RES. AWARDING CONTRACT FOR PORTABLE BASKETBALL FLOOR AND STANDARDS

RES. NO. 82-20

Following recommendation of the City Manager, Council adopted the following resolution:

RESOLUTION NO. 82-20

RESOLUTION AWARDING THE CONTRACT FOR THE PORTABLE BASKETBALL FLOOR TO ROBBINS, INC. IN THE AMOUNT OF $54,457.00 AND OUTDOOR PRODUCTS CO., FOR THE STANDARDS IN THE AMOUNT OF $9,646.00.

* *

RES. APPROVING CAL TRANS AGREEMENT FOR HUTCHINS AND KETTLEMAN LANE TRAFFIC SIGNAL

RES. NO. 82-21

cc.115(k)

The Modification Agreement of Hutchins and Kettleman Traffic Signal with California Department of Transportation was presented for Council's approval. The proposed work at this intersection mainly involves the addition of left turn phases in order to reduce the high number of left turn accidents; however, doing this will require major changes to the signals - new poles, mast arms and detectors. The costs are being split 50-50 between the City and the State and funds ($64,000) for the City's share were budgeted in the 1981-82 Capital Improvement Program.

Following discussion, on motion of Councilman Pinkerton, Hughes second, Council adopted Resolution No. 82-21 approving Cooperative Agreement between the City of Lodi and the California Department of Transportation and directing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute the Agreement on behalf of the City.

cc.10(8)

CONFIRMATION OF COUNCIL'S DIRECTION ON TURNER ROAD R/W

Staff asked Council for a clarification of Council's February 24, 1982 direction to construct Turner Road (at Cluff Avenue) to its ultimate width.

The exact motion, moved by Pinkerton and seconded by Murphy, is as follows:

"That we try to acquire the property so we can continue the streets and tie it into the existing contract and get it done at a reasonable price so it's done, out of the way, and so we have a development with an access to the industrial area of the City of Lodi."

Because of the exact wording of the motion, the Staff, feels that clarification is needed on the following items:

1. Is it the Council's intention to acquire the required rights-of-way from Snell, Jerome, <u>and Anagnos</u>?

   For Council's information, it has been past practice of the City Council to use their condemnation power where portions of future street alignments were needed as part of a proposed development for installation of utilities, additional street width, drainage, etc. However, it has been in the past, the developer's responsibility to pay for the appraisal, condemnation, and any litigation costs, the right-of-way needs and to make the necessary installations required for his development.

   For Council information, the appraisal work will cost $3,000 and the rights-of-way costs and preliminary construction estimates as follows:

Continued March 10, 1982

	Right-of-way Costs*	Construction Costs	Total
Jerome	$ 700	$ 8,000	$ 8,700
Snell	5,500	11,000	16,500
Anagnos	10,800	34,000	44,800
Total	$ 17,000	$53,000	$70,000

*Based on $0.50 per square foot. No value given to severence.

2. Is it the intent that the City pay all of the above costs?

   This is questioned based on the memo that was in the last Council packet from City Attorney Stein. From this memo it appears the developer has indicated to the City Attorney that they would be willing to pay for the improvements in front of Snell and Jerome properties if the City purchased the rights-of-way.

3. Is it the City Council's intent to construct all of the street improvements, including parking lane, curb, gutter and sidewalk, or only those improvements necessary to provide the ultimate four (4) travel lanes?

4. It was clear that the Council wanted this work done in conjunction and together with the work under the Assessment District. Since the Assessment District contract has been let and it is the contractor's intent to install the underground utilities and do the roadway construction on Turner Road first, it doesn't appear that we will be able to do the additional work on Turner Road in conjunction with the Assessment District contract. It is assumed that the Council doesn't want to delay the District work.

5. If it is the Council's intent for the City to be responsible for the construction costs, does the Council want to consider reimbursement at the time the properties develop and convert to a higher use?

6. If it is the Council's intent for the City to pay for the right-of-way and the additional street construction, does the Council have any preference on what City funds should be used?

7. If Cal-Cushion does not develop (the City has no guarantee) is it still the Council's intent to widen Turner Road?

CONFIRMATION OF COUNCIL DIRECTION ON TURNER ROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY

Following discussion, Staff was informed by the Council that it was Council's intention to acquire the required rights-of-way from Snell, Jerome, and Anagnos. Council further directed Staff to proceed with the appraisal work at an estimated cost of $3,000.00 which cost will be paid by the City of Lodi.

FIRE INSURANCE RATING IMPROVED

cc-6

City Manager Glaves apprised the Council that a report had been received from Insurance Services Office of California indicating that the City of Lodi's fire insurance protection class has been improved to Class 3.

CITY COUNCIL

FRED M. REID, Mayor
ROBERT G. MURPHY, Mayor Pro Tempore
EVELYN M. OLSON
JAMES W. PINKERTON, Jr.
JOHN R. (Randy) SNIDER

CITY OF LODI

CITY HALL, 221 WEST PINE STREET
POST OFFICE BOX 320
LODI, CALIFORNIA 95241
(209) 334-5634

HENRY A. GLAVES, Jr.
City Manager

ALICE M. REIMCHE
City Clerk

RONALD M. STEIN
City Attorney

June 17, 1982

Mr. and Mrs. Carl Snell
1011 North Cluff Avenue
Lodi, California 95240

Re: Appraisal of Property at 1011 North Cluff Avenue

Dear ~~Mr. and Mrs. Snell~~:

The City Council at its regular meeting held June 16, 1982 authorized the City Attorney to obtain a San Joaquin County Superior Court Order Permitting Entry on Property [CCP Section 1245.030(a)] in order that we may have an appraisal made of your property to determine the value thereof as required for the Turner Road widening project.

I will be preparing the papers this week to submit to the Court; however, I would hope that the filing of same is not necessary and would ask you to reconsider your position of not allowing an appraiser on your property. If I have not heard from you by Friday, June 25, 1982, it is my intention to file the legal documents as authorized by the Council.

I wish to thank you for your past cooperation and would hope that we can continue in this spirit of cooperation in the future. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

RONALD M. STEIN
CITY ATTORNEY

RMS:vc