AGENDA
CITY COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING
MONDAY, AUGUST 26, 2019
7:00 P.M.

Next Resolution No. 1245

Next Ordinance No. 363

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. OPEN AGENDA - PUBLIC COMMENT WELCOME

This is the appropriate time for members of the public to make comments regarding the items on the consent calendar or items not listed on this agenda. Pursuant to the Brown Act, no action will take place on any items not on the agenda.

4. CONSENT CALENDAR

Matters which may be acted upon by the City Council in a single motion. Any Councilmember may request removal of any item from the Consent Calendar causing it to be considered under Council Actions.

   RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE AS PRESENTED

B. PAYMENT OF BILLS.
   RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE AS PRESENTED

C. REPUBLIC SERVICES RECYCLING TONNAGE REPORT FOR JULY 2019.
   RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE AS PRESENTED

   RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE AS PRESENTED

5. COMMISSION ITEMS

NONE.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS
A. ZONING CASE NO. 953, REQUEST FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A NEW 2,464 SQUARE FOOT STABLE WITH AN 896 SQUARE FOOT LOFT AND A SITE PLAN REVIEW FOR 1,470 CUBIC YARDS OF GRADING FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT AT 13 PORTUGUESE BEND ROAD (LOT 77-RH) ROLLING HILLS, CA, (CARDENAS).

7. OLD BUSINESS


B. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF LIGHTING UPGRADE AT TENNIS COURTS 2 AND 3.

C. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF PROPOSED AMENITIES BY THE ROLLING HILLS COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION, AND THE MANDATED AMERICAN WITH DISABILITY ACT (ADA) IMPROVEMENTS AT THE TENNIS COURTS.

D. CONSIDER AND APPROVE THE SOLID WASTE COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATION TO CONTINUE TO CONTRACT WITH REPUBLIC SERVICES FOR SOLID WASTE SERVICES AND TO USE A SOLID WASTE CONSULTANT TO PREPARE AN AGREEMENT

8. NEW BUSINESS

NONE.

9. MATTERS FROM THE CITY COUNCIL AND MEETING ATTENDANCE REPORTS

A. CONSIDER AND APPROVE THE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATIONS ON EMPLOYEE SALARIES BASED ON RECENT SALARY SURVEYS.

10. MATTERS FROM STAFF

NONE.

11. CLOSE SESSION

City Council Agenda
08/26/19
A. CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS
CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54957.6
CITY DESIGNATED REPRESENTATIVE: CITY MANAGER
UNREPRESENTED EMPLOYEE: PLANNING DIRECTOR CANDIDATE

12. ADJOURNMENT

Next meeting: Monday, September 9, 2019 at 7:00 a.m. at 13 Portuguese Bend Road, Rolling Hills, California.

Public Comment is welcome on any item prior to City Council action on the item.

Documents pertaining to an agenda item received after the posting of the agenda are available for review in the City Clerk's office or at the meeting at which the item will be considered.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting due to your disability, please contact the City Clerk at (310) 377-1521 at least 48 hours prior to the meeting to enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility and accommodation for your review of this agenda and attendance at this meeting.

All Planning Commission items have been determined to be categorically exempt pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines unless otherwise stated.
MINUTES OF
A REGULAR MEETING
OF THE
CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF ROLLING HILLS, CALIFORNIA
MONDAY, JULY 8, 2019

1. CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Rolling Hills was called to order by Mayor Mirsch at 7:00p.m. in the City Council Chamber at City Hall, 2 Portuguese Bend Road, Rolling Hills, California.

2. ROLL CALL

Councilmembers Present: Mayor Mirsch, Pieper, Black, Dieringer and Wilson.
Councilmembers Absent: None
Others Present: Elaine Jeng, P.E., City Manager.
Yolanta Schwartz, Planning Director
Michael Jenkins, City Attorney
Brian Bennet, Los Angeles County Fire Department Battalion Chief
Kristen Raig, RHCA Manager
William Hassoldt, Resident
Dr. Gebhard, Resident
Dr. Black, Resident
Joe Sparrow, Architect
Alfred Visco, Resident
Arvel Witte, Resident
Jim Aichele, Resident

3. OPEN AGENDA - PUBLIC COMMENT WELCOME

Mayor Mirsch introduced Brian Bennet, Los Angeles County Fire Department Battalion Chief. Mayor Mirsch called for public comments. There were no public comments.

4. CONSENT CALENDAR

Matters which may be acted upon by the City Council in a single motion. Any Councilmember may request removal of any item from the Consent Calendar causing it to be considered under Council Actions.


RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE AS PRESENTED.

Councilmember Wilson requested to pull the payment of bills. Councilmember Black also wanted to pull the payment of bills.

City Manager Jeng presented minor changes to the meeting minutes noted by a member of the public and
missed spelled words noted by Councilmember Dieringer. Revised minutes were placed on the dais.

Councilmember Black moved to approve the minutes with corrections. Mayor Pro Tem Pieper seconded the motion and the motion carried as follows:

AYES: COUNCILMEMBERS: Mayor Mirsch, Pieper, Black, and Wilson
NOES: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSTAIN: COUNCILMEMBERS: Dieringer.

B. PAYMENT OF BILLS.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE AS PRESENTED.

Councilmember Black inquired about EFT for unfunded liability.

City Manager Jeng responded that the item was miss coded and the item should have stated PERS payment for current employees. City Manager noted that the Finance Department recently had a change of staff and the description of the payment may not have been accurately captured.

Councilmember Black requested correction to the description. Mayor Mirsch asked for confirmation that the check should still be signed.

City Manager Jeng noted that EFT is an electronic transfer of funds and no check is needed for the PERS payment.

Councilmember Wilson inquired about the check to Cleverly that was lost and the proper accounting. Councilmember Wilson also inquired if the cost for coyote control is for one month. He also asked about the parking lot paving project expense. Councilmember Wilson also asked about the voided checks.

The coyote control bill was pulled and determined to be a monthly invoice.

City Manager Jeng responded that the negative $825 is to void the check that was previously issued to Cleverly and the positive $825 is for the re-issued check. City Manager noted that the City Council decided not to go forward with the paving project but the project was designed and the payment is for design fees. City Manager noted that the Finance Department has new finance software Abila and did some test runs with checks.

There were discussions regarding the use of measure M funds to pay of the design of the parking lot design.

Mayor Mirsch requested additional description for Abila software. Mayor Mirsch inquired if the Abila payment is a cost above the fees to RAMS.

City Manager Jeng responded that cost of using Abila is outside of the RAMS’ fees. Prior to using Abila, the department used another software, Tyler Technologies.
Councilmember Black moved to approve payments. Councilmember Dieringer seconded the motion and the motion carried without objection by a voice vote as follows:

AYES: COUNCILMEMBERS: Mayor Mirsch, Pieper, Black, Dieringer, and Wilson
NOES: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSTAIN: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.

5. COMMISSION ITEMS

A. CONSIDERATION TO RECEIVE AND FILE RESOLUTION NO. 2019-11 FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION GRANTING APPROVAL OF A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO CONVERT AN EXISTING 689 SQUARE FOOT STABLE, TO A MIXED-USE STRUCTURE IN ZONING CASE NO. 959 AT 49 EASTFIELD DRIVE (LOT 33-EF) ROLLING HILLS, CA, (WALDMAN).

Planning Director Schwartz gave a brief presentation on the project.

Councilmember Black noted that he did not have any issues with the mixed-use structure but inquired where is the mixed-used structure is in relation to the neighbor’s house.

Mayor Mirsch called for public comments. There was no public comment.

Councilmember Black requested to delay the vote to get information on the distance asked for earlier.

Councilmember Dieringer moved to continue this item to the next City Council meeting. Councilmember Black seconded the motion and the motion carried as follows:

AYES: COUNCILMEMBERS: Mayor Mirsch, Pieper, Dieringer, Black, and Wilson
NOES: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSTAIN: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.

B. CONSIDERATION TO RECEIVE AND FILE RESOLUTION NO. 2019-10 FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION GRANTING APPROVAL FOR A SITE PLAN REVIEW FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW RESIDENCE WITH ATTACHED GARAGE AND BASEMENT, RETAINING WALL, SWIMMING POOL, AND GRADING; CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS TO CONSTRUCT A STABLE AND CORRAL; AND VARIANCES TO EXCEED THE MAXIMUM PERMITTED DISTURBANCE OF THE LOT AND TO ENCROACH WITH A RETAINING WALL INTO THE SIDE YARD SETBACK IN ZONING CASE NO. 955 AT 1 POPPY TRAIL, (LOT 90-B2-RH), (YEH).

Planning Director Schwartz gave a brief presentation on the project.

There were discussions regarding the encroachment into the setback and the reasons for the applicant’s request.
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Mayor Mirsch called for public comments. There was no public comment.

Councilmember Black moved to receive and file. Mayor Pro Tem Pieper seconded the motion.

Councilmember Dieringer expressed issues with encroachment into the setback. She noted that adjustments could have been made to the footprint of the house to eliminate encroachment into the setback.

Councilmember Dieringer proposed an amended motion to take this project under jurisdiction.

Councilmember Black noted that the subject lot is a tough lot and providing two feet encroachment would give the applicant some more space.

Mayor Mirsch said she was at the site visit and agreed with Councilmember Black.

Councilmember Dieringer proposed an amended motion to take this project under jurisdiction. Councilmember Black seconded the motion and the motion carried as follows:

AYES: COUNCILMEMBERS: Dieringer, and Black.
ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSTAIN: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.

Again, Councilmember Black moved to receive and file. Mayor Pro Tem Pieper seconded the motion and the motion carried as follows:

NOES: COUNCILMEMBERS: Dieringer.
ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSTAIN: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.

C. CONSIDERATION TO RECEIVE AND FILE RESOLUTION NO. 2019-08 FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION GRANTING APPROVAL FOR A SITE PLAN REVIEW AND A CONDITION USE PERMIT FOR GRADING AND CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW STABLE WITH A LOFT IN ZONING CASE NO. 953 AT 13 PORTUGUESE BEND ROAD, ROLLING HILLS, CA (LOT 77-RH) (CARDENAS).

Mayor Mirsch noted because the proximity of Mayor Pro Tem Pieper’s residence, Mayor Pro Tem Pieper recused himself on this item. Mayor Mirsch also noted that the City Council received a letter from the applicant.

Planning Director Schwartz gave a brief presentation on the project.

There was a discussion relating to the proposed stable and the neighbor’s houses.

City Attorney clarified that the discussion should be related to what is wrong with the decision of the
DRAFT

Planning Commission and if the City Council should take this project under its jurisdiction.

Mayor Mirsch opened the item to public comments.

William Hassoldt of 15 Portuguese Bend Road noted that he is currently working on underground his utility line and in doing so discovered that the applicant has not underground his utility line. Mr. Hassoldt requested the City Council to require Mr. Cardenas to underground first before approving his project. Mr. Cardenas damaged the underground vault while grading his easement and he has prevented Edison to repair the vault. Mr. Hassoldt requested the City Council to see Mr. Cardenas’ overhead lines when conducting a field trip to the applicant’s property.

Dr. Gebhard, 11 Portuguese Bend Road noted that the project is too large and too close to his property. He did not think that the Commissioners listened to his concerns. Dr. Gebhard feels that the project should a get a fresh start. The barn should move closer to Portuguese Bend Road. The barn overlooks his bedroom and pool area. Dr. Gebhard noted the project only impacts his property.

Councilmember Black inquired does the previous undergrounding work need to be completed before the project can be approved?

Planning Director Schwartz responded that she needed to verify lines if any, need to be undergrounded from the applicant’s property.

There was discussion regarding windows to the stable and the required setbacks.

Councilmember Dieringer inquired if there were discussions at the Planning Commission responding to Mr. Gebhard to move the stable closer to the Portuguese Bend Road. Councilmember Wilson inquired the need for a Conditional Use Permit.

Planning Director Schwartz the Commissioners did not consider moving the stable as it is being proposed to be located in the same location as the existing barn. Planning Director Schwartz responded that all stables require a CUP.

Councilmember Wilson moved to receive and file. The motion was not seconded.

Councilmember Black moved to take the project under consideration. Councilmember Black liked what the applicant is doing on his property. Councilmember Dieringer seconded the motion and the motion carried as follows:

AYES: COUNCILMEMBERS: Mayor Mirsch, Dieringer, and Black.
ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSTAIN: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.

City Council tentatively set the field trip for 7am, Monday, August 5, 2019. Members of the City Council will confirm with staff before the notice for the field trip is published.
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6. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

   A. REVIEW AND APPROVAL APPLICATION NO. ZONING CASE NO. 957

Planning Director Schwartz gave a brief summary of the project and noted that the City Council took the project under its jurisdiction. The City Council conducted a field trip on July 2, 2019. While on the field trip the City Council noticed the utility pole downstream to the subject pole have low hanging utility lines. Staff contacted Edison to inform the company of the condition of the low hanging utility lines. Edison will conduct a field visit and follow up with staff.

Mayor Mirsch noted that Mayor Pro Tem Pieper rejoined the City Council. Mayor Mirsch opened the item to the public.

Dr. Black commented not specifically to this project but with respect to undergrounding in general. Dr. Black feels that residential projects are required to underground poles and the legal department should follow up if the requirement is not adhered to. He doesn’t understand why this item is on the agenda. Dr. Black expressed that the City Council should deny the request.

Joe Sparrow, architect for the applicant, noted that in this particular project, the undergrounding would be exceptionally expensive. Mr. Sparrow added that there were many experts that provided reasons for not undergrounding, and the undergrounding would de-stabilize the slope. Mr. Sparrow also said that removing the pole would further de-stabilize the slope.

Planning Director Schwartz noted that the City’s requirement does not require the undergrounding of poles and only utility lines.

Councilmember Wilson inquired if the applicant has a preference in the direction of undergrounding.

Mr. Sparrow represented that if Edison came out and determined a new pole would be added, the applicant could underground to the new pole as the route is flatter but there would be a new pole. The applicant would elect to proceed with the cheapest path.

William Hassoldt, 10 Pine Tree Lane, said he had to underground and had to place five vaults. Undergrounding was expensive and costly. Some undergrounding projects will be more expensive, and others will be simple, less expensive. For those projects that cost more, too bad.

There was discussion on the policy of undergrounding.

Councilmember Dieringer suggested to wait for Edison’s information on their review of the site condition. Councilmember Wilson agreed with Dieringer. Mayor Mirsch inquired what information will Edison be providing.

Planning Director Schwartz responded that Edison will give an opinion but not the detail information sought by the City Council.
Mayor Pro Tem Pieper noted that the City Council cannot require the applicant to underground the pole. The requirement is to underground the wires to the pole.

City Manager Jeng clarified with the City Council the information requested of Edison on the upcoming site visit. Councilmember Pieper added that the information needed should include the party responsible for paying to correct unsafe conditions.

Councilmember Dieringer moved to continue the item to be able to receive information from Edison. Councilmember Wilson seconded the motion and the motion carried as follows:

NOES: COUNCILMEMBERS: Black.
ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSTAIN: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.

B. AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF ROLLING HILLS, CALIFORNIA AMENDING SECTION 8.08.580 CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION WASTE OF THE CITY OF ROLLING HILLS MUNICIPAL CODE.

Planning Director Schwartz gave a brief presentation on the new ordinance.

In response to Councilmember Dieringer's question on the deposit, City Attorney Jenkins responded that the deposit cannot be kept as profit. The deposit is a security for performance and must be returned if performed. The deposit cannot be used as a supplemental fee to the permit fee to recover staff time. Five years down the road, if the deposit is still held in the account, we can have the conversation on what to do with the funds at that time. City Attorney suggested to create the deposit and see what happens.

City Manager Jeng added that the deposit is received as a revenue but held in a separate account. The return of the deposit will be paid out of the same account. City Manager Jeng added that the deposit will be seen favorably by CalRecycle because it demonstrates a mechanism to enforce the reporting of diversion data.

Councilmember Wilson inquired about permitted construction hauler and state certification.

City Manager Jeng responded that there is a state certification for construction trades.

Councilmember Black moved to adopt the Ordinance 362 for first reading. Mayor Pro Tem Pieper seconded the motion and the motion carried as follows:

NOES: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSTAIN: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.

7. OLD BUSINESS
A. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF LIGHTING UPGRADE AT TENNIS COURTS 2 AND 3.

City Manager Jeng gave a brief presentation on the tennis court lighting upgrade project and introduced the Association Manager Kristen Raig.

Councilmember Black noted that vendors did not understand the specification as Horst Electric did not propose the same wattage as the other vendors. Councilmember Black worked with Horst Electric and they do great work and from the proposal, they didn’t get the same information.

City Manager Jeng responded that vendors were told to provide the same lighting output as the current output. Vendors are not lighting engineers. Vendors were asked for their opinion on the lighting equivalency. City Manager Jeng also outlined difficulty reaching Horst Electric to discuss their proposal.

Councilmember Black inquired with Association Manager Raig why did the Association go with American Power Solutions.

Association Manager Raig responded that American Power Solutions was the most responsive. The Board selected American Power Solutions.

In response to Mayor Mirsch’s inquiries, City Manager Jeng outlined the difficulty in getting vendors to respond to request for cost estimates. Some don’t conduct site visits and only provide specification sheets to light fixtures. Horst Electric likely conducted a site visit because a scissor lift was noted their proposal. Responsiveness is a good indication of how the vendors will perform and an important aspect during the solicitation process.

Mayor Pro Tem Pieper inquired why isn’t the City using the requirements specified by International Tennis Federation. And why isn’t the Tennis Club giving the City their specifications?

City Manager Jeng responded that staff called many clubs and municipalities and found courts in the vicinity are not using LEDs. There are also different levels of play and higher competition uses different lighting than lower competition.

Mayor Mirsch’s inquired if there is sensitivity to the surrounding residents living adjacent to the tennis courts.

City Manager Jeng responded yes there is a consideration for the surrounding neighbors to specify equivalent lighting compared with existing output.

There was discussion on lumens versus wattage.

Councilmember Black noted that there is confusion between wattage and lumen and that the vendors did get the proper information.

Mayor Pro Tem Pieper noted to staff that we need to have lighting that will not bother the neighbors but sufficient to play tennis.
City Manager Jeng suggested to conduct a lighting study to measure existing lighting and a simulation of new lighting.

Mayor Mirsch pointed out that complexity of multiple expert opinion on lighting measurements.

Mayor Pro Tem Pieper suggested to conduct a lighting study for $300 and if the cost is more than come back to the City Council.

City Manager Jeng repeated the City Council's direction to staff as follows: go out and conduct a lighting study to ensure equivalent lighting; look at lighting standards and give the vendors the same information for apples to apples comparison including the cross bars.

City Manager Jeng confirmed with the City Council that they are not opposed to lighting upgrade at the tennis courts. The City Council confirmed that they feel the tennis courts lights should be upgraded.

B. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF PROPOSED AMENITIES BY THE ROLLING HILLS COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION, AND THE MANDATED AMERICAN WITH DISABILITY ACT (ADA) IMPROVEMENTS AT THE TENNIS COURTS.

City Manager Jeng presented a background on the tennis court improvement projects.

Councilmember Dieringer noted that the staff report did not provide price tags for the improvements. Is the Association asking for approval without the cost?

There was a discussion on the need to bring the restroom at the gate house to meet ADA requirements if the Association Board is considering eliminating the restroom update at the gate house and use the funds to construct a new restroom near the cabana.

Mayor Mirsch inquired if the Association is asking for the City to pay for the requested amenities. Mayor inquired the need for the Association to get the City's approval on the project.

Association Manager Raig said she received an estimate of $580,000 excluding furniture, and the septic tank. Association Manager Raig responded to Mayor Mirsch that it would depend if the City will approve the requested amenities. Will the City Council approve the restroom at the Cabana? And can the City Manager and the Mayor meet with the Board President to discuss how to proceed with the project? Association Manager Raig noted that the Association is the City's tenant.

There is a discussion on who should lead the project.

City Manager Jeng read provisions in the lease agreement between the City and the Association.

Mayor Pro Tem Pieper understood the provisions to read that the Association need to pay prevailing wage if they took on the project. Mayor Pro Tem Pieper said the restroom at the Cabana is incidental to the project.
City Manager Jeng confirmed with the City Council that they would like to move forward with the ADA improvements. City Manager Jeng also confirmed with the City Council that they would like to see construction costs for the proposed amenities by the Association.

Councilmember Black suggested to have the City do the grading, the septic tank and the ADA and then the Association can carry on with their work with their contractor.

Mayor Pro Tem Pieper moved to approve the Association’s proposed amenities provided that the City receives cost information relating to the amenities.

City Manager Jeng clarified direction to staff: approve the Association’s proposed amenities, ask for further development on design plans to have the construction cost reported back to the City Council.

Councilmember Dieringer proposed to have two restrooms at the Cabana.

The City Council did not take a motion and instead provided instructions to staff.

8. NEW BUSINESS

A. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF A PROFESSIONAL SERVICE AGREEMENT WITH ALAN PALERMO CONSULTING FOR PROJECT MANAGEMENT SERVICES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019-2020 FOR AN AMOUNT NOT-TO-EXCEED $53,120

City Manager Jeng presented the need to engage the services of a project manager. The hours proposed by the consultants are limits on the hours the consultants would spend on the projects. If the project warrants less attention, the hours or expense to the City would be less.

Mayor Pro Tem Pieper clarified that the $32,000 is included in the hours for the sewer project.

City Manager Jeng responded that no, the $32,000 is not included in the project manager cost.

There is discussion distinguishing the scopes of work for the sewer consultant and the project manager.

Councilmember Black noted that the City’s traffic engineer would tell the City which streets to pave and the County would come in and pave the street.

City Manager Jeng responded that in the last four years, the Association would select and pave the streets. The County has come out to perform striping for the City. But there have been other vendors solicited through formal bids. The last time the City did striping was in 2015-2016 by JS Striping. Recently, the Traffic Commission also looked at striping horse crossing and locations in the city that need to be refreshed.

There was a discussion on how the City determined areas that needed to be restriped.
Councilmember Dieringer summarized that the project manager would be taking work off of the City Manager’s plate. Councilmember Dieringer confirmed with the City Manager the proposal is to free up time to address other issues like the Housing Element. Councilmember Dieringer pointed out that the proposal is to outsource an area of expertise that the City Manager has, and it would be more efficient to hire a lobbyist for the Housing issues.

Councilmember Wilson thought time spent on Housing Element is much more important and needs the City Manager’s attention.

Mayor Mirsch pointed out that in a short amount of time, as a City Councilmember she has never seen this many public works projects. Mayor Mirsch added that she didn’t hire the City Manager to be a public works professional. She wanted a City Manager to address important issues like the Housing Element and wildfire mitigation.

Alfred Visco supported the item.

Mayor Pro Temp Pieper motioned to approve the item as presented. Councilmember Wilson seconded the motion and the motion carried as follows:

NOES: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSTAIN: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.

9. MATTERS FROM THE CITY COUNCIL AND MEETING ATTENDANCE REPORTS

A. DISCUSS FIRE FUEL ABATEMENT ALONG THE CITY’S SOUTHERN BORDER, AREAS ADJACENT TO THE PALOS VERDES PENINSULA LAND CONSERVANCY (ORAL).

City Manager informed the Council that her approach for fire fuel abatement along the City border with the Land Conservancy and RPV is to attend the quarterly meetings between the two agencies and understand their missions. This approach is progressing slowly. Ultimately, she would like to get an understanding of what needs to be done from a fire fuel abatement perspective and if sources can be pulled together for solutions. Resident Mr. Visco has taken a different approach.

Mr. Visco noted that his approach is much more aggressive. Mr. Visco informed the City Council that there is fire fuel abatement work planned in Rolling Hills by RPV. It is unknown when the work will be performed. He suggested that the City Managers and Mayors should get-together and discuss the matter.

Councilmember Black inquired what is the definition of a firebreak. Is that 150 feet?

Mr. Visco responded that he does not know the definition.

Mr. Arvel Witte provided information on hazardous areas along the Rim Trail. Mr. Witte presented issues to the City Council in 2009. At that time the City Council said the Conservancy won’t do anything about
Mr. Vitte asked the City Council to take a trip down the trail. He noted that the City of Rolling Hills need to do clean up on the City's side. He contributed money to the Land Conservancy to keep the land undeveloped. He proposed a separation of 100 feet between RH and the Land Conservancy to create a separation and this separation should be maintained on an annual basis. Mr. Vitte would be willing to throw money in if it would help. He stressed the importance of the coordination between the Police, Fire and the Block Captains during an emergency.

Mr. Jim Aichele provided some information on constraints of the conservancy on the proposed fire break.

Councilmember Black noted that the City Council has been wanting to implement a fire break and the Conservancy would not allow it. Funds are not an issue.

Councilmember Dieringer suggested legal paths to motivate the Land Conservancy to act.

City Manager Jeng informed the City Council that the Land Conservancy showed her areas where the Conservancy is required by the Fire Department to perform fire fuel abatement work. She like to continue dialog with RPV as RPV provide a lot of their resources to the Conservancy. City Manager Jeng wants to work within their constraints and suggested to bring updates back to the City Council.

Mayor Mirsch informed the City Council that she has had conversation with RPV Mayor Ken Dyda. According to Dyda, he indicated to Mayor Mirsch that RPV is trying to be efficient with its resources but intends to conduct the fire fuel abatement project. Mayor Mirsch reiterated the need for an update on the work by RPV.

Mr. Vitte suggested to clean up on the City's side.

Mayor Mirsch responded that the City has enforcement personnel for cleanup on the City's side.

B. ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE 60 DAY COMMENT PERIOD (JUNE 19, 2019 THROUGH AUGUST 19, 2019) TO THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENT IMPACT REPORT FOR THE SOLANA RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT – A PROPOSED 248 APARTMENT UNITS IN THREE 5-STORY BUILDINGS NEAR THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF HAWTHORNE BOULEVARD AND VIA VALMONTE (ORAL).

City Manager Jeng provided information about the Solana Residential Development project. The reason for this announcement is to inform the public that this project could potentially have traffic impacts to the Peninsula and to provide information to submit comments.

Mayor Mirsch informed the City Council that the City Manager reviewed the project's traffic study and decided not to submit comments.

City Manager informed the City Council that in 2017 did put in a comment letter for the project in a letter signed by the previous City Manager.

Planning Director Schwartz added that the adjacent agencies hired consultants to assist them to review the project draft EIR. The planning department of the four cities will meet again in July to see if the agencies
want to submit a joint comment letter.

Mayor Mirsch reiterated that the intent is not to submit a comment letter but to keep the residents informed.

10. MATTERS FROM STAFF

A. STATUS REPORT ON THE POTENTIAL COST SHARE FORMULA TO FUND TWO SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICER (SRO) TO BE EMPLOYED BY THE PALOS VERDES PENINSULA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (PVPUUSD) AND DISCUSS THE SROs PROPOSED RESPONSIBILITIES/DUTIES (ORAL).

City Manager Jeng provide an update on the SRO. The Regional Law Committee posed questions to PVPUUSD. In response there was a meeting among the four cities and the school district. The Sheriff’s Department does not have staffing to provide SROs. The school district will engage a security firm to provide the SROs. SROs will be able to carry weapons but would not be peace officers. Of the two proposed two SROs, the cost of one SRO will be shared among the four cities. The draft cost share formula is to use the student population. Rolling Hills’s share is approximately 2% of the total cost. The City Attorney’s office is drafting a MOU among the four cities to outline responsibilities. The City Attorney’s office suggested to craft the MOU so that the four cities are only contributors. The school district interviewed several retired Sheriff Deputies but in order to hire them, the retirees would need to join a security firm or start a security firm of their own. The four cities asked for a cap on the cost of the SRO and any cost over the cap would be the responsibility of the school district. Staff is not asking for a vote but to provide an update on this item.

Councilmember Dieringer inquired is there a cap on the amount on City Attorney’s fee to draft the MOU.

City Attorney Jenkins already drafted the MOU.

City Manager Jeng added that the unknowns are related to the responsibilities of the SROs and not of the four cities.

NOES: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS: Black.
ABSTAIN: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.

B. CONSIDERATION AND APPORVAL OF $1,500 FOR A SUMMER INTERN THROUGH EXP SUMMER INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

City Manager Jeng informed the City Council that Councilmember Wilson inquired if City Hall could use the help of an intern. Councilmember Wilson offered to pay for the intern. The EXP Summer Internship program places 11th grade high school students at place of employment to help students gain real world working experience.

Councilmember Wilson noted that he wanted to sponsor the intern and he serves as a Board member on
City Manager Jeng said that while Councilmember Wilson was very generous to sponsor the intern, the intern is working at City Hall and should be paid for by the City.

Councilmember Black expressed concerns about the intern and meeting labor law requirements. He also expressed concerns with employing minors. Councilmember Black noted that he does not want to contribute funds to something that may not be meeting labor law. Mayor Pro Tem Pieper agrees with Councilmember Black.

Councilmember Wilson informed the City Council that he has participated in the program for the past four years and he has not experienced any issues.

There was discussion on the other municipalities that participate in the EXP Summer Internship program.

Councilmember Dieringer inquired with the City Attorney Jenkins if the intern could create legal issues.

City Attorney Jenkins would need to check with labor attorney in his office.

Mayor Pro Tem Pieper suggested to have the City Attorney’s office to provide an opinion on the employing a minor since the intern is already working at City Hall.

Councilmember Wilson suggested to move the intern to his office if necessary. Councilmember Wilson also suggested for staff to reach out to the Director of the internship program.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business before the City Council, Mayor Mirsch adjourned the meeting at 11:15 p.m. The next regular meeting of the City Council is scheduled to be held on Monday, July 15, 2019 beginning at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chamber at City Hall, 2 Portuguese Bend Road, Rolling Hills, California.

Mayor Mirsch noted that the next meeting will be on July 22, 2019 and not on July 15, 2019.

Respectfully submitted,

Elaine Jeng, P.E.
City Manager

Approved,
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MINUTES OF
A REGULAR MEETING
OF THE
CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF ROLLING HILLS, CALIFORNIA
MONDAY, AUGUST 12, 2019

1. CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Rolling Hills was called to order by Mayor Mirsch at 7:01p.m. in the City Council Chamber at City Hall, 2 Portuguese Bend Road, Rolling Hills, California.

2. ROLL CALL

Councilmembers Present: Mayor Mirsch, Pieper, Dieringer, Black and Wilson.
Councilmembers Absent: None
Others Present: Elaine Jeng, P.E., City Manager.
Yolanta Schwartz, Planning Director
Yohana Coronel, City Clerk
Michael Jenkins, City Attorney
Alfred Visco, 15 Cinchring

3. OPEN AGENDA - PUBLIC COMMENT WELCOME

Alfred Visco, resident of 15 Cinchring discussed his communications with Councilmember Susan Brooks from Rancho Palos Verdes regarding his land conservancy concerns. He also stated that he has had email communications with Kristen Raig from the Rolling Hills Community Association about limiting traffic on the conservancy trails. Mr. Visco also mentioned his ongoing efforts to form a Fire Safe Council.

Mayor Mirsch thanked Mr. Visso for his comments and ongoing efforts.

4. CONSENT CALENDAR

Matters which may be acted upon by the City Council in a single motion. Any Councilmember may request removal of any item from the Consent Calendar causing it to be considered under Council Actions.

      RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE AS PRESENTED.
   B. PAYMENT OF BILLS.
      RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE AS PRESENTED.

Councilmember Dr. Black moved that the City Council approve the consent items as presented. Councilmember Dieringer seconded the motion and the motion carried without objection by a voice vote as follows:
AYES: COUNCILMEMBERS: Mayor Mirsch, Pieper, Dieringer, Black, and Wilson
NOES: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSTAIN: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.

*Item 4C was pulled for discussion.*

C. RECEIVE AND FILE A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH FORUM INFO-TECH FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES.  
   RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE AS PRESENTED

Councilmember Black pulled item 4C for further discussion regarding the language in the contract.

Councilmember Dieringer also stated she needed clarity on some of the clauses, terms and conditions in the agreement. Councilmember Dieringer stated she was uncomfortable with sections having to do with billing disputes, limitation of liability, termination without advance notice for exposure of potential liability and their mention of a new support agreement coming soon and whether that agreement would override our potential agreement.

City Manager Jeng clarified that the service agreement presented is only for one year and not for three years as previously mentioned.

Discussion ensued between the City Attorney Jenkins and Councilmembers about how terms and conditions with private companies regarding information technology service agreements tend to be the same across the board and not much room is given by private technology service companies to the customer to negotiate terms. City Manager Jeng pointed that her experience with this particular industry is that they tend to operate in a different way and what is being presented to council is not out of the ordinary.

Mayor Pro Tem Pieper agreed with City Manager Jeng.

Mayor Mirsch noted given the interest in time she would like to have this item approved.

City Attorney Michael Jenkins stated that there were several conversations between the City and Forum Info-Tech and acknowledged that many of Councilmember Dieringer’s concerns were his concerns as well but ultimately the vendor did not budge. He also highlighted the urgency in which the City finds itself with needing a new information technology contract.

Councilmember Dieringer made a suggestion and stated she would like to have an alternate email listed as a point of contact, currently the City Manager is the only one listed and in case the City Manager is not available she would like to have an alternate person who can be available.

Mayor Pro Tem Pieper moved that the City Council approve the consent items as presented. Councilmember Wilson seconded the motion and the motion carried, with comments by
Councilmember Dieringer, by a voice vote as follows:

AYES: COUNCILMEMBERS: Mayor Mirsch, Pieper, Dieringer, Black, and Wilson
NOES: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSTAIN: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.

5. COMMISSION ITEMS

A. CONSIDERATION TO RECEIVE AND FILE RESOLUTION NO. 2019-12 FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION GRANTING APPROVAL FOR A SECOND MAJOR MODIFICATION TO PREVIOUSLY GRANTED SITE PLAN REVIEW, CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, VARIANCE ENTITLEMENT TO APPROVE A VARIANCE TO EXCEED THE MAXIMUM PERMITTED LOT DISTURBANCE IN ZONING CASE NO. 896 AT 11 SADDLEBACK ROAD (WARREN).

Due to the proximity of the property Councilmember Pieper recused himself from consideration on the matter and left the dais.

Planning Director Schwartz gave a brief power point presentation and the history of Zoning Case No. 896 at 11 Saddleback Road. Planning Director Schwartz restated what the Planning Commission granted during their July 16, 2019 meeting. The applicant was granted a variance to exceed the maximum permitted disturbance in order to construct two biofiltration units. The biofiltration/bioretention units are designed to temporarily hold and filter stormwater runoff created by the increase in the impermeable surfaces of the project including the stable, which will be released into dissipaters in a controlled manner.

Planning Director Schwartz outlined the previously approved projects. In March of 2016 the applicant was granted a lot line adjustment to merge two lots. In conjunction with the lot merger, the applicant received a Conditional Use Permit to construct a 13,860 square foot dressage arena, to convert the existing garage to a 2,415 square foot stable and add a 625 square foot loft and 1,685 square foot corral; Site Plan Review for a 4,745 square foot residence plus 659 square foot garage, and other accessory structures, a not to exceed 5’ wall that would encircle the majority of the dressage arena, 950 square foot swimming pool, 23,700 cubic yards of grading, and Variances to locate the equestrian facilities in the front yard area of the lot. Planning Director Schwartz stated that two modifications were approved since the original approval in 2016, each by a resolution with findings and conditions. She pointed out that with the current application, the previous resolutions of approvals were consolidated into one resolution, which contains all findings and conditions applicable to all of the approvals.

Councilmember Dieringer stated that she would have liked to see the previous Resolutions and historical information of the approvals.

Councilmember Wilson stated he had questions about the filtration system and where the water went after it was released from the system.
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Councilmember Black commented that the water being filtered is released into the canyon, across Saddleback Road.

Councilmember Black moved that the City Council receive and file as presented. Mayor Mirsch seconded the motion and the motion carried without objection by a voice vote as follows:

AYES: COUNCILMEMBERS: Mayor Mirsch, Dieringer, Black, and Wilson.
NOES: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSTAIN: COUNCILMEMBERS: Pieper.

B. CONSIDERATION TO RECEIVE AND FILE RESOLUTION NO. 2019-13 FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION GRANTING APPROVAL FOR A SITE PLAN REVIEW FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW RESIDENCE, INCLUDING ATTACHED GARAGE AND BASEMENT, RETAINING WALL, SWIMMING POOL, AND GRADING; CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A GUEST HOUSE; AND VARIANCES TO EXCEED THE MAXIMUM PERMITTED DISTURBANCE OF THE LOT AND TO EXCEED THE MAXIMUM PERMITTED COVERAGE OF THE FRONT YARD SETBACK FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A DRIVEWAY IN ZONING CASE NO. 956 AT 8 MIDDLERIDGE LANE SOUTH (Zhang). AND RECOMMENDATION FROM THE TRAFFIC COMMISSION TO APPROVE THE DRIVEWAY APRON.

Planning Director Schwartz gave a brief power point presentation and the history of Zoning case No. 956 at 8 Middleridge Lane South (Zhang). On July 18, 2019 the Planning Commission meeting adopted Resolution No. 2019-13 granting a Site Plan Review, Conditional Use Permit and Variance for the construction of a new residence with a basement, garage, swimming pool, guest house, driveway and other outdoor amenities on a vacant parcel. The variance was exceeding the maximum permitted disturbance of the lot and exceeding the coverage of the setback by a driveway. At the May 23, 2019 Traffic Commission meeting, members of the Traffic Commission memorialized the recommendation to approve the driveway apron. The Planning Commission held four public hearings and two field trips, before approving the project. Many of the residents of Middleridge Lane South provided input, correspondence and were present at all of the meetings.

Planning Director Schwartz also outlined the changes made by the applicant to the project during the review process.

Councilmember Dieringer stated that she would like to have the minutes available to her when items are mentioned and/or referred to from other council and/or commission meetings.

City Manager Jeng recognized that minutes should be available when an item is referenced and assured Councilmember Dieringer that she would work on making the minutes available.
Councilmember Black moved that the City Council receive and file as presented. Mayor Pro Tem Pieper seconded the motion and the motion carried without objection by a voice vote as follows:

NOES: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSTAIN: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.

6. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

   A. REVIEW AND APPROVE RESOLUTION NO. 1242 DENYING A REQUEST FOR A VARIANCE IN ZONING CASE NO. 957 AT 5 FLYING MANE LANE.

**Planning Director Schwartz** gave a presentation of Zoning Case No. 957 at 5 Flying Mane Lane. The applicant has recently completed a 990 square foot addition and major renovation on the house and pursuant to Section 17.27.030 of the Zoning Code, was required to underground the utility lines, and that the Planning Commission approved the request. The provision does not dictate which pole on or off the property one must underground to. She stated that at the June 10, 2019 City Council meeting, the City Council took the case under jurisdiction and held a field trip on July 2, 2019 and a regular City Council meeting on July 22, 2019. She stated that the applicant claimed difficulty in undergrounding the lines based on the letters of several professionals. She stated that at the July 22, 2019 meeting, councilmembers directed staff to prepare a Resolution denying the request for a variance to not to underground the utility lines to the residence, which is before the Council for consideration.

Councilmember Wilson asked for clarification on the vote being taken and what it meant.

Mayor Pro Tem Pieper explained that a yes vote would mean the council is approving a resolution denying the property owners request.

Councilmember Black moved that the City Council approve resolution no. 1242 denying a request for a variance in zoning case 957. Councilmember Dieringer seconded the motion and the motion carried by a voice vote as follows:

AYES: COUNCILMEMBERS: Mayor Mirsch, Black, and Dieringer.
NOES: COUNCILMEMBERS: Mayor Pro Tem Pieper and Wilson
ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSTAIN: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.

7. **OLD BUSINESS**

NONE.

8. **NEW BUSINESS**
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A. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF A GRANT APPLICATION FOR MEASURE A, THE SAFE, CLEAN NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS, OPEN BENCHES, RIVERS PROTECTION, AND WATER CONSERVANCY FUNDS.

City Manager Jeng gave an overview of Measure A, the Safe, Clean Neighborhoods Parks, Open Space, Beaches, Rivers Protection, and Water Conservation Measure. On November 8, 2016, voters of Los Angeles County approved Measure A, a parcel tax that generates over $90 million in funding annually to be used to improve, acquire, develop and maintain park and recreational facilities within Los Angeles County. City Manager Jeng also pointed out that Measure A has no sunset date.

She stated that cities that were incorporated at the time Measure A was passed receive two types of funding annually: capital improvement and maintenance and service fund. Annual allocations can be accessed by applying for a grant to perform eligible park projects.

She stated that the Park District informed staff that cities with a population of less than 2,500 can share its annual allocation with adjacent high need, or very high-need study area provided the project meets certain conditions.

Further, she stated that the City Council considered rehabilitating the City Hall campus parking lot this past May but decided to delay the work until additional transportation funds are rolled up. Discussing the potential landscaping component with the Parks District, the Grant Section Manager determined that the scope of work can be funded using Measure A funds.

Mayor Pro Tem Pieper moved that the City Council approve the item as presented. Councilmember Black seconded the motion and the motion carried without objection by a voice vote as follows:

NOES: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSTAIN: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.

B. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF JOINING THE SOUTHBAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENT (SBCCOG) FIBER NETWORK AND DIRECT STAFF TO SUBMIT THE LETTER OF COMMITMENT.

City Manager Jeng discussed joining the Southbay Cities Council of Government (SBCCOG) Fiber Network. On July 2019, the Southbay Cities Council of Government contracted with American Dark Fiber to provide a broadband network for its 16 member cities and unincorporated communities. ADF is engaged to build a fiber ring that will connect the Southbay cities and become member cities Internet Service Provider. Bandwidth starts with 1 gigabit service. ADF will price protect by including automatic price reviews as additional buildings get connected to the network or after set periods have elapses. She stated that the City currently uses
Cox Business as its Internet Service Provider with 10 Mb service for $80 per month and at this speed staff often experiences interruptions when downloading and/or uploading large files. This becomes problematic when staff is responding to a Public Records Request.

City Manager Jeng pointed out that in order to join the SBCCOG Fiber Network, ADF would construct a lateral line from City Hall to the fiber network ring and would absorb the capital to construct the lateral line as the COG received approval from Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) to use Regional Measure M transportation funds to build the ring network and laterals for member cities. The City can connect to the fiber network system at a later time but then the City would be responsible for the cost of the lateral line.

Discussion ensued with Councilmembers at the possibility of having better Internet connection within the City and (free) Wi-Fi on City Hall campus.

Mayor Pro Tem Pieper moved that the City Council approve the item as presented. Councilmember Black seconded the motion and the motion carried without objection by a voice vote as follows:

AYES: COUNCILMEMBERS: Mayor Mirisch, Pieper, Dieringer, Black, and Wilson.
NOES: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSTAIN: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.

C. DESIGNATE VOTING DELEGATE AND ALTERNATE TO THE LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES ANNUAL CONFERENCE OCTOBER 16-18 TO BE HELD IN LONG BEACH, CA.

City Manager Jeng asked the City Council if they could designate a voting delegate and an alternate delegate to participate in the League of California Cities 2019 Annual Conference on October 16-18, to be held in Long Beach, CA. At this meeting, the League membership considers and takes action on resolutions that establish League Policy.

It was decided by Council that Councilmember Bea Dieringer will serve as voting delegate and Councilmember Patrick Wilson will serve as alternate voting delegate. Staff was directed to fill out the voting delegate/alternate form and mail to the League.

D. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF A LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR THE CITY OF RANCHO PALOS VERDES’ PROPOSED RESOLUTION FOR THE LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES 2019 ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON USING UTILITY UNDERGROUNDING AS AN EFFORT TO PREVENT/MINIMIZE WILDFIRES.

City Manager Jeng reported that the City of RPV contacted her to request a support letter for a proposed Resolution to the League of California Cities for the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to amend the eligibility of funds of Rule 20A to add projects in the Very
High Fire Hazard Severity Zone and to increase the funding allocation to make more projects possible. She stated that RPV received support letters from several other cities. She stated that at this time this effort is not coordinated with CPUC, however through the League of California Cities, the urging of CPUC to act on this matter can be folded into the rulemaking process of the CPUC.

Councilmember Black moved that the City Council approve the item as presented. Mayor Pro Tem Pieper seconded the motion and the motion carried without objection by a voice vote as follows:

NOES: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.
ABSTAIN: COUNCILMEMBERS: None.

9. MATTERS FROM THE CITY COUNCIL AND MEETING ATTENDANCE REPORTS

A. DISCUSS A JOINT SEWER MAIN PROJECT WITH THE CITY OF RANCHO PALOS VERDES (ORAL)

City Manager Jeng reported that she and Councilmember Wilson and Mayor Mirsch met with Councilmembers Dyda and Cruikshank and staff from Rancho Palos Verdes. The City of Rancho Palos Verdes is currently preparing a study on how to mitigate the landslide area in their City, a portion of which lies south of the landslide area of Rolling Hills. She stated that according to RPV, it is believed that the earth movement is caused by water infiltration, which includes water from septic systems and surface discharges. All of the Flying Triangle area, which is considered the landslide area of the City is on septic systems. She stated that the group discussed construction of a sewer line that would run through the properties in Rolling Hills and Rancho Palos Verdes and that the first step would be to prepare a feasibility study for the project. City Manager Jeng also stated that members of the RPV City Council mentioned that they would contribute to the feasibility study of a sewer line in Rolling Hills.

Councilmember Black inquired about how much money does the city need to begin a study or the project.

City Manager Jeng stated that these discussions are very preliminary and that they will continue in the future.

B. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATION FOR A WORK PLAN TO UPDATE THE CITY’S EMPLOYEE HANDBOOK AND PERSONNEL POLICY MANUAL.

City Manager Jeng went over the recommendations the Personnel Committee discussed when they meet on July 23, 2019. It was pointed out that the Personnel Committee recommended for
the City Manager's office to update the job specifications and salaries for all positions with the assistance of the City Attorney's Office. Also, to clarify the role Finance Department

City Manager Jeng noted currently all grievances are filed with her but in the rare case that someone would have a grievance about her, she would like for a third party to handle said grievance on her behalf to make sure staff feel comfortable with the process. The Personnel Committee recommended that the committee serves in that capacity.

Discussion ensued among Council to include the City of Carson as part of the salary study.

10. MATTERS FROM STAFF


Planning Director Schwartz gave overview of code enforcement activities log, specifically looking at fire fuel cases. She stated that between April 1, 2019 and July 31, 2019, the City received and/or observed 12 dead vegetation violations. 12 violations were resolved, some from prior quarters. 14 cases are outstanding from the inception of the program on July 1, 2018. Planning Director Schwartz pointed out that since the start of the pro-active code enforcement program for fire fuel management, the City obtained arborist opinions on 4 cases.

Councilmember Wilson pointed out his property was listed and his issue was resolved, however it was not shaded properly. He asked for it to be corrected.

B. PRESENTATION ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CITY'S NEW WEBSITE (ORAL).

City Manager Jeng gave a brief power point presentation on the city’s new website and pointed out the different layout of the city’s information. For example, the new website will have a Mayor’s Corner box where the Mayor can post upcoming events. City Manager Jeng also stated that the current photos displayed are not the photos that are going to be used but simply a place holder. The city did have a photographer come into the city and take photos that will be used for the city’s new website.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business before the City Council, Mayor Mirsch adjourned the meeting in memory of community members Bill Horn and Frank Gargas at 8:50 p.m. to an adjourned meeting on August 19, 2019 at 7:00 a.m. at 13 Portuguese Bend Road. The next regular meeting of the City Council is scheduled to be held on Monday, August 26, 2019 beginning at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chamber at City Hall, 2 Portuguese Bend Road, Rolling Hills, California.
Respectfully submitted,

Yohana Coronel, MBA
City Clerk

Approved,

Leah Mirsch
Mayor
MINUTES OF
AN ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING
OF THE
CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF ROLLING HILLS, CALIFORNIA
MONDAY, AUGUST 19, 2019
7:00 am

PRESENT FOR THE FIELD TRIP WERE:

Mayor Mirsch, Councilmembers Wilson, Dieringer and Black
Councilmembers Pieper- Recused
Elaine Jeng, City Manager
Yolanta Schwartz, Planning Director
Sean Cardenas, Applicant
Dr. and Mrs. Gebhard, neighbors - 11 Portuguese Bend Road
Mr. and Mrs. William Hassoldt, neighbor 15 Portuguese Bend Road
Sue Breiholz, Caballeros president
Dave Breiholz, resident
Matt Seaburn, resident
Greg Willis, resident
Sally Swart, resident
Carol Hoffman, resident

A ZONING CASE NO. 953. Request for a Conditional Use Permit to construct a new 2,464 square foot stable with a 758 square foot tack room and an 896 square foot loft; and a Site Plan Review for 1,470 cubic yards of grading at 13 Portuguese Bend Road (Lot 77-RH) Rolling Hills, CA, (Cardenas).

Planning Director Schwartz reviewed the project and pointed out the location of the footprint of the proposed stable, loft, overhangs for turn-outs, access to the loft and the corral, and that the highest ridge of the stable will be 24’. She stated that the interior will have 4 stalls, room for storage, a tack room with a bathroom and a hayloft. She stated that the existing stable will be demolished and a new one constructed. The applicant stated that the architecture of the stable will mimic the garage; including the overhangs and that he has horses that he boards outside the City.

All present walked around the proposed stable to view the structure. In response to Mayor Mirsch, the applicant stated that this is the best location and configuration for the stable, as anything different would require more grading, would have a larger footprint, and locating it closer to the street would eliminate a good portion of the riding rink.
Dr. Gebhard stated that he does not object to the use, but objects to the location and massing of the stable because it is too close to his property and visible from his bedroom windows. He asked if the stable could be moved to the front of the lot. In response to Mayor Mirsch, Caballeros president Breiholz stated that the location of the stable in the rear of the lot is more desirable, leaving the riding rink where it is. Sally Swart and Matt Seaburn concurred.

Councilmember Black inquired about the utility lines and the poles in the easement between the properties. Planning Director Schwartz stated that none of the poles serve the applicant’s property and that all of his structures are undergrounded.

Discussion ensued regarding easements and the three-rail fences. The applicant stated that he proposes to install new fencing along the corral and the easement.

In response regarding screening of the stable, the applicant stated that he does not have room on his property to plant along the north side of the stable (facing Gebhards), because any planting would either have to be in the side easement or too close to the horses. He stated that the Gebhards planted bamboo plants along their easement line, but have removed some of them just before the field trip.

Everyone walked over to Dr. and Mrs. Gebhard’s property to view the silhouette from their perspective. As requested by the Gebhards, everyone stood along the south side of the residence looking towards the proposed stable. Mrs. Gebhard reiterated that the project is too large and when looking from her bedroom she would see a tall wall.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Hearing no further business before the City Council, Mayor Mirsch adjourned the meeting at 8:00 a.m. to a regular meeting of the City Council to be held on Monday, August 26, 2019 beginning at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chamber at City Hall, 2 Portuguese Bend Road, Rolling Hills, California.

Respectfully submitted,

Yolanta Schwartz
Planning Director

Approved,

Leah Mirsch
Mayor
DRAFT
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#### 8/26/2019 CHECK RUN B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHECK NO.</th>
<th>CHECK DATE</th>
<th>PAYEE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26019</td>
<td>8/12/2019</td>
<td>Maureen Kane &amp; Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>TECHNICAL TRAINING FOR CLERKS</td>
<td>1,550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26038</td>
<td>8/25/2019</td>
<td>Abila</td>
<td>AUGUST 2019 SERVICES</td>
<td>175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26039</td>
<td>8/25/2019</td>
<td>Best Best &amp; Krieger LLP</td>
<td>JULY 2019 SERVICES - LAND USE</td>
<td>12,780.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26040</td>
<td>8/26/2019</td>
<td>Best Best &amp; Krieger LLP</td>
<td>JULY 2019 SERVICES - CITY OF ROLLING HILLS</td>
<td>2,014.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26041</td>
<td>8/26/2019</td>
<td>Best Best &amp; Krieger LLP</td>
<td>JULY 2019 SERVICES - VIEW PRESERVATION</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26042</td>
<td>8/26/2019</td>
<td>The Gas Company</td>
<td>USAGE 7/9/19 TO 8/7/19</td>
<td>40.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26043</td>
<td>8/26/2019</td>
<td>Konica Minolta Business Solutions USA Inc.</td>
<td>JULY 2019 MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT</td>
<td>265.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26044</td>
<td>8/26/2019</td>
<td>LA County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>JULY 2019 LAW ENFORCEMENT SERVICES</td>
<td>29,654.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26045</td>
<td>8/26/2019</td>
<td>Opus Bank</td>
<td>JULY 2019 CREDIT CARD EXPENSES</td>
<td>5,051.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26046</td>
<td>8/26/2019</td>
<td>Providence Health &amp; Services</td>
<td>PREEMPLOYMENT SCREENING SERVICES</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26048</td>
<td>8/26/2019</td>
<td>Southern California Edison</td>
<td>USAGE 7/18/19 TO 8/16/19</td>
<td>1,083.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26049</td>
<td>8/26/2019</td>
<td>Western Audio Visual</td>
<td>INSTALLATION AND TRAINING SERVICES</td>
<td>6,758.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26050</td>
<td>8/26/2019</td>
<td>Wildan Inc.</td>
<td>MAY 2019 SERVICES - B&amp;S PLAN CHECK</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26051</td>
<td>9/1/2019</td>
<td>Delta Dental</td>
<td>SEPTEMBER 2019 DENTAL INSURANCE</td>
<td>697.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26052</td>
<td>9/1/2019</td>
<td>Standard Insurance Company</td>
<td>SEPTEMBER 2019 INSURANCE</td>
<td>382.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26053</td>
<td>9/1/2019</td>
<td>Vision Service Plan - (CA)</td>
<td>SEPTEMBER 2019 VISION INSURANCE</td>
<td>112.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>9/1/2019</td>
<td>CALPERS</td>
<td>HEALTH INSURANCE SEPTEMBER 2019</td>
<td>7,940.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* PR LINK</td>
<td>8/16/2019</td>
<td>PR LINK - PAYROLL PROCESSING</td>
<td>PROCESSING FEE</td>
<td>53.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* PR LINK</td>
<td>8/16/2019</td>
<td>PR LINK - PAYROLL &amp; PR TAXES</td>
<td>PAY PERIOD - JULY 17, 2019 THROUGH JULY 30, 2019</td>
<td>18,271.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $87,256.93

---

1. Elaine Jeng, City Manager of Rolling Hills, California certify that the above demands are accurate and there is available in the General Fund a balance of $87,256.93 or the payment of above items.

Elaine Jeng, P.E., City Manager

08/22/2019
# CITY OF ROLLING HILLS RESIDENTIAL ALLIED WASTE RECYCLE NOW REPORT

## Report Date:

### 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH 2019</th>
<th>RECYCLED (tons)</th>
<th>GREEN WASTE (tons)</th>
<th>C&amp;D Recycled</th>
<th>C&amp;D Disposed</th>
<th>Disposal Tonnage</th>
<th>Diversion %</th>
<th>MONTHLY TOTALS (tons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>23.07</td>
<td>114.12</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>137.12</td>
<td>51.07%</td>
<td>295.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>15.09</td>
<td>98.95</td>
<td>33.37</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>122.07</td>
<td>53.30%</td>
<td>276.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>67.62</td>
<td>92.91</td>
<td>23.36</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>91.16</td>
<td>64.51%</td>
<td>285.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>170.26</td>
<td>112.64</td>
<td>56.93</td>
<td>68.18</td>
<td>75.37%</td>
<td>508.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>156.77</td>
<td>27.12</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>60.18%</td>
<td>385.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>85.23</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>149.81</td>
<td>49.70%</td>
<td>304.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td>125.59</td>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>154.38</td>
<td>50.25%</td>
<td>320.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year to Date Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>336.04</strong></td>
<td><strong>843.83</strong></td>
<td><strong>229.13</strong></td>
<td><strong>92.97</strong></td>
<td><strong>872.72</strong></td>
<td><strong>59.33%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,374.69</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Monthly Totals:**

|          | 2019 | 48.01 | 120.55 | 32.73 | 13.28 | 124.67 | 58% | 339.24 |
TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL
FROM: TERRY SHEA, FINANCE DIRECTOR
THRU: ELAINE JENG P.E., CITY MANAGER
DATE: AUGUST 26, 2019

ATTACHMENTS:
1. SCHEDULE OF INVESTMENTS
2. DASH BOARD REPORT CARD
3. INVESTMENT ALLOCATIONS SUMMARY REPORT BY QUARTER

Attached you will find the City’s quarterly investment report for review. Pursuant to the City Council’s direction, it is agendized under “Matters from Staff” in order that it receives an appropriate level of review by the City Council.

Below are Cash and Yield comparative data from the fourth quarter as of June 30, 2019 to the third quarter as of March 31, 2019 and Year to Date Interest Income comparative data from the fourth quarter as of June 30, 2019 to the fourth quarter as of June 30, 2018. The Portfolio has been diversified by investment instrument and maturity between Money Market, LAIF, and FDIC insured Certificates of Deposits.

Also, the CalPERS CERBT Strategy 1 OPEB Irrevocable Trust results for the fourth quarter as of June 30, 2019 and Fiscal Year to Date FY 2018/2019.
Cash & Yield Comparative Data 4th Quarter FY 2018/2019 to 3rd Quarter FY 2018/2019:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4th Quarter FY 2018/19</th>
<th>3rd Quarter FY 2018/19</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Deposits</td>
<td>$7,169,903</td>
<td>$6,832,778</td>
<td>$337,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactive Deposits</td>
<td>42,098</td>
<td>(31,912)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cash</td>
<td>$7,212,001</td>
<td>$6,800,866</td>
<td>$411,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio Yield at Cost</td>
<td>2.320%</td>
<td>2.219%</td>
<td>0.101%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YTD Interest Income Comparative Data 4th Quarter FY 2018/2019 to 4th Quarter FY 2017/2018:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4th Quarter FY 2018/19</th>
<th>4th Quarter FY 2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Interest - Budget</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$57,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total YTD Interest Earned</td>
<td>137,945</td>
<td>89,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over (Under) Budget</td>
<td>$37,945</td>
<td>$32,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Annual Budget</td>
<td>137.95%</td>
<td>157.76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CalPERS CERBT Strategy 1 OPEB Irrevocable Trust results for the fourth quarter as of June 30, 2019 and Fiscal Year to Date FY 2018/2019:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4th Quarter FY 2018/19</th>
<th>Fiscal YTD FY 2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>$604,136</td>
<td>$583,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Earnings</td>
<td>20,335</td>
<td>41,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Expense</td>
<td>(129)</td>
<td>(499)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Balance</td>
<td>$624,342</td>
<td>$624,342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Original Contribution December 2011 $354,733.

We are pleased to answer any questions you may have.

YC

Investment Report cover memo.doc
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TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL
FROM: YOLANTA SCHWARTZ, PLANNING DIRECTOR
THROUGH: ELAINE JENG, P.E. CITY MANAGER

SUBJECT: ZONING CASE NO. 953, REQUEST FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A NEW 2,464 SQUARE FOOT STABLE WITH AN 896 SQUARE FOOT LOFT AND A SITE PLAN REVIEW FOR 1,470 CUBIC YARDS OF GRADING FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT AT 13 PORTUGUESE BEND ROAD (LOT 77-RH) ROLLING HILLS, CA, (CARDENAS).

ATTACHMENT:
1. NEIGHBORS’ CORRESPONDENCE
2. APPLICANT’S CORRESPONDENCE
3. STABLES COMPARISON CHART

BACKGROUND

On June 25, 2019, the Planning Commission granted a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and a Site Plan Review (SPR) in Zoning Case No. 953.

At the July 8, 2019 City Council meeting, following a report from staff on the Planning Commission’s action, the City Council took the case under jurisdiction. The project entails a request to construct a 2,464 square foot stable with 896 square foot loft and to grade 1,470 cubic yards of dirt. An existing 1,505 square foot stable would be demolished, which is generally located in the area of the proposed stable.

Pursuant to Chapter 17.54 of the Rolling Hills Municipal Code, review hearing for cases taken under jurisdiction by the City Council shall be conducted as de novo hearings. The City Council visited the project in the field on August 19, 2019 and continued the
hearing to August 26, 2019. At the field trip discussion ensued regarding the height of the proposed stable as well as its location. Dr. and Mrs. Gebhard, neighbors at 11 Portuguese Bend Road stated that they are not against the construction of the stable, but would like it to be located at the front of the property, out of their view. Several residents stated that the proposed location is more suitable to equestrian uses, with a large corral/riding rink in the front.

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

The property is zoned RAS-1 and the gross lot area excluding is 2.12 acres. For development purposes the net lot area of the lot is 79,761 square feet or 1.83 acres.

The property is currently developed with 3,436 square foot residence, 1,213 square foot detached garage, 1,335 square feet porches, 565 square foot swimming pool & spa and a 1,505 square feet stable with approximately 12,000 square foot corral, a portion of which is located in the front setback, which is a legal non-conforming condition.

PROPOSED PROJECT

The applicant requests a Site Plan Review to grade 1,470 cubic yards of dirt, total cut and fill. The grading will consist of excavating material from the demolition of the existing stable and smoothing it out on the pad. The elevation of the project will not change from the current elevation of the existing uses.

A Conditional Use Permit is also requested to construct a 2,464 square foot stable, which includes a 702 square foot tack room and 56 square foot bathroom, plus 1,024 square feet of stable covered porches, and an 896 square foot loft. The first story would contain four horse stalls, tack room with a bathroom and agricultural storage areas. The stable is proposed to have a center isle with a loft for feed/hay storage above it. No other uses are proposed in the loft. Outside stairs will lead to the loft area.

Agricultural spaces include 4 stalls, storage and tool rooms and will be 71% of the size of the structure. 702 sq.ft. tack room (plus 56 sq.ft. bathroom) is proposed, which will cover 29% of the structure; whereas maximum permitted is 800 square feet, not exceeding 40% of the total structure.

The applicant proposes to retain the existing corral but demolish the existing stable (single-story, 1,505 square feet). There is a 100 square foot shed next to the existing stable, located inside setback that will also be demolished.

MUNICIPAL CODE COMPLIANCE

Grading
As stated, previously, the total combined grading for this project will consist of 1,470 cubic yards of cut and fill. No dirt will be exported, as it will be balanced on site.
Disturbance
All work is proposed to be conducted within the previously disturbed portion of the lot. The existing legal non-conforming disturbed area is 67.1%. No variance is needed.

Height
The height of the highest ridgeline of the proposed stable will be 24 feet. Two cupolas above the highest ridge are also proposed.

Drainage
The rear of the property drains into the rear canyon and the front drainage to the front of the property. The existing drainage direction on the property is not anticipated to change, but will be reviewed by the Building Department drainage and grading engineer. Applicant will be required to implement storm water management and erosion control measures as required by the Building Code.

Lot Coverage
The structural coverage on the lot, once the proposed project is included would be 10,497 square feet (with allowed deductions) or 13.16% (in conformance with the 20% max. permitted). The total lot coverage (structural and flatwork) is proposed to be 21,637 square feet overall (with allowed deductions) or 27.13% (in conformance with the 35% max. permitted). This is an increase from the current coverage by 3.85%

The residential building pad is 24,360 square feet. The residential building pad coverage exists at 6,909 square feet or 28.36%, (30% guideline). The coverage includes the residence, detached garage, porches, swimming pool & spa, pool equipment, and service yard structures.

The stable building pad is proposed to be 12,170 square feet with proposed pad coverage of 3,342 square feet (with allowable deductions) or 27.46% (30% guideline).

Stable Access
Stable access is proposed for vehicles off the main driveway. There are two paths of access for horses; from the rear of the property off Blackwater Canyon Trail or from the easement that runs along the corral off of Portuguese Bend Road. Access to the loft will be taken from exterior staircase.

Utility Lines / Septic Tank
All utility lines to the proposed structure will be placed underground.

The applicant will be required to comply with the requirements of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health regarding the septic tank.
Environmental Review
The project has been determined to be categorically exempt pursuant to Class 3, Section 15303 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines.

NEIGHBORS’ INPUT

Dr. and Mrs. Gebhard of 11 Portuguese Bend Road, object to the project on the basis that it is too massive, looming over their house, it is too large and too close to their residence and pool and that their privacy, air and light will be diminished. However, they would not object to the stable, if it were located closer to the front of the property, out of their view. Dr. Gebhard attended all of the meetings and submitted several letters; the latest one dated July 3, 2019. A memo included with the February 13, 2019 letter questions whether any improper communication transpired between the Commissioners and therefore resulted in violation of Dr. Gebhard’s civil rights. He also questioned the fairness of the proceedings and objectivity, given that the applicant is a commissioner and that he was allowed to speak on his own behalf and that the other recused commissioner also spoke in support of the project. Assistant City Attorney, Jane Abzug, responded to the inquiries at the meetings of January 15 and June 25, 2019 and opined that it was proper for the remaining commissioners to review the project and that the recused commissioners can participate as resident and/or as applicant. Further, after questioning the Commissioners regarding their interaction and communication on this project, she opined that no violations occurred.

At the City Council meeting on July 8, 2019 a neighbor at 15 Portuguese Bend Road expressed concerns about other matters on 13 Portuguese Bend Road and requested that the City Council not consider this project until the issue of removal of an utility line and easement encroachments by the applicant at the south side of the property are addressed. There is a dispute between the neighbors regarding trenching for placement of utility lines and about easements.

City received a letter from Mr. Willis, property owner at 9 Portuguese Bend Road in support of the project.

The applicant provided correspondence for the July 8, 2019 City Council meeting asking for approval of the project.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Following the field trip on August 19, 2019, Mayor Mirsch requested that staff provide information on heights of other 2-story stables in the City. Such list is included with this report.
RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the City Council continue the public hearing, take public testimony and provide direction to staff. Following public input and discussion, the City Council could consider the following options:

1. Direct staff to prepare a resolution upholding the Planning Commission’s action on the proposal;
2. Direct staff to prepare a resolution overturning the Planning Commission’s action on the proposal;
3. Direct staff to prepare a resolution modifying the Planning Commission’s action on the proposal; or
4. Direct staff to prepare a resolution remanding the application back to the Planning Commission for further review and direction.

Applicant’s Justification
The applicant states the following in regards to the project:

"[The applicant is] building a new barn with a hay loft to replace [the] existing barn as allowed per Zoning Code 17.16.210.A.4. The new barn/stable will include the desired features for equestrian use including run-ins, tack room, hay storage and stalls.
The proposed conditional use is consistent with the current use and the General Plan. The proposed stable will be used for equestrian purposes and will meet all requirements for the CUP.
The surrounding lots all (11,14 & 15 PBR & 1 Lower Blackwater) have been developed in a similar manner with stables. The adjacent structure at 11 PBR is also a stable.
The proposed stable will be located in the same area as the existing stable and will not require any variances.
All applicable development standards are being met by keeping the size, location, design and disturbance within the standards”.

SITE PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA

17.46.010  Purpose.

The site plan review process is established to provide discretionary review of certain development projects in the City for the purposes of ensuring that the proposed project is consistent with the City’s General Plan; incorporates environmentally and aesthetically sensitive grading practices; preserves existing mature vegetation; is compatible and consistent with the scale, massing and development pattern in the immediate project vicinity; and otherwise preserves and protects the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Rolling Hills.
17.46.050 Required findings.

A. The Commission shall be required to make findings in acting to approve, conditionally approve, or deny a site plan review application.

B. No project which requires site plan review approval shall be approved by the Commission, or by the City Council on appeal, unless the following findings can be made:

1. The project complies with and is consistent with the goals and policies of the general plan and all requirements of the zoning ordinance;

2. The project substantially preserves the natural and undeveloped state of the lot by minimizing building coverage. Lot coverage requirements are regarded as maximums, and the actual amount of lot coverage permitted depends upon the existing buildable area of the lot;

3. The project is harmonious in scale and mass with the site, the natural terrain and surrounding residences;

4. The project preserves and integrates into the site design, to the greatest extent possible, existing topographic features of the site, including surrounding native vegetation, mature trees, drainage courses and land forms (such as hillsides and knolls);

5. Grading has been designed to follow natural contours of the site and to minimize the amount of grading required to create the building area;

6. Grading will not modify existing drainage channels nor redirect drainage flow, unless such flow is redirected into an existing drainage course;

7. The project preserves surrounding native vegetation and mature trees and supplements these elements with drought-tolerant landscaping which is compatible with and enhances the rural character of the community, and landscaping provides a buffer or transition area between private and public areas;

8. The project is sensitive and not detrimental to the convenient and safe movement of pedestrians and vehicles; and

9. The project conforms to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT:

17.42.050 Basis for approval or denial of conditional use permit.

The Commission (and Council on appeal), in acting to approve a conditional use permit application, may impose conditions as are reasonably necessary to ensure the project is consistent with the General Plan, compatible with surrounding land use, and meets the provisions and intent of this title. In making such a determination, the hearing body shall find that the proposed use is in general accord with the following principles and standards:

A. That the proposed conditional use is consistent with the General Plan;

B. That the nature, condition and development of adjacent uses, buildings and structures have been considered, and that the use will not adversely affect or be materially detrimental to these adjacent uses, building or structures;
C. That the site for the proposed conditional use is of adequate size and shape to accommodate the use and buildings proposed;
D. That the proposed conditional use complies with all applicable development standards of the zone district;
E. That the proposed use is consistent with the portions of the Los Angeles County Hazardous Waste Management Plan relating to siting and siting criteria for hazardous waste facilities;
F. That the proposed conditional use observes the spirit and intent of this title.

SOURCE: City of Rolling Hills Zoning Ordinance
MEMORANDUM TO RECUSE

TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

FROM: Yolanta Schwartz, Planning Director

SUBJECT: Zoning Case No. 953
13 Portuguese Bend Road

DATE: August 26, 2019

Due to the proximity of the property of Councilmember Pieper to the subject property, Councilmember Pieper should recuse himself from consideration of Zoning Case No. 953 at 13 Portuguese Bend Road. He may, however, take a seat in the audience and participate as a resident.
David L. Dennee  
1 Lower Blackwater Canyon Road  
Rolling Hills, CA 90274  
August 22, 2019

City Council  
City of Rolling Hills

Dear Council,

Please enter my comments into the file regarding the proposed barn project at #13 Portuguese Bend Road.

We live at 1 Lower Blackwater Canyon Road directly across the canyon from the proposed barn as well as the project is on either side of the property at #13.

We moved to Rolling Hills for the rural environment and love the fencing, barns, and all associated ranch additions. The proposed new barn project is going to be built within the proper boundaries with all of the correct codes and guidelines being asked to. I’m concerned if an architect is hired and told to keep the projected building within all the given parameters, and then there are objections this far down the road, then why have any guidelines at all??

I want to see this project move forward and it will only enhance the neighborhood, adding additional value and credibility to the concept of maintaining a horsey environment.

Thank you for the opportunity of letting me express my opinion. Hopefully with all the positive input from many surrounding property owners, this project will be allowed to move forward with no additional delays.

Sincerely,

David L. Dennee

[Signature]

RECEIVED
AUG 23 2019
City of Rolling Hills

9/21
Subject: Fwd:
Date: Tuesday, July 23, 2019 at 9:22:05 AM Pacific Daylight Time
From: Elaine Jeng <ejeng@cityofrh.net>
To: Yolanta Schwartz <ys@cityofrh.net>

Yolanta,

Please respond to Greg's request.

Elaine

Begin forwarded message:

From: Greg Willis <gwillis@airleasecorp.com>
Date: July 22, 2019 at 6:56:03 PM PDT
To: "ejeng@cityofrh.net" <ejeng@cityofrh.net>

Dear Elaine,

Hope all is well. My name is Greg Willis and I live at 9 Portugese Bend Road in Rolling Hills. Had heard that there is an upcoming meeting on August 12th. My understanding is that the Cardenas’ barn will be a topic for discussion. Unfortunately I will be in Alabama, but I wanted to make sure that my strong support of the project is heard, as this project appears to be 100% within the code. Could you please let me know if there is a way for me to dial into the meeting, as I would like to be heard. Alternatively I can also write a letter in support of the project as well, but I do have concerns that a letter might be overlooked. I would appreciate it if you could let me know the best way that we can express our strong support of the project.

Best regards
Greg

Gregory B. Willis
Executive Vice President
Chief Financial Officer
Air Lease Corporation
2000 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1000N
Los Angeles, CA 90067
T. (310) 553-0555
JULY 3, 2019

TO: MEMBERS OF THE ROLLING HILLS CITY COUNCIL

RE: ZONING CASE NO. 953
13 PORTUGUESE BEND ROAD
SEAN CARDENAS

We are respectfully requesting that Zoning Case No. 953, approved by the Planning Commission on 06/25/19, be taken under the Jurisdiction of the Rolling Hills City Council.

The process leading to its’ approval in the Planning Commission has been awkward, at best, taking over six months and requiring the recusal of two of the five Planning Commissioners.

We have expressed to the Planning Commission our deep concerns regarding the negative impact this project will have on our privacy, well being and property values. The size and mass of the proposed barn with its’ close proximity to our living space is out of character with other structures in Rolling Hills.

We feel we have suggested remedies for resolving some of our concerns such as moving the location of the proposed barn on the Cardenas property.

The Planning Commission has had a deaf-ear to our concerns with no suggestions from them to mitigate those concerns.

Sincerely,

John F Gebhard
Jayne Gebhard

HAND DELIVERED
February 13, 2019

VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL TO CITY CLERK

Dear Rolling Hills Planning Commission Members,

This is our third letter to you regarding Zoning Case 953. It should be included as an extension of the previous concerns to us in regard to the proposed barn. We will try not to restate those concerns in this letter, but they are still valid from our perspective. Those letters were dated 12/3/2018 and 1/8/2019 and are attached.

We do have additional concerns regarding the present presented plans in addition to those in our two previous letters to you. They would include:

--Septic system issues in light of the proposed toilet

--Lighting issue considering the size of the barn

--issues with activity at the barn with regard to potential boarders

In a broader sense, we are more concerned with the general concept problems, which we feel, were not addressed in the previous Planning Commission meetings and field trips. The first is the mass, size, and height of the barn. Under section 1v.46.050 Required findings 3. “The project is harmonious in scale and mass with the site, the natural terrain and surrounding residences “. There is nothing harmonious or in the scale of the surrounding neighborhood. This barn is two stories and approaching 2/3rd the size of the house on its’ lot or my house for that matter. There are not any two level structures anywhere nearby.
Under 1v.42.050 Basis for approval or denial of conditional use permit: "that nature, condition, and development of adjacent uses, buildings and structures have been considered, and the use will not adversely affect or be materially detrimental to theses adjacent uses, buildings or structures. "While the planning commission has told me repeatedly that the project will increase my property value, I am in procession of at least one realtor’s opinion that it will decrease my property value. It interferes with my light, airflow and privacy. It will negatively effect my quality of life and property value.

Under the Ad Hoc Report on Location of Stables-bullet point three: “Proximity to any neighbor’s livable structures should be taken into account. Stables are encouraged to be placed away from neighboring uses as much as feasible.” This barn directly affects my patio and two of our bedrooms. It was suggested during the field trip by a commissioner that the whole barn could be placed to the east to front Portuguese Bend Rd. That would mitigate some of my issues with my bedroom and patio living. During the Planning Commission meeting there was absolutely no attempt to try to rectify in any way our needs.

Finally, the fact that two of the Commissioners had to recuse themselves on this case has to again be visited. I don’t feel my concerns and needs were heard at all by the Planning Commission. I have little doubt that this project will be approved at the meeting scheduled Feb 19 but would hope that the City Council would take it under its’ consideration and revisit the whole process. I would expect not to have to pay a fee to appeal this case considering the facts. I have attached a Memorandum forwarded to the City Clerk for all your consideration.

Sincerely

Jayne and John Gebhard
MEMORANDUM

To: City Clerk of the City of Rolling Hills for Distribution to Affected Members of the Planning Commission, and Whomever Else as Appropriate

From: Dr. John Gebhard, Affected Neighbor

Date: February 12, 2019

Re: Zoning Cse No. 953 - 13 Portuguese Road

Hello Honorable Members of the Planning Commission,

I want to share with you a conversation I had with a patient of mine, a retired former city attorney. Being on inactive status, he could not represent me and made it clear he was not giving me legal advice. But, we had an interesting discussion.

"The obvious gorilla in the room," he said."is the Civil Rights Act." He went on to say most people see the Civil Rights Act as stuff related to race. Well, according to him, it's not. He says the Act says any person under color of law who deprives any other person of a right guaranteed by the Constitution violates the civil rights of that person.

"Obviously," he went on to say, "you have the Constitutional right to a fair hearing. Equally obvious is the fact that the members of Planning Commissions are acting under color of law when conducting public hearings."

He said in my case he saw the potential of real risk in the voting members of the Planning Commission. There's the reasonable suspicion they had to vote for their Planning Commission buddy. In the ordinary course of human events, buddies want to help buddies. When that happens, warning flags are raised.

He reminisced about his mentor and warning flags. As his mentor would say: "Don't worry about the red flags, the police and prosecutors will take care of them. Beware of flags painted tainted."
He went on and said it's all about a fair hearing and the right to contest any facts or feelings used by the trier of fact in reaching a decision. "With reference to your case," he said, "do you have a right to know if and what the presumed buddies talked about in the hallway, or over drinks, or in the car on the way to the meeting, if such are the facts? It's a constant battle. The continuing issue is what must be disclosed in writing or orally at public hearings so it can be contested by the Applicant."

I pointed out that the City said the Application complied with all the rules. I asked, "If all the rules were complied with, how can a buddy help a buddy?"

His answer was that if all that was to be discussed at the hearing was compliance with the rules then the Commissioner should be replaced by a computer. The computer is better at identifying rules. The computer knows rules the Commissioner never heard of. If such were the case, every other Tuesday a couple computers could meet and make decisions. In fact it's more than rule compliance.

He pointed out if there were not areas of discretion at Planning Commission hearings, why are they having a hearing? He said there are probably some guidelines concerning quality-of-life in the Ordinance that needs be decided. He said he would tell his Planning Commissions the goal is their decisions be based only upon the evidence presented at the hearing. Obviously that standard is seldom reached 100%, but when it's "painted tainted," you must pay attention. Wariness is essential. You may have crossed the line. You may have unintentionally violated somebody's civil rights. He said violation of the Civil Rights Act can result in actual and punitive damages against the City and individual violators. Attorney's fees are granted to the prevailing party. Courts don't like violation of Civil Rights. Violators shine like bullies at trials. "It's serious stuff," he added.

"The good news for Planning Commissioners," he said, "is they can get protection from
the city attorney. If they seek the city attorney's advice and follow it, they have protection. The liability is on the city attorney, assuming the Commissioners fully disclose to the city attorney."

I'm not sure I'm fully aware of all of the gray areas, but I assure you, I don't want my civil rights violated, any more than you would want your civil rights violated.

In that context, in the exercise my rights as a citizen of the City of Rolling Hills, I request the issues of a fair hearing in this matter be referred to the city attorney for full review through meetings with the planning commissioners and staff and whomever, and a written opinion be submitted to the appropriate parties by the city attorney.

Respectfully Submitted

[Signature]

John Gebhard
January 8, 2019

HAND DELIVERED

ROLLING HILLS PLANNING COMMISSION
C/O Julia Stewart

Dear Ms. Stewart,

This letter is in follow-up to, and in addition to my letter to you dated December 3, 2018. I have attached a copy of my previous letter for your reference. In addition to our three principal concerns outlined in that letter, we have expanded and added additional concerns now that the proposed site of construction has been flagged over this past weekend.

The size and height of the proposed structure has even more mass than conjured up from the drawn plans. There is absolutely no doubt that the structure will impact and limit the light entering the entire South-side of our home. There is little doubt the structure will impact and limit the air flowing into the South -side of our home.

We are concerned that the increased square-footage of the structure will have a negative impact on the water-drainage from the South-side of the hill which is always a problem during even moderate rains.
We are particularly concerned that from a Planning Commission of five individuals, two had to recuse themselves from the process of evaluating this project. The potential conflict that here is suspicious to say the least.

We understand that while the structure may have met the building requirements of the City of Rolling Hills, it does not fit the Community. Where is there another property in the city where anyone's home is adjacent to a Two-story building? This structure is at least 35 feet above our property elevation. It looks directly down on our bedrooms, bathroom and patio and pool. It will greatly affect our privacy.

Mr. Seabourne, the recused commissioner, during the comment period of the December 12 meeting stated that he supported the project because it would increase his property values if approved. I have absolutely no doubt it will do the same to my home's value. Put this structure adjacent to Mr. Seabourne's “backyard” and he would no doubt have a different perspective. The simple fact is that we are the only family negatively impacted by this project.

Finally, we have been residents of Rolling Hills since 1981. We have tried to be good citizens and good neighbors. We don't want to have Sean and Monique have a new barn, but not this concept. It's the wrong place and the wrong size.

We end, after all the negative stuff, by thanking Sean for fishing my two-year-old grand son out of our pool on a cold winter day. Where he came from we still don't know, but for that we will be eternally grateful.

Jayne and John Gebhard
Dec. 3, 2018

HAND DELIVERED

Dear Julia Stewart,

We appreciate being made aware of the process for Rolling Hills' consideration of the proposed barn construction at 13 Portuguese Bend Rd. We have three principal concerns:

The first is the proximity of the proposed barn to our property line. It appears to be ten feet closer. Is the barn as proposed within a setback area? Would a location further away be acceptable?

The second is the size and height of the barn. Twenty-five feet tall and 2700 square feet is a big barn. Again it will be closer to our house. A smaller structure would be more palatable to us.

Finally, we noted the loft area of the proposed barn has plumbing. Is the barn intended as a dwelling unit? The possibility of human habitation so close to our house is not appealing.

Would you please make the Planning Commission aware of our concern? We are happy to appear at the Planning Commission meeting scheduled next week. Thank you for your consideration.

John and Jayne Gebhard
Subject: Re: Your CC agenda item
Date: Friday, July 5, 2019 at 10:57:13 PM Pacific Daylight Time
From: Sean Cardenas <scardenas@cityofrh.net>
To: Yolanta Schwartz <ys@cityofrh.net>

Yolanta,

Please be advised that I am unable to attend the City Council Meeting on July 8th. My family and I will be out of town on vacation.

I understand that my neighbor has voiced their concern about us rebuilding our barn. However, we are simply asking for a CUP to construct a new barn in the same location as the current one. We have not asked for any variances or special considerations. Our project strictly adheres to all City, County and Community Association guidelines without exception!

Because I serve on the Planning Commission it has taken several months longer to get a draft resolution of approval. However, I am also just another resident in the City who's right to rebuild their barn should not be diminished due to my service. I urge the City Council to approve the CUP and not penalize us further for this legally conforming request.

Best Regards,
Sean
# ZONING CASE NO. 953
## COMPARISON CHART - 2 STORY STABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size - Total and Loft (if known)</th>
<th>Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed - 13 Portuguese Bend Road</td>
<td>2,464 sq.ft. first story 896 sq.ft. loft (3,360 sq.ft. total)</td>
<td>24.0’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Upper Blackwater Cyn. Rd. (in plan check)</td>
<td>504 sq.ft. first story / 240 sq.ft. loft 744 sq.ft. total</td>
<td>20.0’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Middleridge Ln. S</td>
<td>2,160 sq.ft. first story / 800 sq.ft. loft 2,960 sq.ft. total</td>
<td>23’5”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Crest Rd. East</td>
<td>1,300 sq.ft. first floor / 782 sq.ft. loft 2,082 sq.ft. total</td>
<td>21’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not planned for construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Chuckwagon Rd.</td>
<td>1,296 sq.ft. first story / 792 sq.ft. loft 2,088 sq.ft. total</td>
<td>21’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Crest Rd. W.</td>
<td>735 sq.ft. first floor / 453 sq.ft. loft 1,188 sq.ft. total</td>
<td>19’4”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Saddleback</td>
<td>650 sq.ft. total</td>
<td>17’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Crest Rd. E</td>
<td>3,456 sq.ft. first floor / 235 sq.ft. loft 3,691 sq.ft. total</td>
<td>18’5”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Middleridge Lane S.</td>
<td>700 sq.ft. first floor, 601 sq.ft. loft 1,361 sq.ft. total</td>
<td>22’1/2”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Possum Ridge</td>
<td>1,680 sq.ft. (first floor only)</td>
<td>21’6”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Portuguese Bend Rd.</td>
<td>918 sq.ft. (first floor only)</td>
<td>18’6”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Meadowlark</td>
<td>329 sq.ft. (first floor only)</td>
<td>18’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Meadowlark</td>
<td>480 sq.ft. first floor / 360 sq.ft. loft 840 sq.ft. total</td>
<td>19’6”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in plan check)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Meadowlark</td>
<td>592 sq.ft. first floor, 187 sq.ft. loft 779 sq.ft. total</td>
<td>20’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Upper Blackwater</td>
<td>935 sq.ft. (first floor only)</td>
<td>20’10”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 17.18.060 D(2) of the Rolling Hills Zoning Ordinance requires entry doorways to the stalls to be a minimum of 4’ wide and 7’6” high. Section 17.18.060 E(5) requires that the plate height for the loft not exceed 7’.
TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL
FROM: YOLANTA SCHWARTZ, PLANNING DIRECTOR
        VANESSA MUNOZ, WILLDAN ENGINEERING
THROUGH: ELAINE JENG, P.E., CITY MANAGER

SUBJECT: CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION NO. 1243, A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROLLING HILLS ACCEPTING AN OFFER OF DEDICATION AND EASEMENT RELATING TO THE SEWER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS ALONG JOHNS CANYON ROAD IN THE CITY OF ROLLING HILLS; AND


DATE: AUGUST 26, 2019

ATTACHMENTS:

1. JUNE 18, 2015 APPROVAL LETTER FROM LOS ANGELES COUNTY.
2. RESOLUTION NO. 1122 - AUTHORIZATION TO CONSTRUCT A PRIVATE SEWER LINE.
3. RESOLUTION NO. 1243 - ACCEPTING THE DEDICATION AND EASEMENT FOR A SEWER LINE.
4. RESOLUTION NO. 1244 - GRANTING CONSENT AND JURISDICTION TO THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CONSOLIDATED SEWER MAINTENANCE DISTRICT.

5. CERTIFICATE OF ACCEPTANCE

BACKGROUND

On June 25, 2012 the City of Rolling Hills adopted Resolution 1122 approving the construction of a sewer mainline along Johns Canyon Road that extended an existing mainline constructed in 2009, (which was an extension of a mainline constructed in the early 1990s). The extension serves 35 Crest Road West and 2 and 8 Johns Canyon Road. The original sewer mainline as well as the extension were built privately and are to be maintained by the Los Angeles County Sanitation District.

In September 2018, the City Council approved an agreement with Willdan Engineering to assist staff to analyze County procedures for annexation, perform all the due diligence and prepare the necessary documents for County’s approval for annexation of this project to the LA County Consolidated Sewer Maintenance District. Following some delays due to staff changes and the need to clarify easements, Willdan Engineering completed the assignment and provided City staff with appropriate documentation to report to the City Council.

DISCUSSION

The mainline extension has been completed and inspected in compliance with Los Angeles County Department of Public Works standards as documented in a letter dated June 18, 2015, which is attached. As the next step in the process and per the attached letter, it is necessary that the City of Rolling Hills formally approve the work that has been completed for the sewer improvement for the Private Contract No. 13-01 at 35 Crest Road West, 2 and 8 Johns Canyon Road and accept the dedication and easement. Thereafter, by Resolution No. 1244 the County is requested to annex the improvements for operation and maintenance. The sewer line is operational and the property owners at 35 Crest Road West, 2 and 8 Johns Canyon Road are billed directly by the Los Angeles County for maintenance. Due to the fact that the sewer line was constructed in the roadway easement of property owner at 9 Johns Canyon Road (Stone), an easement from the Stones to the City is required, which will in turn provide the Sanitation District authority to maintain and operate the line.
FISCAL IMPACT

All plan review and permit fees associated with construction of the sewer mainline extension were paid by the applicant. The applicant is also required to pay annexation fee to the County. There is no fiscal impact on the City related to adoption of the proposed Resolutions.

NOTIFICATION

The property owner of 35 Crest Road West, 2 and 8 Johns Canyon Road have been advised that this matter is on the City Council Agenda.

CONCLUSION

Approval of the dedication and easement of the sewer mainline extension and approval of the work that has been completed and accept the sewer improvements for public use and maintenance and granting consent and jurisdiction to the County of Los Angeles for the inclusion of such improvements within a County Sewer Maintenance District is consistent with the City’s past practice and support of sewer construction.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the City Council approve Resolution No. 1243 accepting the dedication and easement of an extension of sewer mainline to service 35 Crest Road, 2 and 8 Johns Canyon Road and Resolution No. 1244 granting consent and jurisdiction to the County of Los Angeles for the inclusion of three parcels within the LA County Consolidated Sewer Maintenance District.
June 18, 2015

The City Council
City of Rolling Hills
2 Portuguese Bend Road
Rolling Hills, CA 90274-5199

SANITARY SEWER IMPROVEMENTS
8 JOHNS CANYON ROAD
PRIVATE CONTRACT NO. 13-1 ROLLING HILLS
THOMAS GUIDE PAGE 832-C2

The construction of the sanitary sewer improvements for 8 Johns Canyon Road, constructed under Private Contract No. 13-1 Rolling Hills, has been completed in compliance with the plans and specifications and in a manner satisfactory to the City Engineer.

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR COUNCIL:

1. Approve the work that has been completed, and accept the sewer for public use.

Please instruct the City Clerk to send a copy of the City Council’s action on this recommendation to the City Engineer.

Should you have any questions regarding the above matters, please contact Mr. David Esfandi of this office at (626) 458-7130 or mesfandi@dpw.lacounty.gov.

Very truly yours,

GAIL FARBER
City Engineer

MDE:plg
P:\LDPUB\SUBMgmt\SEWERIMPROVE\13-1RHL-RLLLC.doc

RECEIVED
JUL 06 2015
City of Rolling Hills
By
RESOLUTION NO. 1122

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROLLING HILLS AUTHORIZING THE CONSTRUCTION OF A SEWER MAINLINE EXTENSION ALONG JOHNS CANYON ROAD

The City Council of the City of Rolling Hills does hereby resolve and order as follows:

Section 1. Mr. Richard Colyear, owner of 35 Crest Road West and 2 Johns Canyon Road and Mrs. Regina Cole, owner of 8 Johns Canyon Road ("Owners") intend to construct at their own expense a public sewer improvement along Johns Canyon Road, shown on Exhibit A attached hereto (the "Improvements").

Section 2. Such sewer line extension shall be constructed on Johns Canyon Road and be a minimum of 60 feet in a south-easterly direction from the existing manhole at Chestnut Lane and Johns Canyon Road.

Section 3. The Owners request that no other properties in the vicinity will be connected to the Improvements via laterals. Hence, at this time, there is no need to form a sanitary sewer reimbursement district for the benefit of the Owners.

Section 4. No property owner shall be permitted to connect to the Improvements by way of a lateral and no permit shall be issued for the connection of any other property to the Improvements via a lateral unless a sanitary sewer reimbursement district is formed pursuant to Chapter 13.16 of the Municipal Code providing for payment of a sewer connection charge that will provide for pro rata reimbursement to the Owners of the cost of constructing the Improvements. Upon completion of the Improvements, the Owners shall submit to the City documentation verifying the cost of construction of the sewer line to enable the City to compute the sewer connection charge should such a reimbursement district ever be formed.

Section 5. Nothing provided herein shall preclude the connection, without payment of a sewer connection charge, of a sewer mainline to the Improvements herein providing sewer service to properties within the same sewer shed (as shown in the Low Pressure Sewer Feasibility Study dated September 2008) as 2 and 8 Johns Canyon and 35 Crest Road West.

Section 6. This authorization to construct the sewer mainline extension shall expire one year from the adoption of this Resolution. Should the project not be commenced within the specified time frame, this authorization shall become null and void. For the purposes of this section, commencement shall mean that a building permit has been issued and has not been permitted to expire.

Section 7. All requirements of the Building and Construction Code, the Zoning Ordinance, and of the zone in which the subject property is located must be complied with unless otherwise set forth in this approval, or shown otherwise on an approved plan.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 25th day of June, 2012.

FRANK E. HILL
MAYOR PRO TEM

ATTEST:

HEIDI LUCE
DEPUTY CITY CLERK
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CITY OF ROLLING HILLS

I certify that the foregoing Resolution No.1122 entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROLLING HILLS AUTHORIZING THE CONSTRUCTION OF A SEWER MAINLINE EXTENSION ALONG JOHNS CANYON ROAD.

was approved and adopted at a regular meeting of the City Council on June 25, 2012 by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Councilmembers Lay, Pernell and Mayor Pro Tem Hill.

NOES: None.

ABSENT: Mayor Black (excused) and Councilmember Heinsheimer (recused).

ABSTAIN: None.

and in compliance with the laws of California was posted at the following:

Administrative Offices.

[Signature]
HEIDI LUCE
DEPUTY CITY CLERK
RESOLUTION NO. 1243

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROLLING HILLS ACCEPTING AN OFFER TO DEDICATE AND FOR THE EASEMENT RELATING TO THE SEWER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS IN THE CITY OF ROLLING HILLS

RECITALS

A. A sanitary sewer project was constructed under Private Contract No. 13-1 in the City of Rolling Hills in the Johns Canyon Road area (the “sewer system”)

B. The sewer system was extended under Private Contract No 13-1 in the vicinity of APN 7569-23-34 (35 Crest Road West), APN 7569-23-11 (2 Johns Canyon Road), and APN 7569-23-17 (8 Johns Canyon Road) in the City of Rolling Hills (the “sewer system improvement”).

C. The sewer system improvement is within the jurisdiction of the County of Los Angeles Consolidated Sewer Maintenance District (the “District”).

D. The County of Los Angeles Public Works Department (the “County”) may assume all responsibility for the operation and maintenance, including the obligation to repair or replace determined by the District to be necessary, sewer systems that are (1) within the jurisdiction of the District, (2) built in accordance with the county standards, and (3) dedicated to public use.

E. In order for the County to operate and maintain the sewer system improvement, it must be deemed to have been built in accordance with County standards and dedicated to public use.

F. The County has indicated it needs the as-built plans in order to confirm that the sewer system improvements was built in accordance with County Standards and dedicated to public use.

G. The owner has executed an offer of dedication and easement, which is attached hereto as Attachment A and filed herewith.

H. In accordance with the provisions of Government Code Section 7050, the City of Rolling Hills now desires, by the adoption of this Resolution, to accept the above-referenced offer and easement.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROLLING HILLS RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The City of Rolling Hills accepts, on behalf of the public for public use, the offer of dedication and easement attached hereto as Attachment A. The acceptance is made on the understanding that it is necessary in order for the County to assume all responsibility for operation, maintenance of the sewer system improvement, including the obligation to repair or replace it as determined by the District to be necessary.
Section 2. The City hereby requests the County of Los Angeles Consolidated Sewer Maintenance District to annex the property served by the sewer system improvement and immediately commences operation and maintenance of and assumption of responsibility for the sewer system improvement.

Section 3. The City Manager, or his designees, is authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Resolution, including but not limited to (1) causing to be recorded with the Los Angeles County Recorder’s Office a certified copy of this Resolution and executed copies of the offer and easement, (2) providing the County copies of the foregoing documents and the as-built plans for the sewer system improvement on file in the office of the City Engineer.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 26th day of August 2019

LEAH MIRSCH, MAYOR

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK
STATE OF CALIFORNIA  )
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES )  §§
CITY OF ROLLING HILLS )

The foregoing Resolution No. 1243 entitled:

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROLLING HILLS ACCEPTING AN OFFER TO DEDICATE AND FOR THE EASEMENT RELATING TO THE SEWER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS IN THE CITY OF ROLLING HILLS.

was approved and adopted at a regular meeting of the City Council on August 26, 2019 by the following roll call vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

CITY CLERK
RECORDING REQUESTED BY AND WHEN RECORDED MAIL TO:

City Clerk
City of Rolling Hills
2 Portuguese Bend Road
Rolling Hills, CA 90274

A.P.N. 7570-025-018
Also known as 9 John's Canyon Road

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THIS DOCUMENT IS PRESENTED FOR RECORDING BY THE CITY OF ROLLING HILLS UNDER GOVERNMENT CODE 27383 AND IS ALSO EXEMPT FROM PAYMENT OF DOCUMENTARY TRANSFER TAX

EASEMENT DEED

FOR A VALUABLE CONSIDERATION, receipt of which is hereby acknowledged,

DAVID N. STONE AND KIMBERLY G. STONE, AS TRUSTEES OF THE STONE FAMILY TRUST UNDER DECLARATION OF TRUST DATED FEBRUARY 6, 1990,

do hereby GRANT to the

CITY OF ROLLING HILLS, A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION

AN EASEMENT FOR SANITARY SEWER, APPURTEMENT STRUCTURES, INGRESS AND EGRESS PURPOSES AND ALL USES INCIDENT THERETO, INCLUDING THE RIGHT TO MAKE CONNECTIONS THEREWITH FROM ANY ADJOINING PROPERTIES, UPON, OVER, AND ACROSS THE REAL PROPERTY IN THE CITY OF ROLLING HILLS, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA AS DESCRIBED IN THE ATTACHED EXHIBIT "A" AND SHOWN IN THE ATTACHED EXHIBIT "B."

Owner

\[Signature\] \[8-15-19\] \[Signature\] \[Date\]

ALL SIGNATURES MUST BE NOTARIZED.
ATTACH ACKNOWLEDGMENT(S) AS REQUIRED.
EXHIBIT "A"

Legal Description of Sewer Easement

A strip of land 10.00 feet wide lying within Lot 1 of Tract No. 30605, in the City of Rolling Hills, County of Los Angeles, State of California, as per map recorded in Book 825 pages 81 and 82 of Maps, records of said county, lying 5.00 feet on each side of the following described centerline:

Commencing at the southerly terminus of that certain course in the southwesterly line of said line having a bearing and length of " N 43°26'20" W6.93 162.48' " as shown on said tract map, said point also being the intersection of John's Canyon Road and Chestnut Lane (Private Streets) also shown on said tract map; thence along said line, North 43°26'20" West, 6.93 feet; thence leaving said line, North 61°54'53" East, 5.38 feet to the True Point of Beginning; thence South 28°05'07" East, 84.27 feet to the end of the described centerline.

As shown on Exhibit "B" attached hereto and made a part hereof

Prepared under my supervision:

David O. Knell PLS 5301 Date

12/20
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.

STATE OF California

COUNTY OF Los Angeles

On 08.15.19, before me, Yohana Coronel, a Notary Public, personally appeared Stone David Nikolaus,

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

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature: Yohana Coronel

Name of Notary: Yohana Coronel

Date Commission Expires 07/17/2021

Commission No. 2205706

Yohana Coronel
Notary Public – California
Los Angeles County
Commission # 2205706
My Comm. Expires Jul 17, 2021
RESOLUTION NO. 1244

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROLLING HILLS GRANTING CONSENT AND JURISDICTION TO THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES FOR THE INCLUSION OF CERTAIN TERRITORY OF THE CITY OF ROLLING HILLS TRACT NO. 29408, 29206 and 23643 WITHIN A COUNTY SEWER MAINTENANCE DISTRICT

WHEREAS, the City of Rolling Hills does not have the forces nor equipment necessary to maintain sanitary sewers; and

WHEREAS, a segment of sanitary sewer pipe has been constructed within the City under Private Contract No. 13-1 Rolling Hills, and has been completed in compliance with the plans and specifications which are satisfactory to the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works pursuant to letter (Notice of Field Acceptance- sanitary Sewer 98%) dated June 18, 2015;

WHEREAS, it appears in the public interest and convenience that certain territory of the City of Rolling Hills be included within a County sewer maintenance district;

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

Section 1. That the public interest and convenience require the inclusion of certain territory within the boundaries of the City of Rolling Hills to be within a County sewer maintenance district formed for the purpose of maintaining local collection pipes and laterals of sanitary sewers pursuant to Chapter 4, Part 3, Division 5 of the Health and Safety Code, as amended, or Chapter 26, Part 3, Division 7 of the Streets and Highways Code, as amended, of the State of California.

Section 2. That pursuant to the authority vested in it by Section 4895 of said Health and Safety Code, or Section 5837 of said Streets and Highways Code, the City Council, being the legislative body of the City of Rolling Hills, hereby consents to the inclusion of that City territory within a County sewer maintenance district as has benefited from receiving sewer service capability from Project PC 13-1 also identified as APN 7569-23-34 (35 Crest Road West), APN 7569-23-11 (2 Johns Canyon Road), and APN 7569-23-17 (8 Johns Canyon Road).

Section 3. That said consent and jurisdiction granted to and exercised by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles over the territory described in Section 2 of this Resolution shall be consistent with the consent and jurisdiction granted in by Resolution No. 470 of the City Council of the City of Rolling Hills dated the 8th day of June, 1981, attached hereto as EXHIBIT A.

Section 4. The City Clerk shall certify to the adoption of this resolution and shall deliver three certified copies thereof to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles.
PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 26th day of August 2019.

ATTEST:  

LEAH MIRSH, MAYOR

CITY CLERK
STATE OF CALIFORNIA  )
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  )  §§
CITY OF ROLLING HILLS  )

The foregoing Resolution No. 1244 entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROLLING HILLS GRANTING CONSENT AND JURISDICTION TO THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES FOR THE INCLUSION OF CERTAIN TERRITORY OF THE CITY OF ROLLING HILLS TRACT NO. 29408, 29206 and 23643 WITHIN A COUNTY SEWER MAINTENANCE DISTRICT

was approved and adopted at a regular meeting of the City Council on August 26, 2019 by the following roll call vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

CITY CLERK
RESOLUTION NO. 470

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROLLING HILLS GRANTING CONSENT AND JURISDICTION TO THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES FOR THE INCLUSION OF CERTAIN TERRITORY OF THE CITY OF ROLLING HILLS WITHIN A COUNTY SEWER MAINTENANCE DISTRICT, TRACT 33871

WHEREAS, the City of Rolling Hills does not have the forces nor equipment necessary to maintain sanitary sewers; and

WHEREAS, sanitary sewers have been or are scheduled to be constructed within the City; and

WHEREAS, it appears in the public interest and convenience that certain territory of the City of Rolling Hills be included within a County sewer maintenance district;

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

Section 1. That the public interest and convenience require the inclusion of certain territory within the boundaries of the City of Rolling Hills within a County sewer maintenance district formed for the purpose of maintaining local and lateral sanitary sewers pursuant to Chapter 4, Part 3, Division 5 of the Health and Safety Code, as amended, or Chapter 36, Part 3, Division 7 of the Streets and Highways Code, as amended, of the State of California.

Section 2. That pursuant to the authority vested in it by Section 4895 of said Health and Safety Code, or Section 5837 of said Streets and Highway Code, the City Council, being the legislative body of the City of Rolling Hills, hereby consents to the inclusion of any of said City territory within a County sewer maintenance district as soon as said City territory is benefited by sewers, or is assured of having sewer benefits in the near future, and to the exercise of exclusive jurisdiction by the Board of Supervisors of said County of Los Angeles over all proceedings necessary thereto for the purpose of consummating the same.

Section 3. That said consent and jurisdiction granted to the Board of Supervisors as set forth in Section 2 of this Resolution shall not be construed to request, require or permit the immediate inclusion of all territory within the City of Rolling Hills in a County sewer maintenance district, but only to request or permit the immediate inclusion of areas that are now benefited by sewers, or that are assured of having sewer benefits in the near future. Additional such areas may be included in a sewer maintenance district by annexation proceedings from time to time without securing further consent and grant of jurisdiction from this Council.

Section 4. The City Clerk shall certify to the adoption of this resolution and shall deliver three certified copies thereof to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 8th day of June, 1981.

[Signature]
Mayor
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I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 470 was duly adopted by the City Council of the City of Rolling Hills, California at a regular meeting thereof held on the 8th day of June, 1981 by the following vote of the Council:

AYES:  Councilmembers Heinsheimer, Pernell, Rose, Swanson
Mayor Crocker

NOES:  None

ABSENT: None

[Signature]
City Clerk

EXHIBIT "A"

[Map of the area with markings for existing and proposed sewers, streets, and tracts, including tracts labeled as 23228, 23229, and others.]

City of Rolling Hills Estates

City of Rancho Palos Verdes

South Bay Engineering Corporation
308 Tejon Place
Palos Verdes Estates
California 90274
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CERTIFICATE OF ACCEPTANCE

This is to certify that the interest in real property conveyed by the deed or grant dated ____________________ from DAVID N. STONE AND KIMBERLY G. STONE, AS TRUSTEES OF THE STONE FAMILY TRUST UNDER DECLARATION OF TRUST DATED FEBRUARY 6, 1990, to the City of Rolling Hills, a municipal corporation and/or governmental agency, is hereby accepted by order of the City Council of the City of Rolling Hills on ________________, by the undersigned officer or agent on behalf of the City Council of the City of Rolling Hills pursuant to authority conferred by action of the City Council of the City of Rolling Hills on ________________, and the grantee consents to recordation thereof by its duly authorized officer.

CITY OF ROLLING HILLS

Dated: ___________________  By: ___________________

Title

ATTEST:

________________________________________
City Clerk
TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL  
FROM: ELAINE JENG, P.E., CITY MANAGER  
SUBJECT: CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF LIGHTING UPGRADE AT TENNIS COURTS 2 AND 3.  
DATE: AUGUST 26, 2019  
ATTACHMENT:  
1. STAFF REPORT JULY 8, 2019 CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
2. PHOTOMETRIC STUDY FROM AMERICAN POWER SOLUTIONS  
3. REVISED COST PROPOSAL FROM HORST K. ELECTRIC

BACKGROUND

In August/September 2018, per the request of the Rolling Hills Tennis Club (RHTC), the Rolling Hills Community Association (RHCA) was seeking vendors to provide recommendations to upgrade the lighting at tennis courts 2 and 3. There are three courts. Court 1 does not have lighting and is located to the south side of courts 2 and 3. Courts 2 and 3 are located next to each other. In total there are 16 light fixtures illuminating courts 2 and 3.

RHTC received cost proposals from Horst K. Electric and LEDtronics Inc. RHCA received a cost proposal from Sun Electric. City staff assisted in the project and solicited cost proposals from Ledsmaster Technology, Co., Ltd, and American Power Solutions.

At the July 8, 2019 City Council meeting, staff presented the below table listing the cost proposals:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Total Proposed Cost</th>
<th>Upgraded Fixture</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Installation Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Power Solutions</td>
<td>$15,440[1]</td>
<td>300Watts</td>
<td>$540</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledsmaster Technology Co., Ltd</td>
<td>$6,720[2]</td>
<td>300-360Watts</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>Excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Electric</td>
<td>$20,250[3]</td>
<td>No specified</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEDtronics, Inc.</td>
<td>$10,100</td>
<td>300Watts</td>
<td>$592</td>
<td>Excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horst K Electric</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
<td>100Watts</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[1] Total cost includes new mounting pole and bracket. Vendor recommended replacement of mounting pole and bracket due to the amount of rust on existing mounting pole observed during site visit. Total cost also includes scissor lift rental for installation.

At the July 8, 2019 City Council meeting, staff recommended the City Council to use the lighting solution provided by American Power Solutions for $15,440. The July 8, 2019 staff report is attached for reference.

DISCUSSION

At the July 8, 2019 City Council meeting, the Council requested the following information from staff:

- Photometric study of proposed lighting fixture;
- Professional lighting standards and requirements; and
- Proposal from Horst K Electric for a 300Watt fixture for comparison.

PHOTOMETRIC STUDY
Photometric analyses are purposed to provide insight on the light level across the entire project area and they also determine whether the layout will meet the lighting specifications for a given use. Staff requested a photometric study from vendors and American Powers Solution offered to conduct one free of charge. Sun Electric suggested staff to hire a lighting engineer for such study. Horst K Electric provided cut sheets from the manufacture. The other two vendors, Ledsmaster Technology Company and LEDtronics function more like manufacturers and are interested primarily in sale of fixtures.

Attached to this report is a photometric study from American Powers Solutions. Staff does not have the expertise to fully understand the photometric analyses other than to know that the study show the expected foot-candle (measurement of light) from installing the proposed lighting fixture. On page 4 and 9, it shows the expected lighting measurements on Courts 2 and 3, between 30 and 35 foot-candles.
PROFESSIONAL LIGHTING STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS

Staff conducted research and found that the International Tennis Federation (ITF) provides requirements on lighting for tennis courts based on tournaments. ATP World Tour Tournaments have different requirements than WTA and Davis Cup. Additionally, the lighting requirements change if the game is televised. For ATP World Tour Tournaments, ITF says that the lighting must be evenly distributed on the court with a minimum recommended intensity of 100 foot-candles (1076 LUX), averaged over 15 readings on the court. ATP Challenger Tour Tournaments, lighting must be evenly distributed on the court with a minimum recommended intensity of 70 foot-candles (750 LUX), averaged over 15 readings on the court. Light poles shall be positioned so that they are evenly distributed around the court and it is recommended that light pole heights for other than show courts be no lower than forty feet.

Since lighting change proposed at the Rolling Hills tennis courts is a retrofit, (not changing the pole height and using existing infrastructure), it is difficult to meet or even consider ITF standards even with requirements for low level competitions.

Staff conducted research and called the following clubs for lighting reference:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Hills Country Club</td>
<td>Waiting for response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan Beach</td>
<td>Waiting for response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheviot Hills</td>
<td>No LED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula Raquet Club</td>
<td>No LED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeaCliff Country Club</td>
<td>No LED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Kramer Club</td>
<td>Waiting for response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV Tennis Club</td>
<td>Waiting for response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Country Club (Long Beach)</td>
<td>No LED, metal sodium halide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta Vista Raquet Courts (Redondo Beach)</td>
<td>No LED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffin Club Los Angeles</td>
<td>Waiting for response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the clubs in the area do not use LEDs.

REVISED PROPOSAL FROM HORST K. ELECTRIC

Staff contacted Horst K. Electric and requested a cost proposal for a higher wattage fixture so that it can be compared with the other proposals received. Horst K. Electric conducted a recent site visit and provide a revised proposal showing again 100 watts LED light fixture but is recommending adding bull horn brackets to the project for a total cost of $9,800. Previous cost proposal was $5,600. While Horst K. Electric did not provide a photometric study, the company did provide specification sheets estimating the lighting output.
The RHCA Board approved the use of American Power Solutions at the June 6, 2019 Board meeting. The lease agreement between the City and RHCA stipulates that capital improvements relating to maintenance and repairs at the tennis courts shall be shared 50-50. Per the lease agreement, the City’s portion of the lighting upgrade would be $7,720 ($15,440/2).

**FISCAL IMPACT**

The tennis courts lighting upgrade was budgeted for FY 2019-2020. There are sufficient funds to pay for the improvement.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends the City Council select American Power Solutions for the lighting upgrade at the tennis courts and to have the City’s tenant, RHCA coordinate directly with American Power Solutions to complete the improvement.
TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL
FROM: ELAINE JENG, P.E., CITY MANAGER
SUBJECT: CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF LIGHTING UPGRADE AT TENNIS COURTS 2 AND 3.
DATE: JULY 8, 2019
ATTACHMENT:

1. COST PROPOSAL FROM AMERICAN POWER SOLUTIONS
2. COST PROPOSAL FROM LEDMASTER TECHNOLOGY CO., LTD
3. COST PROPOSAL FROM SUN ELECTRIC INC.
4. COST PROPOSAL FROM LEDTRONICS, INC.
5. COST PROPOSAL FROM HORST K. ELECTRIC
6. RHCA LETTER DATED JUNE 11, 2019

BACKGROUND

In August/September 2018, per the request of the Rolling Hills Tennis Club (RHTC), the Rolling Hills Community Association (RHCA) was seeking vendors to provide recommendations to upgrade the lighting at tennis courts 2 and 3. There are three courts. Court 1 is located to the south side of courts 2 and 3. Courts 2 and 3 are located next to each other. In total there are 16 light fixtures illuminating courts 2 and 3.

City staff assisted the RHCA by working with the Southbay Council of Governments (SBCCOG) to find available grants to fund the lighting upgrade. Through the SBCCOG Environmental Services Center, the City applied for Southern California Edison (SCE) On-Bill Financing (OBF) Midstream Application. This program allowed customers to pay for the lighting upgrade through energy savings. In other words, no out of pocket
funds are needed for the upgrade. The City’s application was denied in October 2018 as the City did not have an active SCE account for the tennis courts for the last two years. The City took over the electricity expense for the tennis courts in July 2018. With the OBF application denial, staff continued to pursue SCE’s Midstream Point of Purchase Program (MPOPP) with SBCCOG’s assistance. The MPOPP pre-qualified vendors that would provide discounted lighting fixtures.

Between November 2018 and May 2019, SBCCOG Environmental Services Center was unable to locate any vendors to conduct a site visit to the tennis courts to recommend appropriate upgrade fixtures. In the meantime, the RHTC, RHCA and City staff solicited cost proposals from five different companies.

RHTC received cost proposals from Horst K. Electric and LEDtronics Inc. RHCA received a cost proposal from Sun Electric. City staff received cost proposals from Ledsmaster Technology, Co., Ltd, and American Power Solutions. Below is a table listing the cost proposals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Total Proposed Cost</th>
<th>Upgraded Fixture</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Installation Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Power Solutions</td>
<td>$15,440[1]</td>
<td>300Watts</td>
<td>$540</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledsmaster Technology Co., Ltd</td>
<td>$6,720[2]</td>
<td>300-360Watts</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>Excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Electric</td>
<td>$20,250[3]</td>
<td>No specified</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEDtronics, Inc.</td>
<td>$10,100</td>
<td>300Watts</td>
<td>$592</td>
<td>Excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horst K Electric</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
<td>100Watts</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[1] Total cost includes new mounting pole and bracket. Vendor recommended replacement of mounting pole and bracket due to the amount of rust on existing mounting pole observed during site visit. Total cost also includes scissor lift rental for installation.

**DISCUSSION**

The existing tennis court lights are observed by vendors to be metal halide lamps. The metal halide requires warm up time and based on electric bills for the period July 2018 to April 2019, the annual energy cost was projected to be approximately $1,762.

When soliciting cost proposals, the RHTC, RHCA and the City deferred to the vendor for recommendations based on the existing lamps/fixture, equivalent lumen output, and energy savings. Without conducting a lighting study, vendors generally recommended 300 to 360 watts Light Emitting Diode (LED) to replace the metal halide lamps to match
the existing lumen output. Only one vendor, American Power Solutions, conducted an energy savings estimation ($850 per year) and Return On Investment (18.5 years for payback on investment).

Based on the unit cost of individual lighting fixtures, Ledsmaster Technology Co., Ltd. and Horst K. Electric offered the lowest pricing however, Ledsmaster Technology Co., Ltd.'s unit cost does not include installation and would increase if labor expense was included. Horst K. Electric recommended 100 watts LED fixtures. With all other vendors recommending 300-360 watts to match the existing lumen output, 100 watts may be inadequate. LEDtronics, Inc. has the highest unit cost and the unit cost excludes installation. Sun Electric has the highest overall cost. American Power Solutions offered the most complete cost proposal – a competitive unit cost to match the existing lumen output and includes the replacement of rusted mounting pole and bracket.

The RHCA Board approved the use of American Power Solutions at the June 6, 2019 Board meeting. The lease agreement between the City and RHCA stipulates that capital improvements at the tennis courts shall be shared 50-50. Per the lease agreement, the City’s portion of the lighting upgrade would be $7,720 ($15,440/2).

FISCAL IMPACT

The tennis courts lighting upgrade was budgeted for FY 2019-2020. There is sufficient funds to pay for the improvement.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the City Council select American Power Solutions for the lighting upgrade at the tennis courts and to have the City’s tenant, RHCA coordinate directly with American Power Solutions to complete the improvement.
# LIGHTING UPGRADE ESTIMATE

**Customer:**
Rolling Hills City Hall
2 Portuguese Bend Rd
Rolling Hills, CA 90274
Elaine Jeng
310-377-1521

**Location:**
Rolling Hills City Hall

**Service Provider:**
American Power Solutions, Inc.
14355 Industry Circle
La Mirada, CA 90638

**Contact:** Wayne Kim
**Phone:** -

**Utility Company:** SCE

## Proposal Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Lighting</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fixture Wattage</th>
<th>New Measure</th>
<th>New Fixture Wattage</th>
<th>CCT</th>
<th>Fixture Qty</th>
<th>Lamp Qty</th>
<th>Net Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MH1020</td>
<td>Metal Halide Shoebox Pole Light</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>LED Shoebox Fixture</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5000K</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$540.00</td>
<td>$5,460.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Mounting Pole and Bracket</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Scissor Lift Rental</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Project Cost**
$15,440.00

**Estimated Incentive**
$0.00

**Net Project Cost**
$15,440.00

**Annual Savings (in dollars)**
$847.97

**Monthly Savings (in dollars)**
$70.66

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand kW Before</th>
<th>8.84</th>
<th>Annual kWh Before</th>
<th>12,578.84</th>
<th>Annual kWh Savings</th>
<th>6,058.96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand kW After</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>Annual kWh After</td>
<td>5,522.88</td>
<td>Annual kWh Savings</td>
<td>6,058.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand kW Savings</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>Annual kWh Savings</td>
<td>6,058.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annual Return On Investment (ROI)**
5%

**Payback On Investment (in years)**
18.21

---

**Your proposal has been prepared using the following assumptions:**

1. 5-year Warranty for T8 LED lamps and LED fixtures
2. Plug and Play installations will include ballast replacement for 5% of installed fixtures in the event of malfunction at no cost.

Please acknowledge your acceptance of this proposal by signing below as well as the attached terms and conditions.

Signed copies may be faxed to (714) 625-6200. Once received, we will contact you to schedule installation and advise delivery dates.

---

**Agreed by:**
Name/Title ____________________________

**Date:** ____________________________

**American Power Solutions**

---
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## Energy Savings Calculation

**Business Name:** Rolling Hills City Hall  
**Street Address:** 2 Pergamena Blvd  
**City, State, Zip:** Rolling Hills, CA 90274  
**Contact Name:** Elisa Jare  
**Tel:** 310-377-1521  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer E-mail:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Table: Energy Savings Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Courts</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Induction</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1458</td>
<td>6,086.90</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$15,040.00</td>
<td>$18,040.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bosch Fedex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,086.90</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Calculations:

- **Current Demand:** 8.66 kWp  
- **Projected Demand:** 4.48 kWp  
- **Estimated Wastage savings:** $15,440.00

### Financials:

- **Estimated Incentive with Demand:** $0.00
- **Net Project cost after Incentive:** $15,440.00

### Additional Information:

- **Current Annual Usage:** 5,057.84 kWh
- **Proposed Annual Usage:** 4,520.88 kWh
- **Annual Savings:** $847.97
- **ROI (Year):** 12.21
Hi Elaine,

Thanks for providing so much details, we met many tennis courts before, most of them use 1000watt Metal halide lamps, we'd suggest 360watt led flood light replace metal halide lamps directly. According to the pole height, we'd suggest 60degree beam angle, attached the specs and similar picture. We have many products, but only below one can restrain the pollution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Number</th>
<th>Working Voltage</th>
<th>Beam angle</th>
<th>Lights Qty</th>
<th>Unit Price(EXW)</th>
<th>TAX Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS-FLN-360</td>
<td>90-295VAC</td>
<td>60degree</td>
<td>8pcs</td>
<td>USD415/pce</td>
<td>no Tax within 3 month</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no Led Lights tax cost within 3 months between China and The United States, its a good chance for you to buy lights now. Waiting for your reply.

Best Wishes,
Kim
The existing lights appear to be 1000 watt metal halide floodlights. Attached are photos of the lights. I don’t have a pole height but estimating the height, it appears to be around 20 to 25 feet off the ground. There are two tennis courts and I like to replace lights at both courts.

Elaine

From: support10 [mailto:support10@power-lights.com]
Sent: Monday, December 3, 2018 2:35 AM
To: Elaine Jeng
Subject: Re: Re: Greetings to Elaine

Hi Elaine,

Good morning. I only need to know what power of the existing lamps and pole height, then I can decide the angle and qty of lights needed to restrain the lighting pollutions. Our light video share with you.

Best Regards
Kim

Hi Kim,

I should have photos for you tomorrow. Thanks for the follow up.

Elaine Jeng, P.E.

On Nov 29, 2018, at 7:35 PM, support10 <support10@power-lights.com> wrote:

Hi Elaine,

What are the existing lamps? I will recommend equivalent led replacement directly. Thanks,
Kim

<100watt.png>
<100watt led.png>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Model</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Warranty</th>
<th>Unit Price (USD)</th>
<th>Qty (pcs)</th>
<th>Total Amount (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LG-FMN-300</td>
<td>300watt led highbay light, 150lm/w, 90-295VAC, 55-60Hz, gross weight 14kg, 40° angle, 50,000 hours life span</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>USD420</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>USD840.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delivery Time: 30 days
Phone Number: 1
PI Number: KXY8132113201

Door to door cost by UPS: USD180.00
Bank charges if made by paypal: USD 40.00
Amount Cost: USD 1,070.00
a. Scope of Work: Sun Electric Inc. hereby submits the following specifications and estimates:

I propose to replace the existing 1000 watt Metal Halide floodlights with energy efficient LED fixtures. These fixtures offer approximately the same lumen output at the surface. The Metal Halide lamps 79K lumens of light output vs the LED fixtures at 53K due to a more efficient reflection and light distribution. The Metal Halide lamps lose a large majority of the light output due to the rusted reflectors and inefficient design of the original fixtures. Therefore the reduced lumen output of the LED fixtures will provide the same or more light at the floor surface as the original fixtures.

The new fixtures will be mounted onto the existing arms in the same manner as the original fixtures. This proposal includes removal and disposal of the old fixtures.

The new fixtures are black, we suggest the poles and arms be painted to match. (not included)

Includes (2) setup and removal of a rolling scaffold to replace the fixtures.

b. Not Included: This proposal does not include:

City permits and inspections - change out only, not required.

c. WE PROPOSE to furnish material, equipment and labor in accordance with the above specifications for the sum of:

$20,250.00 dollars

NOTE: This proposal may be withdrawn if not accepted within 30 days from 10/30/18 date

Respectfully submitted by

Jim Parker
Company Representative

d. WE ACCEPT the prices, specifications, and terms as stated in this bid proposal are approved. We authorize you to draw up all necessary contract documents so work can begin.

approved and accepted (owner or owner's authorized agent) date

approved and accepted (second owner, if any) date

Form BP1-C Copyright © 1996-2009 ACT Contractors Forms (800) 620-6658 www.actform.com
## QUOTE/ SBX001-150W-XPW-105A-A

**LEDtronics, Inc.**
23105 Kashkwa Court
Torrance, CA 90505
Phone: (310) 534-1505
Fax: (310) 534-1424

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Ship To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARMITRA PROPERTIES INC 23211 HAWTHORNE BLVD SUITE # 300 TORRANCE CA 90505</td>
<td>ARMITRA PROPERTIES INC 23211 HAWTHORNE BLVD SUITE # 300 TORRANCE CA 90505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Expire Date</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>Currency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/31/2019</td>
<td>03/02/2019</td>
<td>71033</td>
<td>USD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Part ID/ Description</th>
<th>Delivery</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Cost Ea</th>
<th>Line Amt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SBX001-150W-XPW-105A-A 85-305Vac.5000K.150Watts.Type V</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>323.2700</td>
<td>1,616.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LEDRK01DL-120W-XDW-101WD 100-277Vac.5000K.Dim</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>273.5500</td>
<td>1,367.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SBX002-300W-XPW-103A-E 85-305Vac.5000K.300Watts.Type III</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>591.3000</td>
<td>10,052.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LEDRK03DL-320W-XDW-101WD 100-277Vac.Wht 5000K.Dim</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>547.1000</td>
<td>9,300.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $22,336.90

### Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARUN BHUMITRA</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>310-465-0600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

PROCESSED BY ELROY TOLBERT EXT 129 etolbert@ledtronics.com

---

*FOB Torrance, CA Quote Valid 30 Days.
*No Cancellations within 60 days of scheduled ship date without approval.
*No Reschedules within 30 days of scheduled ship date without approval.
*Warranty: Varies by Product.
*Foregoing quotation does not include applicable taxes, cost for Special Handling, Special Packaging, DD250's. Source Inspection, Special Certification other than Standard C of C. Pricing for these services must be requested prior to placement of order.
**Horst K Electric**
1637 W. Pacific Coast Hwy
Harbor City, California 90710-2627
310 534-4911/510 534-4795 Fax
www.horstkelectric.com

**PROPOSAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Proposal #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/10/2015</td>
<td>4513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Name / Address**
Armita Properties
23211 Hawthorne Blvd
Unit 300
Torrance, CA 90505

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Site: Rolling Hills Tennis Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Disconnect and remove (16) 400 watt existing lamps/ballasts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Purchase and install (16) 100 watt LED lamps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Use of lift or scaffolding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** Labor and Material: 5,600.00

**Total** 5,600.00

"ARBITRATION OF DISPUTES"
Any controversy or claim arising out of or relating to this contract or the breach thereof shall be settled by arbitration in accordance with the Uniform Rules for Better Business Bureau Arbitration, and the judgment upon the award rendered by the arbitrator(s) may be entered in any court having jurisdiction thereof.

**ACCEPTANCE OF PROPOSAL**
The above prices, specifications and conditions are satisfactory and are hereby accepted. You are authorized to do the work as specified. Any alterations or deviation from above specifications involving extra costs will be executed only upon written order, and will become an extra charge over and above the estimate. Prices are good for 30 days unless otherwise noted.

---

Signature
Date 11/12
Signature
15/37
June 11, 2019

Elaine Jeng, Manager  
City of Rolling Hills  
2 Portuguese Bend Road  
Rolling Hills, CA 90274

Dear Ms. Jeng,

At the June 6, 2019 RHCA Board meeting the Board approved the Tennis Club request for the LED light upgrade to tennis courts 2 and 3 from American Power Solution in the amount of $15,440. Please note, City of RH will be responsible for half of the cost of the LED lights.

Please feel free to contact the office if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Myrna Jacott  
Administrative Assistant

CC: Arun Bhumitra  
Tom and Carrie Lieb
Project_rolling_hills_tennis_court
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City of Rolling Hills
Tennis Court Energy Efficient Lighting Retrofit Project

Customer: Yolanta Schwartz
City of Rolling Hills
2 Portuguese Bend Rd
Rolling Hills, CA 90274
310 377-1521
310-377-7268
ys@cityofrh.net

Operator: Wayne Kim
American Power Solutions, Inc.
14355 Industry Circle
La Mirada CA 90638
714-626-0300
714-626-0200
858-997-6169
waynekim763@gmail.com

Project address:
2 Portuguese Bend Rd
Rolling Hills, CA 90274
Project_rolling_hills_tennis_court

Site 1 (7)
US Green Lighting, Inc. LED ShoeBox L/SBD/280/DU/750/TJ02 1xLED Module

Light output ratio: 100.01%
Luminaire luminous flux: 33607 lm
Power: 280.1 W
Luminous efficacy: 120.0 lm/W

Luminous emittance 1 / Polar LDC
## Site 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Luminaire</th>
<th>φ(Luminaire) [lm]</th>
<th>Power [W]</th>
<th>Luminous efficacy [lm/W]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>US Green Lighting, Inc. - LED ShoeBox L/SBD/280/CU/750/TJ02</td>
<td>33607</td>
<td>280.1</td>
<td>120.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total via all luminaires</td>
<td>537712</td>
<td>4481.6</td>
<td>120.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site 1

Light loss factor: 0.80

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Average (Target)</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean/Min</th>
<th>Max/Min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Calculation surface 3</td>
<td>Perpendicular illuminance [ft] 28.16</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>39.04</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Light loss factor: 0.80

Calculation surface 3: Perpendicular illuminance (Grid)
Light scene: Light scene 1
Average: 28.16 fc, Min: 11.60 fc, Max: 39.04 fc, Mean/Min: 2.43, Max/Min: 3.37
Height: 0.000 ft
Isolines [fc]

Scale: 1 : 200
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-25.202</td>
<td>.36.15</td>
<td>.35.49</td>
<td>.34.45</td>
<td>.33.59</td>
<td>.32.74</td>
<td>.31.59</td>
<td>.29.92</td>
<td>.28.35</td>
<td>.25.98</td>
<td>.23.42</td>
<td>.20.94</td>
<td>.18.22</td>
<td>.16.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-29.068</td>
<td>.35.05</td>
<td>.34.72</td>
<td>.33.73</td>
<td>.33.15</td>
<td>.32.03</td>
<td>.30.60</td>
<td>.26.11</td>
<td>.27.38</td>
<td>.25.35</td>
<td>.22.98</td>
<td>.20.67</td>
<td>.18.04</td>
<td>.16.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-32.933</td>
<td>.35.36</td>
<td>.35.05</td>
<td>.34.54</td>
<td>.33.38</td>
<td>.32.41</td>
<td>.31.18</td>
<td>.29.45</td>
<td>.27.79</td>
<td>.26.04</td>
<td>.23.61</td>
<td>.21.10</td>
<td>.18.37</td>
<td>.16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-36.799</td>
<td>.35.47</td>
<td>.34.96</td>
<td>.34.26</td>
<td>.33.52</td>
<td>.32.75</td>
<td>.31.76</td>
<td>.30.08</td>
<td>.28.26</td>
<td>.26.43</td>
<td>.23.90</td>
<td>.21.35</td>
<td>.18.46</td>
<td>.16.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-40.664</td>
<td>.35.35</td>
<td>.32.72</td>
<td>.32.04</td>
<td>.31.73</td>
<td>.32.25</td>
<td>.31.32</td>
<td>.29.23</td>
<td>.28.75</td>
<td>.26.89</td>
<td>.22.54</td>
<td>.20.57</td>
<td>.18.26</td>
<td>.16.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-44.530</td>
<td>.31.07</td>
<td>.29.95</td>
<td>.29.52</td>
<td>.29.47</td>
<td>.29.83</td>
<td>.28.95</td>
<td>.27.57</td>
<td>.24.76</td>
<td>.22.79</td>
<td>.20.76</td>
<td>.18.98</td>
<td>.16.48</td>
<td>.16.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-52.261</td>
<td>.23.98</td>
<td>.22.99</td>
<td>.22.58</td>
<td>.23.02</td>
<td>.22.82</td>
<td>.22.07</td>
<td>.21.53</td>
<td>.19.40</td>
<td>.17.76</td>
<td>.16.48</td>
<td>.14.96</td>
<td>.16.04</td>
<td>.16.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-56.126</td>
<td>. /</td>
<td>. /</td>
<td>. /</td>
<td>. /</td>
<td>. /</td>
<td>. /</td>
<td>. /</td>
<td>. /</td>
<td>. /</td>
<td>. /</td>
<td>. /</td>
<td>. /</td>
<td>. /</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Name / Address**

City of Rolling Hills
2 Portuguese Bend Road
Rolling Hills, CA 90274
Attn: Elaine

---

**Description** | Qty | Cost | Total
--- | --- | --- | ---
Job Site: Rolling Hills Tennis Courts  
-Erect scaffolding  
-Remove existing (16) light fixtures and arms  
-Purchase and install (16) new 100 watt LED light fixtures  
-Installed (16) bull horn brackets  
TOTAL Labor and Material:  
9,800.00 | 9,800.00

*NOTE:* The lighting output for the new fixtures is 30% greater than the existing shoe box fixtures. The light output on the floor will be approximately 30% brighter (cut sheets enclosed).

---

**Total**  
9,800.00

---

**"ARBITRATION OF DISPUTES"**

Any controversy or claim arising out of or relating to this contract or the breach thereof shall be settled by arbitration in accordance with the Uniform Rules for Better Business Bureau Arbitration, and the judgment upon the award rendered by the arbitrator(s) may be entered in any court having jurisdiction thereof.

---

**ACCEPTANCE OF PROPOSAL**

The above prices, specifications and conditions are satisfactory and are hereby accepted. You are authorized to do the work as specified. Any alterations or deviation from above specifications involving extra costs will be executed only upon written order, and will become an extra charge over and above the estimate. Prices are good for 30 days unless otherwise noted.

Signature ____________________________

Date ____________________________  
Signature ____________________________
WESTGATE
THE FUTURE IS HERE...AND IT'S QUITE BRIGHT!
THUNDER SERIES

LFCO-100W-50K
LFCO-100W-40K

LED HIGH LUMEN LFCO FLOOD LIGHTS

MOUNTING OPTIONS:

LFCO-SA
(Straight Arm)

LFCO-SF
(Slip fitter)

LFCO-TR1
(FOR 50W, 80W, 100W, 150W, 230W)
LFCO-TR2
("U" Bracket)

LFCO-YK
(Yoke)

PHOTOMETRIC CHARTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODEL</th>
<th>WATTS</th>
<th>VOLTAGE</th>
<th>LUMENS</th>
<th>COLOR TEMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LFCO-100W-50K</td>
<td>100W</td>
<td>120-277V</td>
<td>14000LM</td>
<td>5000K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFCO-100W-40K</td>
<td>100W</td>
<td>120-277V</td>
<td>14000LM</td>
<td>4000K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WESTGATE MFG., INC.

* Phone (877) 805-2252 * Fax (877) 809-2252
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LED HIGH LUMEN LFCO FLOOD LIGHTS

Ideal for general site lighting, alleys, loading docks, doorway, pathway, and parking areas.

**ELECTRICAL SPECIFICATIONS:**
- Voltage: 120-277V
- Wattage: 100W
- Efficacy: 140LM/W
- Power factor: >0.90
- THD: <20%

**HOUSING SPECIFICATIONS:**
- Die-cast Aluminum housing with powder coat finish (Dark Bronze)
- G6KV lightning surge protection
- Operating temperature: -40°F to 104°F
- Lifespan: 70,000 hr.
- IP Rating: IP65
- Effective projected areas (EPA) are:
  - Front = 0.38 square feet
  - Side = 0.30 square feet
  - Face = 1.05 square feet

**CERTIFICATIONS:** UL, DLC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODEL</th>
<th>WATTS</th>
<th>VOLTAGE</th>
<th>LUMENS</th>
<th>COLOR TEMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LFCO-100W-50K</td>
<td>100W</td>
<td>120-277V</td>
<td>14000LM</td>
<td>5000K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFCO-100W-40K</td>
<td>100W</td>
<td>120-277V</td>
<td>14000LM</td>
<td>4000K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LIGHTING SPECIFICATIONS:**
- Dimmable: 0~10V Dimming
- Lens: TYPE III TIR optic Lens
- LED: Philips Lumileds Luxeon 3030 High flux LED
- Solid state lighting technology for long life, no maintenance needed and high-efficiency
- Total lumens: 14000LM
- Color temperature: 5000K/4000K
- Color rendering index: >70
- Beam Angle: 140°X80°

**WARRANTY:** 7 years

WESTGATE MFG. INC.

- Phone (877) 805-2252  Fax (877) 809-2252
TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL
FROM: ELAINE JENG, P.E., CITY MANAGER
SUBJECT: CONSIDER AND APPROVE PROPOSED AMENITIES BY THE ROLLING HILLS COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION, AND THE MANDATORY AMERICAN WITH DISABILITY ACT (ADA) IMPROVEMENTS AT THE TENNIS COURTS.

DATE: AUGUST 26, 2019
ATTACHMENT:
1. STAFF REPORT JULY 8, 2019 CITY COUNCIL MEETING
2. BOLTON ENGINEERING CORPORATION
3. COST PROPOSAL FROM WEST CONSTRUCTION AND DESIGN
4. COST PROPOSAL FROM CALCO GRADING INC.

BACKGROUND

The City engaged the services of Bolton Engineering Corp (Bolton) to provide engineering design and construction plans for the tennis courts to comply with ADA requirements. RHCA hired architect Tony Ferrera to design a cabana that includes a kitchen, and a storage area. The current sink at the tennis courts is not connected to a discharge pipe. The future kitchen would provide for proper connection to the septic tank serving the area. Per the Los Angeles County Department Public Health who has jurisdiction over septic tanks in the City of Rolling Hills, the connection requires the existing septic tank to be replaced with a new septic tank. In the last year, RHCA has been contemplating on adding a restroom.

Bolton has completed the design and construction plans for ADA improvements. Bolton submitted the ADA improvements plans to the Los Angeles County Building
Department for permitting and is ready to pull permits for construction. With the RHCA Board’s approval for the restroom, RHCA’s architect is expected to revise the architectural plans for the amenities and Bolton will review the changes to ensure the work is coordinated seamlessly. RHCA Manager noted to City staff that the architectural plan revision is underway to add the restroom followed by plan submittal to the Los Angeles County Building and Public Health Departments for permitting.

At the July 8, 2019 City Council meeting, staff recommended to approve the amenities proposed by the RHCA and for the RHCA to take the lead to implement both projects (amenities and ADA improvements) using one general contractor. The July 8, 2019 staff report is attached for reference.

DISCUSSION

At the July 8, 2019 City Council meeting, Council requested cost information for the ADA improvements and the amenities proposed by the RHCA. Attached is the cost estimate by Bolton Engineering Corporation based on plans dated June 21, 2018. Also attached is the cost estimate from RHCA for their proposed amenities at the tennis courts. RHCA solicited the assistance of West Construction and Design and CALCO Grading Inc.

The ADA improvements are estimated to be $197,732, the RHCA proposed amenities are estimated to be $528,910 and $30,880. RHCA noted that the estimate to replace the existing septic tank remains unchanged from previous presentation at $125,000. In total, all improvements proposed at the tennis courts are estimated to be $882,522.

On August 21, 2019, the RHCA Board President met with the Mayor. RHCA noted that the cost proposal from West Construction and Design may include the ADA improvements. RHCA Manager will confirm with city staff. RHCA Board President also suggested to cost share the entire project and requested the City Council to determine a cost share formula that is acceptable.

FISCAL IMPACT

The tennis courts ADA improvements was budgeted for FY 2019-2020. There is sufficient funding in the budget to complete the ADA improvements. There is insufficient budget to fund the amenities proposed by the RHCA.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the City Council to direct staff to proceed with the ADA improvements at the tennis courts and approve RHCA’s request to implement the proposed amenities. Staff also recommends the City Council discuss the RHCA Board
President’s request for combining the projects and a cost share formula acceptable to the Council.
TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL
FROM: ELAINE JENG, P.E., CITY MANAGER
SUBJECT: CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF PROPOSED AMENITIES BY THE ROLLING HILLS COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION, AND THE MANDATED AMERICAN WITH DISABILITY ACT (ADA) IMPROVEMENTS AT THE TENNIS COURTS.

DATE: JULY 8, 2019
ATTACHMENT:

1. BOLTON ENGINEERING CORP, TENNIS COURT AREA IMPROVEMENT PLANS, MARCH AND JUNE 2018
2. ARCHITECTURAL PLAN (SINGLE SHEET) SHOWING PROPOSED RESTROOM ADJACENT TO CABANA
3. RHCA LETTERS DATED MAY 28, 2019 AND JUNE 17, 2019

BACKGROUND

To comply with the American Disability Act (ADA) at the tennis courts, the City engaged the services of Bolton Engineering Corp (Bolton) to provide engineering design and construction plans. Bolton was instructed to coordinate the ADA improvements with the Rolling Hills Community Association (RHCA) as the Association was planning on adding amenities to the common areas outside of the tennis courts.

RHCA hired architect Tony Ferrera to design a cabana that includes a kitchen, and a storage area. The current sink at the tennis courts is not connected to a discharge pipe. The future kitchen would provide for proper connection to the septic tank serving the area. Per the Los Angeles County Department Public Health who has jurisdiction over
septic tanks in the City of Rolling Hills, the connection requires the existing septic tank to be replaced with a new septic tank.

In the last year, RHCA has been contemplating on adding a restroom. RHCA delayed the decision and their overall project to find out if the City will move forward with constructing a sewer main along Portuguese Bend Road.

The City conducted Phase I of the Portuguese Bend Road Sewer Main Feasibility Study in February 2018. The study did not conclude until October 2018. City Council approved Phase II of the feasibility study in May 2019. Phase II of the study is expected to complete in October 2019. Phase II is expected to provide a high-level construction estimate of the sewer main and at that time the City Council will discuss forwarding the project to precise design and construction plan preparation.

Based on the current progress of the Portuguese Bend Road sewer main study, at the May 16, 2019 meeting, the RHCA Board approved the proposed amenities at the tennis courts, including the restroom and the replacement of the existing septic tank. Following the Board meeting, RHCA staff submitted a letter dated May 28, 2019 to the City requesting the City Council’s consideration of the proposed amenities.

Bolton has completed the design and construction plans for ADA improvements. Bolton submitted the ADA improvements plans to the Los Angeles County Building Department for permitting and is ready to pull permits for construction. With the RHCA Board’s approval for the restroom, RHCA’s architect is expected to revise the architectural plans for the amenities and Bolton will review the changes to ensure the work is coordinated seamlessly. RHCA Manager noted to City staff that the architectural plan revision is underway to add the restroom followed by plan submittal to the Los Angeles County Building and Public Health Departments for permitting.

DISCUSSION

RHCA proposed that the ADA improvements and the amenity additions be carried out separately and since the RHCA’s amenities are mostly above ground, the accessibility work should commence first. RHCA also proposed that each organization to be responsible for the expenditure of their projects. In other words, RHCA would fund the construction of the cabana and all relevant improvements including the replacement of the existing septic tank while the City would fund the improvements per Bolton’s plans.

The need to replace the existing septic tank and the installation of discharge pipes from the proposed restroom and kitchen sink will require RHCA’s improvements to go first, followed by the grading work as a part of the ADA construction. The above ground amenities such as the cabana, the kitchen, the storage area, the restroom facility cannot be constructed until the grading and concrete flat work, and foundation is completed as
a part of the ADA work. The two projects require very close coordination and scheduling to minimize the closure of the tennis courts, impacts to the surrounding neighbors and to ensure proper order of work to protect already completed work.

Presently, the City’s portion of the design work is complete and ready for permit, except minor adjustments relating to the addition of the restroom. RHCA however will need to design the restroom and submit plans for review and permitting.

The City’s lease agreement with the RHCA stipulates the following:

"Except for interior, nonstructural, nonsystemic alterations or additions not cumulatively costing in excess of Ten Thousand Dollars ($10,000.00) in any calendar year, Association shall not make or allow any other alterations, additions, or improvements in or to the Premises, including but not limited to the Building, without City’s’ prior consent, and then only by contractors or mechanics approved in advance in writing by City, which shall not unreasonably withhold consent. In each instance where Association requires City’s approval of an alteration, Association shall furnish City with plans showing the proposed alteration to the Premises, including but not limited to the Building. Association covenants and agrees that all work done by or pursuant to the direction and instruction of Association shall be performed in full compliance with all laws, rules, orders, ordinances, directions, regulations, and requirements of all governmental agencies, offices, departments, bureaus, and boards having jurisdiction, and in full compliance with the rules, orders, directions, regulations, and requirements of the Insurance Service Office, and of any similar body...”

FISCAL IMPACT

The tennis courts ADA improvements was budgeted for FY 2019-2020. Bolton is currently working on a more precise estimate with updated/coordinated plans. Based on the previous construction estimate of $300,000, there is sufficient funding in the budget to complete the ADA improvements.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the City Council approve the RHCA’s proposed amenities to the tennis courts, RHCA’s funding plan for the amenities and the ADA improvements. Staff also recommends the City Council instruct the tenant RHCA to lead and complete both projects using one general contractor so that the coordination of work is facilitated through one company.
May 28, 2019

Elaine Jeng, Manager  
City of Rolling Hills  
2 Portuguese Bend Road  
Rolling Hills, CA 90274

Dear Ms Jeng,

At the May 16, 2019 RHCA Board meeting the RHCA Board agreed to move forward with the tennis court improvements and replacement of the septic tank, RHCA would like the City Council to consider including a bathroom with the improvements.

Please notify the RHCA to advise on the City Council’s decision on whether or not they would like to proceed with the improvements to the tennis area and replacement of the septic tank and the Council’s input on the inclusion of a new bathroom under the cabana.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Myrna Jacott  
Administrative Assistant

CC: Kristen Raig, RHCA Manager
June 17, 2019

Rolling Hills City Council
2 Portuguese Bend Road
Rolling Hills, CA 90274

Re: Tennis Area Improvements

Honorable Council Members,

At the June 6, 2019 Board meeting, the RHCA Board of Directors authorized moving forward with making improvements to the area next to the tennis in the 2019-20 fiscal year. To date, the RHCA, the City and the Tennis Club have come up with a design for a new tennis cabana with an outdoor kitchen, ADA parking and access to the tennis courts and improving the bathroom at the gatehouse to meet ADA requirements. Based on these designs, plans have been prepared for demolition, grading, drainage and construction. This area is leased by the Association from the City.

In light of the City Council’s decision to not go forward with the plan to tie into the sewer, the Association would like to proceed with the tennis improvements which, in addition to the improvements listed above, will also include replacing the septic tank located between the main gate and court #1 and will service the main gate and plumbing fixtures at the new cabana.

In the original improvement plans, no bathroom was planned for the cabana area. The Tennis Club has requested that the RHCA Board and City Council consider including a bathroom at the cabana, so people don’t have to walk up to the gate house and cross a lane of traffic to get to a bathroom. The RHCA Board supports this idea and a proposed location for the bathroom is included in the plans for the Council’s consideration.

Because this is a shared project with the City and the RHCA, the RHCA is requesting the City Council approve including a bathroom at the cabana. Once this is done, the plans may be revised and we can move forward with obtaining cost estimates for the project. The Association is also looking for input from the Council on whether the Council would be interested in starting the work on this shared project in the 2019-20 fiscal year.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Kristen Raig, Manager
Rolling Hills Community Association

RECEIVED
JUN 18 2019

City of Rolling Hills
By________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>L.S.</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>Soil Remediation</td>
<td>Cut + Over-Excavation</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>C.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>Clearing &amp; Grubbing</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>S.F.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mobilization & Mitigation Measures**
Subtotal: **$9,000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>Concrete Wash Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>L.S.</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>Erosion Mats</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>L.S.</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>Inlet Sand Bags</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>L.S.</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>Silt Fencing</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>Perimeter Sandbags</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>L.S.</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>Stabilized Entrance &amp; Shake Plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>L.S.</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>Vehicle Maintenance Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>L.S.</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Erosion Control**
Subtotal: **$6,250**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.01A</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>C.Y.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.01B</td>
<td>Over-Excavation</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>C.Y.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>Total Excavation</td>
<td>Cut + Over-Excavation</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>C.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.02A</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>C.Y.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.02B</td>
<td>Re-Compaction</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>C.Y.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>Total Embankment</td>
<td>Fill + Re-Compaction</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>C.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>Export of Unsuitable Materials</td>
<td>Ex. Rock, Artificial Fill, etc. (10% of excavation)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>C.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>Import of Select Materials</td>
<td>For retaining walls, etc. as needed. (25% of Fill)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>C.Y.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grading**
Subtotal: **$18,500**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>Raised Walkway Curb Wall</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
<td>$20,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>Retaining Wall: 3'</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
<td>$15,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Retaining Walls & Raised Walk Curbs**
Subtotal: **$36,375**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>3&quot; A.C. Paving</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>S.F.</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>ADA Walk at Roadway</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>S.F.</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>6&quot; Curb</td>
<td>Curb at ADA Parking Spot Edge</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>8&quot; CL II Aggregate Base</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>C.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>Curb Marking</td>
<td>Red Striping for ADA Lane</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>Signage: Panel on one Post</td>
<td>Speed Limit, No Parking, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>EA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>Stripping: Cross Walk</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
<td>$325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>Stripping: Parking Spot</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Roadways**
Subtotal: **$7,324**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>ADA Accessible Walkway</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>S.F.</td>
<td>$3,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>ADA Accessible Ramp</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>S.F.</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>ADA Handrail</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
<td>$3,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>Wall Guardrail</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>$55</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
<td>$4,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>Concrete Paving- non ADA Walks</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>S.F.</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>Concrete Stairway</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>S.F.</td>
<td>$2,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>DG Pathway</td>
<td>DG Areas</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>Pervious Paver Walkway</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>S.F.</td>
<td>$6,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>Site Curbs</td>
<td>Curbs along walks / planters</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hardscape**
Subtotal: **$44,632**
## City of Rolling Hills Tennis Court
### Engineer's Opinion of Possible Cost
Prepared by Bolton Engineering Corporation Based on Plans Dated: June 21, 2018
Date: 7/16/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong> Storm Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>4&quot; PVC Pipe</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
<td>$6,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>6&quot; PVC Pipe</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>8&quot; PVC Pipe</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
<td>$4,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>12&quot; Catch Basin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>EA.</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>4&quot; Area Drains</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>EA.</td>
<td>$8,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>6&quot; Area Drains</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>EA.</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>Cleanout</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>EA.</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>Storm Drain Outlet Structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erosion Control Outlet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>EA.</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>Subdrain: 4&quot;</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
<td>$5,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong> Landscaping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>Grass Area</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>S.F.</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>Planters</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>S.F.</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>Site Irrigation</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>S.F.</td>
<td>$1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>Slope Planting &amp; Irrigation</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>S.F.</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong> Sewer / Septic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>City Sewer Connection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EA.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>Sewer Manhole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EA.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>Sewer Pipe (Gravity) 8&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>Sewer Pipe Pressurized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong> Domestic Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>Water Line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L.F.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>Gate Valves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EA.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>Service End Meter (HOA Irrigation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EA.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.04</td>
<td>Double Detector Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EA.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>Backflow Preventer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EA.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong> Dry Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.01</td>
<td>Underground Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L.S.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>Electrical Connection Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L.S.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>Gas Connection Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L.S.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.04</td>
<td>Telephone Connection Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L.S.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>Cable / Internet Connection Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L.S.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvement Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Costs (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvement Total Cost:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: All unit costs rounded to the nearest dollar for estimating purposes.
No construction documents have been approved; plans are at a preliminary stage and additional costs are likely to be required.
Utility fees left blank at this time.
COST PROPOSAL

Date: July 3, 2019
To: RHCA
Project Name: Tennis Courts

**Scope of Work:**

| Item                          | Cost  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electrical / Lighting</td>
<td>$18,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Demolition</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>$18,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framing Labor</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framing Materials</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Demolition</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardscape</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>$10,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tile / Stone</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinetry</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>$22,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Voltage</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenching &amp; Backfill</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appliances, S.S.</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping / Softscape / Irrigation</td>
<td>$45,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Relocation</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stucco</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siding</td>
<td>$18,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal:** $454,000.00

Project Management Fee & Supervision (16.5%) $74,910.00

**Total Job Cost:** $528,910.00

West Construction and Design, Inc P.O. BOX 4737, Palos Verdes Peninsula, CA 90274
accounting@westconstructionanddesign.com Ph: (310) 255 0242
NOTE:
A = Allowances

NIC & NOT RESPONSIBLE:

Scope of Work

PROPOSAL & CONTRACT
Date: 06/19/19

Billing Name: Calco Grading, Inc.
Billing Address: 1150 W. Capitol Dr. #4, San Pedro, CA 90732
Job Site: Rolling Hills Community Association

We propose to furnish all materials and perform all labor necessary to complete the following:
Please see attachment for Scope of Work

All work is to be complete in a substantial and workmanlike manner according to standard practices for the sum of:
Please see attachment for Price

QUOTATION GOOD FOR 60 DAYS

PAYMENT SCHEDULE: Signed contract is required prior to commencement of work. The work will be invoiced as work progresses. Invoices are due within 30 days. The remaining balance is due upon job completion. If completion of an item of work is delayed by factors beyond the control of Calco Grading, Inc., a progress payment for work performed to date will become due and Calco Grading Inc. will be entitled to an extension of project time. Changes and extra work to be compensated by advance mutual agreement of the parties to be reflected in a change order or, where no agreement can be reached, on a time and material basis with markup for overhead and profit at 20%.

GOVERNMENTAL REQUIREMENTS: Additional job requirements (i.e. shoring, fencing, public notifications, etc.) deemed necessary by the local Fire Department, Department of Building and Safety, or any other governmental agency will be billed as job extras.

CHANGED CONDITIONS: Without excluding other changed conditions, the following shall be considered changed conditions entitling the Contractor to additional compensation through a change order: (1) encountering hazardous waste, as defined in Section 25117 of the Health and Safety Code, that is required to be removed to a Class I, Class II, or Class III disposal site in accordance with provisions of existing law, (2) encountering subsurface or latent physical conditions at the site (including but not limited to soil types, rock, and groundwater) differing from those indicated by information about the site made available to Calco Grading Inc. prior to its proposal, (3) encountering unknown physical conditions at the site of any unusual nature, different materially from those ordinarily encountered and generally recognized as inherent in work of the character provided for in the contract or, (4) encountering unidentified utilities or utilities not located as or where depicted.

Price includes one mobilization, if job comes to stand still for more than three days, Calco Grading, Inc. has the right to move off of the job and charge an additional mobilization fee to come back. If factors beyond the control of Calco Grading, Inc. (i.e. heavy rain, etc.) cause excavation if any to become too wet to obtain proper compaction, the cost of remedial measures required to achieve proper compaction (i.e. gravel to stabilize bottom of excavation, replacement of unsuitable soils, etc.) shall be a job extra.

Calco Grading, Inc.
1150 W. Capitol Dr. #4, San Pedro, CA 90732
Phone: 310-890-8792
Fax: 424-287-2976

ACCEPTANCE
You are hereby authorized to furnish all materials and labor required to complete the work mentioned in the above proposal, for which I/We agree to pay the amount mentioned in said proposal, and according to the terms thereof:

Signature: ____________________________
Print Name: ____________________________ Date: ____________________________

License # 1047667
1150 W Capital Dr, Unit 4 • San Pedro, CA 90732
Office: (424) 364-0244
Billing Name: Calco Grading, Inc.
Billing Address: 1150 W. Capitol Dr. #4, San Pedro, CA 90732
Job Site: Rolling Hills Community Association

Scope of work:

Mobilization
$ 2,500

Drainage
$ 15,880

Grading
$ 12,500

Total Amount: $ 30,880

Exclusions:
- Permits
- Special Inspections
- Import/Export
- Fine grading
- Handling of road base
- Construction entrances (can be added at a rate of $4,500 per entrance in most instances)
- Water usage
- Sandbags
- Shoring or slot cutting
- Clean up due to weather

Right to stop work. Contractor will have the right to stop work if any payment shall not be made to contractor under this agreement; contractor may keep the job idle until all payments due are received.

Calco Grading, Inc.

Vincent N. D'Ambrosi
Contractor's License #1047667

Calco Grading, Inc.
1150 W. Capitol Dr. #4, San Pedro, CA 90732
Phone: 310-890-8792
Fax: 424-287-2976
TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL

FROM: ELAINE JENG, P.E., CITY MANAGER

SUBJECT: CONSIDER AND APPROVE THE SOLID WASTE COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION TO CONTINUE TO CONTRACT WITH REPUBLIC SERVICES FOR SOLID WASTE SERVICES AND TO USE A SOLID WASTE CONSULTANT TO PREPARE AN AGREEMENT

DATE: AUGUST 26, 2019

ATTACHMENT:
1. MAY 13, 2019 CITY COUNCIL MEETING STAFF REPORT ON SOLID WASTE SERVICES

BACKGROUND

In April 2010, the City Council entered into a new 5-year contract with Allied Services. In 2013, Allied was acquired by Consolidated Disposal Service, LLP, doing business as Republic Services. In 2015, the City Council extended the agreement with Republic Services to June 30, 2020.

Consideration of options for solid waste services beyond June 30, 2020 was discussed at the April 22, 2019 and May 13, 2019 City Council meetings. The staff report for the May 13, 2019 is attached for reference. At the May 13, 2019 City Council meeting, members of the Council voted to have the Solid Waste Committee take on the issue and report back to the full Council.

The Solid Waste Committee met with Republic Services on June 12, 2019, July 17, 2019, and August 7, 2019.
DISCUSSION

At the April and May 2019 City Council meetings, Republic Services presented the following rate options for consideration

Option 1:
- 5 year contract
- 30% service rate increase in year 1 of contract
- Percentage increase per the Sewer, Trash and Water Index in years 2 and beyond

Option 2:
- 7-8 year contract
- 9.65% service rate increase in year 1 of contract
- 5-6% service rate increase in year 2 and beyond

In the three Solid Waste Committee meetings, the Committee discussed the Sewer, Trash, Water Index versus the Consumer Price Index, versus the Garage Index. The Committee also received data on rate increases from nearby municipalities that recently approved new solid waste service contracts. The Committee discussed upcoming mandates including SB1383 and compliance requirements going forward. Republic Services provided a presentation on the “cost of doing business” in Rolling Hills, showing labor, material, maintenance, operations, waste transfer, processing and disposal cost compared with revenues. Republic Services discussed adjustments to the diversion requirement per the contract and loosening the contract requirement to allow for cost savings. To ensure the City has adequate time to negotiate for a new contract or explore the market, the Committee requested an extension of a 12 month period beyond July 1, 2020 and service rates for this 12 month temporary extension. The Committee also solicited the services of HF&H Consulting to sit in on two of the three meetings to serve as an advisor to the City in reviewing data presented by Republic Services and evaluate proposed rate options.

At the August 7, 2019, Republic Services presented a third rate option for consideration:

Option 3:
- 9 year contract
- 7.4% serve rate increase in year 1 of contract
- Percentage increased per the Sewer, Trash, and Water Index in years 2 and beyond with a max percent increase of 5% and a min percent increase of 3%

Republic Services did not provide service rates for the temporary 12 month extension period. Republic Services will follow up with service rates after the City Council makes a decisions on the service contract beyond July 1, 2020.
Based on the exchanges with Republic Services, data reviewed with HF&H Consulting, service rate increases in the region, consideration of the existing service quality, changes in the recycling market, and upcoming mandates, the Solid Waste Committee is recommending to the City Council to continue to contract with Republic Services and to approve the service rates per Option 3.

CONTRACT PREPARATION
Over the course of three meetings, the Committee had to discuss certain provisions of the existing contract. As an example, the Diversion Requirements of the contract call for a minimum diversion rate of fifty (50%) for residential solid waste collections services. The annual diversion rate will be calculated as “the tons of materials collected by Allied from the provision of Collection Services that are sold, processed, or shipped to a recycler or re-user and net of any residue amount, as required by this Agreement, divided by the total tons of materials collected by Allied in each Calendar Year.”

Republic Services is proposing to alter the contract provision of setting a minimum diversion rate and in lieu of a specified rate, they want to guarantee that the City will meet the CalRecycle mandated waste generation rate measured in pounds per person, per year. Changes in these types of provisions are technical in nature and would require expertise in the industry to properly safeguard the City’s interest. While the City’s legal department has assisted in drafting of a service contract, staff recommended to the Solid Waste Committee to hire a solid waste professional to assist with contract preparation. The Solid Waste Committee agrees with the staff’s recommendation.

SUBSIDY ON SERVICE
If the City Council approves the Solid Waste Committee’s recommendation to continue services with Republic Services for the next nine years, staff recommends that the City Council discuss whether to continue subsidizing service rate increases beyond Fiscal Year 2019-2020 in January 2020 during the strategic plan session. Staff will prepare data on past subsidies and provide projection tables for scenarios if subsidy continued and for scenario if subsidy were eliminated. The next service rate adjustment will take place on July 1, 2020. If public outreach is needed to educate the community on the need for rate increase, and inform the community of upcoming increases, the outreach can be conducted between March and July 2020.

FISCAL IMPACT
Solid waste service fees are collected through the property tax. It is unknown at this time the budget impact based on Option 3 proposed service rates as the budget impact depends on the subsidy. If the subsidy is eliminated, the City’s budget would not be impacted as Republic Services’ fees would be paid for using the fees collected on the property tax.
The consultant fee to prepare a contract is estimated to be $28,000 to $32,000. Republic Services has offered to pay 50% of the consulting fee and if and when the City Council approves the contract with Republic Services, the hauler will reimburse the City for the other 50% of the consulting fee to prepare the contract. If the City Council decides to continue service with Republic and use a consultant to prepare the contract, the City's budget would not be impacted.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the City Council approve the Solid Waste Committee's recommendation to continue service with Republic Services and direct staff to use a solid waste professional to draft a new contract based on proposed service rates listed in Option 3.
TO:        HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL
FROM:     ELAINE JENG, P.E., CITY MANAGER
SUBJECT:  CONSIDERATION OF OPTIONS FOR SOLID WASTE SERVICES
          BEGINNING JULY 1, 2020
DATE:     MAY 13, 2019

BACKGROUND

Allied Waste Industries (Allied) and the City entered into an agreement in June 1995
for Allied to provide waste collection, transportation and disposal services. The
agreement was amended three times: March 2000, May 2005 and May 2009. In January
2009, City Council increased solid waste collection fees to $1,031.67 per parcel per year
and commencing in 2009, authorized annual increases up to the amount of the
Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County area not to
exceed 4.5%. For Fiscal Year 2018-19 the City collected $1,100.00 per parcel from
residents for solid waste collection services and the City subsidized the remaining
portion by paying Allied $1,159.32 per parcel. There are 685 parcels in the City and
based on the current rates, the City is subsidizing approximately $40,635.

In April 2010, the City entered into a new 5-year contract with Allied Services. In 2013,
Allied was acquired by Consolidated Disposal Service, LLC, doing business as Republic
Services. In 2015, the City Council extended the agreement with Republic Services to
CPI increase for service rate commencing July 1, 2019 is 3.5% or approximately $1,200 per parcel per year. If the City continues to subsidize the rate increase, the City would be absorbing approximately $68,500 for Fiscal Year 2019-2020.

In anticipation of the expiring agreement, staff has been discussing with Republic Services the recent changes to international policies restricting foreign imports of recyclable materials, coupled with the need to reduce contamination levels in recycling streams and a declining global market value for some recyclables. Locally, in September 2016, Governor Brown signed into law SB1383 establishing methane emissions reduction targets to reduce emissions of short lived climate pollutants. Methane emissions resulting from the decomposition of organic waste in landfills are a significant source of greenhouse gas emissions. To meet the established metrics of SB1383, household organic waste will need to be sorted and collected differently to ensure organic wastes are recycled and diverted from landfills.

Discussions with Republic Services revealed that the provider anticipates a 30% service rate increase starting July 1, 2020. Assuming the City Council approves a five-year contract extension, rates subsequent to the initial 30% increase would be increased by the Sewer, Trash, Water Index. Historically, the Sewer, Trash, Water Index has been 2-3% above the Consumer Price Index for Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County. Part of the anticipated increase is due to the changes in the recycling market, commodity pricing and the new mandates. Part of the anticipated increase is due to insufficient past rate increases in Rolling Hills to keep up with the cost of doing business. Republic Services also proposed to amortize the increase over a longer contract period. In this scenario, the service rate would increase by 5-6% and remain flat for the duration of the eight to ten year contract.

**DISCUSSION**

At the March 11, 2019 City Council meeting, staff was directed to contact solid waste providers serving adjacent cities to inquire interest in servicing Rolling Hills. Staff reached out to Athens Services and Waste Management Services. Athens Services is currently servicing Redondo Beach and Palos Verdes Estates. Waste Management Services is currently servicing Manhattan Beach and Rolling Hills Estates. Both companies express interest in serving the City of Rolling Hills.

Two members of the City Council were absent from the April 22, 2019 City Council meeting. Staff was directed to continue the item to the next City Council meeting to allow the full council to discuss the matter before deciding on the next steps.

If the City Council would like to continue to be served by Republic Services, staff can negotiate with Republic Services on the rate increase scenarios aforementioned.
Alternatively, staff can prepare a Request for Proposal and competitively solicit service proposals for services beginning July 1, 2020. Typically, this process would need to commence at least 18 months from the contract expiration date. With a little over one year remaining before the contract expires, if this approach is selected, the existing contract with Republic Services would need to be extended for six months, if the selected provider is not Republic Services.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

If the City Council directs staff to negotiate with Republic Services on future rates, staff would solicit the services of a solid waste professional to assist staff with reviewing/evaluating cost proposals. The consultant fee is estimated to be $25,000 to $30,000.

If the City Council directs staff to prepare a Request for Proposal to solicit competitive proposals for service, staff would solicit the services of a solid waste professional to assist staff with the drafting of the Request for Proposal and to assist staff with the evaluation of received proposals. The consultant fee is estimated to be $50,000 to $65,000.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the City Council discuss options presented in this report and provide direction to staff.
TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL
FROM YOHANA CORONEL, MBA, CITY CLERK
THROUGH: ELAINE JENG, P.E., CITY MANAGER

SUBJECT: CONSIDER AND APPROVE THE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATIONS ON EMPLOYEE SALARIES BASED ON RECENT SALARY SURVEYS.

DATE: AUGUST 26, 2019

ATTACHMENT:
1. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA AUGUST 20, 2019

BACKGROUND

At the August 12, 2019 City Council meeting, the Council approved the below work plan to update the Employee Handbook and Personnel Policy Manual (Handbook):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COMMENCE DATE</th>
<th>COMPLETION DATE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Review manual for legislation and mandate updates</td>
<td>August 19, 2019</td>
<td>September 30, 2019</td>
<td>City Attorney (BBK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conduct salary survey for all current positions</td>
<td>July 29, 2019</td>
<td>August 30, 2019</td>
<td>Finance Department (RAMS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Present work plan to the City Council</td>
<td>August 12, 2019</td>
<td>August 12, 2019</td>
<td>Personnel Committee/City Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Review and provide feedback to draft handbook with City Attorney and Finance Department updates</td>
<td>October 7, 2019</td>
<td>October 21, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Present salary survey data and adjustments, if any to the Finance Committee</td>
<td>October 22, 2019</td>
<td>October 25, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Additional revisions to draft handbook</td>
<td>October 28, 2019</td>
<td>November 15, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Review final handbook</td>
<td>November 18, 2019</td>
<td>November 22, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Present final handbook to City Council for approval</td>
<td>November 25, 2019</td>
<td>November 25, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Updated handbook in effect</td>
<td>January 1, 2020</td>
<td>January 1, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Repeat update process (3 year cycle)</td>
<td>June 30, 2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task 2 is completed. The salary surveys were shared with the Personnel Committee on August 20, 2019.

**DISCUSSION**

The Personnel Committee recommended the following:

1. No adjustments to the top range of current salary for all positions;
2. Standardize the range and create a 20% difference between the top range and the low range;
3. Remove the listing of salary ranges for all positions from the Handbook with a reference to the City’s website;
4. The salary schedule will be published on the City’s website and updated annually; and
5. Salary surveys will not be conducted based on a frequency and will only be conducted if there is a need for the data as determined by the City Council or the City Manager.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

The Personnel Committee did not recommend changing the current salaries and therefore no budget impacts.
RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the City Council approve the five recommendations of the Personnel Committee.
AGENDA
PERSONNEL COMMITTEE MEETING

CITY OF ROLLING HILLS
CITY HALL
2 PORTUGUESE BEND ROAD, ROLLING HILLS, CALIFORNIA

TUESDAY, AUGUST 20, 2019
6:00 PM

PARTICIPANTS
Leah Mirsch, Mayor
Bea Dieringer, Councilmember
Elaine Jeng, P.E., City Manager

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. DISCUSSION ITEMS
   A. EMPLOYEE SALARY SURVEY

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

This is the appropriate time for members of the public to make comments regarding items listed on this agenda.

4. ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the Brown Act, no action will take place on any items not on the agenda.

Documents pertaining to an agenda item received after the posting of the agenda are available for review in the City Clerk's office or at the meeting at which the item will be considered.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting due to your disability, please contact the City Clerk at (310) 377-1521 at least 48 hours prior to the meeting to enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility and accommodation for your review of this agenda and attendance at this meeting.
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## City of Rolling Hills

**Salary Schedules of Near by Cities - Annual Amounts**

*As of July 31, 2019*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Manager</th>
<th>Planning Director</th>
<th>City Clerk/Executive Assistant</th>
<th>Administrative Assistant</th>
<th>Senior Planner</th>
<th>Senior Management Analyst</th>
<th>Code Enforcement Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>$ - $240,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$122,316</td>
<td>$156,108</td>
<td>$100,404</td>
<td>$59,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Segundo</td>
<td>233,472</td>
<td>121,368</td>
<td>144,732</td>
<td>79,128</td>
<td>93,384</td>
<td>47,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermosa Beach</td>
<td>219,000</td>
<td>98,264</td>
<td>119,544</td>
<td>63,828</td>
<td>77,616</td>
<td>63,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawndale</td>
<td>185,165</td>
<td>90,732</td>
<td>114,648</td>
<td>107,844</td>
<td>131,088</td>
<td>50,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lomita</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>82,344</td>
<td>101,940</td>
<td>101,268</td>
<td>125,448</td>
<td>49,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palos Verdes Estates *</td>
<td>204,000</td>
<td>80,316</td>
<td>100,728</td>
<td>77,100</td>
<td>96,624</td>
<td>46,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Palos Verdes</td>
<td>225,750</td>
<td>96,312</td>
<td>125,076</td>
<td>92,880</td>
<td>157,260</td>
<td>55,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Hills Estates</td>
<td>226,841</td>
<td>82,380</td>
<td>123,576</td>
<td>77,916</td>
<td>114,492</td>
<td>50,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Hill</td>
<td>231,177</td>
<td>99,012</td>
<td>126,360</td>
<td>61,668</td>
<td>78,696</td>
<td>50,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Habra Heights</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>72,156</td>
<td>96,696</td>
<td>49,524</td>
<td>65,372</td>
<td>36,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden Hills</td>
<td>141,500</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>69,996</td>
<td>78,720</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average of the Cities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ - $202,900</td>
<td>$94,530</td>
<td>$120,941</td>
<td>$80,141</td>
<td>$104,350</td>
<td>$51,070</td>
<td>$65,360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rolling Hills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$192,048</td>
<td>$128,364</td>
<td>$132,864</td>
<td>$87,440</td>
<td>$88,536</td>
<td>$44,472</td>
<td>$58,932</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$103.51 per hour interim, amount is prior CM
Personnel Committee  
August 20, 2019 6:00 PM  
Meeting Notes

Participants  
Leah Mirsch, Mayor  
Bea Dieringer, Councilmember  
Elaine Jeng, P.E., City Manager  
Terry Shea, Finance Director

The Committee met to discuss the following item:

1. Employee Salary Survey

1. Employee Salary Survey

The City Manager indicated the Salary Survey is part of the Handbook. The current salary range listed is from 2014. Because the salaries are adjusted annually for cost of living, at the previous committee meeting, Committee members agreed to remove the listing of salary ranges from the handbook and in lieu of provide a reference to the City’s website where the salary ranges will be published and updated by fiscal year.

The Finance Director went over the Salary Survey and how it was prepared. He explained the Planning Director position for the City does not quite fit with the other cities because the salaries of the Planning Manager and or the most senior planning position was used as a comparison. Rolling Hills’ Planning Director is a hybrid position comprising work beyond planning.

The salaries of all other positions at Rolling Hills comparatively are below the average salaries of surveyed cities.

Councilmember Dieringer asked if the new hires are asking for salaries at the top of the City’s Salary Range and the City Manager indicated they were.

Mayor Mirsch indicated her biggest concern was how to go forward and bridge the gap between our salaries and the salaries of the surveyed cities. She wants the City to be able to attract quality employees and retain them.

The City Manager indicated she has the authority per the City’s Handbook to appoint the new Planning Director. Considerations to appoint rather than advertise are (1) short timeframe to fill vacancy before the current Planning Director vacates the position; (2) to have an overlap with the current Planning Director; (3) the Planning Director is a key
position for the City and appointment would give more flexibility to the City Manager to determine fit with the organization and culture of the City.

The City Manager indicated per the Handbook, she has the authority to make offers to new hires any amount within the salary range but the Handbook is silent on authorities with the benefits. She indicated she would like language in the Handbook addressing the City Manager’s authority with benefits. Benefits can be used as bridge to salary gaps.

The City Manager indicated she had made an offer to a candidate on Monday, August 19, 2019. The offer included the top range of the salary. She is waiting for a response from the candidate.

Councilmember Dieringer voiced her concerns of starting the person at the high range. Would the City have to increase the high range to get the person to stay on?

There was discussion regarding the City’s benefits in comparison with other cities and the automatic COLA increase each year.

There was discussion on the current salaries. Both Committee members did not recommend to adjust the current salaries. There was discussion on establishing steps within the salary range and discussion on standardizing the disparity between the low and high range for all positions. Committee members recommended to keep the top range as is for all positions, and create a 20% difference between the top range and the low range.

The City Manager recommended that the City establish a policy as to when the salary surveys should be conducted: once a year, every three years or whatever interval the Council feels it should be performed.

The City Manager asked the Committee Members what is the value of the salary survey to the Committee. The Handbook states surveys should be performed from time to time but does not indicate when. The Committee discussed what they get out of the surveys. After some discussion, the Committee recommended the salary surveys should only be conducted when needed, such as before a new hire or in response to requests for raises.

Meeting concluded approximately 9:15pm.

Notes prepared by: Terry Shea