EXTENSION OF BID OPENING DATE FOR ASPHALT MATERIAL BIDS APPROVED

Following introduction of the matter by Staff, Council, on motion of Council Member Pinkerton, Reid second, extended the opening date for receipt of bids for Asphalt Materials to Tuesday, April 17, 1984.

i) Viola Reiswig Parcel No. 043-031-05

j) Harry Wiebe, Manager
Cal Gas, Lodi Parcel No. 043-033-03

k) James E. Flaherty, Secretary
Lodi Aerie No. 848,
Fraternal Order of Eagles Parcels No. 043-036-15

Also addressing the Council regarding the subject was J. Paul Dumont, Senior Vice President, Wulff, Hansen and Co. Mr. Dumont responded to questions regarding the proposed district and the financing thereof.

The following persons spoke on behalf of the proposed Assessment District:

a) Fred Weybret, 125 N. Church Street. Lodi

b) Terry Knutson, 213 S. School Street, Lodi

c) Jack Bowen, 218 S. School Street, Lodi

d) Biff Baffoni, 118 W Oak Street, Lodi

e) Mike Lapenta, 1718 E. Edgewood Drive, Lodi

f) Pastor Richard Lundgren, First United Methodist Church

g) Ann Meyer, Sacramento and Pine Street property owner

The following persons spoke in opposition

a) Mr. Vass representing the Lodi Senior Citizens Club
113 N. School Street Parcel No. 043-024-07

b) Mr. Mark Stevens representing Viola Reiswig,
13 N. Church Street Parcel No. 043-031-05

c) Mr. Jim Flaherty, representing the Fraternal Order of Eagles Parcel No. 043-036-16
21 W. Oak St.

d) Mr. Lloyd Jentoff Parcel No. 043-048-01
216 and 228 S.Sacramento St.

e) Mr. Ed DeJong Parcel No. 043-022-07
101 N. Church St.

f) Mr. C. H. Blewett Parcel No. 043-046-11 and
221 & 229 S. Sacramento St. 043-046-12

g) Ms. Lola Roberts Parcel No. 043-024-02
118 N. Church Street

h) Albert Barone Parcel No. 043-026-10
11 W. Elm Street

There being no other persons wishing to speak on the matter, the public portion of the hearing was closed.

It was determined that an 8.72% protest of the square footage within the district had been received.

Following additional discussion, on Motion of Council Member Reid, Murphy second, Council adopted the following Resolutions by unanimous vote of all members of the Council present:

a) Resolution No. 84-039 - A Resolution Ordering Reduction to Assessments and Directing Amendment to Engineer's Report.

Lodi Aerie No. 848
# FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES
Telephone (209)369-5679 Meets Every Thursday

April 3, 1984

Lodi City Council
c/o Alice Reimche, City Clerk

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The Fraternal Order of Eagles, as owners of property in Zone #2 of the proposed Downtown Assessment District (Assessment Lot Number 90 - Assessors Parcel Number 043-036-15), do protest the forming of an Assessment District by some of the merchants at the expense of the property owners.

We do not oppose the improvement of downtown Lodi, only the forming of the Assessment District to accomplish these improvements at a great expense to the property owners. We believe far more improvements can be accomplished by using the Community Redevelopment Law of California, which could have a much broader coverage on improving a larger section of Lodi at little or no additional expense to property owners, except what they will be paying in property taxes anyway.

An Assessment District that is cosmetic in nature serves only to add an additional expense on the property owners in order to subsidize the downtown merchants. According to the IRS, an Assessment is not a tax and is not deductible. This expense cannot be passed onto the lessor unless they agree to pay it on their own. Those of us who own property that is not commercial in nature have no way to recover this expense short of selling our property, if possible.

We hope the City Council will take a long look at all the property and come up with a solution that is fair to all the property owners, not just part of the downtown merchants.

Very truly yours,

LODI EAGLES LODGE #848

James E. Flaherty

JAMES E. FLAHERTY
Secretary

JEF:sm

RECEIVED
84 APR -5 PM 2:45
ALICE M. REIMCHE
CITY CLERK

CAL GAS

**CAL GAS —LODI**

April 3, 1984

Alice M. Reimche, City Clerk
City of Lodi
Lodi CA 95240

Re: Lodi United Downtown Assessment District
Beautification Project

Dear Mrs. Reimche:

We, Cal Gas Lodi, wish to register a protest against the proposed Downtown Assessment District Beautification Project (Parcel 043-033-03).

We are proposed to the entire concept of the assessment. The benefits we might receive from this improvement seem very minute in comparison to the investment.

Sincerely,

CAL GAS LODI

Harry Wiebe
Manager

HW/mr

106 WEST ELM STREET • LODI, CA 95240 • (209) 368-0681-LODI • (209) 466-9621-STOCKTON

Viola's
18 N. Church st.
Lodi, Ca. 95240

4-1-84

RECEIVED
1984 APR -2 AM 9:11
ALICE M. REINICHE
CITY CLERK
CITY OF LODI

Attention: City of Lodi - City Clerk

I am writing in regards to the notice to property Owners, from the L.U.D.A.D. Beautification Project. I agree with the Assesment District Opposition Committee! What garauntee can L.U.D.A.D. make, that their ideas, will in fact increase bussiness? In my opinion putting in colored tiles, new landscaping, and planting of trees, is not going to do the job L.U.D.A.D. claims it will. I have no trouble getting bussiness and I don't even advertise. Why should I spend my money on this projech

when I have no prob'm getting business? And I have been here for many years. Who's going to come just to see how beautiful Rodi is? We the Assessment District Opposition Committee vote NO!

Assessment No. 81
Parcel 049-031--5
OR.

Sincerely
Viola Reiswig

P.S.
This project is not going to be one of the "seven wonders"!

ED DEJONG BURDETTE DEJONG DARYL D. DEJONG ORVILLE DEJONG

# DEJONG INSURANCE

101 NORTH CHURCH STREET
LODI, CALIFORNIA
TELEPHONE 369-3663

March 30, 1984

Lodi United Downtown Assessment
District Beautification Project
City of Lodi, California

RE: Parcel 043-02207 Assessment $ 1,562.09
101 No. Church Street, Lodi, California

We understand we are to be included in the above assessment district, yet no one has ever approached us to be included. We also understand very little, if anything, will be done to our frontage or intersection. This is understandable because we have already landscaped our property plus we have nine off-street parking spaces. Of the downtown merchants and/or property owners, how many have provided off-street parking for their employees and clients?

Some of the downtown merchants and property owners wish to beautify their property; also some intersection work, basically on School Street--why then don't they pay for this themselves. Surely if the benefits of having trees and shrubs along their property will keep their property values up and bring more customers in, these same property owners should be more than willing to pay the bill. Why should property owners that already have these improvements on their property help pay for these improvements for other owners?

Talking to some of the merchants downtown, we are given the impression that trees, shrubs and nice looking intersections will do nothing to bring them more customers. It still comes down to three basic things that the public looks for---convenience in parking, quality of service and prices.

We, therefore, object to being included in the assessment district and paying for someone elses bill to improve their property. We further wish to be excluded from this assessment district.

Sincerely,
Ed DeJong
Burdette DeJong
Burdette De Jong
Partner

Galt March 27. 84

Dear Sir

In regards of your letter dated 3-9-84 we are very much against what you intend to do.
It would be all right in the rest part of the City but regarding Sacto Str specialy north block bet Elm and Locust it goin to be money wasted there is nothing there but four Mexican Beer Places. what it would be better to have the property owners paint the buildings.
Our place The Rainbow Club it was always very clean place but Steve Slaiton operator at the present time he left everything goin to hell. he moved the Liquor Licence out and moved to the "Stud" Elm and School Str and just with wine & Beer they can not make a Living. so why spend money in scrubs and thaus they distroy everything.

**Odd Fellows Hall Association of Lodi**
~~P.O. BOX 184~~ 6 S. PLEASANT
LODI, -:- CALIFORNIA

To the City Clerk of Lodi, Ca.
Dear Madam

As an officer of the Lodi Odd Fellows Hall Association of Lodi, I wish to express our opposition to the assessment of our property for the current plan to beautify the business district.

We request that the plan be voted down and a committee be appointed to form a Redevelopment District with the expectation of receiving some funds from the State through the Redevelopment Law of California.

Sincerely
Richard Colvin
Treasurer of Hall Association.

Our parcels in the city are:
043-032-01
043-032-02

SENIOR CITIZENS CLUB OF LODI, INC.
113 North School Street
Lodi, California 95240
(209) 369-9798

Lodi, Calif.
March 29, 1984

Lodi United Downtown Assessment Dist.
Beautifiaction Project
City of Lodi
c/o Alice M. Reimche, City Clerk
City Hall
221 W. Pine
Lodi, Calif. 95240

Re: Beautification Project
City of Lodi
County Assessors Parcel
No. 043-024-07
Assessment No. 65

Gentlemen:

We, the Senior Citizens Club of Lodi, Inc.; a non-profit organization, exempt from State and Federal tax, hereby request exemption from assessment No. 65 for the beautification project of Lodi.

We have nothing to sell for profit and will receive no monetary advantage from this project.

Yours Very Truly,
Ozzie Pidde
Ozzie Pidde, President
Lodi Senior Citizens Club
113 No. School St.
Lodi, Calif. 95240

mb/OP
c.c.

Tokay Quick Printing
Telephone (209) 368-8617
5 WEST ELM — LODI, CALIFORNIA 95240

March 28, 1984

Alice M. Reimche,
City Clerk,
221 W. Pine
Lodi, California 95240

Dear Alice

As owner of property Parcel 043-026-16, Assessment Lot Number 139, 5 - 7 West Elm, Lodi, in the concept study, Lodi Downtown Improvement Plan.

I protest and go on record against this concept of improvements and assessments of property involved in this beautification project for the city of Lodi.

There have been many changes in the assessment figures and formula, since the original figures, especially relative to Zone 3. Especially in the enormous increase in the amount of our assessments.

I demand a complete re-contact and confirmation of all signatures and on all the petitions with the final accrued assessment figures.

Since all this gerrymandering has taken place subsequent to the original, this plan is insufficient and inequitable to accomplish the results for which it was intended.

I challenge the formula that sets Zone 3 so high and the lowering of Zone 1 and Zone 2.

Sincerely,

Edwin O. Dammel.

Odd Fellows Hall Association of Lodi
P. O. BOX 124
LODI, CALIFORNIA

RECEIVED
1984 MAR 28 AM 8 10
ALICE M. [illegible]
CITY CLERK

Lodi Ca.
3-28-84

Dear Madam.

As an officer of the Lodi Hall Asso. I.O.O.F. wish to express our opposition to the assessment of our property for the current plan to beautify the business district.

We request that the plan be voted down and a Committee be appointed to request funds through the redevelopment laws of California.

Sincerely.
J. W. Schultz
President of Hall asso.

Blewett Dairy
ICE CREAM AND MILK
221 SOUTH SACRAMENTO STREET • 369-3519
LODI, CALIFORNIA 95240

March 22, 1984

ALICE M. REIMCHE, City Clerk
City Hall, Lodi, CA. 95240

As owner of property Parcel No. 043-046-11, 221 S. Sacramento Street and Parcel No. 043-046-12, 229 S. Sacramento Street in the Concept Study, Lodi Downtown Improvement Plan --

I protest and go on record against this concept of improvements and assessments of property involved in this Beautification Project for the City of Lodi.

There have been many changes in the assessment figures and formula since the original figure, especially relative to Zone 3.

I demand a complete re-contact and confirmation of all signatures on all the petitions with the final accrued assessment figures.

Since all this gerrymandering has taken place subsequent to the original, this plan is insuffient and inequitable to accomplish the results for which it was intended.

I challenge the formula that sets Zone 3 so high and Zone 1 lower.

Respectfully submitted,

C. H. BLEWETT

C. H. Blewett

Mar. 11, 1984

REC
84 MAR 1
ALICE M.
CITY
CITY C

To whom it may concern:

We oppose the Assessment District spending our money to benefit a few merchants in Lodi.

We would like to be dropped out of the Assessment District like the property owners on the North side of Locust St was dropped.

Sincerely
Mr & Mrs. Jerry Ballard

Our Assessment No 128
County Assessor Parcel # 043-035-14

RESOLUTION NO. 84-039

BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF
LODI, CALIFORNIA

A RESOLUTION ORDERING REDUCTION OF ASSESSMENTS
AND DIRECTING AMENDMENT TO ENGINEER'S REPORT

LODI UNITED DOWNTOWN ASSESSMENT DISTRICT
BEAUTIFICATION PROJECT

RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of Lodi, California, that

WHEREAS, on February 22, 1984, said Council adopted its Resolution No. 84-17, A Resolution of Intention to Acquire and/or Construct Improvements, to order the acquisition and/or construction of public improvements, as more particularly described in said Resolution; the estimated cost of said improvements was $851,907.00, and the estimated contribution by the City of Lodi was $273,000.00, leaving a balance of $578,907.00 to be assessed;

WHEREAS, following the opening of bids for the work, and the negotiations for the sale of the bonds to be issued upon the unpaid assessments, said assessments should be reduced to reflect the reduction in the cost of construction, and the estimated amount of interest to be earned on the proceeds of the bonds pending disbursement for the project costs;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED as follows:

1. The total assessment is hereby reduced to $555,638.63, and that each of the individual assessments be ratably reduced to reflect the reduction in the cost of construction per district zones, and the estimated interest to be earned on the investment of the bond proceeds pending disbursement for the project costs.

2. The Engineer of Work is authorized and directed to make the changes hereinabove ordered in the Engineer's Report and assessment on file herein.

DATED: April 4, 1984.

I, ALICE M. REIMCHE, City Clerk of the City of Lodi, do hereby certify that Resolution No. 84-039 was passed and adopted at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Lodi, held April 4, 1984, by the following vote:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| AYES: | Councilmen - | Murphy, Pinkerton, Snider, and Reid |
| NOES: | Councilmen - | None |
| ABSENT: | Councilmen - | Olson |
| ABSTENTIONS: | Councilmen - | None |

Alice M. Reimche
ALICE M. REIMCHE, City Clerk

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

# 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

April 10, 1984

Mr. Timothy Hachman
141 East Acacia Street
Stockton, California

Dear Tim:

Enclosed herewith please find certified copies of Resolutions No. 84-039 and 84-042 inclusive pertaining to the Lodi Downtown Assessment District Beautification project.

Thank you so much for all your help in this matter, and if we can provide any further information or if you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to call this office.

Very truly yours,

Alice M. Reimche

Alice M. Reimche
City Clerk

AMR:jj
Enc.

RESOLUTION NO. 84-040

BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF
LODI, CALIFORNIA

A RESOLUTION AWARDING CONTRACT

LODI UNITED DOWNTOWN ASSESSMENT DISTRICT
BEAUTIFICATION PROJECT

RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of Lodi, California, that

WHEREAS, on February 22, 1984, said Council adopted its Resolution No. 84-17, A Resolution of Intention to Acquire and/or Construct Improvements, to order the acquisition and/or construction of public improvements, as more particularly described in said Resolution, and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Notice Inviting Bids duly given and published by the City Clerk of said City, the City Clerk did in open session on the 22nd day of March, 1984, publicly open, examine and declare all sealed proposals or bids for the work to be done and improvements to be made, as described and specified in Resolution of Intention;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, as follows:

1. That said Council hereby rejects all of said proposals or bids, except that hereinafter mentioned, and hereby awards the contract for doing the work and improvements and furnishing the materials, supplies and equipment necessary therefor to the lowest responsible bidder, to wit:

CLAUDE C. WOOD COMPANY

at the unit prices named in said bid.

2. That the Mayor of said City is hereby authorized to make and enter into a written contract with said successful bidder and to receive and approve all bonds in connection therewith, and the City Clerk of said City is hereby directed to attest his signature and affix thereto the official seal of said City.

DATED: April 4, 1984.

I, ALICE M. REIMCHE, City Clerk of the City of Lodi, do hereby certify that Resolution No. 84-040 was passed and adopted at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Lodi, held April 4, 1984, by the following vote:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| AYES: | Councilmen - | Murphy, Pinkerton, Snider, and Reid |
| NOES: | Councilmen - | None |
| ABSENT: | Councilmen - | Olson |
| ABSTENTIONS: | Councilmen - | None |

Alice M. Reimche
ALICE M. REIMCHE, City Clerk

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

# 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

April 10, 1984

Mr. Timothy Hachman
141 East Acacia Street
Stockton, California

Dear Tim:

Enclosed herewith please find certified copies of Resolutions No. 84-039 and 84-042 inclusive pertaining to the Lodi Downtown Assessment District Beautification project.

Thank you so much for all your help in this matter, and if we can provide any further information or if you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to call this office.

Very truly yours,

Alice M. Reimche

Alice M. Reimche
City Clerk

AMR:jj
Enc.

RESOLUTION NO. 84-041

BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF
LODI, CALIFORNIA

A RESOLUTION AWARDING SALE OF BONDS

LODI UNITED DOWNTOWN ASSESSMENT DISTRICT
BEAUTIFICATION PROJECT

RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of Lodi, California, that

WHEREAS, this Council has received a proposal to purchase bonds to be issued to represent unpaid assessments levied in the proceedings under Resolution No. 84-17, A Resolution of Intention to Acquire and/or Construct Improvements, adopted by said Council on February 22, 1984, for the acquisition and/or construction of public improvements, as more particularly described in said Resolution;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED as follows:

1. That upon consummation of special assessment district proceedings said bonds be, and they are hereby ordered sold to WULFF, HANSEN & CO., San Francisco, California, said sale to be subject to all the terms and conditions set forth in said accepted proposal, and that the interest rate of said bonds be, and the same is hereby fixed at the rate stated in said proposal.

2. That the Director of Finance be, and he is hereby directed to have said bonds printed, and that the same be signed, sealed and delivered to said purchaser upon receipt of the amount therefor, in accordance with the terms and conditions contained in said proposal and the proceedings held pursuant to said Resolution and any amendments thereto.

DATED: April 4, 1984.

I, ALICE M. REIMCHE, City Clerk of the City of Lodi, do hereby certify that Resolution No. 84-041 was passed and adopted at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Lodi, held April 4, 1984, by the following vote:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| AYES: | Councilmen - | Murphy, Pinkerton, Snider, and Reid |
| NOES: | Councilmen - | None |
| ABSENT: | Councilmen - | Olson |
| ABSTENTIONS: | Councilmen - | None |

Alice M. Reimche
ALICE M. REIMCHE, City Clerk

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

# 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

April 10, 1984

Mr. Timothy Hachman
141 East Acacia Street
Stockton, California

Dear Tim:

Enclosed herewith please find certified copies of Resolutions No. 84-039 and 84-042 inclusive pertaining to the Lodi Downtown Assessment District Beautification project.

Thank you so much for all your help in this matter, and if we can provide any further information or if you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to call this office.

Very truly yours,

Alice M. Reimche

Alice M. Reimche
City Clerk

AMR:jj
Enc.

RESOLUTION NO. 84-042

BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF
LODI, CALIFORNIA

A RESOLUTION DETERMINING CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY, ADOPTING ENGINEER'S REPORT, AS AMENDED, CONFIRMING ASSESSMENT, AND ORDERING THE WORK AND IMPROVEMENTS

LODI UNITED DOWNTOWN ASSESSMENT DISTRICT
BEAUTIFICATION PROJECT

RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of Lodi, California, that

WHEREAS, on February 22, 1984, said Council adopted its Resolution No. 84-17, A Resolution of Intention to Acquire and/or Construct Improvements, declaring that the public interest, convenience and necessity required, and that it intended to order, the acquisition and/or construction of certain public improvements, as more particularly described in said Resolution, and referred the proposed improvements to the Engineer of Work of said City, he being the officer having charge and control of the acquisitions and improvements in and for said City of the kind described in said Resolution, and being a competent person employed by said City for that purpose;

WHEREAS, said Council thereby directed said Engineer of Work to make and file with the City Clerk of said City a report in writing in accordance with and pursuant to the provisions of the Municipal Improvement Act of 1913, Division 12 of the Streets and Highways Code;

WHEREAS, said report was duly made and filed with the City Clerk of said City whereupon the Clerk presented it to said Council for consideration;

WHEREAS, said Council thereupon duly considered said report and each and every part thereof, and found that it contained all the matters and things called for by the aforesaid provisions of said Code, including (1) maps and descriptions of lands and easements, and a general description of the works or appliances to be acquired, (2) plans and specifications of the proposed improvements to be made, (3) estimate of costs, (4) diagram of district, and (5) an assessment according to benefits, all of which was done in the form and manner required by said Act;

WHEREAS, said Council found that said report and each and every part thereof was sufficient in every particular and determined that it should stand as the report for all subsequent proceedings under said Code and Resolution of Intention, whereupon said Council pursuant to the requirements of said Code, appointed Wednesday, the 4th day of April, 1984, at 8:00 P.M. of said day in the regular meeting place of said Council, Council Chambers, Lodi, California, as the time and place for hearing protests in relation to said proposed acquisitions and/or improvements, and directed the Clerk of said City to give notice of said hearing as required by said Act;

WHEREAS, it appears that notice of said hearing was duly and regularly mailed, posted and published in the time, form and manner required by said Act, as evidenced by the declarations on file with said City Clerk, whereupon said hearing was duly and regularly held at the time and place advertised in said notice;

WHEREAS, 13 persons interested, objecting to said acquisitions and/or improvements, or to the extent of the assessment district, or to the proposed assessment or diagram, or to the maps and descriptions, or to the grades at which said work will be done, or to the Engineer's estimate of the costs and expenses thereof, filed written protests with the Clerk of said City at or before the time set for said hearing, and all persons interested desiring to be heard were given an opportunity to be heard, and all matters and things pertaining to said acquisitions and/or improvements were fully heard and considered by said Council;

NOW, THEREFORE, said Council does hereby find, determine and order as follows:

1. That the owners of one-half of the area of the property to be assessed for the cost of said project did not at or prior to the time fixed for said hearing, file written protests against the said acquisitions and/or improvements, or as to the Engineer's estimate of costs and expenses of said project, or against the maps and descriptions, or against the grades at which said work is proposed to be done, or against the diagram and assessment to pay for the costs and expenses thereof.

2. That any and all protests made either to the questions of the public interest, convenience and necessity of making said acquisitions and/or improvements under said Resolution, or to said proposed acquisitions and/or improvements, or the grades to which said work is proposed to be done, or to the extent of the assessment district, or the maps and descriptions, or the amounts of the several assessments, and all persons desiring to be heard in relation to any of said matters, whether as protestants or otherwise, have been fully heard and considered, and said protests are hereby overruled.

3. That the public interest, convenience and necessity require the acquisitions and/or improvements in the manner proposed, and Division 4 of the Streets and Highways Code of the State of California shall not apply.

4. That the district benefited by said acquisitions and/or improvements and to be assessed to pay the costs and expenses thereof, and the exterior boundaries thereof, is the district described in said Resolution.

5. That the Engineer's estimate of the itemized and total costs and expenses of said acquisitions and/or improvements, and of the incidental expenses in connection therewith, contained in said report, as amended, be, and it is hereby finally adopted and approved as the Engineer's total and detailed estimate of the costs and expenses of said acquisitions and/or improvements.

6. That the plans and specifications for the proposed improvements, contained in said report, as amended, be, and they are hereby finally adopted and approved as the plans and specifications to which said work shall be done as called for in said Resolution.

7. That the maps and descriptions of the lands and easements to be acquired, as contained in said report, as amended, be, and the same are hereby approved and confirmed.

8. That the public interest, convenience and necessity require, and said Council does hereby order the acquisitions and/or improvements to be made as described in and in accordance with said Resolution, on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City, reference to which is hereby made for a more particular description of said acquisitions and/or improvements and for further particulars, pursuant to the provisions of said Act.

9. That the diagram showing the assessment district referred to and described in said Resolution, and also the boundaries and dimensions of the respective subdivisions of land within said district as the same existed at the time of the passage of said Resolution, each of which subdivisions have been given a separate number upon said diagram, as contained in said report, as amended, be, and it is hereby finally approved and confirmed as the diagram of the properties to be assessed to pay the costs and expenses of said acquisitions and improvements.

10. That the assessment of the total amount of costs and expenses of the proposed acquisitions and/or improvements, upon the several subdivisions of land in said assessment district in proportion to the estimated benefits to be received by said subdivisions, respectively, from said acquisitions and improvements, and of the expenses incidental thereto, as contained in said report, as amended, be, and the same is hereby finally approved and confirmed as the assessment to pay the costs and expenses of said improvements.

11. That the Engineer's Report, as amended, be, and the same is hereby finally approved and confirmed as a whole.

12. That the Clerk of said City shall forthwith deliver to the Director of Public Works of said City the said assessment together with the diagram thereto attached and made a part thereof, as confirmed by this Council, with his certificate of such confirmation thereto attached and of the date thereof; and that said Director of Public Works shall record said diagram and assessment in his office in a suitable book to be kept for that purpose, and shall append thereto his certificate of the date of such recording, and such recordation shall be and constitute the assessment roll herein.

13. After the recording of the assessment and diagram in the office of the Director of Public Works, the City Clerk of said City shall execute and record a notice of assessment in the office of the County Recorder in substantially the form provided in Section 3114 of the Streets and Highways Code.

14. The City Clerk of said City shall file in the office of the County Recorders a copy of the assessment diagram. The County Recorder shall endorse on the copy of the assessment diagram filed with him the time and date of filing and shall fasten the same , securely in the Book of Maps of Assessment Citys in which he is obligated to keep boundary maps of assessment districts and shall index such assessment diagram by the name of the district conducting the proceedings and by reference to page of the book of maps of assessment districts in which the boundary map of said assessment district was filed in said book.

15. That said Director of Public Works, upon the recording of said diagram and assessment, shall mail to each owner of real property within the assessment district, at his last known address as the same appears on the tax rolls of the City or on file in the office of the City Clerk, or to both addresses, if said address is not the same, or to general delivery when no address so appears, a statement containing a designation by street number or other description of the property assessed sufficient to enable the owner to identify the same, the amount of the assessment, the date of recordation of said assessment, the time and place of payment thereof, the effect of failure to pay within such time, and a statement of the fact that bonds will be issued upon the unpaid assessments in the manner provided in Improvement Bond Act of 1915, Division 10 of the Streets and Highways Code, and that the applicable provisions of Part 11.1 of said Act providing an alternative procedure for the advance payment of assessments and the calling of bonds, shall apply. The last installment of such bonds shall mature not to exceed fourteen (14) years from the second day of July next succeeding ten (10) months from their date, principal and interest to be reasonably amortized, the proceeds of said bonds to be invested and interest thereon paid into the redemption fund of said bonds.

16. That the Director of Public Works shall also cause Notice to Pay Assessments to be published once a week for two successive weeks in the Lodi News-Sentinel, a newspaper published and circulated in said City, that said assessment has been recorded, that all sums assessed thereon are due and payable immediately, that the payment of said sums is to be made within thirty (30) days after the date of recording said assessment, which date shall be stated in said notice, and of the fact that bonds will be issued upon unpaid assessments as above provided.

DATED: April 4, 1984.

I, ALICE M. REIMCHE, City Clerk of the City of Lodi, do hereby certify that Resolution No. 84-042 was passed and adopted at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Lodi, held April 4, 1984, by the following vote:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| AYES: | Councilmen - | Murphy, Pinkerton, Snider, and Reid |
| NOES: | Councilmen - | None |
| ABSENT: | Councilmen - | Olson |
| ABSTENTIONS: | Councilmen - | None |

Alice M. Reimche

ALICE M. REIMCHE, City Clerk

CITY COUNCIL

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

# 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

April 10, 1984

Mr. Timothy Hachman
141 East Acacia Street
Stockton, California

Dear Tim:

Enclosed herewith please find certified copies of Resolutions No. 84-039 and 84-042 inclusive pertaining to the Lodi Downtown Assessment District Beautification project.

Thank you so much for all your help in this matter, and if we can provide any further information or if you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to call this office.

Very truly yours,

Alice M. Reimche

Alice M. Reimche
City Clerk

AMR:jj
Enc.

# LODI UNITED DOWNTOWN ASSESSMENT DISTRICT BEAUTIFICATION PROJECT

Bid Tabulation — Bids Opened 3/22/84

| Item No. | Description | Unit | Quantity | Architect's Estimate Unit Price | Architect's Estimate Tot Price | Claude C. Wood Co. Unit Pr | Claude C. Wood Co. Total Pr | Teichert & Son Unit Pr | Teichert & Son Total Pr |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Intersections as Detailed | | | | | | | | |
| a | Locust/School | Lump Sum | - | 9244.00 | 9244.00 | 8892.00 | 8892.00 | 12650.00 | 12650.00 |
| b | Elm/School | Lump Sum | - | 28880.00 | 28880.00 | 34130.00 | 34130.00 | 40480.00 | 40480.00 |
| c | Pine/School | Lump Sum | - | 25791.00 | 25791.00 | 34834.00 | 34834.00 | 40480.00 | 40480.00 |
| d | Oak/School | Lump Sum | - | 29713.00 | 29713.00 | 33903.00 | 33903.00 | 37950.00 | 37950.00 |
| e | Walnut/School | Lump Sum | - | 30068.00 | 30068.00 | 36429.00 | 36429.00 | 43010.00 | 43010.00 |
| f | Lodi/School | Lump Sum | - | 10094.00 | 10094.00 | 8844.00 | 8844.00 | 40480.00 | 40480.00 |
| g | Pine/Church | Lump Sum | - | 28128.00 | 28128.00 | 35350.00 | 35350.00 | 12650.00 | 12650.00 |
| h | West one-half of Sacramento/ Pine, incl. one CB & C&G repl @ NW cor. | Lump Sum | - | 12081.00 | 12081.00 | 20864.00 | 20864.00 | 25300.00 | 25300.00 |
| 2 | School St. Alley Entrances | | | | | | | | |
| a | 2 Alleys btwn Locust/Elm | Lump Sum | - | 5576.00 | 5576.00 | 9193.00 | 9193.00 | 6600.00 | 6600.00 |
| b | 2 Alleys btwn Elm/Pine | Lump Sum | - | 5576.00 | 5576.00 | 9312.00 | 9312.00 | 5500.00 | 5500.00 |
| c | 1 Alley btwn Pine/Oak | Lump Sum | - | 2788.00 | 2788.00 | 4708.00 | 4708.00 | 2640.00 | 2640.00 |
| d | 1 Alley btwn Oak/Walnut | Lump Sum | - | 2788.00 | 2788.00 | 4707.00 | 4707.00 | 4180.00 | 4180.00 |
| e | 2 Alleys btwn Walnut/Lodi | Lump Sum | - | 5576.00 | 5576.00 | 9420.00 | 9420.00 | 3080.00 | 3080.00 |
| 3 | Striping | Lump Sum | - | 10428.85 | 10428.85 | 6457.00 | 6457.00 | 6000.00 | 6000.00 |
| 4 | Landscaping & Irrigation | | | | | | | | |
| a | Sawcut new treewells w/rem | EA | 334 | 74.30 | 24816.20 | 42.00 | 14028.00 | 22.50 | 7515.00 |
| b | Fur. & Inst. treewell frame w/brick pavers | EA | 287 | 138.40 | 39720.80 | 110.00 | 31570.00 | 135.00 | 38745.00 |
| c | Fur. & Inst. 15 gal. trees | EA | 397 | 113.45 | 45039.65 | 67.20 | 26678.40 | 60.00 | 23820.00 |
| d | Prov & Inst. C I tree grate on School St. | EA | 95 | 356.80 | 33896.00 | 261.71 | 24862.45 | 205.00 | 19475.00 |
| e | Fur. & Inst. Irrigation Sys in planters @ intersect. | EA | 22 | 725.55 | 15962.10 | 300.00 | 6600.00 | 682.00 | 15004.00 |
| f | Fur. & Inst. Landscaping complete @ intersections | EA | 22 | 506.70 | 11147.40 | 240.00 | 5280.00 | 409.00 | 8998.00 |
| g | Fur. & Inst. Irrigation Sys @ Arch & East Side Sacramento St. | Lump Sum | - | 11000.00 | 11000.00 | 4800.00 | 4800.00 | 13500.00 | 13500.00 |
| h | Fur. & Inst. Landscaping complete @ Arch & East Side Sacramento Street | Lump Sum | - | 14000.00 | 14000.00 | 29356.00 | 29356.00 | 22500.00 | 22500.00 |
| 5 | Traffic Signal Installation | | | | | | | | |
| a | Pine/School | Lump Sum | - | 20000.00 | 20000.00 | 25654.00 | 25654.00 | 25000.00 | 25000.00 |
| b | Pine/Sacramento | Lump Sum | - | 24000.00 | 24000.00 | 31944.00 | 31944.00 | 30000.00 | 30000.00 |
| 6 | Arch Improvements | | | | | | | | |
| a | Arch architectural improv's east one-half | Lump Sum | - | 55600.00 | 55600.00 | 35932.00 | 35932.00 | 53000.00 | 53000.00 |
| 7 | Miscellaneous Street Improv's | | | | | | | | |
| a | Roadway Excavation | CY | 707 | 6.00 | 4242.00 | 20.00 | 14140.00 | 21.00 | 14847.00 |
| b | Compact Original Ground | SF | 14688 | 0.20 | 2937.60 | 0.18 | 2643.84 | 0.30 | 4406.40 |
| c | Concrete Subgrade Compact. | SF | 9484 | 0.80 | 7587.20 | 0.44 | 4172.96 | 0.40 | 3793.60 |
| d | Aggregate Base | T | 359 | 12.00 | 4308.00 | 18.89 | 6781.51 | 17.00 | 6103.00 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| e | Asphalt Concrete | T | 475 | 38.00 | 18050.00 | 43.94 | 20847.75 | 39.00 | 18525.00 | |
| f | Vertical Curb & Gutter | LF | 632 | 14.00 | 8848.00 | 10.68 | 6749.76 | 10.00 | 6320.00 | |
| g | Sidewalk incl. tree well openings | SF | 11712 | 4.00 | 46848.00 | 2.10 | 24595.20 | 1.68 | 19676.16 | |
| h | Commercial Driveway & G. | SF | 1977 | 5.00 | 9885.00 | 2.64 | 5219.28 | 2.65 | 5239.05 | |
| i | Street Sign Post | EA | 1 | 80.00 | 80.00 | 200.00 | 200.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | |
| j | Side Inlet Catch Basin | EA | 1 | 500.00 | 500.00 | 3300.00 | 3300.00 | 500.00 | 500.00 | |
| k | 12" Storm Drain | LF | 719 | 40.00 | 28760.00 | 36.99 | 26595.81 | 38.00 | 27322.00 | |
| l | 48" Manhole | EA | 4 | 1000.00 | 4000.00 | 1151.70 | 4606.80 | 1400.00 | 5600.00 | |
| m | Excavation Safety | Lump Sum | - | 1494.20 | 1494.20 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 1500.00 | 1500.00 | |
| n | Slurry Seal | SF | 217200 | 0.05 | 10860.00 | 0.08 | 17376.00 | .075 | 16290.00 | |

| | | | | New Totals |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subtotal Items 1,2,3,4a-f (District) | 377314.00 | 366061.85 | 394557.00 | 386557.00 |
| Subtotal Items 4g-h,5,6,7 (City) | 273000.00 | 265014.91 | 274222.21 | 274222.21 |
| TOTAL | 650314.00 | 631076.76 | 668779.21 | 660779.21 |
| Alt. No. 1 Alternate planter detail, total 22 | | 20000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Alt. No. 2 Cast Iron tree gr. in lieu of brick total 361 | | 69270.00 | 42400.00 | 42400.00 |
| District Total w/Alt 1 | | 386061.85 | 394557.00 | 386557.00 |
| District Total w/Alt 2 | | 435331.85 | 436957.00 | 428957.00 |
| District Total w/both Alt's | | 455331.85 | 436957.00 | 428957.00 |

Deduct
fr Item 1 -8000.00

**Odd Fellows Hall Association of Lodi**
~~P.O. BOX 104~~ 6 S. PLEASANT
LODI, -:- CALIFORNIA

RECEIVED
OCT 30 PM 2:45
ALICE M. REINCHE
CITY CLERK
CITY OF LODI

To the City Clerk of Lodi, Ca.
Dear Madam

As an officer of the Lodi Odd Fellows Hall Association of Lodi, I wish to express our opposition to the assessment of our property for the current plan to beautify the business district.

We request that the plan be voted down and a committee be appointed to form a Redevelopment District with the expectation of receiving some funds from the State through the Redevelopment Law of California.

Sincerely
Richard Colvin
Treasurer of Hall Association.

Our parcels in the city are:
043-032-01
043-032-02

SENIOR CITIZENS CLUB OF LODI, INC.
113 North School Street
Lodi, California 95240
(209) 369-9798

Lodi, Calif.
March 29, 1984

Lodi United Downtown Assessment Dist.
Beautifiaction Project
City of Lodi
c/o Alice M. Reimche, City Clerk
City Hall
221 W. Pine
Lodi, Calif. 95240

Re: Beautification Project
City of Lodi
County Assessors Parcel
No. 043-024-07
Assessment No. 65

Gentlemen:

We, the Senior Citizens Club of Lodi, Inc.; a non-profit organization, exempt from State and Federal tax, hereby request exemption from assessment No. 65 for the beautification project of Lodi.

We have nothing to sell for profit and will receive no monetary advantage from this project.

Yours Very Truly,
Ozzie Pidde
Ozzie Pidde, President
Lodi Senior Citizens Club
113 No. School St.
Lodi, Calif. 95240

mb/OP
c.c.

Tokay Quick Printing

Telephone (209) 368-8617

5 WEST ELM — LODI, CALIFORNIA 95240

March 28, 1984

Alice M. Reimche,
City Clerk,
221 W. Pine
Lodi, California 95240

Dear Alice

As owner of property Parcel 043-026-16, Assessment Lot Number 139, 5 - 7 West Elm, Lodi, in the concept study, Lodi Downtown Improvement Plan.

I protest and go on record against this concept of improvements and assessments of property involved in this beautification project for the city of Lodi.

There have been many changes in the assessment figures and formula, since the original figures, especially relative to Zone 3. Especially in the enormous increase in the amount of our assessments.

I demand a complete re-contact and confirmation of all signatures and on all the petitions with the final accrued assessment figures.

Since all this gerrymandering has taken place subsequent to the original, this plan is insufficient and inequitable to accomplish the results for which it was intended.

I challenge the formula that sets Zone 3 so high and the lowering of Zone 1 and Zone 2.

Sincerely,

Edwin O. Dammel

Edwin O. Dammel.

Odd Fellows Hall Association of Lodi
P. O. BOX 124
LODI, CALIFORNIA

RECEIVED
1984 MAR 29 AM 8 10
ALICE M. REYNOLDS
CITY CLERK
CITY OF LODI

Lodi Ca.
3-28-84

Dear Madam

As an officer of the Lodi Hall Assn. I.O.O.F wish to express our opposition to the assessment of our property for the current plan to revitalize the business district.

We request that the plan be voted down and a Committee be appointed to request funds through the redevelopment laws of California.

Sincerely.
G. W. Schultz
President of Hall asso.

Galt March 27. 84

Dear Sir

In regards of your letter dated 3.9.84 we are very much against what you intend to do.
It would be all right in the rest part of the City but regarding Locust Str specialy north block bet Elm and Locust it goin to be money wasted there is nothing there but four Mexican Beer Places. what it would be better to have the property owners point the buildings.
Our place The Rainbow Club it was always very clean place but Steve Slaiter operator at the present time he left everything goin to hell, he moved the Liquor Licence out and moved to the "Stud" Elm and School Str and just with wine & Beer they can not make a Living.
So why spend money in suits and thaws they destroy everything.

Blewett Dairy
ICE CREAM AND MILK
221 SOUTH SACRAMENTO STREET • 369-3912
LODI, CALIFORNIA 95240

March 22, 1984

RECEIVED
MAR 27 PM 4:06
ALICE M. REINCHE
CITY CLERK

ALICE M. REINCHE, City Clerk
City Hall, Lodi, CA. 95240

As owner of property Parcel No. 043-046-11, 221 S. Sacramento Street and Parcel No. 043-046-12, 229 S. Sacramento Street in the Concept Study, Lodi Downtown Improvement Plan --

I protest and go on record against this concept of improvements and assessments of property involved in this Beautification Project for the City of Lodi.

There have been many changes in the assessment figures and formula since the original figure, especially relative to Zone 3.

I demand a complete re-contact and confirmation of all signatures on all the petitions with the final accrued assessment figures.

Since all this gerrymandering has taken place subsequent to the original, this plan is insuffient and inequitable to accomplish the results for which it was intended.

I challenge the formula that sets Zone 3 so high and Zone 1 lower.

Respectfully submitted,

C. H. BLEWETT

C. H. Blewett

6

Mar. 11, 1984

RECE
'84 MAR 1
ALICE M.
CITY
CITY C

To whom it may Concern:

We oppose the Assessment District spending our money to benefit a few merchants in Lodi.

We would like to be dropped out of the Assessment District like the property owners on the North side of Locust St were dropped.

Sincerely
Mr & Mrs. Jerry Ballard

Our Assessment No 128
County Assessor Parcel # 043-035-14