CITY OF SHASTA LAKE
CITY COUNCIL
AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
AGENDA

John Beaudet Community Center  
1525 Median Avenue  
Shasta Lake, CA  96019

Tuesday, July 6, 2010 at 6:00 P.M.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.0 CITY COUNCIL MEETING – 6:00 p.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call to order (please place all cell phones &amp; pager on silent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement for the record of Council members present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pledge of Allegiance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.0 AWARDS/RECOGNITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.0 COMMUNICATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1 Presentations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.2 Public Comment Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This time is set aside for citizens to address the City Council on matters not listed on the Consent Calendar as well as other items included on the regular agenda. If your comments concern an item noted on the regular agenda, please address the Council after that item is open for public comment. Pursuant to the Brown Act (Govt Code Section 54950 et. seq), action or Council discussion cannot be taken on matters not on the agenda other than to receive comments. Those matters will customarily be referred to the City Manager’s Office. Each speaker is allocated three (3) minutes to speak. Speakers may not cede their time. Comments should be limited to matters within the jurisdiction of the City. Persons wishing to address the Council must fill out a Speaker Request Form prior to the beginning of the meeting. Forms are available from the City Clerk, 1650 Stanton Drive, Shasta Lake, on the City’s website, or at the back of the meeting hall. If you have documents to present to members of the Council to review, please provide a minimum of seven copies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.3 Commission/Committee Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.4 City Council Reports/Comments/Correspondence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.5 Staff Comments/Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.0 CONSENT CALENDAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1 Approval of the regular meeting minutes of June 15, 2010.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.2 Approval of the Special Meeting Minutes of June 23, 2010.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee and Commission Meetings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee and Commission Meetings</th>
<th>Date and Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Council/ Redevelopment Agency Meetings</td>
<td>1st and 3rd Tuesday at 6:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission</td>
<td>4th Wednesday at 7:00 p.m. in January, March, May, July, September, and November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>3rd Thursday at 6:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City Council Meetings are televised on Channel 11 the following Wednesday at 8:30 p.m. and Friday at 2:00 p.m.

Parties with a disability as provided by the American Disabilities Act who require special accommodations or aides in order to participate in the public meeting should make the request to the City Clerk at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.

“This is an equal opportunity institution”
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING HELD TUESDAY, JUNE 15, 2010, AT THE JOHN BEAUDET COMMUNITY CENTER, 1525 MEDIAN AVENUE, SHASTA LAKE, CALIFORNIA.

1.0 CITY COUNCIL MEETING - 6:00 p.m.

Mayor Watkins called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.
Council members present: Dixon, Farr, Lindsay, Lucero, Watkins
Council members absent: None
Pledge of Allegiance
Invocation

2.0 AWARDS/ RECOGNITIONS:

3.0 COMMUNICATIONS

3.1 Presentations:
   a) Outside Agency Donation Report – Kay Kobe, Shasta Damboree

3.2 Public Comment Period: None

3.3 Commission/Committee Reports:
   Neva Wacker, Shasta Gateway Library, gave a brief report library activities

3.4 City Council Reports/Comments/Correspondence
   Miscellaneous

3.5 Staff Comments/Reports:
   a) City Manager Carol Martin asked Council about their availability to attend a Special Meeting to review the budget for Fiscal Years 2010-2011 and 2011-2012.

   It was decided the Special Council Meeting will be held on June 23, 2010 at 3:30 p.m. in the City Hall Annex.
4.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

Council member Lucero asked that item 4.2 be removed from the consent calendar and addressed separately.

4.1 Approval of the regular meeting minutes of June 1, 2010.

Motion/Vote

By motion made/seconded (Lindsay/Lucero), and carried, the consent calendar was approved.

4.2 Resolution establishing the appropriation limitation for fiscal year 2010-2011 at $4,044,621.

Motion/Vote

By motion made/seconded (Lindsay/Lucero), and carried, Resolution CC10-60 was approved. Noes: Lucero

5.0 PUBLIC HEARINGS:

5.1 Public Hearing for Landscape and Lighting District and Drainage Maintenance District for Deer Creek Manor Subdivision, and possible approval of the following Resolutions:

Mayor Watkins opened the public hearing. There were no public comments and Mayor Watkins closed the public hearing.

a) Resolution approving the Engineer’s Report for the Deer Creek Manor Landscaping and Lighting District and the levy and collection of assessments within such district for Fiscal Year 2010/2011.

Motion/Vote

By motion made/seconded (Lindsay/Farr), and carried, Resolution CC10-61 was approved. Noes: Lucero

b) Resolution approving the Engineer’s Report for Deer Creek Manor Drainage Maintenance District.

Motion/Vote

By motion made/seconded (Lindsay/Farr), and carried, Resolution CC10-62 was approved. Noes: Lucero

5.2 Public Hearing and possible action on the following:

a) Resolution approving a 2010/2011 application and contract Execution for funding from the General Allocation of the State of California Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program and authorizing the City Manager to execute the grant agreement and any amendments thereto with the State of California for the purposes of this grant.

b) Resolution approving a 2010/2011 application and contract execution for funding from the Native American Allocation of the State of California Community Block Grant (CDBG) program and authorizing the City Manager to execute the grant agreement and any amendments thereto with the State of California for the purposes of this grant.
Mayor Watkins opened the public hearing. There were no public comments and Mayor Watkins closed the public hearing.

**Motion/Vote**

By motion made/seconded (Farr/Lindsay), and carried, Resolution CC10-63 was approved.

**Motion/Vote**

By motion made/seconded (Farr/Lindsay), and carried, Resolution CC10-64 was approved.

6.0 **OLD BUSINESS:** None

7.0 **NEW BUSINESS**

7.1 Discussion concerning Electric Operations Manager Position.

**Motion/Vote**

By motion made, seconded (Farr/Lindsay/Dixon), and carried, Staff was instructed to continue to advertize the Electric Operations Manager Position at a salary of $109,327. Noes: Lucero

8.0 **COUNCIL/STAFF REPORTS/COMMENTS**

8.1 Council Comments/Reports None

8.2 Staff Comments/Reports:

9.0 **ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to come before the City Council, Mayor Watkins adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

TONI M. COATES, CMC, City Clerk
MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL JOINT MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY, JUNE 13, 2010, AT THE CITY HALL ANNEX, 1650 STANTON DRIVE, SHASTA LAKE, CALIFORNIA.

1.0 CITY COUNCIL/REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY - CONCURRENT MEETING - 3:30 p.m.

Mayor Watkins called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.
Council members present: Dixon, Farr, Lindsay, Lucero, Watkins
Council members absent: None

2.0 COUNCIL/STAFF COMMENTS:

Assistant City Manager John Duckett informed Council that as a result of questions posed by Councilmember Lucero at the June 15th Council Meeting regarding the Annual Appropriation Limit, staff had compiled reference materials that further explain the legislation that the City is required to comply with.

3.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: None

4.0 NEW BUSINESS

4.1 Discussion and possible action to approve the 2010/2011 and 2011/2012 Fiscal Year Budget.

Following the Budget Presentation, Assistant City Manager John Duckett answered questions posed by council and the public.

a) City Council Resolution approving and adopting a two year budget for Fiscal Year 2010-2011 and 2011-2012.

Motion/Vote

By motion made/seconded (Lindsay/Lucero), and carried, Resolution CC10-65 was approved.

b) Redevelopment Agency Resolution approving and adopting a two year budget for the July 6, 2010
Fiscal Year 2010-2011 and 2011-2012.

**Motion/Vote**

By motion made/seconded (Lindsay/Farr), and carried, Resolution RDA10-7 was approved. Noes: Lucero

5.0 **ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to come before the City Council/Redevelopment Agency, Mayor/Chair Watkins adjourned the meeting at 6:02 p.m.

TONI M. COATES, CMC, City Clerk
Redevelopment Agency Secretary
AGENDA ITEM
CITY COUNCIL MEETING

TO: Carol Martin, City Manager
FROM: Jessaca Lugo, Program Manager
DATE: June 10, 2010
SUBJECT: Used Motor Oil Recycling Grant
FILE: G-100-900-003

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends approval of the attached resolution, which is an administrative requirement for funding applications in which the City partners with the County of Shasta for recycling and waste disposal programs.

BACKGROUND:
The California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) is the administrative agency for various recycling and litter reduction programs. The City has partnered with the County of Shasta in past years to obtain funding from the CIWMB, making possible a variety of waste collection events for disposal of household hazardous waste, used motor oil, beverage containers, and other litter. Staff recently received a request from the Shasta County Department of Resource Management for City Council authorization to partner in the 2010/2011 Oil Recycling program.

The amount of the grant is expected to be $5,000 for Shasta Lake. This program is advertised by the County through Used Motor Oil and Hazardous Household Waste Handouts (available at City Hall). Used Motor Oil containers are also given away to residents of Shasta Lake. The program also pays for the collection of Used Motor Oil and Used Oil filters at J&S Auto Parts and Buckeye Transfer Station.

FISCAL IMPACTS: None

ATTACHMENTS: Governing Board Resolution

DISTRIBUTION:
City Council Members
Shasta County Department of Resource Management
RESOLUTION CC 10-XX

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SHASTA COUNTY TO SUBMIT A REGIONAL APPLICATION FOR THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF RESOURCES RECYCLING AND RECOVERY USED OIL PAYMENT PROGRAM FUNDS

WHEREAS, pursuant to Public Resources Code § 48690 the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), formerly known as the California Integrated Waste Management Board, has established the Used Oil Payment Program (OPP) to make payments to qualifying jurisdictions for implementation of their used oil programs; and

WHEREAS, the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery has been delegated the responsibility for the administration of the program within the state, setting up necessary procedures governing application by cities and counties or their designees under the program; and

WHEREAS, the Used Oil Payment Program allows regional participation; and

WHEREAS, CalRecycle’s procedures for administering the Used Oil Payment Program requires, among other things, a regional applicants’s governing body to declare by resolution certain authorizations related to the administration of CalRecycle’s Used Oil Payment Program.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Shasta Lake:

1) Authorizes the joint participation and the submittal of a Used Oil Payment Program regional application on behalf of the City of Shasta Lake to the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery.

2) Authorizes Shasta County to be the Lead Agency for the CalRecycle Used Oil Payment Program.

3) Authorizes the Shasta County Director of Resource Management, or his/her designee, as agent of Shasta County to conduct all negotiations, execute and submit all documents including, but not limited to, applications, agreements, amendments and payment requests which may be necessary for the completion of the aforementioned project.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 6th day of July, 2010, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

______________________________
GREG WATKINS, Mayor

ATTEST:

_______________________________
TONI M. COATES, CMC, City Clerk

July 6, 2010
AGENDA ITEM
City Council

TO: Carol Martin, City Manager
FROM: Carla L. Thompson, AICP, Development Services Director
DATE: June 22, 2010
SUBJECT: Economic Development Corporation Board of Directors
FILE NO.: E-030-120-522

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that City Council adopt the attached Resolution reappointing Richard van Wyhe as the City’s representative on the Shasta County Economic Development Corporation Board of Directors for a two-year term.

BACKGROUND:

The Economic Development Corporation of Shasta County (EDC) is a private, nonprofit corporation founded in 1958 to assist local expansion and to promote Shasta County and its cities for new industrial development. Services provided by the EDC include business development, retention and expansion; industrial recruitment; business financial services; enterprise zone and recycling zone information.

The EDC Board of Directors oversees the general operation of the EDC. Directors are appointed by its permanent members: the County of Shasta, the City of Redding, the City of Anderson, the City of Shasta Lake and the Chambers of Commerce for Redding, Anderson, Cottonwood, Burney and Fall River.

Richard van Wyhe was initially appointed by City Council on July 2004 to serve a two-year term as a representative on the Economic Development Corporation (EDC) Board of Directors. Council reappointed him on July 18, 2006, and again on July 15, 2008, for additional two-year terms.

Mr. van Wyhe is interested in continuing serving on the EDC Board and requests reappointment for an additional two-year term. Mr. van Wyhe has proven to be an extremely committed representative of the City in this position and currently serves on the EDC Executive Committee. A letter of interest from Mr. van Wyhe is attached.
FISCAL IMPACTS:
There are no fiscal impacts to the City as a result of this action.

ATTACHMENTS:
Proposed Resolution of Approval
Letter of Interest from Richard van Wyhe, June 9, 2010

DISTRIBUTION:
City Council
Fred Castagna, Project Manager
RESOLUTION CC 10-

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE REAPPOINTING RICHARD VAN WYHE TO THE SHASTA COUNTY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR A TWO-YEAR TERM.

WHEREAS, the Economic Development Corporation of Shasta County (EDC) is a private, nonprofit corporation founded in 1958 to assist local expansion and to promote Shasta County and its cities for new industrial development; and

WHEREAS, services provided by the EDC include business development, retention and expansion; industrial recruitment; business financial services; enterprise zone and recycling zone information; and

WHEREAS, the EDC Board of Directors oversees the general operation of the EDC, with membership of the Board comprised of representatives from Shasta County, the cities of Anderson, Redding and Shasta Lake, and Chambers of Commerce for Redding, Anderson, Cottonwood, Burney and Fall River; and

WHEREAS, the current City of Shasta Lake representative, Mr. Richard van Wyhe, requests reappointed for an additional two-year term.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Shasta Lake hereby appoints Mr. Richard van Wyhe to the Shasta County Economic Development Corporation Board of Directors for a two-year term.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 6th day of July 2010 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

_________________________________  GREG WATKINS, Mayor

ATTEST:

_______________________________  TONI M. COATES, CMC, City Clerk
June 9, 2010

Carla Thompson  
City of Shasta Lake  
P.O. Box 777  
Shasta Lake, CA  96019

Carla

Please inform the City Council of my desire to continue to serve the City as their appointed Board Member on the Economic Development Corporation of Shasta County, Board of Directors. Let it also be known that I have an outstanding attendance and participation record, and that I am currently a member of the Executive Committee for the Board.

For the new Council Members who may not be familiar with my background, I offer the following. I have been a business owner for 35 years. As a Shasta Lake resident and business owner, I have a vested interest in the economic well being of our community. I have served as a board member for the local Chamber of Commerce, the Shasta Dam Kiwanis, and as a member of the Shasta Damboree Committee. I serve as a Planning Commissioner for the City of Shasta Lake, and as President of both the Shasta County and South Lake Shasta Fire Safe Councils. I however, do not simply attend meetings, as I am an active and committed participant. Not only am I an ambassador for the City of Shasta Lake and Shasta County locally, but promote both in my travels and on my company’s website.

I would appreciate your continued support by reappointing me to the EDC Board of Directors.

Sincerely,

Richard van Wyhe  
Partner  
van Wyhe’s Custom Engraving  
EV4U Custom Conversions
AGENDA ITEM
City Council Meeting

TO: Mayor and City Council Members
FROM: Carol Martin, City Manager
DATE: July 2, 2010
SUBJECT: Gateway Unified School District Request for Letter of Support and Partnership Agreement with a Carol M. White Grant

FILE:

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends Council approve the attached letter of support and partnership agreement with Gateway Unified School District (GUSD) and Project Stride.

BACKGROUND:
Matt Diskin, Gateway Unified School District (GUSD) contacted the City about a Carol M. White Grant. The purpose of the grant is to support improving physical activity, nutrition and wellness in the GUSD.

The proposed grant would target children who cannot afford camps and other activities both after school and in the summer. The grant would include funding to cover such costs as transportation and supervision. Another element of the grant is to introduce nutritional education to children and families.

An essential component of the grant is letters of support and partnership agreements with other local entities. As you are aware, the City of Shasta Lake does provide a “Summer of Fun” program at Shasta Lake School. Additionally, the City already has a joint use agreement with GUSD for the use of facilities.

Matt Diskin will be at the City Council meeting to answer any additional questions for the Council.

FISCAL IMPACTS:
There are no fiscal impacts associated with this action.

ATTACHMENTS:
Draft Letter of Support
Sample LEA Partner Agreement

DISTRIBUTION:
City Council
July 1, 2010

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools
Washington, DC

Re: Gateway Unified School District (GWUSD) Application for a Carol M. White Physical Education Partnership (PEP) Grant

To Whom It May Concern:

With a population of 10,269, the City of Shasta Lake is situated in rural far Northern California and is served by Gateway Unified School District (GWUSD). Our poverty rate hovers at 20.1%, consistently surpassing the State of California (12.9%) and the nation as a whole (12.4%). Community partnerships are vital in addressing issues such as these. The City wholeheartedly supports GWUSD’s application for a Carol M. White PEP (Physical Education Partnership) Grant. Gateway’s Project S.T.R.I.D.E. is consistent with the City’s desire to promote safe neighborhoods for children and families, and the well-being of our community in general.

We recognize the importance of promoting healthy communities by encouraging families to eat nutritiously and exercise daily, and proactively encourage the entire community to support programs directly benefiting our youth. We are particularly interested in the concept of introducing nutrition education and providing access to fresh fruits and vegetables to campers at our Summer Fun Camp.

We urge you to favorably consider this application and look forward to working with staff at GWUSD to successfully implement this award for the benefit of our community.

Sincerely,

Greg Watkins
Mayor
Roles and Responsibilities: The stated mission of the City of Shasta Lake, in part, includes working together for community prosperity by promoting community cohesiveness and strong family values. Because of the City’s small size and rural nature, options for enhancing the well being of our youth are somewhat limited. It is the City’s intent to work cooperatively with other agencies that support children and families to coordinate the delivery of available resources.

Contribution to the Project:
Each year, the City of Shasta Lake funds a ten-week Summer Fun Camp providing an active, safe environment for elementary and junior high kids to participate in healthy activities, including hands-on projects, field trips, and visits to the local aquatic center. This service to the youth of our community has become a priority and its success relies on mutual working relationships with Gateway Unified School District and other partners. The City anticipates that Summer Fun Camp could become a project site for nutrition education and access to healthy food choices offered by GUWSD, augmenting daily physical activity at camp.

This agreement is in support of Project S.T.R.I.D.E, Gateway Unified School District PEP project and was developed after timely and meaningful consultation between the required partners.

Signature of Head of Local Government or Designee: ____________________________
Dated: ________________
TO: Carol Martin, City Manager
FROM: Toni M. Coates, CMC, City Clerk
DATE: June 29, 2010
SUBJECT: Processing and Delivering of Council Mail by the City Clerk’s Office
FILE NO.: A-050-090-000

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that Council discuss and consider a new administrative policy regarding City Council mail handling. Staff has included a draft policy for Council review and discussion. The attached Resolution has been left open in order for Council to craft the policy as they determine is appropriate.

BACKGROUND:

Councilmember Lucero has asked that mail addressed to her at City Hall or the City’s P.O. Box not be opened.

During the Goals and Objectives Workshop held on April 21, 2008, the topic of how City Council mail was to be handled was included in the session. The following italicized content was what was presented to council. The bold content reflects the direction given to staff in each case.

General Administrative Policies and Protocols (GAAP). Include written procedures for communications to be incorporated in the City Council Information Manual.

Upon authorization of the City Council Member, the City Clerk shall open all mail addressed to the Mayor and City Members, with the exception of those marked “Personal or “Confidential.”

Council directed the City Clerk to open all mail not marked “Personal” or “Confidential,” and disseminate and distribute as appropriate,” as they discussed that mail received at the city should be deemed city business.

Communications Addressed to the City Council – All correspondence addressed to the “City Council” is treated as public information. A copy is made for each member of the City Council and City Manager, and all other affected departments for information, referral or handling. The original document is retained in the City Central Files.
Council agreed with the process.

Communication addressed to the Mayor – Commonly, the sender’s intent when addressing communication to the “Mayor” is merely to forward it to the head of the city governing body, and consequently, this type of correspondence is often handled in the same manner as communication addressed to the “City Council”. Handling of the Mayor’s mail is, however, at the discretion of the individual serving in this capacity which is ascertained each year following the reorganization of the City Council.

Council agreed with the process and re-confirmed that all mail received by the City for City Council or an individual Councilmember should be deemed city business and as such, public information unless marked “Personal” or “Confidential”.

FISCAL IMPACTS:

There are no fiscal impacts to the City as a result of this action.

ATTACHMENTS:

Proposed Resolution for approval of a new administrative policy

DISTRIBUTION:

City Council
A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE APPROVING AN ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY FOR THE HANDLING OF ALL MAIL ADDRESSED TO CITY COUNCIL.

WHEREAS, Council desires a policy for the handling of City Council mail and correspondence in order to maintain consistent policies and practices; and

WHEREAS,

WHEREAS,

WHEREAS, upon approval of this Resolution, the City Clerk will amend the City Council Candidate's Informational Manual to add this new policy.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Shasta Lake hereby establishes an administrative policy for the handling of all City Council mail.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 6th day of July 2010 by the following vote:

AYES: 
NOES: 
ABSENT:

_____________________________
GREG WATKINS, Mayor

ATTEST:

TONI M. COATES, CMC, City Clerk
CITY OF SHASTA LAKE
Administrative Policy
for the Processing and Delivering of City Council Mail
by the City Clerk’s Office

Each City Council Member has their own box in the City Hall Annex in which to receive mail, correspondence and other written information. Mail from both the Street Address and the Post Office Box for the City of Shasta Lake is sorted in the Customer Service Department. All Council mail is placed in the City Clerk’s box for further dissemination.

Items that are addressed to “City Council” will be opened by the City Clerk, copied and distributed to each council member, the City Manager, and all other affected departments for information, referral or handling. This process ensures that all city council members and related staff have equal access to information. The City Clerk will retain a copy for the central files of all correspondence handled in this manner, as they are public records.

Items addressed to individuals by name and title will be placed in their box, unopened. The individual council member will be responsible for the copying and distributing of pertinent city business correspondence to all other members of city council, to the City Manager, and the City Clerk. The City Clerk shall retain a copy in the central files as a public record.

All items marked “Personal” or Confidential” will be placed in the box of the addressee unopened.
AGENDA ITEM
City Council/Redevelopment Agency Meetings

TO: Carol Martin, City Manager
FROM: Fred Castagna, Project Manager
DATE: June 30, 2010
SUBJECT: Award of Construction Contract for the Shasta Lake Law Enforcement Center and Approval of Supplemental Expenditure.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is the recommendation of staff that the City of Shasta Lake (City) and the Shasta Lake Redevelopment Agency (Agency) approve the respective attached Resolutions and:

a) Declare Lakmann Construction, Inc. of Redding, CA the lowest responsive, responsible bidder.

b) Award the construction contract for the Law Enforcement Center Project to Lakmann Construction, Inc. in the amount of $3,258,503 for the base bid plus $630,000 for four additive alternates for a total of $3,888,503.

c) Authorize a construction contingency of $208,305 for a total construction budget of $4,096,808.

d) Request City Council authorize a supplemental expenditure on the project of a $93,000 solar power rebate to be provided by the City Electric Utility. This rebate is the same amount any developer of a similar sized solar power project would receive from the utility.

BACKGROUND:

The Shasta Lake Law Enforcement Center Project is a joint effort of the City of Shasta Lake and the Shasta Lake Redevelopment Agency. The City Council and the Sheriff’s Station will share a single 8,363 square foot building for which the City and the Agency are sharing proportionate costs. The City is the lead agency in the project. The project represents the first phase in what will eventually become the Civic Center for the City of Shasta Lake. Included in the project
construction scope is a Turbine Monument which will honor the construction of Shasta Dam and the workers who built it.

On May 20, 2010 the City solicited contractors for bids on the project. The project solicitation was advertised locally and provided to builders exchanges throughout Northern California. The solicitation required bidders to submit a base bid amount plus costs for four alternates which the City could add into the contract at its option subject to budget limitations. As specified in the Contract Documents, low bidder was to be selected based on the amount of his/her base bid. Costs for alternates were not used to determine the low bidder. However, the low bidder, Lakmann Construction, Inc. provided the lowest total including the costs of the alternates. At a bid opening June 29, 2010, eleven (11) bids were received from general contractors for the project. The bids ranged from a low of $3,258,503 to a high of $4,081,000.

The table below includes the names and bid amounts from each bidder.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Base Bid</th>
<th>Alternate 1</th>
<th>Alternate 2</th>
<th>Alternate 3</th>
<th>Alternate 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lakmann Construction, Inc.</td>
<td>$3,258,503.00</td>
<td>60,000.00</td>
<td>60,000.00</td>
<td>360,000.00</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald F. Gallino, Inc.</td>
<td>$3,416,824.00</td>
<td>58,021.00</td>
<td>39,000.00</td>
<td>328,000.00</td>
<td>210,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. H. Mack Construction</td>
<td>$3,551,405.00</td>
<td>48,659.00</td>
<td>56,964.00</td>
<td>349,912.00</td>
<td>193,087.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danco Builders</td>
<td>$3,597,413.00</td>
<td>57,327.00</td>
<td>87,223.00</td>
<td>357,923.00</td>
<td>167,612.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Hill Construction</td>
<td>$3,727,963.00</td>
<td>40,422.00</td>
<td>51,605.00</td>
<td>338,425.00</td>
<td>210,121.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward Builders, Inc.</td>
<td>$3,734,000.00</td>
<td>60,000.00</td>
<td>70,000.00</td>
<td>365,000.00</td>
<td>232,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilbers, Inc.</td>
<td>$3,755,697.00</td>
<td>68,650.00</td>
<td>88,299.00</td>
<td>372,324.00</td>
<td>251,603.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batzer, Inc.</td>
<td>$3,819,047.00</td>
<td>72,137.00</td>
<td>84,487.00</td>
<td>351,407.00</td>
<td>204,958.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierson Company</td>
<td>$3,955,396.00</td>
<td>70,000.00</td>
<td>44,000.00</td>
<td>355,000.00</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRCO Constructors, Inc.</td>
<td>$4,030,000.00</td>
<td>44,000.00</td>
<td>78,000.00</td>
<td>338,000.00</td>
<td>186,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifford Construction</td>
<td>$4,081,000.00</td>
<td>115,000.00</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td>310,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bid alternates included the following:
Alternate 1: Clock tower on West side of building.
Alternate 2: Masonry wall around secure parking area vs. fence.
Alternate 3: Photovoltaic array for solar power to facility.
Alternate 4: Shade structure to cover Sheriff’s vehicles in secure parking area and support the solar array.

With all four alternates included, Lakmann Construction’s bid totals $3,888,503. This is well within expectations and below the construction allocation in the original project budget. After receiving the construction bid, staff allocated the savings to a construction contingency. The contingency is now higher than the 5% recommended by the project architects. The winning base bid represents a cost of approximately $389/sq.ft. This is below the original estimate of $400/sq.ft for the project. Staff believes this is a very good price considering this building is constructed as an essential services facility and to LEED standards.

Attached is a Project Budget Analysis. This spreadsheet represents all of the costs associated with the project including design, construction, permits, furnishings, technology, etc. Included in the analysis are certain offsets against costs. These are funds from other sources which are designated to be spent on the project. They include a rebate from the City Electric Utility for
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installation of solar power, funds from the County Sheriff’s Asset Seizure Fund, and a portion of
the previously approved Turbine Monument Project. The Asset Seizure Fund money will be
spent to provide electronic equipment, computers, printers, etc for the Sheriff’s personnel. The
portion of the Turbine Monument money transferred to this project will be used to construct the
walkway around the monument and the concrete base for the turbine runner. The balance of
funds designated for that project will be used to clean, transport, and place the runner on the
base.

**FISCAL IMPACTS:**

$4,096,808 total construction cost including contingency. $1,524,013 from the General Fund
and $2,572,795 from Redevelopment Funds.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Resolution
Project Budget Analysis

**DISTRIBUTION:**

City Council
Redevelopment Agency Board
Assistant City Manager
City Engineer
RESOLUTION CC 10-

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE TO DECLARE LAKMANN CONSTRUCTION, INC. THE LOWEST RESPONSIVE, RESPONSIBLE BIDDER AND ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH LAKMANN CONSTRUCTION, INC. FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE SHASTA LAKE LAW ENFORCEMENT CENTER PROJECT IN THE AMOUNT OF $4,096,808 AND AUTHORIZE A SUPPLEMENTAL EXPENDITURE OF ELECTRIC DEPARTMENT REBATE FUNDS FOR THE PROJECT IN THE AMOUNT OF $93,000.

WHEREAS, the City advertised for competitive bids starting on May 29, 2010; and

WHEREAS, the City opened eleven bids on June 29, 2010 each of which provided a base bid and bids for four alternates; and

WHEREAS, competition between bidders was based solely on base bids; and

WHEREAS, Lakmann Construction, Inc. was the lowest responsive bidder with a base bid of $3,258,503; and

WHEREAS, the project budget will support all four alternates totaling an additional $630,000, bringing the total to $3,888,503.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Shasta Lake City Council hereby declares Lakmann Construction, Inc. the lowest responsive, responsible bidder and authorizes staff to enter into a contract for construction of the Shasta Lake Law Enforcement Center Project with Lakmann Construction, Inc. in the amount of $3,888,503 and approves a construction contingency of $208,305 and authorizes a supplemental expenditure of $93,000 from Electric Department rebates on the project.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this ___ day of _______, 2010, by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:

______________________________
GREG WATKINS, Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
TONI M. COATES, CMC, City Clerk
## Shasta Lake Law Enforcement Center Project

**Project Budget cost distribution**
37.2% goes to Council Chambers. 62.8% to Law Enforcement Cntr.

**Account codes**
05-09-032-1380 60-09-001-1380

**Original Budget**
$4,900,439

### New Budget after Bid Award

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>New Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Design</td>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$230,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural &amp; Engineering + approved</td>
<td>NMR Architects</td>
<td>$533,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$533,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security fence</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractors Bid</td>
<td>Lakmann Const</td>
<td>$3,888,503</td>
<td>$208,305.00</td>
<td>$4,096,808.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Visual/Phones/Security</td>
<td>Gaynor Telecom</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$110,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special materials inspections &amp; testing</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$1,400.00</td>
<td>$15,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E gas charge</td>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
<td>$4,649</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$4,649.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Utility Transformer</td>
<td>SL Electric Dept</td>
<td>$5,582</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$5,582.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-1 line installation</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$33,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen appliances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers/Printers/Copiers/Fax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workout equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitor’s equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Budgeted Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>New Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4,819,734</td>
<td>$214,705.00</td>
<td>$5,034,439.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Offsets Against Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solar Rebate</td>
<td>$93,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff’s Dept Seizure Fund</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from Monument Project</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Offsets</td>
<td>$134,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Original budget**
$4,900,439.00

**New Budget With Offsets**
$4,900,439.00
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AGENDA ITEM
City Council/Redevelopment Agency Meetings

TO: Carol Martin, City Manager
FROM: Fred Castagna, Project Manager
DATE: June 30, 2010
SUBJECT: Award of Construction Contract for the Shasta Lake Law Enforcement Center and Approval of Supplemental Expenditure.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is the recommendation of staff that the City of Shasta Lake (City) and the Shasta Lake Redevelopment Agency (Agency) approve the respective attached Resolutions and:

a) Declare Lakmann Construction, Inc. of Redding, CA the lowest responsive, responsible bidder.

b) Award the construction contract for the Law Enforcement Center Project to Lakmann Construction, Inc. in the amount of $3,258,503 for the base bid plus $630,000 for four additive alternates for a total of $3,888,503.

c) Authorize a construction contingency of $208,305 for a total construction budget of $4,096,808.

d) Request City Council authorize a supplemental expenditure on the project of a $93,000 solar power rebate to be provided by the City Electric Utility. This rebate is the same amount any developer of a similar sized solar power project would receive from the utility.

BACKGROUND:

The Shasta Lake Law Enforcement Center Project is a joint effort of the City of Shasta Lake and the Shasta Lake Redevelopment Agency. The City Council and the Sheriff’s Station will share a single 8,363 square foot building for which the City and the Agency are sharing proportionate costs. The City is the lead agency in the project. The project represents the first phase in what will eventually become the Civic Center for the City of Shasta Lake. Included in the project
construction scope is a Turbine Monument which will honor the construction of Shasta Dam and the workers who built it.

On May 20, 2010 the City solicited contractors for bids on the project. The project solicitation was advertised locally and provided to builders exchanges throughout Northern California. The solicitation required bidders to submit a base bid amount plus costs for four alternates which the City could add into the contract at its option subject to budget limitations. As specified in the Contract Documents, low bidder was to be selected based on the amount of his/her base bid. Costs for alternates were not used to determine the low bidder. However, the low bidder, Lakmann Construction, Inc. provided the lowest total including the costs of the alternates. At a bid opening June 29, 2010, eleven (11) bids were received from general contractors for the project. The bids ranged from a low of $3,258,503 to a high of $4,081,000.

The table below includes the names and bid amounts from each bidder.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Base Bid</th>
<th>Alternate 1</th>
<th>Alternate 2</th>
<th>Alternate 3</th>
<th>Alternate 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lakmann Construction, Inc.</td>
<td>$3,258,503</td>
<td>60,000.00</td>
<td>60,000.00</td>
<td>360,000.00</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald F. Gallino, Inc.</td>
<td>$3,416,824</td>
<td>58,021.00</td>
<td>39,000.00</td>
<td>328,000.00</td>
<td>210,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. H. Mack Construction</td>
<td>$3,551,405</td>
<td>48,659.00</td>
<td>56,964.00</td>
<td>349,912.00</td>
<td>193,087.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danco Builders</td>
<td>$3,597,413</td>
<td>57,327.00</td>
<td>87,223.00</td>
<td>357,923.00</td>
<td>167,612.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Hill Construction</td>
<td>$3,727,963</td>
<td>40,422.00</td>
<td>51,605.00</td>
<td>338,425.00</td>
<td>210,121.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward Builders, Inc.</td>
<td>$3,734,000</td>
<td>60,000.00</td>
<td>70,000.00</td>
<td>365,000.00</td>
<td>232,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilbers, Inc.</td>
<td>$3,755,697</td>
<td>68,650.00</td>
<td>88,299.00</td>
<td>372,324.00</td>
<td>251,603.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batzer, Inc.</td>
<td>$3,819,047</td>
<td>72,137.00</td>
<td>84,487.00</td>
<td>351,407.00</td>
<td>204,958.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierson Company</td>
<td>$3,955,396</td>
<td>70,000.00</td>
<td>44,000.00</td>
<td>355,000.00</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRCO Constructors, Inc.</td>
<td>$4,030,000</td>
<td>44,000.00</td>
<td>78,000.00</td>
<td>338,000.00</td>
<td>186,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifford Construction</td>
<td>$4,081,000</td>
<td>115,000.00</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td>310,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bid alternates included the following:
Alternate 1: Clock tower on West side of building.
Alternate 2: Masonry wall around secure parking area vs. fence.
Alternate 3: Photovoltaic array for solar power to facility.
Alternate 4: Shade structure to cover Sheriff’s vehicles in secure parking area and support the solar array.

With all four alternates included, Lakmann Construction’s bid totals $3,888,503. This is well within expectations and below the construction allocation in the original project budget. After receiving the construction bid, staff allocated the savings to a construction contingency. The contingency is now higher than the 5% recommended by the project architects. The winning base bid represents a cost of approximately $389/sq.ft. This is below the original estimate of $400/sq.ft. for the project. Staff believes this is a very good price considering this building is constructed as an essential services facility and to LEED standards.

Attached is a Project Budget Analysis. This spreadsheet represents all of the costs associated with the project including design, construction, permits, furnishings, technology, etc. Included in the analysis are certain offsets against costs. These are funds from other sources which are designated to be spent on the project. They include a rebate from the City Electric Utility for...
installation of solar power, funds from the County Sheriff's Asset Seizure Fund, and a portion of the previously approved Turbine Monument Project. The Asset Seizure Fund money will be spent to provide electronic equipment, computers, printers, etc for the Sheriff’s personnel. The portion of the Turbine Monument money transferred to this project will be used to construct the walkway around the monument and the concrete base for the turbine runner. The balance of funds designated for that project will be used to clean, transport, and place the runner on the base.

**FISCAL IMPACTS:**

$4,096,808 total construction cost including contingency. $1,524,013 from the General Fund and $2,572,795 from Redevelopment Funds.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Resolution
Project Budget Analysis

**DISTRIBUTION:**

City Council
Redevelopment Agency Board
Assistant City Manager
City Engineer
RESOLUTION RDA 10-

A RESOLUTION OF THE SHASTA LAKE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY TO APPROVE THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE’S INTENTION TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH LAKMANN CONSTRUCTION, INC. FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE SHASTA LAKE LAW ENFORCEMENT CENTER PROJECT IN THE AMOUNT OF $4,096,808.00

WHEREAS, the City of Shasta Lake (City) and the Shasta Lake Redevelopment Agency (Agency) have agreed to share proportionate costs for construction of the Law Enforcement Center Project as adopted by the Agency in Resolution RDA 09-04, and

WHEREAS, the agreement adopted by the City and the Agency requires approval of construction contracts entered into by the City on behalf of both agencies,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Shasta Lake Redevelopment Agency hereby approves a contract between the City of Shasta Lake and Lakmann Construction, Inc. for construction of the Shasta Lake Law Enforcement Center Project in the amount of $3,888,503 and approves a construction contingency of $208,305 for a total of $4,096,808.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this ___ day of ________, 2010, by the following vote:

AYES: __________________________
NOES: __________________________
ABSENT: _________________________

_________________________________
GREG WATKINS, Chair

ATTEST:

_________________________________
TONI M. COATES, CMC, Secretary
MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL JOINT MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY, JUNE 13, 2010, AT THE CITY HALL ANNEX, 1650 STANTON DRIVE, SHASTA LAKE, CALIFORNIA.

1.0 CITY COUNCIL/REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY - CONCURRENT MEETING - 3:30 p.m.

Mayor Watkins called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.
Council members present: Dixon, Farr, Lindsay, Lucero, Watkins
Council members absent: None

2.0 COUNCIL/STAFF COMMENTS:

Assistant City Manager John Duckett informed Council that as a result of questions posed by Councilmember Lucero at the June 15th Council Meeting regarding the Annual Appropriation Limit, staff had compiled reference materials that further explain the legislation that the City is required to comply with.

3.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: None

4.0 NEW BUSINESS

4.1 Discussion and possible action to approve the 2010/2011 and 2011/2012 Fiscal Year Budget.

Following the Budget Presentation, Assistant City Manager John Duckett answered questions posed by council and the public.

a) City Council Resolution approving and adopting a two year budget for Fiscal Year 2010-2011 and 2011-2012.

Motion/Vote

By motion made/seconded (Lindsay/Lucero), and carried, Resolution CC10-65 was approved.

b) Redevelopment Agency Resolution approving and adopting a two year budget for the
Fiscal Year 2010-2011 and 2011-2012.

**Motion/Vote**

By motion made/seconded (Lindsay/Farr), and carried, Resolution RDA10-7 was approved.  
Noes: Lucero

5.0 **ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to come before the City Council/Redevelopment Agency, Mayor/Chair Watkins adjourned the meeting at 6:02 p.m.

TONI M. COATES, CMC, City Clerk  
Redevelopment Agency Secretary