast height of the tree.				

Development Services Engineering and Encroachment Permit Fees

Fee Description	Fee	Initial Deposit	Fee Paid	Bond Amount [a]	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
1 Final Subdivision Map	Billed hourly based on total labor hrs	\$2,500 plus \$10 per lot	At submittal			Y
2 Final Parcel Map						
a) base fee	\$1,250		At submittal		[b]	Y
b) per lot fee	\$50		At submittal		[b]	Y
3 Lot Line Adjustment (per adjusted line)	\$225		At submittal		[c]	Y
4 Improvement Plan Check/Inspection	Billed hourly based on total labor hrs \$1,000 minimum	5% of Eng. cost est. 2.5% at submittal 2.5% at plan approval	2.5% at submittal 2.5% at plan approval	100% of improvements		Y
5 Grading Plan						Y
a) Subdivision, Commercial, or Industrial Sites	Billed hourly based on total labor hrs \$1,000 minimum	5% of Eng. cost est. 2.5% at submittal 2.5% at plan approval	2.5% at submittal 2.5% at plan approval	10% of erosion control and grading		
b) All Other Sites	\$300	\$100 at submittal				Y
i) Up to 500 Cubic Yards			\$100 at submittal remainder due at permit issuance	10% of erosion control and grading		
ii) Greater than 500 Cubic Yards	Billed hourly based on total labor hrs	\$1,000 at submittal	\$1,000 at submittal balance due prior to final signoff	10% of erosion control and grading		Y
6 Encroachment Permit:						
a) Dumpster	\$60		At submittal	\$0		Y
b) Sidewalk	5% of Project Cost \$60 minimum		At submittal	\$1,000 / contractor		N
c) Driveway	5% of Project Cost \$60 minimum		At submittal	\$500/resident \$1,000/c'ntrctr		N
d) Lane Closure	\$150		At submittal	\$0		Y
e) Swim Pool Access	\$150		At submittal	TBD by Director		Y
f) Monitoring Wells	5% of Project Cost \$60 minimum		At submittal	\$2,000 per well		N

	g) All Others	Billed hourly based on total labor hrs	5% of Eng. cost est. 2.5% at submittal 2.5% at plan app'r'vl; \$1,000 minimum	2.5% at submittal 2.5% at plan app'r'vl	100% of improvements		Y
7	Technology Fee	3% of permit fee		At permit issuance			N

Development Services Engineering and Encroachment Permit Fees

Fee Description	Fee	Initial Deposit	Fee Paid	Bond Amount [a]	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
-----------------	-----	-----------------	----------	-----------------	------	---------------

* Note regarding annual inflationary adjustment: The Initial deposit amounts will not be inflated annually, but the underlying hourly billing rates should inflate annually by the change in hourly labor rates and/or indirect cost rate multipliers.

[a] Bond amounts paid at permit issuance.

[b] Final parcel map fee collected as base fee plus per lot fee.

[c] Lot line adjustment fee is fee for each adjusted line.

Trench Cut Recovery Fees

Fee Description		Permit Fee	Trench Cut Fee	Cut Fee Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
Trench Cuts Requiring Pmt. of Admin. Permit Fee Only						
1	Street scheduled for resurfacing within next fiscal year	\$300	\$0.00			Y
2	Proposed excavation includes an overlay	\$300	\$0.00			Y
3	Proposed excavation for a CIP	\$300	\$0.00			Y
4	Street pavement quality index (PQI) 0-4	\$300	\$0.00			Y
All Other Trench Cuts						
5	Longitudinal Cut					
	a) Cut within 3' of lane line					
	i) PQI: 4.1 - 6.5	\$300	\$12.96	per LF		Y
	ii) PQI: 6.6 - 8.4	\$300	\$17.28	per LF		Y
	iii) PQI: 8.5 or greater	\$300	\$21.60	per LF		Y
	b) Cut within one lane width					
	i) PQI: 4.1 - 6.5	\$300	\$9.72	per LF		Y
	ii) PQI: 6.6 - 8.4	\$300	\$12.96	per LF		Y
	iii) PQI: 8.5 or greater (<i>moratorium street</i>)	\$300	\$16.20	per LF	[a]	Y
6	Traverse Cut					
	i) PQI: 4.1 - 6.5	\$300	\$7.90	per LF		Y
	ii) PQI: 6.6 - 8.4	\$300	\$10.53	per LF		Y
	iii) PQI: 8.5 or greater (<i>moratorium street</i>)	\$300	\$13.16	per LF	[a]	Y
7	Cut is a Patch					
	i) PQI: 4.1 - 6.5	\$300	\$8.75	per LF		Y
	ii) PQI: 6.6 - 8.4	\$300	\$11.66	per LF		Y
	iii) PQI: 8.5 or greater (<i>moratorium street</i>)	\$300	\$14.58	per LF	[a]	Y

[a] Moratorium streets require director approval for trenching.

Building Fees

A. Construction Valuation Table - Table A is the construction valuation table adopted for the purpose of establishing permit fees as construction valuation is a factor in the cost of providing permitting services. These valuations correlate to the square footage costs of permitting, plan review, and inspection services based upon the hourly rate for building services identified in this fee schedule.

Table A - Construction Valuation

Group		Valuation		Unit	Y'rly In'fltr
		<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>		
1	A-1 Assembly, theaters, with stage	\$93.60	\$46.80	per SF	N
2	A-1 Assembly, theaters, without stage	\$93.60	\$46.80	per SF	N
3	A-2 Assembly, nightclubs	\$93.60	\$46.80	per SF	N
4	A-2 Assembly, restaurants, bars, banquet halls	\$111.80	\$55.90	per SF	N
5	A-3 Assembly, churches	\$93.60	\$46.80	per SF	N
6	A-3 Assembly, general, community halls, libraries, museums	\$88.40	\$44.20	per SF	N
7	A-4 Assembly, arenas	\$105.30	\$52.65	per SF	N
8	B Business	\$88.40	\$44.20	per SF	N
9	E Educational	\$94.90	\$47.45	per SF	N
10	F-1 Factory and Industrial, moderate hazard	\$49.40	\$24.70	per SF	N
11	F-2 Factory and Industrial, low hazard	\$49.40	\$24.70	per SF	N
12	H-1 High Hazard, explosives	\$49.40	\$24.70	per SF	N
13	H-2,3,4 - High Hazard	\$49.40	\$24.70	per SF	N
14	H-5 - HPM	\$79.30	\$39.65	per SF	N
15	I-1 Institutional, supervised environment	\$126.72	\$63.36	per SF	N
16	I-2 Institutional, hospitals	\$131.29	\$65.65	per SF	N
17	I-2 Institutional, nursing homes	\$249.09	\$124.55	per SF	N
18	I-3 Institutional, restrained	\$145.80	\$72.90	per SF	N
19	I-4 Institutional, day care facilities	\$126.72	\$63.36	per SF	N
20	M Mercantile	\$62.40	\$31.20	per SF	N
21	R-1 Residential, hotels	\$97.50	\$48.75	per SF	N
22	R-2 Residential, multiple-family	\$100.18	\$50.09	per SF	N
23	R-3 Residential, one- and two-family	\$110.00	\$55.00	per SF	N
24	R-4 Residential, care/assisted living facilities	\$106.60	\$53.30	per SF	N
25	S-1 Storage, moderate hazard	\$42.90	\$21.45	per SF	N
26	S-2 Storage, low hazard	\$41.60	\$20.80	per SF	N
27	U Utility, miscellaneous	\$32.50	\$16.25	per SF	N

Building Fees

B. Determination of Construction Valuations - The building official shall determine construction valuations as follows:

- 1 **New Construction.** New construction shall be based upon the square footage of the proposed project multiplied by the amount stated in **Column A of Table A** corresponding to the occupancy group, as determined by the building official, for a total construction value.
- 2 **Improvements.** Improvements to existing buildings shall be based upon the square footage of the proposed improvements multiplied by the amount stated in **Column B of Table A** corresponding to the occupancy group, as determined by the building official, for a total construction value.

C. Commercial Building Valuations - Minimum commercial building valuations are stated below for the purposes of establishing minimum permit fees to cover the cost of service for the project listed. The higher valuation shall be assessed unless otherwise stated.

- 1 **Tenant Improvements Processed Over the Counter (OTC Permits).** Tenant Improvement OTC permits shall have a minimum valuation of \$8,000.
- 2 **Tenant Improvements Requiring Plan Submittal.** Tenant Improvements (TIs) requiring plan submittal shall have a minimum valuation based upon Column B of Table A. For purposes of this section, a tenant improvement is defined as any improvement, maintenance or other updating on commercial property; improvement, maintenance or other updating on multi-family property; improvement, maintenance or other updating on residential care facilities and model home sales complexes, including sales trailers.
- 3 **Commercial Photovoltaic.** Commercial photovoltaic permits shall be based on a set valuation of \$40,000.
- 4 **Electrical Service Upgrade.** Electrical service upgrade permit fees shall have a minimum valuation of \$3,000.
- 5 **Commercial Reroofing.** Commercial reroofing permits shall have a minimum valuation of \$423.17 per 100 square feet of roof area or a total minimum valuation of \$20,000.
- 6 **OTC Permits for Commercial Projects.** OTC permits for commercial projects such as demolition, electrical, mechanical, plumbing and other work not otherwise defined shall have a minimum valuation of \$3,000.
- 7 **OTC Permits for Commercial Projects.** OTC permits for commercial projects such as demolition, electrical, mechanical, plumbing and other work not otherwise defined shall have a minimum valuation of \$3,000.
- 8 **Cell Towers - Change out of Antennas Only.** Cell towers requiring change-out of antennas only shall be considered a TI remodel with a minimum valuation of \$3,000.
- 9 **Cell Towers - Major Remodel.** Cell towers undergoing a major remodel shall have a minimum valuation of \$8,000.
- 10 **Shelves and Racking.** Permits for shelves and racking shall be considered a TI remodel. Construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$8,000 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the square footage by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the U, Utility, Miscellaneous Occupancy Group.
- 11 **Stucco or Siding on Multi-Family.** For permits for stucco or siding on multi-family units, construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$8,000 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the linear footage of exterior home and garage x 1 SF (= remodel SF) by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the R-2, Residential Multi-Family Occupancy Group.
- 12 **Stair Repair on Multi-Family.** For permits for stair repair on multi-family units, construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$8,000 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the square footage of the stair area(s) x number of floors of the building(s) by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the R-2, Residential MultiFamily Occupancy Group.

Building Fees

- 13 **Pool Replaster and Repairs.** For permits for commercial pool replaster and/or repairs, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$8,000 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the pool square footage by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the U, Utility, Miscellaneous Occupancy Group.
- 14 **Electronic Gates.** For permits for electronic gates, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$8,000 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the lineal footage of the gate and replacement fence x 1 SF (=SF) by the amount stated in Column A of Table A for the U, Utility, Miscellaneous Occupancy Group.
- 15 **Facade Remodel.** For permits for facade remodel, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$8,000 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the lineal footage of the facade x 1 SF (=SF) by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the Occupancy Group listed on the certificate of occupancy.
- 16 **Spray Booth.** For permits for spray booth installation, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$8,000 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the square footage of the booth area by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the F, Factory and Industrial Occupancy Group.
- 17 **Parking Lot Restriping: Site Work.** Permits for parking lot restriping shall have a minimum valuation of \$8,000.
- 18 **ADA Upgrades.** Permits for ADA upgrades shall have a minimum valuation of \$8,000.
- 19 **Barrier Removal.** Permits for barrier removal shall have a minimum valuation of \$8,000.
- 20 **Crane install runways.** Permits for crane install runways shall have a minimum valuation of \$8,000.
- 21 **Construction Trailer.** For permits for construction trailers hooking up to water/sewer and/or electric, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be calculated by multiplying the trailer square footage by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the B, Business Occupancy Group.
- 22 **Commercial Charging Station.** For permits for commercial charging stations, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be based on the construction valuation provided by the applicant with a minimum valuation of \$8,000.
- 23 **Emergency Generator to Cell Site.** Permits for emergency generators to cell sites shall have a minimum valuation of \$8,000.
- 24 **Pumpkin Lot/Tree Lot.** Permits for pumpkin or tree lots shall have a minimum valuation of \$8,000.

D. Residential Building Valuations - Minimum residential building valuations are stated below for the purposes of establishing minimum permit fees to cover the cost of service for the project listed. The higher valuation shall be assessed unless otherwise stated.

- 1 **Patio Covers.** Patio covers shall have minimum valuation based upon new construction valuation of Column A of Table A.
- 2 **Swimming Pools.** Swimming pools shall have a set valuation of \$25,000 for the purposes of establishing the building permit fee. The swimming pool construction contract valuation shall be reported on the permit application if such amount exceeds \$25,000.
- 3 **Residential Remodel.** Residential remodel permits shall have a minimum valuation based upon Column B of Table A.
- 4 **Residential Additions.** Residential additions shall have a minimum valuation based upon Column A of Table A (new construction).
- 5 **Combination of Residential Remodel and Residential Addition.** With respect to a permit application for a combination residential remodel and residential addition subsection (D)(3) shall apply with respect to the residential remodel portion and subsection (D)(4) shall apply with respect to the residential addition (new construction) portion for a total construction valuation for the permit.

Building Fees

- 6 **Photovoltaic.** Photovoltaic permits shall be based upon a set valuation of \$18,000 for the purposes of establishing the permit fee.
 - 7 **Reroof.** Reroof permits for residential structures shall have a minimum valuation of \$239.49 per 100 square feet of roof area or a total minimum valuation of \$2,400.
 - 8 **Plumbing OTC Permits.** OTC permits pertaining to plumbing shall have a minimum valuation of \$900.
 - 9 **Mechanical, Electrical, Car Charging Stations, Demolition and Other OTC Permits Not Specified in this Section.** OTC permits for mechanical, electrical, car charging stations, demolition, and other permits not specified in this section shall have a minimum valuation of \$2,400.
 - 10 **Stucco or Siding.** For permits for stucco or siding on residential units, construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$2,400 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the linear footage of exterior home and garage x 1 SF (= remodel SF) by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the R-3, Residential, One- and Two-Family Occupancy Group.
 - 11 **Fence or Retaining Wall.** For permits for residential fences or retaining walls, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$2,400 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the linear footage of fence or wall x 1 SF (= SF) by the amount stated in Column A of Table A for the U, Utility, Miscellaneous Occupancy Group.
 - 12 **Windows.** Permits for residential windows shall have a minimum valuation of \$2,400.
 - 13 **Freestanding Fireplace.** Permits for a freestanding fireplace shall have a minimum valuation of \$2,400.
 - 14 **BBQ.** Permits for a barbeque (BBQ) shall have a minimum valuation of \$2,400.
 - 15 **Pool Replaster and Repairs.** For permits for residential pool replaster and/or repairs, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$2,400 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the pool square footage by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the U, Utility, Miscellaneous Occupancy Group.
 - 16 **Shed.** For permits for residential sheds, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$2,400 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the square footage of the shed (= SF) by the amount stated in Column A of Table A for the U, Utility, Miscellaneous Occupancy Group.
 - 17 **Deck Repair.** For permits for deck repair, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$2,400 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the square footage of the deck area being repaired (= SF) by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the U, Utility, Miscellaneous Occupancy Group.
 - 18 **Fire Repair.** For permits for residential fire repair, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be calculated in the same manner as a residential remodel.
- E. Permit Fees** - Subject to any applicable minimum permit fees stated elsewhere in this schedule, Table B and B.1, shall apply for the purpose of establishing minimum permit fees.

Table B - Permit Fees

Total Valuation	Permit Fee	Y'rly In'fltr
-----------------	------------	---------------

Building Fees

\$1 to \$500	\$50.00			Y
\$501 to \$1,000	\$50.00			Y
\$1,001 to \$3,000	\$62.50	for the first \$500	plus \$2.50	Y
\$3,001 to \$25,000	\$117.50	for the first \$1,000	plus \$2.75	Y
\$25,001 to \$50,000	\$349.75	for the first \$3,000	plus \$11.00	Y
\$50,001 to \$100,000	\$574.75	for the first \$25,000	plus \$9.00	Y
\$100,001 to \$500,000	\$887.25	for the first \$50,000	plus \$6.25	Y
\$500,001 to \$1,000,000	\$2,887.25	for the first \$100,000	plus \$5.00	Y
\$1,000,001 and up	\$4,764.25	for the first \$500,000	plus \$3.75	Y
		for the first \$1,000,000	plus \$2.00	

Production Home Permit Fees - Building permits for production homes (those homes that are one and two family homes having an approved master plan, which is a complete set of building plans from which multiple homes may be constructed) shall have a minimum permit fee as calculated in Table B.1.

Table B.1 - Production Home Permit Fees

Total Valuation	Permit Fee	Y'rly In'fltr
\$0 to \$120,000	\$1,183.00	Y
\$120,001 and up	\$1,183.00	Y
	for the first \$120,000 plus \$8.00 for each add'l \$11,000 or fraction thereof	

F. Administration Fee - In addition to the permit fee, an administration fee is established for the city to recover the cost of permit application processing, permit issuance, and plan review and shall be applied as follows:

Fee Description	Fee	Y'rly In'fltr
1 Permits Requiring Plan Submittal for Review	95% of the Building Permit Fee	N

Building Fees

2	Over the Counter Permits Requiring Minimal or No Plan Review	25% of the Hourly Rate or Actual Cost (for time in excess of 1/2 hour)	N
3	Production Home Permits	37% of the Building Permit Fee	N
4	Plans Submitted for the Purposes of Being Mastered	95% of the Building Permit Fee (based on SF valuation of proposed design)	N
5	Emergency Water Heater Repair	Exempt From the Admin Fee (allocated one inspection visit. If add'l visits are required re-inspection fees apply for add'l visits)	N

Building Fees

G. Additional Time and Materials Fees and Refunds and Appeals - Building permits are subject to additional time and material fees where the cost of service provided by city exceeds the amount collected at application. Such fees shall be calculated as follows:

Fee Description		Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
1	Additional Services (1/2 hour minimum)	\$172	per hour	[a]	Y
2	Re-inspections (per scheduled stop)	\$100	per stop	[b]	Y
3	Inspections Outside of Normal Business Hours	\$172	per hour	[c]	Y
4	Work Commenced without a Permit	\$172	minimum	[d]	Y
5	Certificate of Occupancy (1 hour minimum)	\$172	per hour	[e]	Y
6	Permit Extension or Reinstatement of an Expired Permit	\$172	per hour	[f]	Y
7	Third Party Plan Review (fee is in addition to City Administration Fee in Section F)	pass through of consultant fee		[g]	N
8	Credit Card Fee	3.0%		[h]	N
9	Fees for Services Not Listed in this Schedule	Actual Cost		[i]	N
10	Refunds and Appeals				
	a) Fees erroneously paid by applicant or collected or charged by the agency	100% refund		[j][m]	N
	b) When no work has been commenced	up to 75% refund		[k][m]	N
	c) Expired permit applications and permits	0% refund		[l][m]	N

[a] Additional Services (e.g. administrative and plan review) Fees shall be assessed at time of permit issuance and/or prior to final inspection at application. Additional service is defined as follows:

1. Plan Reviews in excess of three (3) submittals to city for review and approval.
2. Plan Review by city departments other than the development services department for projects affecting other City services and not covered by any fees set forth in this section.
3. Other staff time and resources for the purposes of facilitating and approving permit applications and permits.
4. Expedited plan review, when available, and additional resources required to facilitate the expedited plan review process, including consultants and/or other city departments and divisions whose assistance is required for plan approval.

[b] Re-inspections may be assessed based on any of the following:

1. Inspections which are not ready at the time of the scheduled inspection, as determined by a city inspector.
2. Failure by applicant to complete inspection items from previous correction notices.
3. Inspections additional to the inspection with respect to emergency water heater permits.

[c] Inspections outside of normal business hours will be subject to a 2-hour minimum for evening work and a 4-hour minimum for weekend work.

Building Fees

[d] Whenever any work for which a permit is required has been commenced without first applying for a building permit and receiving permission by the building official, a minimum fee for investigation and administration shall be assessed in addition to the full cost of any required permits.

[e] The fee for a certificate of occupancy shall be a minimum of one hour, and any additional costs beyond one hour of staff time to approve such certificates.

[f] Permit applications and permits shall expire per the provisions of the California Building Code. Reinstatement and extensions may be granted provided that all costs incurred by the city to date of the request are paid for by the permit applicant. For this purpose, cost is defined as the hours expended for review and administration multiplied by the hourly rate.

[g] Third party plan review, when available, shall be assessed and paid at time of permit application. The fee for this service is the hourly or flat rate charged by the consulting firm performing the review. This fee is in addition to the permit Administration Fees identified in "Section F" of this fee schedule for the additional resources required to facilitate the process.

[h] Permit applicants who choose to pay with a credit card for any fees may do so providing they pay to city an administration fee, not to exceed 3% of the transaction cost. This fee is a convenience fee for merchant processing and is only charged to applicants utilizing a credit card and only with respect to the amount of the total permit fee which is paid by such credit card.

[i] Fees for services not otherwise listed in this schedule shall be determined by the building official and based upon the actual cost of providing the service.

[j] The building official may authorize refunding of any fee paid, or portion thereof, which was erroneously paid by applicant or collected by city.

[k] The building official may authorize refunding of not more than seventy-five percent (75%) of fees paid when no work has been done under a permit application or an issued permit in accordance with the adopted California Code of Regulations. In no case shall the refund exceed the cost of services provided to date of cancellation of permit issuance.

[l] Permit applications and building permits that have expired as defined in the California Building Code shall not be subject to any refund.

[m] A building permit applicant may, upon payment of the requested permit fees to city and otherwise complying with California Government Code Section 66022, protest the requested amount to the city council by lodging an appeal with the building official. City staff shall schedule the appeal to be heard by the city council as soon as reasonably practicable.

H. Technology Fee, General Plan Maintenance Fee, Strong Motion Impact Fee, SB 1473 Fee

Fee Description		Fee	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
1	Technology Fee (applicable to building permits, fire permits, improvement plan, and entitlement fees)	3%	[a]	N
2	General Plan Maintenance Fee	\$0.50 per \$1,000 valuation, not to exceed \$20,000		N
3	Strong Motion Impact (SMI) Fee Calculation			
	a) Residential	\$0.50 or valuation x .0001	[b]	N
	b) Commercial	\$0.50 or valuation x .00021	[b]	N

Building Fees

4	Building Standards Administration Special Revolving Fund (SB 1473) Fee Calculation			
	Valuation:			
	a) \$1 - \$25,000	\$1		N
	b) \$25,001 - \$50,000	\$2		N
	c) \$50,001 - \$75,000	\$3		N
	d) \$75,001 - \$100,000	\$4		N
	e) Every \$25,000 or fraction thereof above \$100,000	Add \$1		N

[a] “Building permit” means the permit issued or required by the city for the construction or modification of any structure pursuant to and as defined by the building code. “Fire permit” means the permit issued or required by the city for the construction or ongoing operations of a structure or business pursuant to and as defined by the fire code. “Improvement plan” means the permit issued or required by the city for the construction of any public or private site improvements as defined by the city’s improvement and construction standards. “Entitlement” means those approvals provided under Title 19, Zoning.

[b] Fee set by State.

I. Findings Regarding Permit Fees for Residential Rooftop Solar Energy Systems - Pursuant to Section 66015 of the California Government Code (Fees for Rooftop Solar Energy Systems), the city council finds that the reasonable cost to issue a permit for a residential rooftop solar energy system exceeds \$500 plus \$15 per kilowatt (kW) for each kW above 15 because issuance of the permit requires all of the following:

- 1One-half (1/2) hour administration time for application and data input
- 21/2 hour administration time for permit issuance and one hour plan review time including up to two (2) submittals
- 3Typically 2 inspections at a minimum of 1/2 hour of staff time
- 4Other applicable fees assessed by the State of California and by the Roseville Electric Department pursuant to the Roseville Electric Solar Energy Program Meter Upgrade Charges, as amended from time to time

This higher fee results in a quick and streamlined approval process.

Development Impact Fee Deferral Fees

Fee Description	Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
1 Development Impact Fee Deferral a) Residential b) Non-Residential i) Administrative Fee ii) Interest Charge on Deferred Fees	\$250	per deferral		Y
	\$625	per deferral		Y
	equal to unearned interest based on City's 10-yr avg pooled interest rate	per deferral	[a]	N

[a] Fee deferral will result in a loss of interest income on monies deferred over the construction timeframe. The interest charge is intended to cover these costs.

Electric Fees

Fee Description		Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
Solar Energy Program - Meter Upgrade Charges					
1	Residential PV Net-Meter	\$596.64			Y
2	Business PV Net-Meter (<10kW system size)	\$1,462.56			Y
3	Business PV Net & PBI Meter (10-100kW system size, up to 200amp PBI panel)	\$3,132.23		[a]	Y
4	Business PV Net & PBI Meter (10-100kW system size, >200amp PBI panel)	\$5,227.53		[a]	Y
5	Variance Review Request	\$177.44	per hour		Y
6	Plan Reviews or Field Meets Exceeding the Initial and Subsequent Submittal Limit	\$177.44	per hour	[b]	Y
7	PBI Meter Installations Requiring a Phone Switcher	\$290.34	per switcher		Y
Other Service Fees					
8	Pedestal Meter Fee	\$324.28			Y
9	Temporary Power Meter Set				
	a) Temp Power Meter Set Fee - Residential	\$391.66			Y
	b) Temp Power Meter Set Fee - Commercial	Actual Cost			Y
10	Extension of Facilities	Actual Cost			Y
11	Svc Connections and Facilities on Customer's Premises	Actual Cost			Y
12	Meter Test				
	a) Test - More than six-months since prior test	\$0.00			Y
	b) Test - Within six-months of meter install or prior test	Actual Cost			Y
13	Overhead-to-Underground Conversion of Overhead Utilities	Actual Cost			Y

** Note regarding annual inflationary adjustment: For items billed at actual cost, the underlying hourly billing rates should inflate annually by the change in hourly labor rates and/or indirect cost rate multipliers.*

* All meter upgrade costs must be paid prior to receiving interconnection approval to operate the PV system.

[a] Customer is required to supply a dedicated working phone line and monitoring for the duration of the PBI payment term. See the construction standards for phone line requirements.

[b] The initial and first resubmittal plan review and the initial and first resubmittal field inspections are included in the basic Meter Upgrade Charge.

Environmental Utilities Fees

Fee Description	Fee	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
Water			
1 Construction Water			
a) Fire Hydrant Application Fee	\$225		Y
b) Usage Rate	Current rate per Ccf		N
c) Meter and Backflow Rental			
i) Monthly Rental Charge	\$100		N
ii) Initial Deposit	\$1,500		N
2 Meter Installation for New Residential Construction			
a) Labor Charge	\$125		Y
b) Meter and Meter Appurtenance Charge	Actual Cost		Y
c) Quantity Charge	\$75		Y
3 Meter Installation - All Other	Actual Cost		Y
4 Service Connections	Actual Cost		Y
5 Tap	Actual Cost		Y
6 Abandon Water Service Line	Actual Cost		Y
7 Installation of Facilities in Subdivisions/Other Dev'lpmts	Actual Cost		Y
Water Conservation			
8 Water - Water Efficient Landscape Review	Actual Cost		Y
Backflow Prevention Inspection and Cross-Connection Control			
9 Backflow Prevention Assembly - Installation, Repair, Replacement	Actual Cost	[a]	Y
10 Backflow Prevention Assembly - Reinspection Fee	\$60	[b]	Y
Well Water			
11 Well Permit			
a) First Well	\$250	[c]	Y
b) Each Additional Well	\$125	[c]	Y
c) Soil Boring (no well)	\$250		Y
Sewer			
12 Private Sewage Disposal System - Plan Review and Inspection	Actual Cost		Y
13 Building Sewers and Connections			
a) Residential and Commercial Service	Actual Cost		Y
b) Service Establishments Producing Industrial Waste	Actual Cost		Y

14	Review of Grease, Oil, and Grit Interceptors	Actual Cost		Y
15	Rate-of-Flow Controller Facility			
	a) Installation	Actual Cost		Y
	b) Re-inspection	Actual Cost		Y
16	Industrial Waste Manhole - Plan Review and Inspection	Actual Cost		Y
17	Closed Circuit TV for Inspection and Warranty Service	Actual Cost		Y
18	Vactor Service for Cleaning of New Infrastructure for Final Acceptance	Actual Cost		Y
19	Fabrication of Special Fittings	Actual Cost		Y
20	Fats, Oils, and Grease Program (FOG) - Costs incurred by the City as a result of required on-site sampling and analysis	Actual Cost		Y

Environmental Utilities Fees

Fee Description		Fee	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
21	FOG Program Violation Appeal Cost Reimbursement			
	a) Public Utilities Commission	Actual Cost		Y
	b) City Council	Actual Cost		Y
	Recycled Water			
22	Recycled Water - Cost of Meter and Installation			
	a) 3/4"	\$469.23		Y
	b) 1"	\$530.32		Y
	c) 1 1/2"	\$1,223.66		Y
	d) 2"	\$1,385.06		Y
	e) 3"	\$1,872.40		Y
	f) 4"	\$3,133.49		Y
	g) 6"	\$5,265.56		Y
	h) 8"	\$8,389.14		Y
	i) 10"	\$10,697.23		Y
23	Recycled Water - Plan Review and Inspection	Actual Cost		Y
	Industrial Wastewater			
24	On-Site Sampling	Actual Cost		Y
	Other Fees			
25	Plan Review	Actual Cost		Y

26	On-site Inspections	Actual Cost	Y
27	Water Warranty Inspections	Actual Cost	Y
28	Wastewater Warranty Inspections	Actual Cost	Y
29	Cross Connection Testing	Actual Cost	Y
30	Cross Connection Testing for Backflows	Actual Cost	Y
31	Water Continuity Testing	Actual Cost	Y
32	Spark Testing	Actual Cost	Y
33	Mapping	Actual Cost	Y
34	Standby	Actual Cost	Y
35	Disposal of Chlorinated or Contaminated Water	Actual Cost	Y
36	Tee Installation	Actual Cost	Y
37	401 Transition Pipe	Actual Cost	Y
38	Pipe Coating	Actual Cost	Y

** Note regarding annual inflationary adjustment: For items billed at actual cost, the underlying hourly billing rates should inflate annually by the change in hourly labor rates and/or indirect cost rate multipliers.*

[a] Installation, repair, or replacement of a backflow prevention assembly shall be performed by a licensed contractor, or with customer approval, by City personnel. The cost to the City for materials and labor at the prevailing wage shall be paid by the owner or customer.

[b] Reinspection fee is the fee required to be paid upon finding by an inspector that the backflow prevention assembly is defective or not in compliance backflow prevention assembly standards.

[c] Fee is 50% refundable if denied.

Fire Prevention Fees

Fee Description		Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
	Permits to Operate (Type of Permit Activity)				
1	Amusement Building	\$292.60			Y
2	Carnivals and Fairs	\$292.60			Y
3	Combustible Dust Operations	\$292.60			Y
4	Covered Mall Buildings	\$292.60			Y
5	Exhibits and Trade Shows	\$292.60			Y
6	Explosives or Blasting Agents	\$731.50			Y
7	Recreational or Bon Fire	\$146.30			Y
8	Theatrical Fire Performance	\$292.60			Y
9	High Pile Storage	\$292.60			Y
10	Hot Work Operations	\$292.60			Y
11	Industrial Ovens	\$292.60			Y
12	Lumber Yards	\$292.60			Y
13	Misc. Combustible Storage	\$292.60			Y
14	Places of Assembly				
	a) Less than 300 occupant load	\$292.60			Y
	b) 300 - 999 occupant load	\$438.90			Y
	c) 1,000 or more occupant load	\$585.20			Y
15	Commercial Day Care Facility				
	a) 7 - 49 persons	\$292.60			Y
	b) 50 - 149 persons	\$438.90			Y
	c) 150 or more persons	\$585.20			Y
16	Institutional				
	a) Less than 6 patients	\$292.60			Y
	b) 6 or more patients	\$438.90			Y
	c) Detention facilities	\$585.20			Y
17	Apartments/Hotels/Motels				
	a) 3 - 16 units	\$219.45			Y

Fire Prevention Fees

	b) 17 - 32 units	\$292.60			Y
	c) 33 or more units	\$438.90			Y
18	Large Family Day Care	\$292.60			Y
19	Residential Care Facilities				
	a) 7 or more residents	\$438.90			Y
	b) Pre-inspection (at hourly rate)	\$146.30	per hour		Y
20	Temporary Membrane Structures (Tents/Canopies)				
	a) 401 - 1,499 SF	\$219.45			Y
	b) 1,500 - 2,999 SF	\$292.60			Y
	c) 3,000 - 5,999 SF	\$438.90			Y
	d) 6,000 or more SF	\$585.20			Y
	Plan Review (Including Inspection Service)				
21	Fire Alarm System				
Fee Description		Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
	a) New Installation	\$1,316.17			Y
	b) Tenant Improvement	\$585.20			Y
	c) Large Project > 50 Notification Devices	\$3,511.20			Y
	d) High Rise	\$5,266.80			Y
22	Fire Sprinkler System - New Installation				
	a) 1 - 99 heads	\$1,755.60			Y
	b) 100 - 199 heads	\$2,194.50			Y
	c) 200 or more heads	\$2,926.00			Y
23	Fire Sprinkler System - Tenant Improvement				
	a) 1 - 50 heads	\$585.20			Y
	b) 51 or more heads	\$1,170.40			Y
24	Fire Stand Pipe System	\$1,170.40			Y
25	Fire Pump System	\$2,194.50			Y
26	Hood and Duct System	\$1,024.10			Y
27	Special Suppression System (Clean agent, Co2, etc.)	\$1,463.00			Y

Fire Prevention Fees

Fee Description		Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
38	d) Hazardous Waste Generator Fee > 2,500 gal	\$877.80			Y
	Tiered Permitting				
	a) Permit by Rule (PBR)	\$877.80			Y
	b) Conditionally Authorized	\$438.90			Y

Fire Prevention Fees

	c) Conditionally Exempt	\$438.90		Y
39	Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG)			
	a) Annual tank > 125 gal	\$292.60		Y
	b) Tank installation (plan review and inspection)	\$585.20		Y
40	State of California Surcharge CALARP	\$270.00		Y
41	State of California Surcharge Hazardous Materials	\$35.00		Y
42	Review of Hazardous Materials Risk Management Plans	\$146.30	per hour	Y
43	Review of Hazardous Materials Emergency Response Plans	\$146.30	per hour	Y
44	Hazardous Materials Emergency Spill Response	Actual Cost		Y
45	Hazardous Materials Oversight of Remediation	\$146.30	per hour	Y
	Underground Storage Tanks			
46	Annual Permit	\$1,463.00		Y
47	Tank Installation (plan review and inspection)			
	a) First tank	\$2,926.00		Y
	b) Each additional tank	\$438.90		Y
48	Transfer of Ownership	\$292.60		Y
49	Tank Removal or Abandonment	\$1,463.00		Y
50	System Modification	\$585.20		Y
51	UST Piping Upgrade	\$1,170.40		Y
52	State of California UST Surcharge (per tank)	\$15.00		Y
	Aboveground Storage Tanks			
53	Annual Permit			
	a) Annual Permit ≥ 1,320 gal & < 10,000 gal	\$292.60		Y
	b) Annual Permit ≥ 10,000 gal & < 100,000 gal	\$438.90		Y
	c) Annual Permit ≥ 100,000 gal & < 1,000,000 gal	\$585.20		Y
	d) Annual Permit > 1,000,000 gal	\$877.80		Y
54	Tank Installation (plan review and inspection)			
	a) First tank	\$585.20		Y
	b) Each additional tank	\$146.30		Y
55	Transfer of Ownership	\$292.90		Y
56	Tank Removal or Abandonment	\$585.20		Y

Fire Prevention Fees

57	System Modification	\$438.90			Y
58	State of California APSA Surcharge	\$26.00			Y
Administrative Fees					
59	Copy of Incident Report (per incident)	\$10.00			Y
60	Media Reproduction (audio, video, photographic)	Actual Cost			Y
Fee Description		Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'filtr
61	Emergency Response Caused by DUI	Actual Cost			Y
62	Weed Abatement Administrative Parcel Fee	\$292.60			Y
63	Code Appeal	\$731.50			Y
64	Fire Flow / Hydrant Test	\$438.90			Y
65	Fire & Life Safety Division Hourly Rate	\$146.30	per hour		Y
66	Minimum Intake Fee	\$146.30			Y
67	Voluntary Inspection	\$292.60			Y
68	Technical Report (alternate material or method request)	\$1,170.40			Y
69	Inspection Requests (after normal business hours)	\$438.90			Y
70	Administrative Fee (excessive resubmittals and inspections)	\$365.75			Y
71	Expedited Plan Review Fee (per hour)	\$172.00	per hour		Y
72	Re-inspection Fee	\$292.60			Y
73	Administrative Fee (work without a permit)	\$438.90			Y
74	Code Review or Design Consultation (per hour)	\$146.30			Y
75	False Alarm Fee	\$365.75			Y
76	Fire Extinguisher Training	\$438.90			Y
77	Late Payment Penalty for Permits				
	a) 30 days past due	\$50.00			N
	b) 60 days past due	\$100.00			N
	c) 90 days past due	\$200.00			N

** Note regarding annual inflationary adjustment: For items billed at actual cost, the underlying hourly billing rates should inflate annually by the change in hourly labor rates and/or indirect cost rate multipliers.*

[a] Fee includes Hazardous Waste Generator < 55 gal.

Fire Prevention Fees

General Information

- * All fees or charges shall be calculated at one (1) hour minimum unless otherwise specified.
- * All fees for specified services shall be calculated by the Fire Department.
- * When required, no permit or approval shall be issued until facility or process is brought into compliance with applicable codes and the required service fee is paid in full.
- * When a requester fails to cancel a requested inspection prior to the scheduled time of inspection, the standard inspection fee shall be charged, with a one hour minimum fee.

CUPA/Hazardous Materials Compliance Incentive Program

To qualify for a 25% discount on annual CUPA permit fees, a business cannot have within the last three years, any Class 1 violations of CCR Title 22, Title 23, or Title 24.

A business also cannot have any repeat violations noted during the previous year's inspection. All other violations or deficiencies must have been corrected within 30 days of the last inspection. Annual permit fees must have been paid by the date indicated on the annual permit invoice. A business may qualify for this discount annually if the above listed criteria is met.

Police Department Fees

Fee Description		Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
1	Alarm Permit Application				
	a) Initial permit application	\$35	for two-year permit		N
	b) Renewal permit application	\$15	for two-year permit		N
	c) Late Filing Fees				
	i) Less than 30 days late	\$5			N
	ii) 30 Days	\$20			N
	iii) 60 Days	\$40			N
	iv) 90 Days	\$80			N
	v) 91+ Days				
	a) Base Fee	\$80			N
	b) Administrative Citation	TBD			N
	c) Fine	\$100			N
2	Excessive False Alarms:				
	a) First false alarm				
	i) Burglary	\$0	flat fee	[a]	N
	ii) Duress/robbery	\$0	flat fee	[a]	N
	b) Second false alarm				
	i) Burglary	\$60	flat fee	[a]	N
	ii) Duress/robbery	\$60	flat fee	[a]	N
	c) Third false alarm				
	i) Burglary	\$85	flat fee	[a]	N
	ii) Duress/robbery	\$85	flat fee	[a]	N
	d) Fourth false alarm				
	i) Burglary	\$100	flat fee	[a]	N
	ii) Duress/robbery	\$150	flat fee	[a]	N
	e) Fifth and subsequent false alarms				
	i) Burglary	\$150	flat fee	[a]	N
	ii) Duress/robbery	\$200	flat fee	[a]	N
3	Appeal of Decision to Deny, Suspend, or Revoke an Alarm Permit	\$75	flat fee		N
4	Traffic Collision Report	\$10	per request		Y

Police Department Fees

5	Impounded Vehicle Release Fee	\$150	per vehicle	[b]	Y
6	Vehicle Tow Hearing	\$75	per request		Y
7	Criminal Background / Good Conduct Letter (aka Records Check and Clearance Letter)	\$20	per request		N
8	Commercial Indoor Firing Range Permit	\$100	flat fee		Y
9	Retail Firearms Dealer License				
	a) Initial permit application	\$100	flat fee		Y
	b) Renewal permit application	\$100	flat fee		Y
Fee Description		Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
10	Adult-oriented Business				
	a) Initial permit application				
	i) Permit fee	\$250	flat fee		Y
	ii) Dept of Justice fee	\$32	flat fee	[c]	N
	iii) LiveScan fingerprint processing fee	\$15	flat fee	[c]	N
	iv) Additional FBI fingerprinting fee, if applicable	\$17	flat fee	[c]	N
	b) Renewal permit application				
	i) Permit fee	\$250	flat fee		Y
11	Dance Permit Application	\$100	flat fee	[d]	Y
12	Entertainment Permit				
	a) Initial permit application				
	i) Permit fee	\$200	flat fee		Y
	ii) Dept of Justice fee	\$32	flat fee	[c]	N
	iii) LiveScan fingerprint processing fee	\$15	flat fee	[c]	N
	iv) Additional FBI fingerprinting fee, if applicable	\$17	flat fee	[c]	N
	b) Renewal permit application				
	i) Permit fee	\$200	flat fee		Y
13	Ice Cream Vendor Permit Application				
	a) Initial permit application				
	i) Permit fee	\$35	flat fee		Y
	ii) Dept of Justice fee	\$32	flat fee	[c]	N
	iii) LiveScan fingerprint processing fee	\$15	flat fee	[c]	N

Police Department Fees

Fee Description	Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
iv) Additional FBI fingerprinting fee, if applicable	\$17	flat fee	[c]	N
b) Renewal permit application i) Permit fee	\$35	flat fee		Y
14 Massage Therapist Permit Application			[e]	
a) Initial permit application i) Permit fee	\$28	flat fee		N
ii) Dept of Justice fee	\$32	flat fee	[c]	N
iii) LiveScan fingerprint processing fee	\$15	flat fee	[c]	N
iv) Additional FBI fingerprinting fee, if applicable	\$17	flat fee	[c]	N
b) Renewal permit application i) Permit fee	\$25	flat fee		N
15 Pawnbroker/Secondhand Dealer				
a) Initial permit application i) Permit fee	\$100	flat fee		Y
ii) Dept of Justice fee	\$32	flat fee	[c]	N
iii) LiveScan fingerprint processing fee	\$15	flat fee	[c]	N
iv) Additional FBI fingerprinting fee, if applicable	\$17	flat fee	[c]	N
b) Renewal permit application				

* Note regarding annual inflationary adjustment: For items billed at actual cost, the underlying hourly billing rates should inflate annually by the change in hourly labor rates and/or indirect cost rate multipliers.

[a] Fines are determined by the combined number of both burglary and duress/robbery false alarms. Reimbursement may be waived by the police chief where uncommon circumstances not considered an emergency resulted in false alarm and where the permittee has undertaken to correct alarm system deficiencies.

[b] This fee shall be collected only from the registered owner or agent of the registered owner. This fee shall not apply to vehicles impounded as the result of automobile accidents, abatement program, or lien sale, unless the sale is sufficient in amount to pay the lienholder's total charges and administrative costs.

Police Department Fees

	i) Permit fee	\$60	flat fee		Y
16	Taxicab Driver Permit Application				
	a) Initial permit application				
	i) Permit fee	\$50	flat fee		N
	ii) Dept of Justice fee	\$32	flat fee	[c]	N
	iii) LiveScan fingerprint processing fee	\$15	flat fee	[c]	N
	iv) Additional FBI fingerprinting fee, if applicable	\$17	flat fee	[c]	N
	b) Renewal permit application				
	i) Permit fee	\$50	flat fee		N
17	Noise Violation	actual cost of enforcement	per separate offense following first citation		Y
18	Extraordinary Law Enforcement Services (multiple responses to disturbance w/in 12-hrs)	actual cost of enforcement	per separate offense following first warning		Y
19	Supplemental Law Enforcement Services				
	a) Hourly Rates for Police Dept Personnel				
	i) Community Service Officers	\$42	per hour		Y
	ii) Police Officers	\$65	per hour		Y
	iii) Sergeants	\$77	per hour		Y
	iv) Dispatchers	\$53	per hour		Y
	b) Hourly Rates for Marked Vehicles				
	i) Base Rate	\$25	per hour		N
	ii) Per mile rate, for each mile over 50	\$0.50	per mile		N
20	Concealed Weapon License	n/a - issued by Placer County Sheriff		[f]	N

[c] This fee is not established by the City of Roseville. It is collected on behalf of a third party (e.g. vendor; other public agency). The fee schedule is intended to mirror amounts adopted by third parties. If the amount charged by a third party changes, the amounts collected by the City on behalf of the third party are presumed to change simultaneously. Amounts shown in the fee schedule will be updated as soon as practicable after the City receives notice of the fee change.

[d] Fee applies for initial annual permits, renewal permits, and special event/one-time permits.

[e] Fee amounts shown are for non-state certified massage therapist applications. There is no fee for State-certified massage therapists/practitioners registering to provide massage services or activities within the City of Roseville.

[f] Any Roseville resident wishing to apply for a license to carry a concealed weapon shall be directed to the Placer County Sheriff's Office for permit application and the permit process.

Animal Licensing and Permit Fees

Fee Description	Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
1 Dog License a) 1 Year i) Certified altered dogs ii) Non-altered dogs iii) Senior Discount b) 2 Years i) Certified altered dogs ii) Non-altered dogs iii) Senior Discount c) 3 Years i) Certified altered dogs ii) Non-altered dogs iii) Senior Discount d) Transfer of active license from other jurisdiction	 \$20 \$40 \$5 off standard fee \$39 \$79 \$5 off standard fee \$58 \$118 \$5 off standard fee \$0	 each each each each each each each each each each	 	 Y Y N Y Y N Y
2 Delinquent Penalty for Failure to Renew License within 15 days of Expiration a) Altered dog b) Unaltered dog	 \$5 \$10	 flat fee flat fee	 	 N N
3 Lost License or Tag	\$5	flat fee		Y
4 Kennel License	\$10	per year		Y
5 Special Animal Permit	\$35	per year		Y

6	Voluntary Disposal Fee			
	a) Dogs and Other Animals Commonly Considered Pets	\$0	per animal/litter	Y
	b) Livestock and Wild Animals	\$0	per animal	Y
7	Appeal of Decision to Destroy Vicious Animal	\$75	flat fee	N

* Per RMC 7.16.070, license fees are waived for: service dog owned by a person with a need for assistance; dog used by any law enforcement personnel; dog owned by any government entity or political subdivision

Oversize Vehicle Permit Fees and Building Moving Permit Fees

Fee Description		Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
1	Oversize Vehicle Permit				
	a) Single trip permit	\$16	per vehicle	[a]	N
	b) Annual permit	\$90	per vehicle	[a]	N
2	Building Moving Permit				
	a) Base Fee	\$25	per request		Y
	b) Costs of plan review, utility and street light moving, tree trimming, traffic directing, etc.	actual costs	per request		Y

* Note regarding annual inflationary adjustment: For items billed at actual cost, the underlying hourly billing rates should inflate annually by the change in hourly labor rates and/or indirect cost rate multipliers.

[a] Oversize vehicle permit fees set to match fees adopted by California Department of Transportation (CalTrans).

Parking Permit Fees

Fee Description		Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'ftr
1	Residential Parking Permit	\$0	per vehicle		N
2	Merchant Parking Permit				
	a) January 1st through December 31st	\$20	per vehicle		N
	b) July 1st through December 31st	\$10	per vehicle		N

* Permit is valid only for the calendar year issued. A merchant parking permit is issued to a specific vehicle and is not transferable. A valid merchant parking permit decal must be appropriately displayed on the left rear bumper or left rear window of the permittee's vehicle.

Special Event, Film, and Banner Permit Fees

Fee Description		Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
1	Special Event Permit				
	a) Application Fee				
	i) Event that requires limited site/plan review, no closures, etc. (i.e. park rentals/activities, misc. events, etc.)	\$75	per event		Y
	ii) Event that requires, but not limited to, street/parking lot closures, site/plan review, trail use, etc. (i.e. fun runs, festivals, parking garage, etc.)	\$150	per event		Y
	b) Service Charges	actual costs			Y
	c) Park/facility rental fee	varies by location	per event		N
2	Photography and Filming Permit				
	a) Application Fee	\$0			Y
	b) Service Charges	actual costs			Y
3	Banner Permit	\$30			Y

** Note regarding annual inflationary adjustment: For items billed at actual cost, the underlying hourly billing rates should inflate annually by the change in hourly labor rates and/or indirect cost rate multipliers.*

Parks, Recreation, & Libraries Department Fees

Fee Description	Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
1 Parks, Recreation, & Libraries Department Program, Class, Facility Use, and Service Fees	See Note		[a]	N
2 Capital Replacement Fee	Not to exceed 10% of program fee	per registration		N

[a] See Department for Recreation Guide and Programs, Events, and Classes information, Facility Use, and Service Fees. Information is updated seasonally. Fees are approved by the Department Director. Fees are established and updated using the Departmental Pricing Policy.

RESOLUTION NO. 17-03

ADOPTING A MASTER SCHEDULE OF USER AND REGULATORY FEES,
EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2017 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2018

WHEREAS, user and regulatory fees are established by the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the City recently completed a study to identify the cost of providing various user and regulatory fee-related services; and

WHEREAS, while the majority of the City's fees have been adjusted during the last several years, many of the fees proposed for adjustment have not been adjusted for many years; and

WHEREAS, adopting a master schedule of user and regulatory fees will allow for consolidation of the schedule of fees and help formally establish a pattern for annual review and update, including annual inflationary adjustments; and

WHEREAS, staff recommends adopting the Schedule of User and Regulatory Fees, effective July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018, attached hereto as Exhibit "A"; and

WHEREAS, staff further recommends authorizing the Finance Director to make automatic annual inflationary adjustments for various fees identified in the Schedule of User and Regulatory Fees based on the all-urban Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose area; and

WHEREAS, inflationary adjustments will be based on the CPI change from October to October of the immediately preceding year; and

WHEREAS, if the CPI does not change or goes down, no change shall be made to the fee schedule for that year unless an adjustment is made to targeted cost recovery levels or fee study findings indicate that an adjustment is appropriate; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Roseville that said Schedule of User and Regulatory Fees, effective July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018 is hereby adopted.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Finance Director has authority to make automatic annual inflationary adjustments for various fees identified in the Schedule of User and Regulatory Fees based on the all-urban Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose area in accordance with this resolution.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk



Schedule of User and Regulatory Fees
Effective July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018

Fee Category	Page(s)
1 Administrative Fees	3 - 4
2 Utility Customer Billing, Accounting, and Service Fees	5
3 Planning (Entitlement) Fees	6 - 9
4 Development Services Engineering and Encroachment Permit Fees	10 - 11
5 Trench Cut Recovery Fees	12
6 Building Fees	13 - 22
7 Development Impact Fee Deferral Fees	23
8 Electric Fees	24
9 Environmental Utilities Fees	25 - 26
10 Fire Prevention Fees	27 - 30
11 Police Department Fees	31 - 33
12 Animal Licensing and Permit Fees	34
13 Oversize Vehicle Permit Fees and Building Moving Permit Fees	35
14 Parking Permit Fees	36
15 Special Event, Film, and Banner Permit Fees	37
16 Parks, Recreation, & Libraries Department Fees	38

Administrative Fees

Fee Description		Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
City-Wide Records					
1	Documents				
	a) 8.5 x 11 - Black and White	No Charge			N
	i) 0 - 9 Copies				
	ii) 10+ Copies	\$0.10	per page		N
	b) 8.5 x 14 and 11 x 17 - Black and White	\$0.20	per page		N
	c) Color Copies				
	i) 8.5 x 11	\$0.50	per page		N
	ii) 11 x 17	\$1.00	per page		N
	iii) 18 x 24	\$2.00	per page		N
	iv) 24 x 36	\$3.00	per page		N
2	Photos	\$0.50	per copy		N
3	Recordings	\$6	each		N
4	Agenda Subscription				
	a) 6 Months	\$20			N
	b) 12 Months	\$40			N
5	Budget Book				
	a) Available on City website	No charge			N
	b) Hardcopy	Actual cost or per page fee			N
6	Requests Requiring Special Programming or Formatting	Actual cost		[a]	N
Passport					
7	Passport Processing Fee	\$25		[b]	N
8	Passport Photo Fee	\$10			Y
9	Passport Express Postage	Actual postage cost			N
Notary					
10	Notary Charge	\$10	each		N
Subpoena					
11	Subpoena Fees	Fees Vary - See Note		[b]	N
Election					
11	Candidate Nomination Filing Fee	\$25	per filing	[b]	N
12	Fee for Late Filing of Reports of Campaign Contributions and Expenditures	See Note		[c]	N

Administrative Fees

Fee Description		Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
13	Amplified Sound Sound Permit	\$20			Y
14	Franchise Application Franchise Application Fee				
	a) Refuse Hauler	\$260	two-year term		N
	b) Community Antenna Television System	\$100			N
	c) All Others	\$150			N

[a] Fee for preparation of reports/formats that need to be generated by the City because they are not typically maintained. Amounts charged will include a pass-through of any vendor costs incurred.

[b] Maximum fees established by State/Federal agencies.

[c] See Roseville Municipal Code Fine Schedule and/or Roseville Municipal Bail Schedule.

Utility Customer Billing, Accounting, and Service Fees

Fee Description		Fee	Y'rly In'fltr
1	Reestablishment Fee - Residential Electric		
	a) During Normal Hours	\$40	N
	b) After Hours	\$85	N
2	Reestablishment Fee - Commercial Electric		
	a) During Normal Hours	\$150	N
	b) After Hours	\$175	N
3	Reestablishment Fee - Water	\$150	N
4	Returned Check/ABD/ACH Fee	\$25	N
5	On-Line American Express Fee	2% of payment amount	N
6	Late Payment Fee	5% of late balance	N
7	Unauthorized Service Reconnect Fee	\$50	N
8	Utility Bill Reprint Fee	\$1	N
9	Access Fee	\$50	N
10	Same Day Service	Equal to Reestablishment Fee	N

Planning (Entitlement) Fees

Fee Description		Fixed Fee	Deposit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
Appeals					
1	Planning Director's Decision	\$1,194			Y
2	PC/DC Decision to City Council	\$1,118			Y
Annexations					
1	Annex/PZ/Detach/SOI		\$20,000		Y
Development Agreements (DA)					
1	Adoption of DA		\$20,000		Y
2	Amendment of DA		\$20,000		Y
3	Associated with Affordable Housing	\$2,177			Y
4	Associated with Single Topic Item	\$4,922			Y
Environmental Review					
1	Exemption Without Initial Study	\$288			Y
2	Exemption With Initial Study	\$726			Y
3	Negative Declaration with No Mitigation	\$1,090			Y
4	Tiered Negative Declaration with Mitigation	\$2,262			Y
5	EIR Deposit		\$20,000		Y
General Plan Amendment (GPA)					
1	GPA 10 Acres or Less, Map/Text		\$10,000		Y
2	GPA 10+ Acres, Map/Text		\$17,000		Y
3	GPA - Text Policy Amend		\$15,000		Y
Public Utility Easement Abandonment					
1	Summary Vacation	\$2,247			Y
2	General Vacation	\$3,272			Y
Signs					
1	Standard Sign Permit	\$232			Y
2	Planned Sign Permit Program	\$891			Y
3	Sign Permit/Program - Public Hearing Required	\$1,813			Y
4	Administrative Permit for Sign Exception (Variance)	\$1,498			Y
5	PSP Minor Modification	\$214			Y
Specific Plan Amendment (SPA)					
1	SPA Adoption, Map/Text		\$30,000		Y
2	SPA 10 Acres or Less, Map/Text		\$10,000		Y
3	SPA 10+ Acres, Map/Text		\$20,000		Y
4	SPA Text/Policy Deposit		\$15,000		Y
Subdivisions/Condominiums					
1	Grading Plan - Minor	\$2,058			Y
2	Grading Plan - Major		\$8,000		Y
3	Lot Line Adjustment	\$2,058			Y
4	Extension to a Tentative Map	\$2,058			Y

Planning (Entitlement) Fees

Fee Description		Fixed Fee	Deposit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
5	Voluntary Merger	\$2,058			Y
6	Reversion to Acreage	\$2,938			Y
7	Minor Modification to a Tentative Map		\$2,000		Y
8	Major Modification to a Tentative Map		\$10,000		Y
9	Tentative Parcel Map, 4 or Fewer Lots		\$6,000		Y
10	Tentative Parcel Map, 5 - 99 Lots		\$11,000		Y
11	Tentative Parcel Map, 100 - 499 Lots		\$16,000		Y
12	Tentative Parcel Map, 500+ Lots		\$24,000		Y
Zoning Ordinance Entitlements					
1	Administrative Permit	\$1,026			Y
2	Conditional Use Permit		\$9,000		Y
3	CUP Modification		\$5,000		Y
4	CUP Extension	\$4,723			Y
5	Design Review Permit (DRP)		\$8,000		Y
6	DRP - Modification		\$5,000		Y
7	DRP - Extension	\$4,206			Y
8	DRP - Minor	\$159			Y
9	DRP - Additions or New Construction (DTSP Only)	\$159			Y
10	DRP - Façade Improvements (DTSP Only)	\$159			Y
11	DRP - Predesign (DTSP Only)	\$159			Y
12	DRP - Residential Subdivision with Other Permit	\$4,571			Y
13	Flood Encroachment Permit		\$8,000		Y
14	MPP Stage 1 or Stages 1 & 2		\$20,000		Y
15	MPP Modification		\$7,000		Y
16	MPP Stage 2, Extend of Stage 1 and/or 2		\$7,000		Y
17	MPP Administrative Modification	\$1,311			Y
18	Planned Development Permit		\$11,000		Y
19	TP Admin - Approved at Public Counter	\$160			Y
20	TP - Req. Public Hearing for SFD or 10 Trees or Less	\$3,170			Y
21	TP - Req. Public Hearing for DRP/TM or 11+ Trees	\$4,845			Y
22	Administrative Variance	\$1,024			Y
23	Variance to Develop Standards - Req. Public Hearing	\$3,626			Y
24	Variance to Parking Standards	\$4,319			Y
25	Zoning Clearance	\$121			Y
26	Zoning Interpretation - Hearing Required	\$2,716			Y
27	Zoning Interpretation - Non Hearing Item	\$106			Y
Zoning Ordinance Amendments					
1	Ordinance Text Amend (Zoning, Subdivision, Sign)		\$10,000		Y
2	Zoning Map Change (RZ) 10 Acres or Less		\$10,000		Y
3	Zoning Map Change (RZ) 10+ Acres		\$17,000		Y

Planning (Entitlement) Fees

Fee Description		Fixed Fee	Deposit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
	Other				
1	Pre-Application Meetings		\$4,000	[a]	Y
2	New Non-Residential Plan Check	15% of Bldg PC		[b]	N
3	Commercial Plan Check - TI	\$119		[b]	Y
4	Planning Department Plot Plan Review (Bundles of 10)	\$119			Y
5	Radius List Prep-Previously Developed Area	\$111			Y
6	Preparation Undeveloped Area/Mailing	\$277			Y
7	Farmer's Market Permit	\$375			Y
8	Home Occupation Permit	\$121			Y
9	Parking In-Lieu Fee (DTSP Only)	\$9,680		[c]	N
10	In-Lieu Tree Mitigation Fee (Per Inch)	\$118		[d]	N
11	CUP - Vernon St. and Historical District Only	\$1,026			Y
12	Technology Fee	3%			N

Full Cost Deposits and Deposit Replenishment

Applicants for Full Cost Entitlement Applications shall pay for all City staff time required to process the application. A full cost reimbursement agreement shall be included with the project application submittal package. Projects outside the scope of this fee schedule (as determined by the Development Services Director) will be subject to a full cost reimbursement agreement to be approved by the City Council. This reimbursement agreement will include the identification of a work program and will include cost estimates for both City staff time and consultant services based on a defined scope of work.

Initial deposits as shown on the fee schedule will be collected and held by the City in a deposit account at the time the application is submitted. The cost of staff time will be drawn from the deposit account. A positive account balance shall be maintained at all times during the review process. No work will be performed on a project with a negative fund balance. If the deposit is reduced to below 20% of the initial deposit amount, the applicant will be notified and required to supplement the deposit account with an additional amount no less than 50% of the original deposit.

When more than one Full Cost application is submitted, the sum total of the initial full cost deposit amount can be reduced by 20%.

Funds expended for staff time shall not be dependent upon the City's approval or disapproval of the application request. The deposit account will be held open for 90 days after project approval for City to complete any miscellaneous clean up items and to account for all project related costs. Any deposit amounts remaining after final project close out will be returned to applicant. In the event that the deposit account is exhausted prior to final close out, the balance owed to the City will be credited against the plan check and inspection fee deposit at time of improvement plan review.

As may be required by the Development Services Department for project evaluation or environmental review, all payment for consultant work shall be the responsibility of the applicant.

** Note regarding annual inflationary adjustment: The Initial deposit amounts will not be inflated annually, but the underlying hourly billing rates should inflate annually by the change in hourly labor rates and/or indirect cost rate multipliers.*

Planning (Entitlement) Fees

Fee Description	Fixed Fee	Deposit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
-----------------	-----------	---------	------	------------------

Refund Policy

Application fees are not refundable except as follows:

- A. Refund of 100% shall be made if a determination is made by the Development Services Director that the permit and associated fee are not required by the City of Roseville Municipal Code or adopted City Resolution.
- B. If an applicant requests to withdraw a fixed fee application prior to the PEM, refund of 50% of the applicable fee shall be refunded.
- C. No refund of application fees shall be made after a Project Evaluation Meeting has been held, unless a fee waiver is approved by the Roseville City Council.

[a] Pre Application Meetings – The City will provide up to 2 meetings with staff to discuss the initial project review and City policies relative to the proposed project. Additional meetings and staff review prior to a formal application shall be billed on a time and material basis. The project proponent will be asked to submit the pre application deposit and a full cost reimbursement agreement. Staff will record all time against the deposit account. Balances remaining in the deposit account will be applied to the application deposit account or refunded within 60 days. Negative balances will be due in full along with the application deposit or fee at time of Entitlement Application submittal.

[b] Non-Residential - Per Building Code, this includes Commercial and Multi-family developments. Plan Check Fees to be assessed as part of Building Department Plan Check Fee. This fee shall be 15% of the building Plan Check Fee for New Non-Residential construction (Commercial and Multi-family). Fee to be collected with Building's Plan Check Fee.

[c] Parking In-Lieu Fee is an optional fee that non-residential uses in the Downtown Specific Plan Area can utilize instead of providing required parking on-site. Fees for the 1st stall will be 10% of the parking in-lieu fee, 2nd stall 25%, 3rd Stall 50%, 4th stall 75% and 5 or more stalls 100% of the in-lieu fee.

[d] In-Lieu Tree Mitigation Fee for the removal of protected trees is calculated per inch of the diameter at breast height of the tree.

Development Services Engineering and Encroachment Permit Fees

Fee Description	Fee	Initial Deposit	Fee Paid	Bond Amount [a]	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
1 Final Subdivision Map	Billed hourly based on total labor hrs	\$2,500 plus \$10 per lot	At submittal			Y
2 Final Parcel Map						
a) base fee	\$1,275		At submittal		[b]	Y
b) per lot fee	\$51		At submittal		[b]	Y
3 Lot Line Adjustment (per adjusted line)	\$230		At submittal		[c]	Y
4 Improvement Plan Check/Inspection	Billed hourly based on total labor hrs \$1,000 minimum	5% of Eng. cost est. 2.5% at submittal 2.5% at plan approval	2.5% at submittal 2.5% at plan approval	100% of improvements		Y
5 Grading Plan						
a) Subdivision, Commercial, or Industrial Sites	Billed hourly based on total labor hrs \$1,000 minimum	5% of Eng. cost est. 2.5% at submittal 2.5% at plan approval	2.5% at submittal 2.5% at plan approval	10% of erosion control and grading		Y
b) All Other Sites						
i) Up to 500 Cubic Yards	\$306	\$100 at submittal	\$100 at submittal remainder due at permit issuance	10% of erosion control and grading		Y
ii) Greater than 500 Cubic Yards	Billed hourly based on total labor hrs	\$1,000 at submittal	\$1,000 at submittal balance due prior to final signoff	10% of erosion control and grading		Y
6 Encroachment Permit:						
a) Dumpster	\$61		At submittal	\$0		Y
b) Sidewalk	5% of Project Cost \$60 minimum		At submittal	\$1,000 / contractor		N
c) Driveway	5% of Project Cost \$60 minimum		At submittal	\$500/resident \$1,000/c'ntrctr		N
d) Lane Closure	\$153		At submittal	\$0		Y
e) Swim Pool Access	\$153		At submittal	TBD by Director		Y
f) Monitoring Wells	5% of Project Cost \$60 minimum		At submittal	\$2,000 per well		N
g) All Others	Billed hourly based on total labor hrs	5% of Eng. cost est. 2.5% at submittal 2.5% at plan appr'vl; \$1,000 minimum	2.5% at submittal 2.5% at plan appr'vl	100% of improvements		Y
7 Technology Fee	3% of permit fee		At permit issuance			N

Development Services Engineering and Encroachment Permit Fees

Fee Description	Fee	Initial Deposit	Fee Paid	Bond Amount [a]	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
-----------------	-----	--------------------	-------------	--------------------	------	------------------

** Note regarding annual inflationary adjustment: The Initial deposit amounts will not be inflated annually, but the underlying hourly billing rates should inflate annually by the change in hourly labor rates and/or indirect cost rate multipliers.*

[a] Bond amounts paid at permit issuance.

[b] Final parcel map fee collected as base fee plus per lot fee.

[c] Lot line adjustment fee is fee for each adjusted line.

Trench Cut Recovery Fees

Fee Description		Permit Fee	Trench Cut Fee	Cut Fee Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
Trench Cuts Requiring Pmt. of Admin. Permit Fee Only						
1	Street scheduled for resurfacing within next fiscal year	\$306	\$0.00			Y
2	Proposed excavation includes an overlay	\$306	\$0.00			Y
3	Proposed excavation for a CIP	\$306	\$0.00			Y
4	Street pavement quality index (PQI) 0-4	\$306	\$0.00			Y
All Other Trench Cuts						
5	Longitudinal Cut					
	a) Cut within 3' of lane line					
	i) PQI: 4.1 - 6.5	\$306	\$13.22	per LF		Y
	ii) PQI: 6.6 - 8.4	\$306	\$17.63	per LF		Y
	iii) PQI: 8.5 or greater	\$306	\$22.03	per LF		Y
	b) Cut within one lane width					
	i) PQI: 4.1 - 6.5	\$306	\$9.91	per LF		Y
	ii) PQI: 6.6 - 8.4	\$306	\$13.22	per LF		Y
	iii) PQI: 8.5 or greater (<i>moratorium street</i>)	\$306	\$16.52	per LF	[a]	Y
6	Traverse Cut					
	i) PQI: 4.1 - 6.5	\$306	\$8.06	per LF		Y
	ii) PQI: 6.6 - 8.4	\$306	\$10.74	per LF		Y
	iii) PQI: 8.5 or greater (<i>moratorium street</i>)	\$306	\$13.42	per LF	[a]	Y
7	Cut is a Patch					
	i) PQI: 4.1 - 6.5	\$306	\$8.92	per LF		Y
	ii) PQI: 6.6 - 8.4	\$306	\$11.90	per LF		Y
	iii) PQI: 8.5 or greater (<i>moratorium street</i>)	\$306	\$14.87	per LF	[a]	Y

[a] Moratorium streets require director approval for trenching.

Building Fees

A. Construction Valuation Table - Table A is the construction valuation table adopted for the purpose of establishing permit fees as construction valuation is a factor in the cost of providing permitting services. These valuations correlate to the square footage costs of permitting, plan review, and inspection services based upon the hourly rate for building services identified in this fee schedule.

Table A - Construction Valuation

Group		Valuation		Unit	Y'rly In'fltr
		<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>		
1	A-1 Assembly, theaters, with stage	\$93.60	\$46.80	per SF	N
2	A-1 Assembly, theaters, without stage	\$93.60	\$46.80	per SF	N
3	A-2 Assembly, nightclubs	\$93.60	\$46.80	per SF	N
4	A-2 Assembly, restaurants, bars, banquet halls	\$111.80	\$55.90	per SF	N
5	A-3 Assembly, churches	\$93.60	\$46.80	per SF	N
6	A-3 Assembly, general, community halls, libraries, museums	\$88.40	\$44.20	per SF	N
7	A-4 Assembly, arenas	\$105.30	\$52.65	per SF	N
8	B Business	\$88.40	\$44.20	per SF	N
9	E Educational	\$94.90	\$47.45	per SF	N
10	F-1 Factory and Industrial, moderate hazard	\$49.40	\$24.70	per SF	N
11	F-2 Factory and Industrial, low hazard	\$49.40	\$24.70	per SF	N
12	H-1 High Hazard, explosives	\$49.40	\$24.70	per SF	N
13	H-2,3,4 - High Hazard	\$49.40	\$24.70	per SF	N
14	H-5 - HPM	\$79.30	\$39.65	per SF	N
15	I-1 Institutional, supervised environment	\$126.72	\$63.36	per SF	N
16	I-2 Institutional, hospitals	\$131.29	\$65.65	per SF	N
17	I-2 Institutional, nursing homes	\$249.09	\$124.55	per SF	N
18	I-3 Institutional, restrained	\$145.80	\$72.90	per SF	N
19	I-4 Institutional, day care facilities	\$126.72	\$63.36	per SF	N
20	M Mercantile	\$62.40	\$31.20	per SF	N
21	R-1 Residential, hotels	\$97.50	\$48.75	per SF	N
22	R-2 Residential, multiple-family	\$100.18	\$50.09	per SF	N
23	R-3 Residential, one- and two-family	\$110.00	\$55.00	per SF	N
24	R-4 Residential, care/assisted living facilities	\$106.60	\$53.30	per SF	N
25	S-1 Storage, moderate hazard	\$42.90	\$21.45	per SF	N
26	S-2 Storage, low hazard	\$41.60	\$20.80	per SF	N
27	U Utility, miscellaneous	\$32.50	\$16.25	per SF	N

B. Determination of Construction Valuations - The building official shall determine construction valuations as follows:

- New Construction.** New construction shall be based upon the square footage of the proposed project multiplied by the amount stated in **Column A of Table A** corresponding to the occupancy group, as determined by the building official, for a total construction value.
- Improvements.** Improvements to existing buildings shall be based upon the square footage of the proposed improvements multiplied by the amount stated in **Column B of Table A** corresponding to the occupancy group, as determined by the building official, for a total construction value.

Building Fees

C. Commercial Building Valuations - Minimum commercial building valuations are stated below for the purposes of establishing minimum permit fees to cover the cost of service for the project listed. The higher valuation shall be assessed unless otherwise stated.

- 1 **Tenant Improvements Processed Over the Counter (OTC Permits).** Tenant Improvement OTC permits shall have a minimum valuation of \$8,000.
- 2 **Tenant Improvements Requiring Plan Submittal.** Tenant Improvements (TIs) requiring plan submittal shall have a minimum valuation based upon Column B of Table A. For purposes of this section, a tenant improvement is defined as any improvement, maintenance or other updating on commercial property; improvement, maintenance or other updating on multi-family property; improvement, maintenance or other updating on residential care facilities and model home sales complexes, including sales trailers.
- 3 **Commercial Photovoltaic.** Commercial photovoltaic permits shall be based on a set valuation of \$40,000.
- 4 **Electrical Service Upgrade.** Electrical service upgrade permit fees shall have a minimum valuation of \$3,000.
- 5 **Commercial Reroofing.** Commercial reroofing permits shall have a minimum valuation of \$423.17 per 100 square feet of roof area or a total minimum valuation of \$20,000.
- 6 **OTC Permits for Commercial Projects.** OTC permits for commercial projects such as demolition, electrical, mechanical, plumbing and other work not otherwise defined shall have a minimum valuation of \$3,000.
- 7 **OTC Permits for Commercial Projects.** OTC permits for commercial projects such as demolition, electrical, mechanical, plumbing and other work not otherwise defined shall have a minimum valuation of \$3,000.
- 8 **Cell Towers - Change out of Antennas Only.** Cell towers requiring change-out of antennas only shall be considered a TI remodel with a minimum valuation of \$3,000.
- 9 **Cell Towers - Major Remodel.** Cell towers undergoing a major remodel shall have a minimum valuation of \$8,000.
- 10 **Shelves and Racking.** Permits for shelves and racking shall be considered a TI remodel. Construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$8,000 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the square footage by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the U, Utility, Miscellaneous Occupancy Group.
- 11 **Stucco or Siding on Multi-Family.** For permits for stucco or siding on multi-family units, construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$8,000 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the linear footage of exterior home and garage x 1 SF (= remodel SF) by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the R-2, Residential Multi-Family Occupancy Group.
- 12 **Stair Repair on Multi-Family.** For permits for stair repair on multi-family units, construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$8,000 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the square footage of the stair area(s) x number of floors of the building(s) by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the R-2, Residential Multi-Family Occupancy Group.
- 13 **Pool Replaster and Repairs.** For permits for commercial pool replaster and/or repairs, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$8,000 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the pool square footage by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the U, Utility, Miscellaneous Occupancy Group.
- 14 **Electronic Gates.** For permits for electronic gates, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$8,000 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the lineal footage of the gate and replacement fence x 1 SF (=SF) by the amount stated in Column A of Table A for the U, Utility, Miscellaneous Occupancy Group.
- 15 **Facade Remodel.** For permits for facade remodel, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$8,000 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the lineal footage of the facade x 1 SF (=SF) by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the Occupancy Group listed on the certificate of occupancy.

Building Fees

- 16 **Spray Booth.** For permits for spray booth installation, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$8,000 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the square footage of the booth area by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the F, Factory and Industrial Occupancy Group.
- 17 **Parking Lot Restriping: Site Work.** Permits for parking lot restriping shall have a minimum valuation of \$8,000.
- 18 **ADA Upgrades.** Permits for ADA upgrades shall have a minimum valuation of \$8,000.
- 19 **Barrier Removal.** Permits for barrier removal shall have a minimum valuation of \$8,000.
- 20 **Crane install runways.** Permits for crane install runways shall have a minimum valuation of \$8,000.
- 21 **Construction Trailer.** For permits for construction trailers hooking up to water/sewer and/or electric, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be calculated by multiplying the trailer square footage by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the B, Business Occupancy Group.
- 22 **Commercial Charging Station.** For permits for commercial charging stations, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be based on the construction valuation provided by the applicant with a minimum valuation of \$8,000.
- 23 **Emergency Generator to Cell Site.** Permits for emergency generators to cell sites shall have a minimum valuation of \$8,000.
- 24 **Pumpkin Lot/Tree Lot.** Permits for pumpkin or tree lots shall have a minimum valuation of \$8,000.

D. Residential Building Valuations - Minimum residential building valuations are stated below for the purposes of establishing minimum permit fees to cover the cost of service for the project listed. The higher valuation shall be assessed unless otherwise stated.

- 1 **Patio Covers.** Patio covers shall have minimum valuation based upon new construction valuation of Column A of Table A.
- 2 **Swimming Pools.** Swimming pools shall have a set valuation of \$25,000 for the purposes of establishing the building permit fee. The swimming pool construction contract valuation shall be reported on the permit application if such amount exceeds \$25,000.
- 3 **Residential Remodel.** Residential remodel permits shall have a minimum valuation based upon Column B of Table A.
- 4 **Residential Additions.** Residential additions shall have a minimum valuation based upon Column A of Table A (new construction).
- 5 **Combination of Residential Remodel and Residential Addition.** With respect to a permit application for a combination residential remodel and residential addition subsection (D)(3) shall apply with respect to the residential remodel portion and subsection (D)(4) shall apply with respect to the residential addition (new construction) portion for a total construction valuation for the permit.
- 6 **Photovoltaic.** Photovoltaic permits shall be based upon a set valuation of \$18,000 for the purposes of establishing the permit fee.
- 7 **Reroof.** Reroof permits for residential structures shall have a minimum valuation of \$239.49 per 100 square feet of roof area or a total minimum valuation of \$2,400.
- 8 **Plumbing OTC Permits.** OTC permits pertaining to plumbing shall have a minimum valuation of \$900.
- 9 **Mechanical, Electrical, Car Charging Stations, Demolition and Other OTC Permits Not Specified in this Section.** OTC permits for mechanical, electrical, car charging stations, demolition, and other permits not specified in this section shall have a minimum valuation of \$2,400.

Building Fees

- 10 **Stucco or Siding.** For permits for stucco or siding on residential units, construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$2,400 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the linear footage of exterior home and garage x 1 SF (= remodel SF) by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the R-3, Residential, One- and Two-Family Occupancy Group.
- 11 **Fence or Retaining Wall.** For permits for residential fences or retaining walls, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$2,400 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the linear footage of fence or wall x 1 SF (= SF) by the amount stated in Column A of Table A for the U, Utility, Miscellaneous Occupancy Group.
- 12 **Windows.** Permits for residential windows shall have a minimum valuation of \$2,400.
- 13 **Freestanding Fireplace.** Permits for a freestanding fireplace shall have a minimum valuation of \$2,400.
- 14 **BBQ.** Permits for a barbeque (BBQ) shall have a minimum valuation of \$2,400.
- 15 **Pool Replaster and Repairs.** For permits for residential pool replaster and/or repairs, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$2,400 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the pool square footage by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the U, Utility, Miscellaneous Occupancy Group.
- 16 **Shed.** For permits for residential sheds, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$2,400 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the square footage of the shed (= SF) by the amount stated in Column A of Table A for the U, Utility, Miscellaneous Occupancy Group.
- 17 **Deck Repair.** For permits for deck repair, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$2,400 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the square footage of the deck area being repaired (= SF) by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the U, Utility, Miscellaneous Occupancy Group.
- 18 **Fire Repair.** For permits for residential fire repair, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be calculated in the same manner as a residential remodel.

Building Fees

E. Permit Fees - Subject to any applicable minimum permit fees stated elsewhere in this schedule, Table B and B.1, shall apply for the purpose of establishing minimum permit fees.

Table B - Permit Fees

Total Valuation	Permit Fee				Y'rly In'fltr
\$1 to \$500	\$51.00				Y
\$501 to \$1,000	\$51.00	for the first \$500	plus	\$2.55 for each add'l \$100 or fraction thereof, to and including \$1,000	Y
\$1,001 to \$3,000	\$63.75	for the first \$1,000	plus	\$2.81 for each add'l \$100 or fraction thereof, to and including \$3,000	Y
\$3,001 to \$25,000	\$119.85	for the first \$3,000	plus	\$11.22 for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$25,000	Y
\$25,001 to \$50,000	\$356.75	for the first \$25,000	plus	\$9.18 for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$50,000	Y
\$50,001 to \$100,000	\$586.25	for the first \$50,000	plus	\$6.38 for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$100,000	Y
\$100,001 to \$500,000	\$905.00	for the first \$100,000	plus	\$5.10 for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$500,000	Y
\$500,001 to \$1,000,000	\$2,945.00	for the first \$500,000	plus	\$3.83 for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$1,000,000	Y
\$1,000,001 and up	\$4,859.54	for the first \$1,000,000	plus	\$2.04 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof	Y

Production Home Permit Fees - Building permits for production homes (those homes that are one and two family homes having an approved master plan, which is a complete set of building plans from which multiple homes may be constructed) shall have a minimum permit fee as calculated in Table B.1.

Table B.1 - Production Home Permit Fees

Total Valuation	Permit Fee				Y'rly In'fltr
\$0 to \$120,000	\$1,206.66				Y
\$120,001 and up	\$1,206.66	for the first \$120,000	plus	\$8.16 for each add'l \$11,000 or fraction thereof	Y

Building Fees

F. Administration Fee - In addition to the permit fee, an administration fee is established for the city to recover the cost of permit application processing, permit issuance, and plan review and shall be applied as follows:

Fee Description		Fee	Y'rly In'fltr
1	Permits Requiring Plan Submittal for Review	95% of the Building Permit Fee	N
2	Over the Counter Permits Requiring Minimal or No Plan Review	25% of the Hourly Rate or Actual Cost (for time in excess of 1/2 hour)	N
3	Production Home Permits	37% of the Building Permit Fee	N
4	Plans Submitted for the Purposes of Being Mastered	95% of the Building Permit Fee (based on SF valuation of proposed design)	N
5	Emergency Water Heater Repair	Exempt From the Admin Fee (allocated one inspection visit. If add'l visits are required re-inspection fees apply for add'l visits)	N

Building Fees

G. Additional Time and Materials Fees and Refunds and Appeals - Building permits are subject to additional time and material fees where the cost of service provided by city exceeds the amount collected at application. Such fees shall be calculated as follows:

Fee Description		Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
1	Additional Services (1/2 hour minimum)	\$175	per hour	[a]	Y
2	Re-inspections (per scheduled stop)	\$102	per stop	[b]	Y
3	Inspections Outside of Normal Business Hours	\$175	per hour	[c]	Y
4	Work Commenced without a Permit	\$175	minimum	[d]	Y
5	Certificate of Occupancy (1 hour minimum)	\$175	per hour	[e]	Y
6	Permit Extension or Reinstatement of an Expired Permit	\$175	per hour	[f]	Y
7	Third Party Plan Review (fee is in addition to City Administration Fee in Section F)	pass through of consultant fee		[g]	N
8	Credit Card Fee	3.0%		[h]	N
9	Fees for Services Not Listed in this Schedule	Actual Cost		[i]	N
10	Refunds and Appeals				
	a) Fees erroneously paid by applicant or collected or charged by the agency	100% refund		[j][m]	N
	b) When no work has been commenced	up to 75% refund		[k][m]	N
	c) Expired permit applications and permits	0% refund		[l][m]	N

[a] Additional Services (e.g. administrative and plan review) Fees shall be assessed at time of permit issuance and/or prior to final inspection at application. Additional service is defined as follows:

1. Plan Reviews in excess of three (3) submittals to city for review and approval.
2. Plan Review by city departments other than the development services department for projects affecting other City services and not covered by any fees set forth in this section.
3. Other staff time and resources for the purposes of facilitating and approving permit applications and permits.
4. Expedited plan review, when available, and additional resources required to facilitate the expedited plan review process, including consultants and/or other city departments and divisions whose assistance is required for plan approval.

[b] Re-inspections may be assessed based on any of the following:

1. Inspections which are not ready at the time of the scheduled inspection, as determined by a city inspector.
2. Failure by applicant to complete inspection items from previous correction notices.
3. Inspections additional to the inspection with respect to emergency water heater permits.

[c] Inspections outside of normal business hours will be subject to a 2-hour minimum for evening work and a 4-hour minimum for weekend work.

[d] Whenever any work for which a permit is required has been commenced without first applying for a building permit and receiving permission by the building official, a minimum fee for investigation and administration shall be assessed in addition to the full cost of any required permits.

Building Fees

[e] The fee for a certificate of occupancy shall be a minimum of one hour, and any additional costs beyond one hour of staff time to approve such certificates.

[f] Permit applications and permits shall expire per the provisions of the California Building Code. Reinstatement and extensions may be granted provided that all costs incurred by the city to date of the request are paid for by the permit applicant. For this purpose, cost is defined as the hours expended for review and administration multiplied by the hourly rate.

[g] Third party plan review, when available, shall be assessed and paid at time of permit application. The fee for this service is the hourly or flat rate charged by the consulting firm performing the review. This fee is in addition to the permit Administration Fees identified in "Section F" of this fee schedule for the additional resources required to facilitate the process.

[h] Permit applicants who choose to pay with a credit card for any fees may do so providing they pay to city an administration fee, not to exceed 3% of the transaction cost. This fee is a convenience fee for merchant processing and is only charged to applicants utilizing a credit card and only with respect to the amount of the total permit fee which is paid by such credit card.

[i] Fees for services not otherwise listed in this schedule shall be determined by the building official and based upon the actual cost of providing the service.

[j] The building official may authorize refunding of any fee paid, or portion thereof, which was erroneously paid by applicant or collected by city.

[k] The building official may authorize refunding of not more than seventy-five percent (75%) of fees paid when no work has been done under a permit application or an issued permit in accordance with the adopted California Code of Regulations. In no case shall the refund exceed the cost of services provided to date of cancellation of permit issuance.

[l] Permit applications and building permits that have expired as defined in the California Building Code shall not be subject to any refund.

[m] A building permit applicant may, upon payment of the requested permit fees to city and otherwise complying with California Government Code Section 66022, protest the requested amount to the city council by lodging an appeal with the building official. City staff shall schedule the appeal to be heard by the city council as soon as reasonably practicable.

Building Fees

H. Technology Fee, General Plan Maintenance Fee, Strong Motion Impact Fee, SB 1473 Fee

Fee Description	Fee	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
1 Technology Fee (applicable to building permits, fire permits, improvement plan, and entitlement fees)	3%	[a]	N
2 General Plan Maintenance Fee	\$0.50 per \$1,000 valuation, not to exceed \$20,000		N
3 Strong Motion Impact (SMI) Fee Calculation			
a) Residential	\$0.50 or valuation x .0001	[b]	N
b) Commercial	\$0.50 or valuation x .00021	[b]	N
4 Building Standards Administration Special Revolving Fund (SB 1473) Fee Calculation			
Valuation:			
a) \$1 - \$25,000	\$1		N
b) \$25,001 - \$50,000	\$2		N
c) \$50,001 - \$75,000	\$3		N
d) \$75,001 - \$100,000	\$4		N
e) Every \$25,000 or fraction thereof above \$100,000	Add \$1		N

[a] "Building permit" means the permit issued or required by the city for the construction or modification of any structure pursuant to and as defined by the building code. "Fire permit" means the permit issued or required by the city for the construction or ongoing operations of a structure or business pursuant to and as defined by the fire code. "Improvement plan" means the permit issued or required by the city for the construction of any public or private site improvements as defined by the city's improvement and construction standards. "Entitlement" means those approvals provided under Title 19, Zoning.

[b] Fee set by State.

Building Fees

I. Findings Regarding Permit Fees for Residential Rooftop Solar Energy Systems - Pursuant to Section 66015 of the California Government Code (Fees for Rooftop Solar Energy Systems), the city council finds that the reasonable cost to issue a permit for a residential rooftop solar energy system exceeds \$500 plus \$15 per kilowatt (kW) for each kW above 15 because issuance of the permit requires all of the following:

- 1 One-half (1/2) hour administration time for application and data input
- 2 1/2 hour administration time for permit issuance and one hour plan review time including up to two (2) submittals
- 3 Typically 2 inspections at a minimum of 1/2 hour of staff time
- 4 Other applicable fees assessed by the State of California and by the Roseville Electric Department pursuant to the Roseville Electric Solar Energy Program Meter Upgrade Charges, as amended from time to time

This higher fee results in a quick and streamlined approval process.

Development Impact Fee Deferral Fees

Fee Description		Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
1	Development Impact Fee Deferral				
	a) Residential	\$255	per deferral		Y
	b) Non-Residential				
	i) Administrative Fee	\$638	per deferral		Y
	ii) Interest Charge on Deferred Fees	equal to unearned interest based on City's 10-yr avg pooled interest rate	per deferral	[a]	N

[a] Fee deferral will result in a loss of interest income on monies deferred over the construction timeframe. The interest charge is intended to cover these costs.

Electric Fees

Fee Description		Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
Solar Energy Program - Meter Upgrade Charges					
1	Residential PV Net-Meter	\$608.57			Y
2	Business PV Net-Meter (<10kW system size)	\$1,491.81			Y
3	Business PV Net & PBI Meter (10-100kW system size, up to 200amp PBI panel)	\$3,194.87		[a]	Y
4	Business PV Net & PBI Meter (10-100kW system size, >200amp PBI panel)	\$5,332.08		[a]	Y
5	Variance Review Request	\$180.99	per hour		Y
6	Plan Reviews or Field Meets Exceeding the Initial and Subsequent Submittal Limit	\$180.99	per hour	[b]	Y
7	PBI Meter Installations Requiring a Phone Switcher	\$296.15	per switcher		Y
Other Service Fees					
8	Pedestal Meter Fee	\$330.77			Y
9	Temporary Power Meter Set				
	a) Temp Power Meter Set Fee - Residential	\$399.49			Y
	b) Temp Power Meter Set Fee - Commercial	Actual Cost			Y
10	Extension of Facilities	Actual Cost			Y
11	Svc Connections and Facilities on Customer's Premises	Actual Cost			Y
12	Meter Test				
	a) Test - More than six-months since prior test	\$0.00			Y
	b) Test - Within six-months of meter install or prior test	Actual Cost			Y
13	Overhead-to-Underground Conversion of Overhead Utilities	Actual Cost			Y

** Note regarding annual inflationary adjustment: For items billed at actual cost, the underlying hourly billing rates should inflate annually by the change in hourly labor rates and/or indirect cost rate multipliers.*

* All meter upgrade costs must be paid prior to receiving interconnection approval to operate the PV system.

[a] Customer is required to supply a dedicated working phone line and monitoring for the duration of the PBI payment term. See the construction standards for phone line requirements.

[b] The initial and first resubmittal plan review and the initial and first resubmittal field inspections are included in the basic Meter Upgrade Charge.

Environmental Utilities Fees

Fee Description		Fee	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
Water				
1	Construction Water			
	a) Fire Hydrant Application Fee	\$230		Y
	b) Usage Rate	Current rate per Ccf		N
	c) Meter and Backflow Rental			
	i) Monthly Rental Charge	\$100		N
	ii) Initial Deposit	\$1,500		N
2	Meter Installation for New Residential Construction			
	a) Labor Charge	\$128		Y
	b) Meter and Meter Appurtenance Charge	Actual Cost		Y
	c) Quantity Charge	\$77		Y
3	Meter Installation - All Other	Actual Cost		Y
4	Service Connections	Actual Cost		Y
5	Tap	Actual Cost		Y
6	Abandon Water Service Line	Actual Cost		Y
7	Installation of Facilities in Subdivisions/Other Dev'lpmts	Actual Cost		Y
Water Conservation				
8	Water - Water Efficient Landscape Review	Actual Cost		Y
Backflow Prevention Inspection and Cross-Connection Control				
9	Backflow Prevention Assembly - Installation, Repair, Replacement	Actual Cost	[a]	Y
10	Backflow Prevention Assembly - Reinspection Fee	\$61	[b]	Y
Well Water				
11	Well Permit			
	a) First Well	\$255	[c]	Y
	b) Each Additional Well	\$128	[c]	Y
	c) Soil Boring (no well)	\$255		Y
Sewer				
12	Private Sewage Disposal System - Plan Review and Inspection	Actual Cost		Y
13	Building Sewers and Connections			
	a) Residential and Commercial Service	Actual Cost		Y
	b) Service Establishments Producing Industrial Waste	Actual Cost		Y
14	Review of Grease, Oil, and Grit Interceptors	Actual Cost		Y
15	Rate-of-Flow Controller Facility			
	a) Installation	Actual Cost		Y
	b) Re-inspection	Actual Cost		Y
16	Industrial Waste Manhole - Plan Review and Inspection	Actual Cost		Y
17	Closed Circuit TV for Inspection and Warranty Service	Actual Cost		Y
18	Vactor Service for Cleaning of New Infrastructure for Final Acceptance	Actual Cost		Y
19	Fabrication of Special Fittings	Actual Cost		Y
20	Fats, Oils, and Grease Program (FOG) - Costs incurred by the City as a result of required on-site sampling and analysis	Actual Cost		Y

Environmental Utilities Fees

Fee Description		Fee	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
21	FOG Program Violation Appeal Cost Reimbursement			
	a) Public Utilities Commission	Actual Cost		Y
	b) City Council	Actual Cost		Y
	Recycled Water			
22	Recycled Water - Cost of Meter and Installation			
	a) 3/4"	\$478.61		Y
	b) 1"	\$540.93		Y
	c) 1 1/2"	\$1,248.13		Y
	d) 2"	\$1,412.76		Y
	e) 3"	\$1,909.85		Y
	f) 4"	\$3,196.16		Y
	g) 6"	\$5,370.87		Y
	h) 8"	\$8,556.92		Y
	i) 10"	\$10,911.17		Y
23	Recycled Water - Plan Review and Inspection	Actual Cost		Y
	Industrial Wastewater			
24	On-Site Sampling	Actual Cost		Y
	Other Fees			
25	Plan Review	Actual Cost		Y
26	On-site Inspections	Actual Cost		Y
27	Water Warranty Inspections	Actual Cost		Y
28	Wastewater Warranty Inspections	Actual Cost		Y
29	Cross Connection Testing	Actual Cost		Y
30	Cross Connection Testing for Backflows	Actual Cost		Y
31	Water Continuity Testing	Actual Cost		Y
32	Spark Testing	Actual Cost		Y
33	Mapping	Actual Cost		Y
34	Standby	Actual Cost		Y
35	Disposal of Chlorinated or Contaminated Water	Actual Cost		Y
36	Tee Installation	Actual Cost		Y
37	401 Transition Pipe	Actual Cost		Y
38	Pipe Coating	Actual Cost		Y

** Note regarding annual inflationary adjustment: For items billed at actual cost, the underlying hourly billing rates should inflate annually by the change in hourly labor rates and/or indirect cost rate multipliers.*

[a] Installation, repair, or replacement of a backflow prevention assembly shall be performed by a licensed contractor, or with customer approval, by City personnel. The cost to the City for materials and labor at the prevailing wage shall be paid by the owner or customer.

[b] Reinspection fee is the fee required to be paid upon finding by an inspector that the backflow prevention assembly is defective or not in compliance backflow prevention assembly standards.

[c] Fee is 50% refundable if denied.

Fire Prevention Fees

Fee Description		Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
Permits to Operate (Type of Permit Activity)					
1	Amusement Building	\$298.45			Y
2	Carnivals and Fairs	\$298.45			Y
3	Combustible Dust Operations	\$298.45			Y
4	Covered Mall Buildings	\$298.45			Y
5	Exhibits and Trade Shows	\$298.45			Y
6	Explosives or Blasting Agents	\$746.13			Y
7	Recreational or Bon Fire	\$149.23			Y
8	Theatrical Fire Performance	\$298.45			Y
9	High Pile Storage	\$298.45			Y
10	Hot Work Operations	\$298.45			Y
11	Industrial Ovens	\$298.45			Y
12	Lumber Yards	\$298.45			Y
13	Misc. Combustible Storage	\$298.45			Y
14	Places of Assembly				
	a) Less than 300 occupant load	\$298.45			Y
	b) 300 - 999 occupant load	\$447.68			Y
	c) 1,000 or more occupant load	\$596.90			Y
15	Commercial Day Care Facility				
	a) 7 - 49 persons	\$298.45			Y
	b) 50 - 149 persons	\$447.68			Y
	c) 150 or more persons	\$596.90			Y
16	Institutional				
	a) Less than 6 patients	\$298.45			Y
	b) 6 or more patients	\$447.68			Y
	c) Detention facilities	\$596.90			Y
17	Apartments/Hotels/Motels				
	a) 3 - 16 units	\$223.84			Y
	b) 17 - 32 units	\$298.45			Y
	c) 33 or more units	\$447.68			Y
18	Large Family Day Care	\$298.45			Y
19	Residential Care Facilities				
	a) 7 or more residents	\$447.68			Y
	b) Pre-inspection (at hourly rate)	\$149.23	per hour		Y
20	Temporary Membrane Structures (Tents/Canopies)				
	a) 401 - 1,499 SF	\$223.84			Y
	b) 1,500 - 2,999 SF	\$298.45			Y
	c) 3,000 - 5,999 SF	\$447.68			Y
	d) 6,000 or more SF	\$596.90			Y
Plan Review (Including Inspection Service)					
21	Fire Alarm System				

Fire Prevention Fees

Fee Description		Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
	a) New Installation	\$1,342.49			Y
	b) Tenant Improvement	\$596.90			Y
	c) Large Project > 50 Notification Devices	\$3,581.42			Y
	d) High Rise	\$5,372.14			Y
22	Fire Sprinkler System - New Installation				
	a) 1 - 99 heads	\$1,790.71			Y
	b) 100 - 199 heads	\$2,238.39			Y
	c) 200 or more heads	\$2,984.52			Y
23	Fire Sprinkler System - Tenant Improvement				
	a) 1 - 50 heads	\$596.90			Y
	b) 51 or more heads	\$1,193.81			Y
24	Fire Stand Pipe System	\$1,193.81			Y
25	Fire Pump System	\$2,238.39			Y
26	Hood and Duct System	\$1,044.58			Y
27	Special Suppression System (Clean agent, Co2, etc.)	\$1,492.26			Y
28	Compressed Gas System				
	a) Hazardous Material	\$596.90			Y
	b) Medical Gas	\$596.90			Y
29	Smoke Management Systems	\$3,581.42			Y
30	Spray Booths (Includes fire protection system)	\$1,193.81			Y
31	Radio Amplification System	\$3,581.42			Y
	Fireworks				
32	Fireworks - Public Display (High/Low Level & Ground Devices)				
	a) 200 or less devices	\$895.36			Y
	b) 201 or more devices	\$1,044.58			Y
33	Fireworks - Retail Stand	\$298.45			Y
34	Fireworks - Special Pyrotechnic Effects	\$596.90			Y
	Hazardous Materials				
35	Flammable or Combustible Liquids				
	a) Class I, II, or IIIA ≥ 25 gallons inside storage	\$447.68			Y
	b) Class I, II, or IIIA ≥ 60 gallons outside storage	\$447.68			Y
	c) Class IIIB ≥ 110 gallons	\$447.68			Y
36	Hazardous Materials Storage, Use, or Handling				
	a) Carbon Dioxide System	\$298.45		[a]	Y
	b) 1 - 10 chemicals	\$447.68		[a]	Y
	c) 11 - 20 chemicals	\$895.36		[a]	Y
	d) 21 or more chemicals	\$1,790.71		[a]	Y
37	Hazardous Waste Generator				
	a) Hazardous Waste Generator Fee < 55 gal	\$298.45			Y
	b) Hazardous Waste Generator Fee 55 - 500 gal	\$447.68			Y
	c) Hazardous Waste Generator Fee 501 - 2,500 gal	\$596.90			Y

Fire Prevention Fees

Fee Description		Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'ftr
	d) Hazardous Waste Generator Fee > 2,500 gal	\$895.36			Y
38	Tiered Permitting				
	a) Permit by Rule (PBR)	\$895.36			Y
	b) Conditionally Authorized	\$447.68			Y
	c) Conditionally Exempt	\$447.68			Y
39	Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG)				
	a) Annual tank > 125 gal	\$298.45			Y
	b) Tank installation (plan review and inspection)	\$596.90			Y
40	State of California Surcharge CALARP	\$275.40			Y
41	State of California Surcharge Hazardous Materials	\$35.70			Y
42	Review of Hazardous Materials Risk Management Plans	\$149.23	per hour		Y
43	Review of Hazardous Materials Emergency Response Plans	\$149.23	per hour		Y
44	Hazardous Materials Emergency Spill Response	Actual Cost			Y
45	Hazardous Materials Oversight of Remediation	\$149.23	per hour		Y
	Underground Storage Tanks				
46	Annual Permit	\$1,492.26			Y
47	Tank Installation (plan review and inspection)				
	a) First tank	\$2,984.52			Y
	b) Each additional tank	\$447.68			Y
48	Transfer of Ownership	\$298.45			Y
49	Tank Removal or Abandonment	\$1,492.26			Y
50	System Modification	\$596.90			Y
51	UST Piping Upgrade	\$1,193.81			Y
52	State of California UST Surcharge (per tank)	\$15.30			Y
	Aboveground Storage Tanks				
53	Annual Permit				
	a) Annual Permit ≥ 1,320 gal & < 10,000 gal	\$298.45			Y
	b) Annual Permit ≥ 10,000 gal & < 100,000 gal	\$447.68			Y
	c) Annual Permit ≥ 100,000 gal & < 1,000,000 gal	\$596.90			Y
	d) Annual Permit > 1,000,000 gal	\$895.36			Y
54	Tank Installation (plan review and inspection)				
	a) First tank	\$596.90			Y
	b) Each additional tank	\$149.23			Y
55	Transfer of Ownership	\$298.76			Y
56	Tank Removal or Abandonment	\$596.90			Y
57	System Modification	\$447.68			Y
58	State of California APSA Surcharge	\$26.52			Y
	Administrative Fees				
59	Copy of Incident Report (per incident)	\$10.20			Y
60	Media Reproduction (audio, video, photographic)	Actual Cost			Y

Fire Prevention Fees

Fee Description	Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
61 Emergency Response Caused by DUI	Actual Cost			Y
62 Weed Abatement Administrative Parcel Fee	\$298.45			Y
63 Code Appeal	\$746.13			Y
64 Fire Flow / Hydrant Test	\$447.68			Y
65 Fire & Life Safety Division Hourly Rate	\$149.23	per hour		Y
66 Minimum Intake Fee	\$149.23			Y
67 Voluntary Inspection	\$298.45			Y
68 Technical Report (alternate material or method request)	\$1,193.81			Y
69 Inspection Requests (after normal business hours)	\$447.68			Y
70 Administrative Fee (excessive resubmittals and inspections)	\$373.07			Y
71 Expedited Plan Review Fee (per hour)	\$175.44	per hour		Y
72 Re-inspection Fee	\$298.45			Y
73 Administrative Fee (work without a permit)	\$447.68			Y
74 Code Review or Design Consultation (per hour)	\$149.23			Y
75 False Alarm Fee	\$373.07			Y
76 Fire Extinguisher Training	\$447.68			Y
77 Late Payment Penalty for Permits				
a) 30 days past due	\$50.00			N
b) 60 days past due	\$100.00			N
c) 90 days past due	\$200.00			N

** Note regarding annual inflationary adjustment: For items billed at actual cost, the underlying hourly billing rates should inflate annually by the change in hourly labor rates and/or indirect cost rate multipliers.*

[a] Fee includes Hazardous Waste Generator < 55 gal.

General Information

- * All fees or charges shall be calculated at one (1) hour minimum unless otherwise specified.
- * All fees for specified services shall be calculated by the Fire Department.
- * When required, no permit or approval shall be issued until facility or process is brought into compliance with applicable codes and the required service fee is paid in full.
- * When a requester fails to cancel a requested inspection prior to the scheduled time of inspection, the standard inspection fee shall be charged, with a one hour minimum fee.

CUPA/Hazardous Materials Compliance Incentive Program

To qualify for a 25% discount on annual CUPA permit fees, a business cannot have within the last three years, any Class 1 violations of CCR Title 22, Title 23, or Title 24.

A business also cannot have any repeat violations noted during the previous year's inspection. All other violations or deficiencies must have been corrected within 30 days of the last inspection. Annual permit fees must have been paid by the date indicated on the annual permit invoice. A business may qualify for this discount annually if the above listed criteria is met.

Police Department Fees

Fee Description	Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
1 Alarm Permit Application				
a) Initial permit application	\$35	for two-year permit		N
b) Renewal permit application	\$15	for two-year permit		N
c) Late Filing Fees				
i) Less than 30 days late	\$5			N
ii) 30 Days	\$20			N
iii) 60 Days	\$40			N
iv) 90 Days	\$80			N
v) 91+ Days				
a) Base Fee	\$80			N
b) Administrative Citation	TBD			N
c) Fine	\$100			N
2 Excessive False Alarms:				
a) First false alarm				
i) Burglary	\$0	flat fee	[a]	N
ii) Duress/robbery	\$0	flat fee	[a]	N
b) Second false alarm				
i) Burglary	\$60	flat fee	[a]	N
ii) Duress/robbery	\$60	flat fee	[a]	N
c) Third false alarm				
i) Burglary	\$85	flat fee	[a]	N
ii) Duress/robbery	\$85	flat fee	[a]	N
d) Fourth false alarm				
i) Burglary	\$100	flat fee	[a]	N
ii) Duress/robbery	\$150	flat fee	[a]	N
e) Fifth and subsequent false alarms				
i) Burglary	\$150	flat fee	[a]	N
ii) Duress/robbery	\$200	flat fee	[a]	N
3 Appeal of Decision to Deny, Suspend, or Revoke an Alarm Permit	\$75	flat fee		N
4 Traffic Collision Report	\$10	per request		Y
5 Impounded Vehicle Release Fee	\$153	per vehicle	[b]	Y
6 Vehicle Tow Hearing	\$77	per request		Y
7 Criminal Background / Good Conduct Letter (aka Records Check and Clearance Letter)	\$20	per request		N
8 Commercial Indoor Firing Range Permit	\$102	flat fee		Y
9 Retail Firearms Dealer License				
a) Initial permit application	\$102	flat fee		Y
b) Renewal permit application	\$102	flat fee		Y

Police Department Fees

Fee Description	Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
10 Adult-oriented Business				
a) Initial permit application				
i) Permit fee	\$255	flat fee		Y
ii) Dept of Justice fee	\$32	flat fee	[c]	N
iii) LiveScan fingerprint processing fee	\$15	flat fee	[c]	N
iv) Additional FBI fingerprinting fee, if applicable	\$17	flat fee	[c]	N
b) Renewal permit application				
i) Permit fee	\$255	flat fee		Y
11 Dance Permit Application	\$102	flat fee	[d]	Y
12 Entertainment Permit				
a) Initial permit application				
i) Permit fee	\$204	flat fee		Y
ii) Dept of Justice fee	\$32	flat fee	[c]	N
iii) LiveScan fingerprint processing fee	\$15	flat fee	[c]	N
iv) Additional FBI fingerprinting fee, if applicable	\$17	flat fee	[c]	N
b) Renewal permit application				
i) Permit fee	\$204	flat fee		Y
13 Ice Cream Vendor Permit Application				
a) Initial permit application				
i) Permit fee	\$36	flat fee		Y
ii) Dept of Justice fee	\$32	flat fee	[c]	N
iii) LiveScan fingerprint processing fee	\$15	flat fee	[c]	N
iv) Additional FBI fingerprinting fee, if applicable	\$17	flat fee	[c]	N
b) Renewal permit application				
i) Permit fee	\$36	flat fee		Y
14 Massage Therapist Permit Application			[e]	
a) Initial permit application				
i) Permit fee	\$28	flat fee		N
ii) Dept of Justice fee	\$32	flat fee	[c]	N
iii) LiveScan fingerprint processing fee	\$15	flat fee	[c]	N
iv) Additional FBI fingerprinting fee, if applicable	\$17	flat fee	[c]	N
b) Renewal permit application				
i) Permit fee	\$25	flat fee		N
15 Pawnbroker/Secondhand Dealer				
a) Initial permit application				
i) Permit fee	\$102	flat fee		Y
ii) Dept of Justice fee	\$32	flat fee	[c]	N
iii) LiveScan fingerprint processing fee	\$15	flat fee	[c]	N
iv) Additional FBI fingerprinting fee, if applicable	\$17	flat fee	[c]	N
b) Renewal permit application				

Police Department Fees

Fee Description	Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
16 i) Permit fee	\$61	flat fee		Y
16 Taxicab Driver Permit Application				
a) Initial permit application				
i) Permit fee	\$50	flat fee		N
ii) Dept of Justice fee	\$32	flat fee	[c]	N
iii) LiveScan fingerprint processing fee	\$15	flat fee	[c]	N
iv) Additional FBI fingerprinting fee, if applicable	\$17	flat fee	[c]	N
b) Renewal permit application				
i) Permit fee	\$50	flat fee		N
17 Noise Violation	actual cost of enforcement	per separate offense following first citation		Y
18 Extraordinary Law Enforcement Services (multiple responses to disturbance w/in 12-hrs)	actual cost of enforcement	per separate offense following first warning		Y
19 Supplemental Law Enforcement Services				
a) Hourly Rates for Police Dept Personnel				
i) Community Service Officers	\$43	per hour		Y
ii) Police Officers	\$67	per hour		Y
iii) Sergeants	\$79	per hour		Y
iv) Dispatchers	\$54	per hour		Y
b) Hourly Rates for Marked Vehicles				
i) Base Rate	\$25	per hour		N
ii) Per mile rate, for each mile over 50	\$0.50	per mile		N
20 Concealed Weapon License	n/a - issued by Placer County Sheriff		[f]	N

** Note regarding annual inflationary adjustment: For items billed at actual cost, the underlying hourly billing rates should inflate annually by the change in hourly labor rates and/or indirect cost rate multipliers.*

[a] Fines are determined by the combined number of both burglary and duress/robbery false alarms. Reimbursement may be waived by the police chief where uncommon circumstances not considered an emergency resulted in false alarm and where the permittee has undertaken to correct alarm system deficiencies.

[b] This fee shall be collected only from the registered owner or agent of the registered owner. This fee shall not apply to vehicles impounded as the result of automobile accidents, abatement program, or lien sale, unless the sale is sufficient in amount to pay the lienholder's total charges and administrative costs.

[c] This fee is not established by the City of Roseville. It is collected on behalf of a third party (e.g. vendor; other public agency). The fee schedule is intended to mirror amounts adopted by third parties. If the amount charged by a third party changes, the amounts collected by the City on behalf of the third party are presumed to change simultaneously. Amounts shown in the fee schedule will be updated as soon as practicable after the City receives notice of the fee change.

[d] Fee applies for initial annual permits, renewal permits, and special event/one-time permits.

[e] Fee amounts shown are for non-state certified massage therapist applications. There is no fee for State-certified massage therapists/practitioners registering to provide massage services or activities within the City of Roseville.

[f] Any Roseville resident wishing to apply for a license to carry a concealed weapon shall be directed to the Placer County Sheriff's Office for permit application and the permit process.

Animal Licensing and Permit Fees

Fee Description		Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'ltr
1	Dog License				
	a) 1 Year				
	i) Certified altered dogs	\$20	each		Y
	ii) Non-altered dogs	\$41	each		Y
	iii) Senior Discount	\$5 off standard fee	each		N
	b) 2 Years				
	i) Certified altered dogs	\$40	each		Y
	ii) Non-altered dogs	\$81	each		Y
	iii) Senior Discount	\$5 off standard fee	each		N
	c) 3 Years				
	i) Certified altered dogs	\$59	each		Y
	ii) Non-altered dogs	\$120	each		Y
	iii) Senior Discount	\$5 off standard fee	each		N
	d) Transfer of active license from other jurisdiction	\$0	each		Y
2	Delinquent Penalty for Failure to Renew License within 15 days of Expiration				
	a) Altered dog	\$5	flat fee		N
	b) Unaltered dog	\$10	flat fee		N
3	Lost License or Tag	\$5	flat fee		Y
4	Kennel License	\$10	per year		Y
5	Special Animal Permit	\$36	per year		Y
6	Voluntary Disposal Fee				
	a) Dogs and Other Animals Commonly Considered Pets	\$0	per animal/litter		Y
	b) Livestock and Wild Animals	\$0	per animal		Y
7	Appeal of Decision to Destroy Vicious Animal	\$75	flat fee		N

* Per RMC 7.16.070, license fees are waived for: service dog owned by a person with a need for assistance; dog used by any law enforcement personnel; dog owned by any government entity or political subdivision

Oversize Vehicle Permit Fees and Building Moving Permit Fees

Fee Description		Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
1	Oversize Vehicle Permit				
	a) Single trip permit	\$16	per vehicle	[a]	N
	b) Annual permit	\$90	per vehicle	[a]	N
2	Building Moving Permit				
	a) Base Fee	\$26	per request		Y
	b) Costs of plan review, utility and street light moving, tree trimming, traffic directing, etc.	actual costs	per request		Y

** Note regarding annual inflationary adjustment: For items billed at actual cost, the underlying hourly billing rates should inflate annually by the change in hourly labor rates and/or indirect cost rate multipliers.*

[a] Oversize vehicle permit fees set to match fees adopted by California Department of Transportation (CalTrans).

Parking Permit Fees

Fee Description		Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
1	Residential Parking Permit	\$0	per vehicle		N
2	Merchant Parking Permit				
	a) January 1st through December 31st	\$20	per vehicle		N
	b) July 1st through December 31st	\$10	per vehicle		N

* Permit is valid only for the calendar year issued. A merchant parking permit is issued to a specific vehicle and is not transferable. A valid merchant parking permit decal must be appropriately displayed on the left rear bumper or left rear window of the permittee's vehicle.

Special Event, Film, and Banner Permit Fees

Fee Description		Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
1	Special Event Permit				
	a) Application Fee				
	i) Event that requires limited site/plan review, no closures, etc. (i.e. park rentals/activities, misc. events, etc.)	\$77	per event		Y
	ii) Event that requires, but not limited to, street/parking lot closures, site/plan review, trail use, etc. (i.e. fun runs, festivals, parking garage, etc.)	\$153	per event		Y
	b) Service Charges	actual costs			Y
	c) Park/facility rental fee	varies by location	per event		N
2	Photography and Filming Permit				
	a) Application Fee	\$0			Y
	b) Service Charges	actual costs			Y
3	Banner Permit	\$31			Y

** Note regarding annual inflationary adjustment: For items billed at actual cost, the underlying hourly billing rates should inflate annually by the change in hourly labor rates and/or indirect cost rate multipliers.*

Parks, Recreation, & Libraries Department Fees

Fee Description		Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
1	Parks, Recreation, & Libraries Department Program, Class, Facility Use, and Service Fees	See Note		[a]	N
2	Capital Replacement Fee	Not to exceed 10% of program fee	per registration		N

[a] See Department for Recreation Guide and Programs, Events, and Classes information, Facility Use, and Service Fees. Information is updated seasonally. Fees are approved by the Department Director. Fees are established and updated using the Departmental Pricing Policy.

ORDINANCE NO. ____

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE AMENDING SECTION 2.36.030 OF CHAPTER 2.36 AND SECTION 2.40.070 OF CHAPTER 2.40 OF TITLE 2, AMENDING SECTIONS 4.50.020 AND 4.50.040 OF CHAPTER 4.50, REPEALING SECTIONS 4.50.050, 4.50.060, 4.50.080, AND 4.50.100 OF CHAPTER 4.50, AND AMENDING SECTION 4.57.030 OF CHAPTER 4.57 OF TITLE 4, AMENDING SECTIONS 7.16.050, 7.16.100, AND 7.16.110 OF CHAPTER 7.16, AMENDING SECTION 7.20.030 OF CHAPTER 7.20, AMENDING SECTION 7.36.110 OF CHAPTER 7.36, AMENDING SECTION 7.48.035 OF CHAPTER 7.48, AMENDING SECTIONS 7.56.010, 7.56.020, AND 7.56.030 OF CHAPTER 7.56, AND REPEALING SECTION 7.56.040 OF CHAPTER 7.56 OF TITLE 7, AMENDING SECTIONS 8.04.070 AND 8.04.080 OF CHAPTER 8.04 OF TITLE 8, AMENDING SECTION 9.17.030 OF CHAPTER 9.17 OF TITLE 9, AMENDING SECTIONS 10.64.060, 10.64.110, 10.64.160 AND 10.64.180 OF CHAPTER 10.64, AMENDING SECTION 10.65.080 OF CHAPTER 10.65 AND AMENDING SECTION 10.66.080 OF CHAPTER 10.66 OF TITLE 10, AMENDING SECTION 11.20.530 OF CHAPTER 11.20 OF TITLE 11, AMENDING SECTION 13.20.070 OF CHAPTER 13.20, AMENDING SECTION 13.21.030 OF CHAPTER 13.21 AND AMENDING SECTION 13.28.070 OF CHAPTER 13.28 OF TITLE 13, AMENDING SECTIONS 14.04.040, 14.04.060, 14.04.065, 14.04.070 AND 14.04.071 OF CHAPTER 14.04, REPEALING 14.04.200 OF CHAPTER 14.04, AMENDING SECTIONS 14.08.105 AND 14.08.130 OF CHAPTER 14.08, AMENDING SECTIONS 14.10.080 AND 14.10.090 OF CHAPTER 14.10, AMENDING SECTION 14.11.050 OF CHAPTER 14.11, AMENDING SECTIONS 14.14.150, 14.14.180, 14.14.210 AND 14.14.360 OF CHAPTER

14.14, AMENDING SECTIONS 14.17.070 AND 14.17.080 OF CHAPTER 14.17, AMENDING SECTIONS 14.20.220, 14.20.230 AND 14.20.240 OF CHAPTER 14.20, AMENDING SECTIONS 14.26.330 AND 14.26.430 OF CHAPTER 14.26 OF TITLE 14, AND AMENDING SECTION 16.04.120 OF CHAPTER 16.04 OF TITLE 16 REGARDING USER AND REGULATORY FEES

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. Section 2.36.030 of Chapter 2.36 of Title 2 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

2.36.030 Franchise application and fee—Filing with city clerk.

The application for a franchise under this chapter shall be filed with the city clerk, together with a ~~fee of \$150.00~~ nonrefundable fee as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

SECTION 2. Section 2.40.070 of Chapter 2.40 of Title 2 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

2.40.070 Application for franchise—Determination and grant by council.

A. Each application for a franchise to construct, operate or maintain any cable television system in this city shall be filed with the city clerk and shall contain or be accompanied by the following:

1. The name, address and telephone number of the applicant;
2. A detailed statement of the corporate or other business entity organization of the applicant including, but not limited to, the following and to whatever extent required by the city:
 - a. The names, residence and business addresses of all officers, directors and associates of the applicant,
 - b. The names, residence and business addresses of all officers, persons and entities having, controlling or being entitled to have or control five percent or more of the ownership of the applicant and the respective ownership share of each such person or entity,
 - c. The names and addresses of any parent or subsidiary of the applicant, namely, any other business entity owning or controlling applicant in whole or in part or owned or controlled in whole or in part by the applicant, and a statement describing the nature of any such parent or subsidiary business entity, including but not limited to cable television systems owned or controlled by the applicant, its parent and subsidiary and the areas served thereby,
 - d. A detailed description of all previous experience of the applicant in providing cable television system service and in related or similar fields,
 - e. A detailed and complete financial statement of the applicant, prepared by a certified public accountant, for the fiscal year next preceding the date of the application hereunder, or a letter or other acceptable evidence in writing from a recognized lending institution or funding source, addressed to both the applicant and the council, setting forth the basis for a study performed by such lending institution or funding source, and a clear statement

of its intent as a lending institution or funding source to provide whatever capital shall be required by the applicant to construct and operate the proposed system in the city, or a statement from a certified public accountant, certifying that the applicant has available sufficient free, net and uncommitted cash resources to construct and operate the proposed system in this city,

f. A statement identifying, by place and date, any other cable television franchise(s) awarded to the applicant, its parent or subsidiary; the status of such franchise(s) with respect to completion thereof; the total cost of completion of such system(s); and the amount of applicant's and its parent's or subsidiary's resources committed to the completion thereof;

B. A detailed description of the proposed plan of operation of the applicant which shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. A detailed map indicating all areas proposed to be served and a proposed time schedule for the installation of all equipment necessary to become operational throughout the entire area to be served,

2. A statement or schedule setting forth all proposed classifications of rates and charges to be made against subscribers and all rates and charges as to each of such classifications, including installation charges and service charges,

3. A detailed, informative and referenced statement describing the actual equipment and operational standards proposed by the applicant. In no event shall such operational and performance standards be less than those contained in Title 47, Subpart K (sections 76.601 et seq.), Rules and Regulations, Federal Communications Commission, adopted February 2, 1972, and as amended,

4. A copy of the form of any agreement, undertaking or other instrument proposed to be entered into between the applicant and any subscriber,

5. A detailed statement setting forth in its entirety any and all agreements and undertakings, whether formal or informal, written, oral or implied, existing or proposed to exist between the applicant and any person, firm or corporation, which materially relate, pertain to or depend upon the application and the granting of the franchise;

C. A copy of any agreement covering the franchise area, if existing between the applicant and any public utility subject to regulation by the state public utilities commission providing for the use of any facilities of the public utility, including but not limited to poles, lines or conduits;

D. Any other details, statements, information or references pertinent to the subject matter of such application which shall be required or requested by the council, or by any provision of this code, any other ordinance of the city and of its Charter;

E. ~~An application fee in the sum of one hundred dollars, which shall be in the form of cash, certified or cashier's check or money order, to pay the costs of studying, investigating and otherwise processing such application, and which shall be in consideration thereof and not returnable or refundable in whole or in part, except to the extent that such fee exceeds the actual costs incurred by the city in studying, investigating and otherwise processing the application; provided, that any applicant who shall deliver to the city clerk a written withdrawal of or cancellation of any application hereunder, not later than the seventh day next following the day such application is received by the city clerk, shall be entitled to have returned and refunded the~~

~~sum of \$75.00, less any actual costs or expenses incurred by the city by reason of such application;~~ A nonrefundable application fee as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

F. The council may, by advertisement or any other means, solicit and call for applications for cable television system franchises, and may determine and fix any date upon or after which the same shall be received by the city, or the date before which the same must be received, or the date after which the same shall not be received and may make any other determinations and specify any other times, terms, conditions or limitations respecting the soliciting, calling for, making and receiving of such applications.

The grantee shall pay to the city a sum of money sufficient to reimburse it for all publication expenses incurred by it in connection with the granting of a franchise pursuant to the provisions of this chapter. Such payment shall be made within 30 days after the city furnishes the grantee with a written statement of such expenses;

G. Upon receipt of any application for franchise, the council shall refer the same to the chief administrative officer who shall prepare a report and make his recommendations respecting such application and cause the same to be completed and filed with the council within 21 days;

H. In making any determination hereunder as to any application, the council may give due consideration to the quality of the service proposed, rates to subscriber, income to the city, experience, character, background and financial responsibility of any applicant and its management and owners, technical and performance quality of equipment, willingness and

ability to meet construction and physical requirements and to abide by policy conditions, franchise limitations and requirements, and any other considerations deemed pertinent by the council for safeguarding the interests of the city and the public. The council, in its discretion, shall determine the award of any franchise on the basis of such considerations and without competitive bidding.

If the council shall determine to reject such application, such determination shall be final and conclusive, and the same shall be deemed rejected;

I. If the council shall determine to further the application, the following shall be done:

1. The council shall decide and specify the terms and conditions of any franchise to be granted hereunder and as herein provided,

2. The council shall pass its resolutions of intention to consider the granting of such a franchise, giving notice of receipt of the application and describing the character of the franchise desired, stating the name of the proposed grantee, the character of the franchise, the terms and conditions upon which such franchise is proposed to be granted, that copies of the proposed franchise may be obtained at the office of the city clerk, fixing and setting forth a day, hour and place certain when and where any persons having any interest therein or objection to the granting thereof may file written protests and appear before the council and be heard and directing the city clerk to publish such resolution at least once within ten days of the passage thereof in a newspaper of general circulation within the city;

J. At the time set for the hearing or any adjournment thereof, the council shall proceed to hear all written protests. Thereafter, the council shall make one of the following determinations:

1. That such franchise be denied,
2. That such franchise be granted upon the terms and conditions as specified in the resolution of intention to grant the same,
3. That such franchise be granted but upon the terms and conditions different from those specified in the resolution of intention to grant the same;

K. If the council shall determine that a franchise be denied, such determination shall be expressed by resolution and shall be final and conclusive.

If the council shall determine that a franchise be granted upon the terms and conditions as specified in the resolution of intention to consider granting the same, such determination shall be expressed by ordinance granting a franchise to the applicant.

If the council shall determine upon granting a franchise upon terms and conditions different from those specified in the resolution of intention to consider granting the same, then such determination shall be expressed by resolution adopted prior to granting a franchise by ordinance.

SECTION 3. Section 4.50.020 of Chapter 4.50 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

4.50.020 Records check and clearance letter.

The fee for processing requests for personal records checks and letters certifying the results of such checks shall be ~~\$20.00~~ established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

SECTION 4. Section 4.50.040 of Chapter 4.50 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

4.50.040 Auto impounds.

The fee for releasing impounded vehicles shall be ~~\$98.00~~ as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time. This fee shall be collected only from the registered owner or agent of the registered owner. This fee shall not apply to vehicles impounded as the result of automobile accidents, abatement program, or lien sale, unless the sale is sufficient in amount to pay the lienholder's total charges and administrative costs.

SECTION 5. Section 4.50.050 of Chapter 4.50 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby repealed.

SECTION 6. Section 4.50.060 of Chapter 4.50 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby repealed.

SECTION 7. Section 4.50.080 of Chapter 4.50 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby repealed.

SECTION 8. Section 4.50.100 of Chapter 4.50 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby repealed.

SECTION 9. Section 4.57.030 of Chapter 4.57 of Title 4 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

4.57.030 Imposition of fee.

A. A fee ~~of three percent~~ calculated as a percentage of the cost of the building permit, fire permit, improvement plan, and entitlement, as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time, is required to be imposed upon the application and issuance for such permit or entitlement.

B. The fee shall be determined by calculating ~~three percent~~ the applicable adopted percentage of the permit or entitlement cost for which application is made or issued.

C. The fee shall be placed in a separate fund to be known as the development services technology fee fund and such revenues shall be used only for the purpose of funding the capital costs associated with an online permitting system inclusive of software purchases, software licensing, implementation services, and hardware.

SECTION 10. Section 7.16.050 of Chapter 7.16 of Title 7 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

7.16.050 Fee.

A fee for the license, or the renewal thereof, ~~shall be as set forth in the fee schedule contained in Chapter 7.56 of this title~~ shall be paid as established by resolution adopted by the

city council, as amended from time to time. No license shall be issued until the required fee is paid.

SECTION 11. Section 7.16.100 of Chapter 7.16 of Title 7 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

7.16.100 Failure to renew—Delinquent penalty.

A person who fails to renew a dog license within 15 days of its expiration shall pay a penalty fee, ~~upon renewal, of five dollars per altered dog or \$10.00 per unaltered dog~~ as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

SECTION 12. Section 7.16.110 of Chapter 7.16 of Title 7 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

7.16.110 Lost license or tag.

If during the period for which a license or dog tag is issued, the holder of such license or tag reports to the animal control officer that the same has been lost or stolen, he or she shall be issued a duplicate upon payment of the required fee as ~~set forth in Chapter 7.56~~ established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

SECTION 13. Section 7.20.030 of Chapter 7.20 of Title 7 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

7.20.030 Fee.

The fee for the issuance of a kennel license shall be ~~that fee set forth in Chapter 7.56 of this title~~ established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

Such fee shall be in addition to all fees required for the licensing of each individual dog kept at the kennel. Nothing herein shall be read to permit any dog kept at any kennel to remain unlicensed.

SECTION 14. Section 7.36.110 of Chapter 7.36 of Title 7 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

7.36.110 Annual fee.

~~There is a fixed fee of \$25.00 per year for a special animal permit, which sum~~ An annual fee for a special animal permit, as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time, shall be paid to the police department.

SECTION 15. Section 7.48.035 of Chapter 7.48 of Title 7 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

7.48.035 Hearing and appeal regarding destruction.

A. Upon written request by the owner of the animal received by the police chief within 10 days after the mailing of a notice of intention to destroy the animal, a hearing shall be held by the police chief or his or her designee on the question of the destruction. The owner of the animal and all victims and complainants shall be given notice of the hearing by first-class

U.S. mail or in person at least five calendar days prior to the date of the hearing. The hearing shall be open to the public.

B. The owner of the animal may appear in person at the hearing or present a sworn written statement contesting the animal control officer's determination.

C. Following the hearing, the police chief shall make written findings of fact showing whether the animal is a threat to the public safety. Such written findings of fact shall be the basis for the decision of the police chief. A finding that the animal should be destroyed shall specify a date for destruction that is later than the expiration of the appeal period provided in subsection D of this section.

D. Appeal from any decision of the police chief may be made, in writing, to the city council within 10 calendar days from the police chief's action. Within the same 10-day period, the appellant shall pay an appeal fee ~~of \$75.00~~ as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time, no part of which shall be refundable.

E. Any order of destruction made by the police chief shall be stayed pending the final decision of the city council.

SECTION 16. Section 7.56.010 of Chapter 7.56 of Title 7 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

7.56.010 ~~Generally.~~ Dog licenses and tags.

~~When reference is made to fees in any part of the title, the applicable fee shall be determined by reference to this chapter.~~The fees for a dog license, for a duplicate license or tag, and the amount of any applicable senior discounts to license fees, shall be as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

SECTION 17. Section 7.56.020 of Chapter 7.56 of Title 7 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

7.56.020 ~~Dog licenses and tags.~~Kennel license.

~~_____A._____The fee for a dog license shall be as follows:~~

-

	1 year	2 years	3 years
Certified Altered Dogs	\$15.00	\$29.00	\$43.00
Non-Altered Dogs	\$30.00	\$57.00	\$86.00

-

~~_____B._____The fee for a duplicate license or tag shall be five dollars.~~

~~_____C._____A senior discount of five dollars is available to customers 65 years and older upon proof of age.~~The fee for a kennel license shall be as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

SECTION 18. Section 7.56.030 of Chapter 7.56 of Title 7 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

7.56.030 ~~Kennel license.~~Disposal—Voluntary.

~~_____ The fee for a kennel license shall be \$10.00 per year.~~ Any owner of any animal, as specified in Chapters 7.16, 7.20, 7.28, 7.32, or 7.36, who voluntarily turns the same over to the animal control officer for disposal, shall pay a fee as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

SECTION 19. Section 7.56.040 of Chapter 7.56 of Title 7 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby repealed.

SECTION 20. Section 8.04.070 of Chapter 8.04 of Title 8 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

8.04.070 Permits—Application—Issuance—Denial.

A. Any person desiring a permit to do any act or thing for which a permit is required under this chapter shall make written application to the director for such a permit; along with payment of a permit application fee as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time. The application shall set forth the act or things intended to be done, the number, kind, and the location of street trees to be affected, the proposed manner of doing the act or thing and such other information as the director may require. The permit shall be issued when the director finds that the purpose, act or thing is necessary to provide the life, health, safety, or property of the public and that the proposed method is satisfactory.

B. The action of the director in denying a permit shall be subject to an appeal to the city council. Notice of such appeal shall be filed with the city clerk within 10 calendar days after the denial of such permit. Upon the failure to file such notice within the 10-day period, the action of the director in denying such permit shall be final and conclusive.

SECTION 21. Section 8.04.080 of Chapter 8.04 of Title 8 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

8.04.080 Master permits.

The director may issue master permits to any person doing business as a public utility subject to the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission of the state and to any duly constituted public agency authorized to provide and actually providing utilities service, permitting such person to trim, brace, remove, or perform such other acts with respect to street trees to the extent they encroach as may be necessary to maintain the safe operation of such business. A permit application fee shall be collected as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

SECTION 22. Section 9.17.030 of Chapter 9.17 of Title 9 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

9.17.030 Franchise required—Franchise application fee.

It is unlawful for any person to operate as a refuse hauler, including a refuse hauler of C&D waste from covered projects referenced in Section 9.17.050, without first obtaining a

franchise from the city in accordance with this chapter. The franchise, if granted, shall be nonexclusive. Consistent with the provisions of this chapter, an application for a nonexclusive refuse hauling franchise shall be filed with the director. The application fee shall be in the amount ~~of \$260.00 or as otherwise as established determined from time to time~~ by resolution ~~adopted of~~by the city council, as amended from time to time. Notwithstanding the provisions of this section, a person who operates solely as a recycler shall not be required to obtain a franchise for refuse hauling.

SECTION 23. Section 10.64.060 of Chapter 10.64 of Title 10 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

10.64.060 Alarm permit required.

A. Police response to private alarm sites in the city is a privilege available only to those alarm users who have a valid alarm system permit.

B. Individual Users. It is unlawful for any person to operate, or to cause to be operated, an alarm system within the city without obtaining an active and valid alarm permit within 14 days of connecting or commencing to operate an alarm system and keeping a valid alarm system permit in full force and effect at all times thereafter. Upon registration, each alarm permit shall be assigned a permit number.

C. Alarm Company/Installers. An alarm company may install an alarm system at an alarm site prior to the alarm user obtaining an alarm permit. However, it is unlawful for an alarm

company to connect or activate an alarm system at any alarm site within the city without verifying that an active and valid alarm permit exists for the alarm site.

D. Alarm System Monitoring Company. No monitoring company providing monitoring service to alarm sites in the city shall activate alarm monitoring service or initiate alarm dispatch requests for any alarm site in the city that is not properly permitted.

E. Any person found operating an alarm system without a permit shall obtain a permit within 30 days of the police department's mailing of a notice to obtain permit, and shall pay the permit fee, including late fees, in the amounts established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time. ~~provided for in Section 10.64.110, plus a five dollar late fee. Failure to obtain a permit within the required time shall result in additional fees as set forth below.~~ In addition, any non-registration 120 days past due will be sent to collections for processing.

30 days	\$20 late fee + \$35 permit fee (or \$15 renewal fee)
60 days	\$40 late fee + \$35 permit fee (or \$15 renewal fee)
90 days	\$80 late fee + \$35 permit fee (or \$15 renewal fee)
91+ days	\$80 late fee + \$35 permit fee (or \$15 renewal fee), plus sent to the city attorney for processing as an

	administrative citation and \$100- fine.
--	---

~~———— In addition, any non-registration 120 days past due will be sent to collections for processing.~~

F. Failure to acquire an alarm permit in the city is a class one civil infraction provided in Section 10.64.130.

G. Payment of Fee. A non-registration fee invoice shall be mailed with the notice to obtain permit to the alarm user within 30 days following the assessment of the fee. Fees are due and owing no later than 30 days after the date of the invoice; fees received after that date shall be subject to additional fees as provided in subsection E.

SECTION 24. Section 10.64.110 of Chapter 10.64 of Title 10 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

10.64.110 Applications—Forms.

A. The Roseville police department shall prescribe the form of the application and request such information as is necessary to evaluate and act upon the alarm permit application.

B. Applications for alarm permits required by this chapter shall be filed with the Roseville police department and shall be accompanied by a nonrefundable ~~\$35.00~~ fee as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time. After the initial two-year permit period, renewal permits are required and will be valid for two additional

years. The renewal permit shall be accompanied by a nonrefundable ~~\$15.00~~ fee as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

C. The application for an alarm permit shall contain an agreement, which the applicant must sign before the permit can be issued, whereby the applicant agrees to reimburse the city for costs resulting from excessive false alarms, as well as all costs related to the collection of alarm registrations. The cost recovery shall be accomplished through reimbursement payments as set out in Section 10.64.160 of this chapter.

D. Upon receipt of the application, fees, and copy of signed agreement, the alarm administrator or designee shall issue an alarm permit number to the user.

E. The alarm permit number assigned to an alarm user will remain the same for as long as the alarm user continuously maintains registration for the alarm site.

F. Permits may be renewed under the following conditions:

1. The alarm site has no past due service fees;
2. The alarm site permit is not suspended;
3. The alarm site permit is not revoked;
4. The alarm user either updates his or her permit information, or verifies that the current permit information is still correct; and
5. The appropriate permit fee is paid.

G. Renewal information and fees are submitted to the alarm administrator, or designee, on or before the initial registration anniversary date every two years.

SECTION 25. Section 10.64.160 of Chapter 10.64 of Title 10 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

10.64.160 False alarm reimbursement.

A. Whenever the police department responds to a false alarm, the alarm user shall reimburse the city in accordance with ~~the following schedule:~~ a schedule of fees established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

Residences/Businesses	Burglary	Duress/Robbery
1. First False Alarm	No Charge	No Charge
2. Second False Alarm	\$60.00	\$60.00
3. Third False Alarm	\$85.00	\$85.00
4. Fourth False Alarm	\$100.00	\$150.00
5. Fifth and Subsequent False Alarms	\$150.00	\$200.00

B. Fees are cumulative and determined by the combined number of both burglary and duress/robbery false alarms.

C. Failure to promptly reimburse the city shall be deemed a breach of contract and a civil debt owed to the city.

D. Only alarm users with a valid alarm permit are entitled to one free false alarm without reimbursement to the city per rolling 365-day period.

E. Reimbursement may be waived by the police chief or designee where uncommon circumstances not considered an emergency resulted in a false alarm and where the permittee has taken measures to correct alarm system deficiencies.

SECTION 26. Section 10.64.180 of Chapter 10.64 of Title 10 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

10.64.180 Denial, suspension or revocation of permit.

A. If the police chief denies the issuance of a permit, suspends or revokes a permit issued under this chapter, the police chief shall serve the permittee with a written order stating the reasons for the denial, suspension or revocation of the permit. The order shall be effective immediately upon service and, unless there is a separate indication that there is a crime in progress, the police chief may refuse police response to the alarm site after the suspension or revocation of an alarm permit.

B. It is unlawful to use any alarm system after service of notice of denial, suspension, or revocation of an alarm permit.

C. The police chief may reconsider the denial, suspension or revocation of a permit or reinstate a suspended permit, provided that within 45 days of the denial or suspension, the applicant or permittee shall establish to the satisfaction of the police chief that the alarm system will be operated in compliance with this chapter, by complying with the following:

1. Provide a letter from an alarm company licensed by the state of California indicating that the alarm has been completely checked and any mechanical malfunctions have been repaired;
2. Agree that an agent of the business, or, if the alarm is residential, a responsible party, shall respond to the alarm site within 30 minutes of notification, each time the alarm is activated;
3. Review correct alarm setting procedures with every resident, agent, employee or other person who may be responsible for user error alarm activations;
4. Pay in full all outstanding fines and/or charges associated with the alarm permit;
5. Pay in full all outstanding excessive false alarm fees or charges; and
6. Other reasonable procedures or requirements as may be established by the police chief.

D. Any denial to issue a permit which has not been appealed within 45 days of such denial shall be final. Any suspended permit which is not reinstated within 45 days shall automatically be deemed revoked. No revoked permit shall be reissued until six months after the revocation, at which time a new application may be filed pursuant to Section 10.64.110. The

police chief's decision to suspend a permit shall suspend police response for non-duress and non-robbery alarms at that alarm site for the period of suspension.

E. The decision of the police chief to deny an application for a permit, suspend a permit, or refuse to reinstate a permit may be appealed in writing by any interested person to the city council within 15 calendar days of the decision upon the payment of ~~a \$75.00~~ an appeal fee as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time, to the city clerk, no part of which shall be refundable. The 45-day period for suspended permits shall be tolled during the pendency of any such appeal.

SECTION 27. Section 10.65.080 of Chapter 10.65 of Title 10 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

10.65.080 Annual fee for vendor's permit.

~~There is a~~ A fixed fee ~~of \$25.00,~~ per year, for an ice cream vendor's permit, ~~which sum~~ shall be paid to the police department. The fee amount shall be established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

SECTION 28. Section 10.66.080 of Chapter 10.66 of Title 10 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

10.66.080 Fee for taxicab driver's license.

~~There is~~ A fixed a fee ~~of \$50.00,~~ per year, for a taxicab driver's license, ~~which sum~~ shall be paid to the police department. The fee amount shall be established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

SECTION 29. Section 11.20.530 of Chapter 11.20 of Title 11 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

11.20.530 Application for permits.

The police chief, or designee, shall issue such permits on a yearly basis to any business owner within the 200 block of Vernon Street for use by employees of the business exempting their vehicles from the parking time limitations within the designated commercial parking permit zones. The permits shall be valid for one year. ~~If the permit is obtained between January 1st and June 30th, the fee for the permit shall be \$20.00. If the permit is obtained on or after July 1st, the fee for the permit shall be \$10.00.~~ The permit application fee shall be in the amount determined from time to time by resolution of the city council. The permit must be renewed no later than January 2nd of the following year to remain in effect.

SECTION 30. Section 13.20.070 of Chapter 13.20 of Title 13 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

13.20.070 Fee and costs.

A. An application for a building moving permit shall be accompanied by a ~~\$25.00-~~ fee as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

B. If the application is approved, the applicant shall pay all costs incurred by the city in moving utilities, street lights, trimming trees, directing traffic, or performing any other work to facilitate the moving of the building.

SECTION 31. Section 13.21.030 of Chapter 13.21 of Title 13 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

13.21.030 Fee and costs.

An application for an oversized vehicle permit shall be accompanied by a fee ~~of \$16.00 for a single trip permit and \$90.00 for an annual permit.~~ as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

SECTION 32. Section 13.28.070 of Chapter 13.28 of Title 13 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

13.28.070 Fees.

~~A fee, based on an estimate approved by the director of the cost of the work to be performed under the permit shall be charged for each permit issued pursuant to this chapter as follows:~~

A fee as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time, shall be charged for each permit issued pursuant to this chapter.

~~—A. Four percent of the value of the public improvements for minor encroachment permits, or \$60.00, whichever is greater; or—~~

~~———B.——— Actual cost for all other encroachment permits. A deposit of two and one-half percent of the value of the public improvements, grading, and erosion control, or \$1,000.00, whichever is greater, shall be provided at the time plans are submitted to the city for review. Prior to plan approval and issuance of a permit, an additional deposit of two and one-half percent or \$1,000.00, whichever is greater, shall be provided. Should the actual city costs exceed the deposit amount, the director may request the deposit of additional funds as determined by the director. All funds remaining in the deposit account will be refunded upon completion of the maintenance period.~~

SECTION 33. Section 14.04.040 of Chapter 14.04 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.04.040 Billing procedures.

Invoices for utility services rendered shall be as follows:

A. Except in instances where explicitly allowed by city ordinance or approved policy, utility services shall be invoiced monthly. Each invoice period shall represent as near as possible one month's service, except for new services which may have been connected during the invoice period. Flat rate charges shall be invoiced one month in arrears. New services established during an invoice period shall be invoiced for services received during that period.

B. Flat rate charges for new or discontinued services shall be prorated when service for a full billing period is not received.

C. For customer-generators eligible for the net metering rate with surplus (NM-1), as established by California Public Utilities Code, Section 2827, where the on-premises solar, wind, and/or solar/wind hybrid electric generation, interconnected behind the customer-generator's meter of record, and servicing a maximum of 100 percent of the customer-generator's meter of record total annual kilowatt-hour electric load, the customer-generator will receive an annualized billing for the energy charges for the electric meter of record, as allowed by city Ordinance and/or approved city policy.

D. Annual period for all net metering customer generators: The eligible net metering customer-generator's annual period is defined as:

1. A 12-month period, during which the customer-generator operates the solar, wind, and/or solar/wind system beginning with the occurrence of the anniversary date, resulting in the customer-generator being an annual net energy consumer or an annual net energy generator. A new annual period will begin with the end of each 12-month cycle with the next calendar occurrence of the anniversary date, or when a customer-generator has been classified as a net metering customer-generator.

2. When customer-generators discontinue electric service prior to the completion of their annual period, the default annual period is the amount of time between the customer-generator's annual period anniversary date and the date of service cancellation.

3. Anniversary Date. The "anniversary date" is defined as the beginning date of the annual period. The anniversary date is determined as follows.

a. For active electric accounts: the date the customer-generator electric account is transferred to a net metering rate.

b. For new electric accounts: the date the customer-generator electric account is transferred to, or established as, a net metering account.

E. Past due amounts on a customer's active utility service account may be transferred to any other active utility service account of the same customer. Where the final bill amounts from a customer's previous utility services accounts become past due and that customer has an active utility services account, the past due amounts shall be transferred to the current active account of the customer. No new utility services account shall be established until all of a customer's past due utility service obligations to the city have been paid in full.

F. Where a rental property owner has past due charges for utility services, no new account can be established for service at that same property until payment is rendered for those same charges.

G. Each supply of water or electric service shall be separately metered and meter readings shall not be combined for invoice purposes except as authorized by the finance director.

H. Invoice and payment of water and sewer service charges are inseparable.

I. Customers requesting same day service shall be charged a fee ~~equal to a reestablishment fee.~~ as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time. This service is subject to availability.

SECTION 34. Section 14.04.060 of Chapter 14.04 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.04.060 Time period for payment of bills—Delinquent bills.

A. Utility service account payment shall be due upon receipt of invoice. Payment may be made either by mail, or at authorized payment locations or through other city-authorized payment methods. An account shall be considered past due if payment is not received on or before the bill due date, which shall be no less than 21 days from the invoice date.

B. Customers shall be mailed reminder notices if payment is not received on or before the bill due date. A reminder notice may also be conspicuously posted at the customer's premises. If payment in full is not received within 15 days of the reminder notice, service shall be subject to termination.

At least 48 hours prior to termination of service, a final notice shall be provided to the customer by telephone, mail, in person, or by posting in a conspicuous location at the premises in accordance with Section 10010.1(b) of the Public Utilities Code.

Service to an account already subject to special payment arrangements shall be terminated 24 hours after notice is posted on the served premises.

Customers requesting reestablishment of utility service following termination as provided above shall be charged a reestablishment fee ~~per Section 14.04.200.~~ as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

C. No terminated utility service shall be reestablished until a deposit equivalent to two months' estimated service charges has been made at the discretion of the finance department, together with all delinquent utility charges. A reestablishment charge ~~per Section 14.04.200~~ as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time, shall also be due. If reestablishment of terminated service is requested after regular working hours and all deposits and delinquent charges have been paid, the after hours reestablishment fee shall be due ~~per Section 14.04.200~~ as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

D. Payments for utility services not received by the due date shall be subject to a late payment fee ~~per Section 14.04.200~~ as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time, which shall be added to the subsequent invoice for services.

E. In addition to the right to discontinue utility services, the city shall have the right to collect the unpaid utility charges from the owner or occupant of such premises at its discretion by any appropriate legal action.

F. Late payment charges may be waived if the customer enters into a payment arrangement agreement with the city.

SECTION 35. Section 14.04.065 of Chapter 14.04 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.04.065 Payment types.

A. Personal or business checks may be accepted for payment of invoices. Dishonored personal or business checks shall be subject to a check return fee ~~per Section 14.04.200~~as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time. Failure to immediately redeem an account following return of a dishonored personal or business check shall subject the customer to service termination after five (5) days' notice. Terminated service shall not be reestablished until the amount due is paid in cash, money order, cashier's check, or credit card along with a reestablishment charge ~~per Section 14.04.200~~as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

B. Credit cards maybe accepted for payment of invoices.

C. Customers with current accounts may sign up for payment of invoices by automatic bank draft (ABD). Customers with more than two personal or business checks that are dishonored for any reason during a six-month period are not eligible for ABD. Participation in the ABD program may be terminated by the customer or the City of Roseville at any time.

ABD transactions returned for non-sufficient funds shall be subject to an ABD return fee ~~per Section 14.04.200~~as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time. Failure to immediately redeem an account following return of an ABD shall subject the customer to service termination after five days' notice. Terminated service shall not be reestablished until the amount due is paid in cash, money order, cashier's check, or credit card along with a reestablishment charge ~~per Section 14.04.200~~as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

If an ABD transaction is returned due to a closed bank account, the customer will be removed from the ABD program and be subject to delinquency processing in accordance with subsections A through D of this section.

D. Customers with active utility accounts may enroll in Online BillPay. Online BillPay customers will have two payment options: credit card or ACH (automated clearing house) in addition to bill presentment and other features. Customers with two personal or business checks or ABD payments that are dishonored for any reason during a six-month period are not eligible for ACH payments on Online BillPay. Accounts that are ineligible for ACH payments may not have access to any of the Online BillPay features.

Online BillPay transactions returned for non-sufficient funds shall be subject to an ACH return fee ~~per Section 14.04.200.~~as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time. Failure to immediately redeem an account following return of an ACH payment shall subject the customer to service termination after five days' notice. Terminated service shall not be reestablished until the amount due is paid in cash, money order, cashier's check, or credit card along with a reestablishment charge ~~per Section 14.04.200.~~as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

E. If any combination of two of the following payment types: personal or business checks, ABD payments, or Online BillPay ACH payments are returned for any reason during a six-month period, these payment types will no longer be acceptable for payment.

F. A convenience fee ~~per Section 14.04.200~~ as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time, will be added to all American Express Card payments made on-line.

SECTION 36. Section 14.04.070 of Chapter 14.04 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.04.070 Unauthorized service connections.

A. Any consumer who connects or reconnects a utility service without authorization by any means, including the breaking of meter seals, shall have his or her utility services immediately disconnected without notice and shall be charged a service fee for unauthorized service reconnect ~~per Section 14.04.200~~ as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time. Such service shall be resumed only in compliance with Section 14.04.060(C) and when the unauthorized service reconnect fee ~~required by Section 14.04.200~~ has been paid.

B. Where the city determines that there has been unauthorized use of any utility service, the city may bill the customer for such use based on city's estimate of the amount of unauthorized use for up to three years. Such estimated billing shall indicate unauthorized use for the most recent three years.

SECTION 37. Section 14.04.071 of Chapter 14.04 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.04.071 Electric service limitation for nonpayment.

An electric service limitation device may be placed on a customer's electric meter in lieu of service termination as provided under Section 14.04.060 where a customer with a valid medical support rate reduction application on file with the finance department is more than two months past due in payment. Customers requiring service limitation devices shall be charged an amount equal to the reestablishment fee ~~per Section 14.04.200.~~as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time. A service limitation device shall remain in place until all past due amounts, together with all additional charges or fees are paid in full.

SECTION 38. Section 14.04.200 of Chapter 14.04 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby repealed.

SECTION 39. Section 14.08.105 of Chapter 14.08 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.08.105 Installation of water meters.

A. New Construction. A water meter shall be required for all residential dwelling units for which a building permit was issued after January 1, 1992.

B. Installation and Location.

1. All water meters and metering equipment will be supplied and installed by the city upon the service premises at a location approved by the environmental utilities director.

2. ~~The following charges for water meter installation shall be made:~~

~~_____ a. _____ A \$75.00 labor charge for installation shall be paid by the applicant for service prior to installation. The labor charge shall be increased by the finance director as labor costs increase, as reflected in the adoption of the city's salary ordinances.~~

~~_____ b. _____ A meter supply charge shall be paid by the applicant for service prior to installation. The meter supply charge shall be equal to the per meter amount of the most recent water meter bid awarded by the city.~~

~~_____ c. _____ In addition to the direct meter supply charge, additional charges may apply for meter appurtenances as required by the environmental utilities director. This includes, but is not limited to, features required to make meter ready for remote reading.~~

~~_____ d. _____ A \$75.00 water quantity charge per unit for water use during construction of residential units shall be paid by the applicant prior to meter installation. The water quantity charge shall be increased by the environmental utilities director to reflect increases in water supply rates.~~ Charges for water meter installation shall be made as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

3. All water meters shall be safely accessible to authorized employees of the city at all times for inspection, testing and reading.

4. The city may require a customer to relocate a metering installation, at customer's expense, if any existing water meter location becomes inaccessible or for other operational needs.

5. Property owners of condominium and apartment complexes are liable for costs to install meters on their property upon receipt of bill for such services.

C. Rights of Access.

1. The city shall have the right of access to the customer's premises, at all reasonable hours for any purpose related to the furnishing of water service including, but not limited to, meter reading, testing, inspection, construction, maintenance and repair of meter.

2. Service may be refused or disconnected if permanent safe accessibility is not provided by the customer.

3. Upon termination of service, the city shall have the right of access to the service premises to remove the water meter.

D. Customer Responsibilities. It shall be the duty of each customer upon whose premises the city has installed a water meter to ensure that such meters are not damaged, destroyed or interfered with and, in the case of any defect in any such meter, to notify the city. The customer is also responsible for keeping the meter box clear and accessible for reading and maintenance by keeping landscape and other improvements from covering or encroaching over the meter box.

E. Metered Water Rate. New services installed after January 1, 2002 will be placed on a metered water rate.

SECTION 40. Section 14.08.130 of Chapter 14.08 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.08.130 Use of water for construction purposes.

It is unlawful for any person to use the water service of another for construction purposes without first obtaining a permit from the environmental utilities director and the consent of the other person. All water service for construction purposes shall be metered as provided by Section 14.08.090, unless the environmental utilities director approves alternate measuring methods. All persons doing work on the public streets, public easements or rights-of-way, existing or proposed, shall apply for and be issued a permit prior to drawing water or obtaining service for construction purposes such as for the settling of earth, rock, gravel or dust. Service for such purposes shall be charged per rates identified in Section 14.08.090, per 100 cubic feet of water, and ~~for~~ charged a connection charge ~~of \$100.00 as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time,~~ per connection to a fire hydrant. Each temporary connection shall be protected against potential cross connection and resulting contamination of the water distribution system. Water meters and backflow preventors are available from the water/sewer division ~~with a \$500.00 deposit and \$50.00 per month rental charge.~~ Charges for use and rental of water meters and backflow preventors shall be as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time. The environmental utilities director, in the director's discretion, may establish related requirements for the use of all construction water and service.

SECTION 41. Section 14.10.080 of Chapter 14.10 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.10.080 Reinspection.

A. If the inspector determines that the backflow prevention assembly does not meet the standards established by this chapter, the city will issue the customer a notice to correct. The customer shall make the necessary repairs or replacement within 30 days of issuance of the notice to correct.

B. The backflow prevention assembly shall be reinspected by an inspector within 30 days, at which time a ~~\$30.00~~-reinspection fee shall be charged to the customer: as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

C. Each time a reinspection is required, an additional reinspection fee ~~of \$30.00~~ will be charged to the customer, until such time that the city sends the customer a notice of compliance.

SECTION 42. Section 14.10.090 of Chapter 14.10 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.10.090 ~~Inflationary adjustments.~~Reserved.

~~The fee established by this chapter shall be adjusted on January 1st of each calendar year by a percentage equal to the inflation rate for the prior year for labor and equipment costs in accordance with the Engineering News-Record Construction Index and as determined by the director.~~

SECTION 43. Section 14.11.050 of Chapter 14.11 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.11.050 Application and inspection fees—Required license.

A. ~~A fee of \$250.00 shall be charged per permit for the first well and \$125.00 for each additional well covered by the same well permit. This fee shall be paid prior to issuance of the well permit and is 50 percent refundable if the well permit is denied. This fee shall cover costs for inspection by environmental utilities department inspectors. Whenever an environmental utilities department inspector is called upon by the permittee to conduct an inspection, and, upon arrival on the job site it is determined that the permittee has not completed the work for inspection or that the work fails said inspection, thus requiring a re-inspection, an additional fee of \$40.00 shall be charged for each necessary re-inspection. The fee shall be adjusted annually for inflation or deflation on January 1st in accordance with the Engineering News Record Construction Index.~~ Applicable fees as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time, shall be paid prior to issuance of a well permit.

B. All construction, reconstruction or destruction of wells shall be by a person who possesses an active class C-57 contractors' license issued in accordance with the provisions of the Contractors' State License Law, Business and Professions Code, Section 7000 et seq.

C. As a condition of each well permit, the permittee shall be responsible for the safe and appropriate handling and disposal of drilling fluids and all other drilling materials used in connection with the permitted work.

D. It shall be the responsibility of the permittee to maintain a copy of the permit as issued at the drilling site during all stages of well construction or destruction.

SECTION 44. Section 14.14.150 of Chapter 14.14 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.14.150 Charges and fees.

A. ~~The city may adopt charges and fees by resolution which may include:~~

~~1. Fees for reimbursement of costs of setting up and operating the city's FOG program;~~

~~2. Fees for consistent removal by the city of pollutants otherwise subject to Federal Pretreatment Standards;~~

~~3. Other fees as the city may deem necessary to carry out the requirements contained in this chapter.~~

~~B. Costs incurred by the city as a result of required on-site sampling and analysis shall be reimbursed to the city by the owner, user or FOG DWP permittee.~~

B. The city may adopt other fees as the city may deem necessary to carry out the requirements of this chapter. Fees shall be as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

SECTION 45. Section 14.14.180 of Chapter 14.14 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.14.180 FOG WDP application fee.

A FOG WDP application fee shall be paid by the applicant in an amount as established by resolution ~~of~~ adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time. Payment of the FOG WDP application fee must be received by the director upon submission of the FOG WDP

application. A permittee shall also pay any delinquent invoices in full prior to any FOG WDP renewal.

SECTION 46. Section 14.14.210 of Chapter 14.14 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.14.210 FOG WDP duration and renewal.

FOG WDPs shall be issued for a specified time period, not to exceed three years. At least 30 days prior to the expiration of the FOG WDP, the permittee shall re-apply and pay applicable fees for the renewal of the WDP as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time, in accordance with the provision of this chapter.

SECTION 47. Section 14.14.360 of Chapter 14.14 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.14.360 Violation—Penalty.

A. Any violation of this chapter, or the orders, rules, regulations and permits issued under this chapter, is unlawful and shall be an infraction or misdemeanor as determined by the city attorney.

B. Any user, discharger and/or permittee in violation of this chapter, or the orders, rules, regulations and permits issued under this chapter, may be ordered by the director to cease and desist operations until the violation is cured. Continuance of operations after notice to cease and desist has been furnished to the user and/or permittee shall be unlawful and an infraction or

misdemeanor as determined by the city attorney. Each day in which any such violation shall continue shall be deemed a separate offense.

C. The violation of any of the provisions of this chapter, or the orders, rules, regulations and permits issued under this chapter, or the doing of any act prohibited or the failure or omission to do any act required by this chapter, or the orders, rules, and regulations and permits issued under this chapter, is a public nuisance and may be enjoined by the city attorney.

D. If any violation of this chapter, or the orders, rules, regulations and permits issued under this chapter, causes damage to the POTW, the director may seek to recover civil damages from the user causing such damage.

E. The director is authorized to levy against any person administrative fines of up to \$10,000.00 per day for each violation of the rules, regulations, and permits issued under this chapter. The notice shall provide information as to the reason for the administrative fine and the authority and the notice shall also specify the person's right to appeal.

1. The director shall provide written notice of such levy to the person by certified mail. The user, discharger and/or permittee has the right to appeal the administrative action to the Roseville public utilities commission by filing an appeal with the city clerk.

2. The appeal shall be submitted within 20 days of receipt of the notice and shall be accompanied by a nonrefundable fee ~~of \$75.00~~ as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

3. The user, discharger and/or permittee has the right to appeal the decision of the Roseville public utilities commission to the city council. The appeal shall be submitted to the city clerk within 20 days of the decision of the Roseville public utilities commission and shall be accompanied by a nonrefundable fee ~~of \$75.00~~ as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

F. The remedies and provisions of this section are cumulative, and are in addition to any other remedy or provision of law.

SECTION 48. Section 14.17.070 of Chapter 14.17 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.17.070 Recycled water service connection and meter charges.

A. Before a recycled water service connection is supplied to or installed on the premises, the customer shall pay to the city the costs of the recycled water service connection including, but not limited to, the cost of a meter, unless the city agrees in writing to other arrangements.

B. Before a recycled water service connection is supplied to or installed on the premises, the customer shall pay to the city the costs incurred by the city in extending existing off-site facilities, including but not limited to the recycled water service line, in order to provide recycled water service to the customer unless the city agrees in writing to other arrangements. Construction of recycled water transmission mains and water service extensions shall be subject to the provisions of this chapter. All recycled water service provided prior to the installation of final street improvements shall be considered to be temporary, and the costs for all repairs or

changes required to be made to the recycled water service line upon installation of final street improvements shall be paid by the customer.

C. Upon approval of recycled water service by the director, the site owner shall sign the terms and conditions for recycled water operations, use and service prior to recycled water being delivered to the site.

D. If recycled water service to any customer is suspended or terminated because of failure by a customer to adhere to the provisions of this chapter, including but not limited to, the failure of a new site owner to sign terms and conditions within 30 days, or the failure by a customer to pay for recycled water in accordance with this chapter, the customer shall pay in advance of resumption of recycled water service a delinquent and/or reconnection charge which shall be equal to that delinquent and/or reconnection charge for potable water as established ~~from time to time~~ by resolution adopted by ~~of~~ the city council, as amended from time to time, in addition to any payment for recycled water service then due.

SECTION 49. Section 14.17.080 of Chapter 14.17 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.17.080 Fees and charges—Delinquency—Disconnection or termination.

A. All fees, charges, deposits or penalties provided for in this chapter, including recycled water charges, shall be in the amount set forth in Chapter 14.08 or as ~~may be~~ established by resolution adopted by ~~of~~ the city council, as amended from time to time.

B. Payment by a customer for recycled water service shall be due and payable as specified in Chapter 14.04 for water service. If payment is not received in accordance with Chapter 14.04, then the recycled water service may be disconnected or terminated. In the event the city disconnects or terminates recycled water service pursuant to this section, then in addition to the payment due for recycled water, the customer shall pay any and all delinquent and reconnection charges for recycled water service as specified in Chapter 14.04 for water service.

C. Price of Recycled Water. The price for recycled water sold, supplied, distributed or transported to customers of the city shall be at a rate or charge equal to 50 percent of the rate or charge which the city council may establish from time to time as set forth in Chapter 14.08 for potable water and which is in effect on the date of delivery of recycled water by the city to such customer. Such charge or rate shall be the sum of the customer charge, commodity charge and adjustments as detailed in this chapter and specified in Chapter 14.08.

SECTION 50. Section 14.20.220 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.220 Fees.

If applicable, every application for an annual stormwater management permit or renewal shall be accompanied by a nonrefundable fee, as established by resolution adopted by the city council, [as amended](#) from time to time.

SECTION 51. Section 14.20.230 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.230 Stormwater quality design requirements and waivers.

A. All stormwater control measures shall be constructed and designed in accordance with the Stormwater Quality Design Manual.

B. A waiver from the requirements of the Stormwater Quality Design Manual may be requested if impracticability for a specific property can be established. A waiver for impracticability shall be granted only when all other stormwater control measures have been considered and rejected as infeasible. The city engineer may grant a waiver for the following situations of impracticability:

1. If there are extreme limitations of space for treatment on a redevelopment project;
2. If there are unfavorable or unstable soil conditions at a site to attempt infiltration;
3. If there is a risk of ground water contamination because a known unconfined aquifer lies beneath the land surface or an existing or potential underground source of drinking water is less than 10 feet from the soil surface.

Any waivers to stormwater quality design requirements for situations of impracticability not specified in this section must be granted by the Regional Board.

C. All requests to waive the stormwater quality design requirements, or any portions thereof, shall be submitted in writing to the city engineer for review. All requests shall be accompanied by a proposed stormwater management plan, including site plans and design documentation, which demonstrates the impracticability. The city engineer will review all

requests and determine if a separate petition must be submitted to the Regional Board for consideration.

D. When a waiver is granted pursuant to this section, the landowner may be required to pay a stormwater control measure mitigation fee as established by resolution adopted by the city council, [as amended](#) from time to time.

SECTION 52. Section 14.20.240 of Chapter 14.20 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.20.240 Self certification reports and inspections.

A. All stormwater management permittees shall annually submit to the city engineer a self certification report demonstrating compliance with the approved stormwater maintenance plan. The self certification report shall verify that the operating condition of the stormwater control measures are in good working order and that the stormwater maintenance plan has been executed to ensure that stormwater control measures continue to perform adequately. The city engineer may conduct inspections of the stormwater control measures to confirm the information filed in the self certification report. It shall be unlawful to make any false statement or representation in a self certification report submitted to the city engineer.

B. If a stormwater management permittee fails to submit the required self certification report, the city engineer or enforcement officer may conduct an inspection of the stormwater control measures to verify compliance with the approved stormwater maintenance plan. If the city engineer or enforcement officer determines the stormwater management permittee is not in compliance with the stormwater maintenance plan, or the stormwater control

measures are not in good working order, the city engineer or enforcement officer may issue a compliance order pursuant to Section 14.20.430 setting forth a schedule for compliance. The city engineer or enforcement officer shall perform a follow-up reinspection at the conclusion of the schedule for compliance. Each time a reinspection is required beyond the initial follow-up reinspection for the compliance order, a reinspection fee will be charged to the permittee, until such time that the permittee comes into compliance. The amount of the reinspection fee shall be as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time- ~~resolution~~. Any unpaid costs owed by the permittee may be charged as a lien against the property.

SECTION 53. Section 14.26.330 of Chapter 14.26 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.26.330 Permit application.

A. Users required to obtain a wastewater contribution permit shall complete and file with the city an application in the form prescribed by the director. In support of the application the user shall submit, in units and terms appropriate for evaluation, the following information:

1. Name, address, and location (if different from the address);
2. SIC number according to the Standard Industrial Classification Manual, Bureau of the Budget, 1972, as amended;
3. Wastewater constituents and characteristics including but not limited to those mentioned in Article II of this chapter, as determined by a reliable analytical laboratory.

Sampling and analysis shall be performed in accordance with procedures established by the EPA pursuant to Section 304 (g) of the Act and contained in 40 CFR, Part 136, as amended;

4. Time and duration of contribution;
5. Average daily and three minutes peak wastewater flow rates, including daily, monthly and seasonal variations if any;
6. Site plans, floor plans, mechanical and plumbing plans and details to show all sewers, sewer connections, and appurtenances by the size, location and elevation;
7. Description of activities, facilities and plant processes on the premises including all materials which are or could be discharged;
8. Where known, the nature and concentration of any pollutants in the discharge which are limited by any city, state, or federal pretreatment standards, and a statement regarding whether or not the pretreatment standards are being met on a consistent basis and if not, whether and what additional actions and/or additional pretreatment is required for the user to meet applicable pretreatment standards. New users who have not commenced discharge shall provide estimates of the nature and concentration of pollutants in the discharge;
9. If additional pretreatment or actions will be required to meet the pretreatment standards, the shortest schedule by which the user will provide such additional pretreatment or actions. The completion date in this schedule shall not be later than the compliance date established for the applicable pretreatment standard.

The following conditions shall apply to this schedule:

- a. The schedule shall contain increments of progress in the form of dates for the commencement and completion of major events leading to the construction and operation of additional pretreatment or actions required for the user to meet the applicable pretreatment standards (e.g., hiring an engineer, completing preliminary plans, completing final plans, executing contract for major components, commencing construction, completing construction, etc.).
 - b. No increment referred to in subsection (A)(9)(a) of this section shall exceed nine months.
 - c. Not later than 14 calendar days following each date in the schedule and the final date or compliance, the user shall submit a progress report to the director including, as a minimum, whether or not it complied with the increment progress to be met on such date and, if not, the date on which it expects to comply with this increment of progress, the reason for delay, and the steps being taken by the user to return the construction to the schedule established. In no event shall more than nine months elapse between such progress reports to the director;
- 10. Each product produced by type, amount, process or processes and rate of production;
 - 11. Type and amount of raw materials processed (average and maximum per day);
 - 12. Number and type of employees, and hours of operation of plant and proposed or actual hours of operation of pretreatment system;

13. Any other information as may be deemed necessary by the city to evaluate the application.

B. The city may evaluate the data furnished by the user and may require additional information. After evaluation and acceptance of the data furnished, the city may issue a wastewater contribution permit subject to terms and conditions provided in this chapter.

C. Wastewater contribution permit applications shall be accompanied by a nonrefundable fee ~~of \$25.00~~ as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

D. If a permit application is denied, the applicant may within 20 calendar days of the decision appeal the decision to the city council. An appeal shall be accompanied by a nonrefundable fee ~~of \$75.00~~ as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

SECTION 54. Section 14.26.430 of Chapter 14.26 of Title 14 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.26.430 Violation—Penalty.

A. Any violation of this chapter, or the orders, rules, regulations and permits issued under this chapter, is unlawful and shall be an infraction or misdemeanor as determined by the city attorney.

B. Any user in violation of this chapter, or the orders, rules, regulations and permits issued under this chapter, may be ordered by the director to cease and desist operations until the

violation is cured. Continuance of operations after notice to cease and desist has been furnished to user shall be unlawful and an infraction or misdemeanor as determined by the city attorney. Each day in which any such violation shall continue shall be deemed a separate offense.

C. The violation of any of the provisions of this chapter, or the orders, rules, regulations and permits issued under this chapter, or the doing of any act prohibited or the failure or omission to do any act required by this chapter, or the orders, rules, and regulations and permits issued under this chapter, is a public nuisance and may be enjoined by the city attorney.

D. If any violation of this chapter, or the orders, rules, regulations and permits issued under this chapter, causes damage to the POTW, the director may seek to recover civil damages from the user causing such damage.

E. The director is authorized to levy against any person administrative fines of up to \$10,000.00 per day for each violation of the rules, regulations, and permits issued under this chapter. The notice shall provide information as to the reason for the administrative fine and the authority. And the notice shall also specify the person's right to appeal.

1. The director shall provide written notice of such levy to the person by certified mail, user has the right to appeal the administrative action to the Roseville public utilities commission by filing an appeal with the city clerk.

2. The appeal shall be submitted within 20 days of receipt of the notice and shall be accompanied by a nonrefundable fee ~~of \$75.00~~ as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

3. The user has the right to appeal the decision of the Roseville public utilities commission to the city council. The appeal shall be submitted to the city clerk within 20 days of the decision of the Roseville public utilities commission and shall be accompanied by a nonrefundable fee ~~of \$75.00~~ as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.

F. The remedies and provisions of this section are cumulative, and are in addition to any other remedy or provision of law.

SECTION 55. Section 16.04.120 of Chapter 16.04 of Title 16 of the Roseville Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

16.04.120 Fees.

Requests for permits under this chapter shall be subject to payment of fees by the permit applicant as established by resolution adopted by the city council, as amended from time to time.
~~in accordance with the following provisions:~~

~~———A.———Construction Valuation Table. Table A is the Construction Valuation Table adopted for the purpose of establishing permit fees as construction valuation is a factor in the cost of providing permitting services. These valuations correlate to the square footage costs of permitting, plan review and inspection services based upon an hourly rate of \$172.00 pursuant to the 2013/2014 Permit Fee Study on file with the building inspection division of development services.~~

Table A Construction Valuation

Group- (2012 International Building Code)	A	B
A-1 Assembly, theaters, with stage	93.60	46.80
A-1 Assembly, theaters, without stage	93.60	46.80
A-2 Assembly, nightclubs	93.60	46.80
A-2 Assembly, restaurants, bars, banquet halls	111.80	55.90
A-3 Assembly, churches	93.60	46.80
A-3 Assembly, general, community halls, libraries, museums	88.40	44.20
A-4 Assembly, arenas	105.30	52.65
B-Business	88.40	44.20
E-Educational	94.90	47.45
F-1 Factory and industrial, moderate hazard	49.40	24.70
F-2 Factory and industrial, low hazard	49.40	24.70
H-1 High hazard, explosives	49.40	24.70
H234 High hazard	49.40	24.70
H-5 HPM	79.30	39.65
I-1 Institutional, supervised environment	126.72	63.36
I-2 Institutional, hospitals	131.29	65.65

I-2 Institutional, nursing homes	249.09	124.55
I-3 Institutional, restrained	145.80	72.90
I-4 Institutional, day care facilities	126.72	63.36
M Mercantile	62.40	31.20
R-1 Residential, hotels	97.50	48.75
R-2 Residential, multiple family	100.18	50.09
R-3 Residential, one and two family	110.00	55.00
R-4 Residential, care/assisted living facilities	106.60	53.30
S-1 Storage, moderate hazard	42.90	21.45
S-2 Storage, low hazard	41.60	20.80
U Utility, miscellaneous	32.50	16.25

-

~~———— B. ——— The building official shall determine construction valuations as follows:~~

~~———— 1. ——— New Construction. New construction shall be based upon the square footage of the proposed project multiplied by the amount stated in Column A in the above Table A corresponding to the occupancy group, as determined by the building official, for a total construction value.~~

~~———— 2. ——— Improvements. Improvements to existing buildings shall be the square footage of the proposed improvements multiplied by the amount stated in Column B in the above Table A corresponding to the occupancy group, as determined by the building official, for a total construction value.~~

~~———— C. ——— Commercial Building Valuations. Minimum commercial building valuations are stated below for the purposes of establishing minimum permit fees to cover the cost of service for the project listed. The higher valuation shall be assessed unless otherwise stated.~~

~~———— 1. ——— Building permits for tenant improvements processed over the counter (OTC permits) shall have a minimum valuation of \$8,000.00.~~

~~———— 2. ——— Tenant improvements (TIs) requiring plan submittal shall have a minimum valuation based upon Column B in above Table A. For purposes of this section, a tenant improvement is defined as any improvement, maintenance or other updating on commercial property; improvement, maintenance or other updating on multi-family property; improvement, maintenance or other updating on residential care facilities and model home sales complexes, including sales trailers.~~

~~———— 3. ——— Commercial photovoltaic permits shall be based upon a set valuation of \$40,000.00.~~

~~———— 4. ——— Electrical service upgrade permit fees shall have a minimum valuation of \$3,000.00.~~

~~———— 5. ——— Commercial reroofing permits shall have a minimum valuation of \$423.17 per 100 square feet of roof area or a total minimum valuation of \$20,000.00.~~

~~———— 6. ——— OTC permits for commercial projects such as demolition, electrical, mechanical, plumbing and other work not otherwise defined shall have a minimum valuation of \$3,000.00.~~

~~———— D. ——— Residential Building Valuations. Minimum residential building valuations are stated below for the purposes of establishing minimum permit fees to cover the cost of service for the project listed. The higher valuation shall be assessed unless otherwise stated.~~

~~———— 1. ——— Patio covers shall have minimum valuation based upon new construction valuation of Column A of Table A.~~

~~———— 2. ——— Swimming pools shall have a set valuation of \$25,000.00 for the purposes of establishing the building permit fee. The swimming pool construction contract valuation shall be reported on the permit application if such amount exceeds \$25,000.00.~~

~~———— 3. ——— Residential remodel permits shall have a minimum valuation based upon Column B of Table A.~~

~~———— 4. ——— Residential additions shall have a minimum fee based upon Column A (as new construction) of Table A.~~

~~———— 5. ——— With respect to a permit application for a combination residential remodel and residential addition subsection (D)(3) shall apply with respect to the residential remodel portion and subsection (D)(4) shall apply with respect to the residential addition (new construction) portion for a total construction valuation for the permit.~~

~~———— 6. ——— Photovoltaic permits shall be based upon a set valuation of \$18,000.00 for the purposes of establishing the permit fee.~~

~~———— 7. ——— Reroof permits for residential structures shall have a minimum valuation of \$239.49 per 100 square feet of roof area or a total minimum valuation of \$2,400.00.~~

~~8. OTC permits pertaining to plumbing shall have a minimum valuation of \$900.00.~~

~~9. OTC permits for mechanical, electrical, car charging stations, demolition, and other permits not specified in this section shall have a minimum valuation of \$2,400.00.~~

~~E. Permit Fees. Subject to any applicable minimum permit fees stated elsewhere in this section, Tables B and B.1, which are a factor in the cost of providing permitting services, are hereby adopted and shall apply for the purpose of establishing minimum permit fees. These minimum fees correlate to the square footage costs of permitting, plan review and inspection services based upon an hourly rate of \$172.00 and found in the 2013/2014 Permit Fee Study on file with the building inspection division of development services.~~

-

Table B Permit Fees

-

Total Valuation	Permit Cost shall be:
\$1.00 to \$500.00	\$50.00
\$501.00 to \$1,000.00	\$50.00 for the first \$500.00 plus \$2.50 for each additional \$100.00 or fraction thereof, to and including \$1,000.00

\$1,001.00 to \$3,000.00	\$62.50 for the first \$1,000.00 plus \$2.75 for each additional \$100.00 or fraction thereof, to and including \$3,000.00
\$3,001.00 to \$25,000.00	\$117.50 for the first \$3,000.00 plus \$11.00 for each additional \$1,000.00 or fraction thereof, to and including \$25,000.00
\$25,001.00 to \$50,000.00	\$349.75 for the first \$25,000.00 plus \$9.00 for each additional \$1,000.00 or fraction thereof, to and including \$50,000.00
\$50,001.00 to \$100,000.00	\$574.75 for the first \$50,000.00 plus \$6.25 for each additional \$1,000.00 or fraction thereof, to and including \$100,000.00
\$100,001.00 to \$500,000.00	\$887.25 for the first \$100,000.00 plus \$5.00 for each additional \$1,000.00 or fraction thereof, to and including \$500,000.00
\$500,001.00 to \$1,000,000.00	\$2,887.25 for the first \$500,000.00 plus \$3.75 for each additional \$1,000.00 or fraction

	thereof, to and including \$1,000,000.00
\$1,000,001.00 and up	\$4,764.25 for the first \$1,000,000.00 plus \$2.00 for each additional \$1,000.00 or fraction thereof

-

~~Table B.1 Production Home Permit Fees~~

-

~~Building permits for production homes (those homes that are one- and two-family homes having an approved master plan, which is a complete set of building plans from which multiple homes may be constructed) shall have a minimum permit fee of:~~

-

\$0.00 – \$120,000.00- valuation	\$1,183.00
\$120,001.00 and up	\$1,183.00 for the first \$120,000.00 plus \$8,000.00 for each- additional \$11,000.00 or fraction thereof

-

~~—— F. —— Administration Fee. In addition to the permit fee, an administration fee is hereby established for city to recover the cost of permit application processing, permit issuance, and plan review and shall be applied as follows:~~

~~—— 1. —— Permits requiring plan submittal for review shall be assessed a fee at 95 percent of the building permit fee.~~

~~—— 2. —— OTC permits requiring minimal or no plan review shall be assessed a fee of 25 percent of the hourly rate or the actual cost for time in excess of one-half hour.~~

~~—— 3. —— Production home permits shall be assessed a fee of 37 percent of the building permit fee.~~

~~—— 4. —— Plans submitted for the purposes of being mastered shall be assessed an administration fee of 95 percent of the building permit fee based upon the square foot valuation of the proposed design.~~

~~—— 5. —— Subject to subsection (G)(2)(c) below, emergency repairs for water heaters are exempt from the administration fee and are allocated one inspection visit for the purpose of inspection for compliance with the building code.~~

~~—— G. —— Additional Time and Materials Fees. Building permits are subject to additional time and material fees where the cost of service provided by city exceeds the amount collected at application. Such fees shall be calculated as follows:~~

~~1. The fee for additional administrative and plan review services (additional service) shall be assessed at time of permit issuance and/or prior to final inspection at a minimum rate of \$172.00 per hour with a one-half hour minimum charge.~~

~~a. Additional service is defined as:~~

~~i. Plan reviews in excess of three submittals to city for review and approval.~~

~~ii. Plan review by city departments other than the development services department for projects affecting other city services and not covered by any fees set forth in this section.~~

~~iii. Other staff time and resources for the purposes of facilitating and approving permit applications and permits consistent with the 2013/2014 Fee Study.~~

~~iv. Expedited plan review, when available, and additional resources required to facilitate the expedited plan review process, including consultants and/or other city departments and divisions whose assistance is required for plan approval.~~

~~2. Re-inspections shall be set at a minimum flat rate of \$100.00 per scheduled stop and may be assessed based on any of the following:~~

~~a. Inspections which are not ready at the time of the scheduled inspection, as determined by a city inspector.~~

~~b. Failure by applicant to complete inspection items from previous correction notices.~~

~~———— c. ——— Inspections additional to the inspection with respect to emergency water heater permits as set forth in subsection (F)(5).~~

~~———— 3. ——— Inspections outside of normal business hours shall be billed at \$172.00 per hour.~~

~~———— 4. ——— For evening and weekend work a minimum of two and four hours, respectively.~~

~~———— 5. ——— Whenever any work for which a permit required by this chapter has been commenced without first applying for a building permit and receiving permission by the building official, a minimum fee of \$172.00 for investigation and administration shall be assessed in addition to the full cost of any required permits.~~

~~———— 6. ——— A certificate of occupancy shall be a minimum of \$172.00 and any applicable additional cost beyond one hour of staff time to approve such certificates.~~

~~———— 7. ——— Permit applications and permits shall expire per the provisions of Sections 105.3.2 and 105.5 of the California Building Code. Reinstatement and extensions may be granted provided that all costs incurred by the city to date of the request are paid for by the permit applicant. Cost is defined here as the hours expended for review and administration multiplied by the hourly rate of \$172.00.~~

~~———— 8. ——— Third party plan review, when available, shall be assessed and paid at time of permit application. The fee for this service is the hourly or flat rate charged by the consulting firm performing the review. This fee is in addition to the administration fees set forth in subsection F for the additional resources required to facilitate the process.~~

~~9. Permit applicants who choose to pay with a credit card for any fees may do so providing they pay to city an administration fee not to exceed three percent of the transaction cost. This fee is a convenience fee for merchant processing and is only charged to applicants utilizing a credit card and only with respect to the amount of the total permit fee which is paid by such credit card.~~

~~10. Fees not listed in this section shall be determined by the building official and based upon the actual cost of providing the service.~~

~~H. Refunds. The building official may authorize refunding of any fee, or portion thereof, paid hereunder which was erroneously paid by applicant or collected or charged by city.~~

~~1. The building official may authorize refunding of not more than 75 percent of fees paid when no work has been done under a permit application or an issued permit in accordance with the adopted California Code of Regulations. In no case shall the refund exceed the cost of services provided to date of cancellation or permit issuance.~~

~~2. Permit applications and building permits that have expired as defined in Sections 105.3.2 and 105.5 of the California Building Code shall not be subject to any refund.~~

~~3. A building permit applicant may, upon payment of the requested permit fees to city and otherwise complying with California Government Code Section 66022, protest the requested amount to the city council by lodging an appeal with the building official. City staff shall schedule the appeal to be heard by the city council as soon as reasonably practicable.~~

~~I. Findings.~~

~~1. Pursuant to Section 66015 of the California Government Code (Fees for rooftop solar energy systems), the city council hereby finds that the reasonable cost to issue a permit for a residential rooftop solar energy system exceeds \$500.00 plus \$15.00 per kilowatt for each kilowatt above 15 kilowatts because issuance of the permit requires all of the following:~~

~~a. One half hour administration time for application and data input.~~

~~b. One half hour administration time for permit issuance and one hour plan review time including up to two submittals.~~

~~c. Typically two inspections at a minimum of one half hour of staff time.~~

~~d. Other applicable fees assessed by the state of California and by the Roseville electric department pursuant to the Roseville Electric Solar Energy Program Meter Upgrade Charges, effective July 1, 2013, as amended from time to time.~~

~~e. This higher fee results in a quick and streamlined approval process by covering the cost of additional plan review staff.~~

~~2. The city council hereby finds that the 2013/2014 Fee Study has an hourly cost of \$172.00 per hour for staff time and material to provide permitting, plan review and inspection services for projects subject to review by the City of Roseville building division and development services department staff. This hourly rate may be adjusted from time to time by amendment of the ordinance codified in this section.~~

SECTION 56. This ordinance shall be effective at the expiration of thirty (30) days from the date of adoption.

SECTION 57. The City Clerk is hereby directed to cause this ordinance to be published in full at least once within fourteen (14) days after it is adopted in a newspaper of general circulation in the City, or shall within fourteen (14) days after its adoption cause this ordinance to be posted in full in at least three (3) public places in the City and enter in the Ordinance Book a certificate stating the time and place of said publication by posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this ____ day of _____, 20__, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

City Clerk