

THOUSAND OAKS CITY COUNCIL



Supplemental Information Packet

R. Lawrence

**Agenda Related Items - Meeting of January 13, 2015
Supplemental Packet Date: January 13, 2015**

Supplemental Information:

Any agenda related public documents received and distributed to a majority of the City Council after the Agenda Packet is printed are included in Supplemental Packets. Supplemental Packets are produced as needed, typically a minimum of two—one available on the Thursday preceding the City Council meeting and the second on Tuesday at the meeting. The Thursday Supplemental Packet is available for public inspection in the City Clerk Department, 2100 E. Thousand Oaks Boulevard, during normal business hours (main location pursuant to the Brown Act, G.C. 54957.5(2) Both the Thursday and Tuesday Supplemental Packets are available for public review at the City Council meeting in the City Council Chambers, 2100 E. Thousand Oaks Boulevard.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA):

In compliance with the ADA, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting or other services in conjunction with this meeting, please contact the City Clerk Department at (805) 449-2151. Assisted listening devices are available at this meeting. Ask City Clerk staff if you desire to use this device. Upon request, the agenda and documents in this agenda packet, can be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting or time when services are needed will assist City staff in assuring reasonable arrangements can be made to provide accessibility to the meeting or service.

Antoinette Mann - TOCC Consent calendar 7J Appt. Treasurer & 7B Un-american minutes

From: "NICK I. Quidwai" <concernedcitztoaks@gmail.com>
To: CityClerk <cityclerk@toaks.org>, "city@toaks.org" <city@toaks.org>, Joel...
Date: 1/13/2015 12:42 PM
Subject: TOCC Consent calendar 7J Appt. Treasurer & 7B Un-american minutes
CC: Albert Adam work <albertsadam@gmail.com>, Claudia Bill <claudiabill@road...

2015 JAN 13 PM 2:27

CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS

Nick I. Quidwai

"Do not take life too seriously. You will never get out of it alive."

To TOCC that does NOT respond to tax payers! 01/13/15 hearing Agenda 7J Treasurer appointment

+++++
<http://www.toaks.org/civica/filebank/blobdload.asp?BlobID=29700> The Un-American minutes continue with a mockery of the Thousand Oaks tax payers; you will NOT mention what was said by us yet have the audacity to print COMPLETE speeches @ the coronation meeting of 12/09/14 SHAME!! All 4 CMs get an F for this Un-american behavior especially the 2 that claim to be holier than thou and NOT represent any special interest!

Nick I. Quidwai

"Do not take life too seriously. You will never get out of it alive."

Newbury Park CA 91320-1821 ConcernedCitzTOaks at gmail.com

Cell 805-390-2857 <http://cctoaks-nick.blogspot.com/>

NO registration needed <https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=100003180981002&sk=wall>

Concernedcitizensthousandoaks NickQuidwai

IQuidwai7860 @cctoaks



I have spoken yearly about the POTENTIAL for misuse of funds/authority with too much power vested in one individual. Policy should not be based on individuals but for the long term best interest of the institution.

John is held in the highest regard as were his predecessors including the greatest JUGGLER Mr. Biery who is extremely honest personally. The report is SILENT on the role of the Treasurer except for the investments; on investments it does raise eyebrows about the "Supernaturals" Copied definition from report; is this part of the ONE WORLD govt. that we hear about?? Is investment in our OWN ECONOMY, in the good ol' USA not good enough?

Issue is WHOSE SIGNATURE is accepted on checks and what are the safeguards to have TWO signatures; I have been told privately that there are safeguards but why is the report SILENT about that?

Can this be addressed both verbally & in writing as to the policy regarding who can write checks and for what amount; EVERY DAY we read about scum bags stealing from the tax payers; copy just one story from Pasadena!

THANK YOU for ignoring me and NOT doing your sworn fiduciary duty!!

Supranational

TO

Scott Mitnick, City Manager

FROM:

John F. Adams, Finance Director

DATE

January

13 2015 SUBJECT

Annual Appointment of Treasurer and Adoption of Investment Policy

An organization formed by a group of countries through an international treaty with specific objectives, such as promoting economic development. Pg 18 of report

[https://draft.blogger.com/blogger.g?](https://draft.blogger.com/blogger.g?blogID=1321311241700037109#editor/target=post;postID=4929769013852395919;onPublishedMenu=allposts;onClosedMenu=allposts;postNum=4;src=postn)

[blogID=1321311241700037109#editor/target=post;postID=4929769013852395919;onPublishedMenu=allposts;onClosedMenu=allposts;postNum=4;src=postn](https://draft.blogger.com/blogger.g?blogID=1321311241700037109#editor/target=post;postID=4929769013852395919;onPublishedMenu=allposts;onClosedMenu=allposts;postNum=4;src=postn)

Oxnard consultants illuminate fiscal shortfall

Gretchen Wenner

5:41 PM, Jan 12, 2015

1. **Pasadena employee allegedly embezzles \$6 million from...**

www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-ln-city-worker... Cached

TO COUNCIL 1-13-2015
AGENDA ITEM NO. 7.B. + 7.J.
MEETING DATE 1-13-2015

...embezzling more than \$6 million from city coffers and ... Pasadena employee allegedly embezzles \$6 million from city ... Pasadena city employee, ...

Pasadena employee allegedly embezzles \$6 million from city



Bill Bogaard, mayor of Pasadena (left), listens as Pasadena City Manager Michael Beck addresses the media during a Dec. 30, 2014 press conference at Pasadena City Hall on the arrest of a former city employee accused of embezzling more than \$6 million. (Gary Friedman / Los Angeles Times)
By [Matt Hamilton](#), [Marisa Gerber](#) and [Samantha Masunaga](#) [contact the reporters](#)

- [KPMG](#)
- [Crime](#)
- [Crime, Law and Justice](#)

A former Pasadena city employee and 2 others are suspected of embezzling \$8 million

Pasadena's city manager blamed a "a complete breakdown" of internal controls Tuesday as prosecutors announced the arrest of a former city employee accused of embezzling more than \$6 million from city coffers and funneling some of the money through two local churches.

Investigators with the Los Angeles County district attorney's office arrested Danny R. Wooten, 51, a former analyst with Pasadena's Department of Public Works; Tyrone Collins, 55; and Melody Jenkins, 48.

The arrests come as part of a 60-count felony complaint alleging grand theft, conflict of interest and embezzlement.



Related

[L.A. Now](#)
[Earthquake: 3.9 quake strikes near San Pedro, Calif.](#)

[See all related](#)
8

For more than a decade, prosecutors contend, Wooten embezzled the funds by generating about 300 false invoices for the city's underground utility program, which he managed.

The program -- independent of the city's general fund -- is funded by a tax on electric customers. It pays for moving power and communications lines underground.

"The fact that this fraud went on for this many years is not only disappointing, it's unacceptable," said City Manager Michael J. Beck. "Clearly it is a complete breakdown of our internal controls."

Comments

- [@rtamc | gocha](#). I was naive. But I'm on some kind of blacklist by the LAT "moderators". Why? I have no idea. [girod2007](#) at 2:42 PM January 05, 2015

[Add a comment](#) [See all comments](#)
98

Wooten directed more than \$3.5 million to Collins, the owner of Pasadena-based Collins Electric, through "questionable or unauthorized" invoices for labor and services involved in moving utility lines underground, according to an external audit conducted by KPMG for the city.

[Officials published](#) KPMG's full audit Tuesday on the city's website.

Money paid to Collins Electric was either repaid in cashier's checks to Wooten or paid to New Covenant Christian Fellowship Center in Pomona, where Wooten is a senior pastor, according to the audit.

An additional \$2.7 million was paid out to New Covenant and a second church Wooten is affiliated with, the Southern California Evangelist Jurisdiction Center in Pasadena, KPMG's audit said. Wooten sits on its executive board, according to the church's website.

It's unclear if the churches ever received the funds. Wooten approved and picked up the checks made payable to the two churches, then deposited them in accounts held in his name, according to KPMG's audit.

On Wooten's city-owned computer, investigators found the template he allegedly used to generate sham invoices for one of the churches, listing charges ranging from \$7,645 to \$787,495.

The invoices from the churches claimed labor and services related to moving electrical lines underground, but KPMG auditors could find no valid purpose for the payments.

Invoices from the churches -- like those from Collins Electric -- lacked standard elements such as purchase orders and didn't specify addresses where electrical work was to be performed, according to the audit.

One of the churches is also located in an area of Pasadena that wasn't scheduled to have underground utilities work begin until 2016, the audit said.

Jenkins, a former temporary Pasadena city employee, was paid more than \$40,000 for labor connected to moving utility lines underground.

City employees noticed accounting irregularities in May 2014, prompting an internal investigation, KPMG's audit and a separate investigation by the district attorney's office, according to a city spokesman.

The case remains under investigation, but officials do not believe other employees were involved.

Woolen, who worked for the city for 12 years, was placed on administrative leave in March for an unrelated matter. He was terminated July 25 for reasons unrelated to the embezzlement investigation, city officials said.

Woolen is being held on \$1.75-million bail and is scheduled to be arraigned Wednesday.

Reached by phone Tuesday afternoon, Bishop Milton, a pastor at Holy Assembly C.O.G.I.C. church in Pasadena, said he was still struggling to reconcile the Woolen he's known for 20 years as a friend with the newly emerging depiction.

"He's my right hand man. I'm shocked," Milton said. "This is like unbelievable right now. Unbelievable."



Public Works Department MEMORANDUM

2100 Thousand Oaks Boulevard • Thousand Oaks, CA 91362
Phone 805/449.2400 • Fax 805/449.2475 • www.toaks.org

2015 JAN 13 PM 2:35
CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS

TO: Scott Mitnick, City Manager
FROM: Jay T. Spurgin, Public Works Director
DATE: January 13, 2015
SUBJECT: Agenda Item 9.A. – Northbound Westlake Boulevard onto Eastbound Valley Spring Drive Stop Sign Control

Please find attached comments from residents regarding the Valley Spring Drive Stop Sign Control issue. They are all in support of staff recommendation to remove the stop sign and replace with a yield sign.


Jay T. Spurgin
Public Works Director

Attachments

DPW:\823-15\jds\Council\2015\2015-01-13\Valley Spring Stop Sign Green Packet.doc

TO COUNCIL 1-13-2015
AGENDA ITEM NO. 9.A.
MEETING DATE 1-13-2015



Jim Mashiko - RE: Valley Spring Drive Stop Sign Item Set for City Council December 13, 2015

From: "Randall S. Witt" <rrwitt@earthlink.net>
To: "Jim Mashiko" <JMashiko@toaks.org>
Date: 1/9/2015 10:58 PM
Subject: RE: Valley Spring Drive Stop Sign Item Set for City Council December 13, 2015
Attachments: image001.jpg

Jim;

You never fail to amaze me at your ability to keep up on emails, your attention to details and your general ability to stay organized. I received this same notice by U. S. Post.

I will likely be out of town on business that evening. However, I would be inclined to admit that while I initially thought the Stop Sign was a good idea and it does make it easier to exit Oak Grove by creating gaps in the cars, from a community standpoint the Stop Sign is likely more of an annoyance than a benefit.

So, while I count myself as one of the 11 homes that benefit from this sign, I would suggest removal for the overall benefit of the community at large.

Thanks for your dedication to our local government and your impressive attention to detail.

Randy Witt

VP, WNPOA

From: Jim Mashiko [JMashiko@toaks.org]
Sent: Friday, January 09, 2015 10:08 AM
To: Mashiko, Jim
Subject: Valley Spring Drive Stop Sign Item Set for City Council December 13, 2015

Please see attached meeting notification regarding the stop sign from northbound Westlake Blvd onto eastbound Valley Spring Drive.

Jim Mashiko, Acting Traffic Engineering Division Manager
Public Works Department
City of Thousand Oaks
(805) 449-2418
jmashiko@toaks.org



City Council Members
City of Thousand Oaks
Thousand Oaks, CA.

Dear Council Members,

I am writing regarding item 9. A. on the January 13, 2015 agenda. (Remove stop sign at Westlake Blvd and and Valley Spring and replace with yield sign.)

I am totally in favor of removing the stop sign and re-installing a yield sign at that intersection.

The stop sign is located at the end of the 'slip lane' which merges onto Valley Spring Drive from Westlake Blvd. With the stop sign in place it requires drivers to do a more than 180 degree about face to see oncoming traffic when they are in a stopped position. With the yield sign, drivers an easily see any oncoming traffic as they enter the 'slip lane' and can react accordingly.

If you have driven this area you can easily see that a yield sign works perfectly well in this instance. Please vote to remove the stop sign and install a yield sign instead.

Thank you,

Cathy Schutz

4240 Arrowhead Circle
Thousand Oaks, Ca. 91362
805-497-2276

Jim Mashiko - Stop/Yield sign at Valley Spring and Westlake Blvd.

From: "Tanya Caligiuri" <tcaligiuri8@verizon.net>
To: <jmashiko@toaks.org>
Date: 1/11/2015 3:31 PM
Subject: Stop/Yield sign at Valley Spring and Westlake Blvd.

As a resident on Oak Grove Place, we are delighted to have the Stop sign (at Westlake Blvd. and Valley Spring) changed to a Yield sign.

Thank you so much for doing that.

Tanya and Joe Caligiuri
1353 Oak Grove Place

Jim Mashiko - Stop Sign Control at Valley Spring / Westlake Blvd.

From: John Morgan <jmjm1999@gmail.com>
To: <jmashiko@toaks.org>
Date: 1/12/2015 1:34 PM
Subject: Stop Sign Control at Valley Spring / Westlake Blvd.

Dear Mr. Mashiko,

I am a resident in the North Ranch area and unfortunately cannot make the hearing tomorrow on this issue as I will be traveling.

I highly recommend and support the change from a stop sign to a yield sign. This would be more practical as so often there is no left hand traffic coming from the Southward/West flow from Westlake Blvd to Valley Spring. The current stop sign serves minimal purpose for improved safety or traffic flow.

Thank you.

Regards,

John Morgan
C: 805-660-1138

Jim Mashiko - valley spring stop sign

From: Norman Reddick <nsreddick@gmail.com>
To: <JMashiko@toaks.org>
Date: 1/12/2015 10:12 PM
Subject: valley spring stop sign

Dear Mr Mashiko i am in suppot of removing the stop sign. norm reddick

--
nsreddick.com drreddick.com

1/13/15

Rose Larson

Received mailed notice of meeting and phoned in to staff to advise City Council her support for the proposed change to Yield Sign Control from existing Stop sign control.

Meeting notices were mailed to residents within 1000 feet of existing stop sign.

TO: Scott Mitnick, City Manager
FROM: Jay T. Spurgin, Public Works Director
DATE: January 13, 2015
SUBJECT: **Agenda Item 9.B. – Local Emergency – December Storms**

Attachment #2 to the staff report, Damage Survey Report (DSR), has been updated by the National Resources Conservation Service. Please refer to the new version (pages 1 through 12) attached. All other portions of the DSR are unchanged.

The scope of work and the funding level in the updated DSR is reduced from \$135,000 to \$130,000, and the local 25 percent match is reduced from \$33,750 to \$32,500. Recommendation #5 and the Financial Impact section of the staff report are revised as follows:

5. Approve budget appropriation in the amount of \$32,500 from A/C #001-0000-311-1000 (General Fund/Fund Balance) to A/C #001-5310-631-5699 (EMER14 Winter Storms December 2014/General Fund Engineering Contracted Services).

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

\$32,500 Increase to FY 2014-15 General Fund Operating Budget. Adoption of Resolution is a procedural step necessary to allow for potential recovery of City and private resident costs associated with emergencies. Appropriation of up to \$32,500 in matching funds to NRCS disaster assistance from General Fund capital reserves requested.

Attachment

DPW:\520-25\jts\dlz\Council\2015\011315 Declaration of Local Emergency Supplemental.doc

CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS

2015 JAN 13 PM 3:50

TO COUNCIL 1-13-2015
AGENDA ITEM NO. 9.B.
MEETING DATE 1-13-2015



Emergency Watershed Protection

Damage Survey Report

For

Community of Dos Vientos

DSR NO: 02-15-3657

December 18, 2014

VENTURA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Prepared By:

USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service

3550 S. Harbor Blvd, Suite 2-202

Oxnard, CA 93035-4150

In Cooperation with

City of Thousand Oaks

2100 Thousand Oaks Blvd

Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

**DAMAGE SURVEY REPORT (DSR)
 Emergency Watershed Protection Program – Recovery**

Section 1A

Date of Report: December 18, 2014

DSR Number: 2-15-3657 Project Number: _____

<u>NRCS Entry Only</u>	
Eligible:	YES _____ NO _____
Approved:	YES _____ NO _____
Funding Priority Number (from Section 4)	_____
Limited Resource Area:	YES _____ NO _____

Section 1B Sponsor Information

Sponsor Name: City of Thousand Oaks
 Address: 2100 Thousand Oaks Boulevard
 City/State/Zip: Thousand Oaks, CA 91362
 Contact Name: James L Taylor, Senior Civil Engineer
 Telephone Number: (805) 449-2442
 Email: jtaylor@toaks.org

Section 1C Site Location Information

Julia Brownley (D)

County: Ventura State: California Congressional District 26

Latitude: _____ Longitude: _____ Section: _____ Township: _____ Range: _____
 UTM Coordinates: _____

Drainage Name: Calleguas- Conejo Reach: _____

Damage Description: Heavy rains November into mid-December dropped significant rainfall over previously burnt watershed (May 2013 Fire) above the Dos Vientos Community, City of Thousand Oaks; resulting in damage to several homes and properties due to mudslides/debris flows. High risk remains that additional damages are likely with further rain events. Watershed has shown minimal recovery since the Fire because of excessive drought.

Section 1D Site Evaluation

All answers in this Section must be YES in order to be eligible for EWP assistance.

Site Eligibility	YES	NO	Remarks
Damage was a result of a natural disaster?*	X		
Recovery measures would be for runoff retardation or soil erosion prevention?*	X		
Threat to life and/or property?*	X		8-12 Homes Affected
Event caused a sudden impairment in the watershed?*	X		
Imminent threat was created by this event?***	X		
For structural repairs, not repaired twice within ten years?***	X		
Site Defensibility			
Economic, environmental, and social documentation adequate to warrant action (Go to pages 3, 4, 5 and 6 ***)	X		B/C RATIO = 13.3
Proposed action technically viable? (Go to Page 9 ***)	X		

Have all the appropriate steps been taken to ensure that all segments of the affected population have been informed of the EWP program and its possible effects? YES X NO _____

Comments: EWP Program discussed with City of Thousand Oaks and Thousand Oaks HOA.

* Statutory

** Regulation

*** DSR Pages 3 through 5 are required to support the decisions recorded on this summary page. If additional space is needed on this or any other page in this form, add appropriate pages.

Section 1E Proposed Action

Describe the preferred alternative from Findings: Section 5 A:

Project consists of the installation of three inclined trash racks, one in-stream debris catcher, 220 LF K-Rail placement and approximately 600 LF sandbags for the protection of the Dos Vientos community in the City of Thousand Oaks, Ventura County, CA.

Total installation cost identified in this DSR: Section 3: \$130,000.00

Section 1F NRCS Review and Approval

Reviewed by: _____
State Conservation Engineer

Date: _____

Approved By: _____
State Conservationist Representative

Date Approved: _____

PRIVACY ACT AND PUBLIC BURDEN STATEMENT

NOTE: The following statement is made in accordance with the Privacy Act of 1974, (5 U.S.C. 552a) and the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, as amended. The authority for requesting the following information is 7 CFR 624 (EWP) and Section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1950, Public Law 81-516, 33 U.S.C. 701b-1; and Section 403 of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978, Public Law 95-334, as amended by Section 382, of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996, Public Law 104-127, 16 U.S.C. 2203. EWP, through local sponsors, provides emergency measures for runoff retardation and erosion control to areas where a sudden impairment of a watershed threatens life or property. The Secretary of Agriculture has delegated the administration of EWP to the Chief or NRCS on state, tribal and private lands.

Signing this form indicates the sponsor concurs and agrees to provide the regional cost-share to implement the EWP recovery measure(s) determined eligible by NRCS under the terms and conditions of the program authority. Failure to provide a signature will result in the applicant being unable to apply for or receive a grant the applicable program authorities. Once signed by the sponsor, this information may not be provided to other agencies. IRS, Department of Justice, or other State or Federal Law Enforcement agencies, and in response to a court or administrative tribunal.

The provisions of criminal and civil fraud statutes, including 18 U.S.C. 286, 287, 371, 641, 651, 1001; 15 U.S.C. 714m; and 31 U.S.C. 3729 may also be applicable to the information provided. According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 0578-0030. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 117/1.96 minutes/hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, field reviews, gathering, designing, and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection information.

USDA NONDISCRIMINATION STATEMENT

"The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.)

Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination write USDA, Director of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call (800)795-3272 (voice) or (202)720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Civil Rights Statement of Assurance

The program or activities conducted under this agreement will be in compliance with the nondiscrimination provisions contained in the Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended; the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987 (Public Law 100-259); and other nondiscrimination statutes: namely, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title IX of the Amendments of 1972, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. They will also be in accordance with regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture (7 CFR 15, 15a, and 15b), which provide that no person in the United States shall on the grounds of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age or disability, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Agriculture or any agency thereof.

Section 2 Environmental Evaluation

Completed By: Dawn Afman District Conservationist

Date: 12/19/2014

2A Resource Concerns	2C Existing Condition	2C Alternatives and Effects		
		Proposed Action	No Action	Alternative
		Project consists of installation of trash racks, sand bags, and K-Rails	Outlets and drainage ways will be undersized to handle the debris load that is currently present at this location	
2D Effects of Alternatives				
Soil				
Erosion (Mass movement)	Due to fire a large watershed has been denuded of vegetation and leaving downed debris, bare soil exposed		When rain event occurs prior establishment of native vegetation, heavy loaded sediment travels down steep hills floods homes and damages property	
Water				
Quantity (Excessive Runoff, Flooding, Ponding)	Due to fire a large watershed has been denuded of vegetation and leaving downed debris, bare soil exposed		When rain event occurs runoff within the watershed will increase to the decrease of the infiltration rate of the soils due to the loss of vegetation and crusting effects of the soil.	
Air				
Particulate matter PM 10 and 2.5	Exposed soils that could be suspended in the air if strong winds present.	Equipment emissions during work would have a ST negative effect on air quality	ST negative effect, exposed soils that could be suspended in air, strong winds, LT no effect due to the vegetation growth within watershed	

Plant					
No resource concerns ID	Watershed has been denuded of grasses, forbs, shrubs and trees.	Fire follower vegetation has started slowly to establish recent rains	Fire follower vegetation will naturally establish within the watershed		
Animal					
No resource Concern ID					
Other					
No resource Concern ID					

Section 2E Special Environmental Concerns

Resource Consideration	Existing Condition	Alternatives and Effects		
		Proposed Action	N o A c t i o n	Alternative
Clean Water Act Waters of the U.S.	N/A Not present	<p>The proposed likely will not result in the discharge of dredged or fill material into the waters of the U.S., and a federal permitting program under CWA is found in NECH 610.82</p> <p>The proposed action is not located in proximity to waters listed by the state as "impaired" under the 303 (d) of the CWA.</p> <p>The proposed action will not result in point-source discharges from developments, construction sites, or other areas of soil disturbance or sewer discharge (e.g., projects involving storm water ponds or point source pollution including CAFOs for which CNMPs are being developed). Section 402 of the CWA requires a permit for these activities through the National Pollution Elimination Discharge (NPDES) program which the states administer</p>		
Coastal Zone Management Areas	N/A Not present	The proposed action is not near a designated Coastal zone Management area		
Coral Reefs	N/A Not present	NO coral reefs or associated water bodies (e.g. embayment areas) are present in or near the planning area		
Cultural Resources	During the multiple site visits NO CR were ID	CR approved by Archeologist project is a go 1/8/2015		
Endangered and Threatened Species	Will consult with Biologist or City T & E Personnel	Endangered species designated critical habitat(s), proposed species/habitat, or state/tribal species of concern protected by law or regulation present, or potentially present are in the area with consult with area biologist prior to final signing of plans.		

Environmental Justice	No effect	There are no low income, minority populations, Native Am. tribes or others that would be impacted by any measures resulting from the proposed actions.		
Essential Fish Habitat	No essential fish habitat present	The proposed action is not in an area designated as Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) or in any area that could indirectly affect EFH.		
Fish and Wildlife Coordination	Most of the fish and wildlife habitat has burnt a few trees and brush has remained making this essential habitat, cover shelter since the fire.	In the lower 48 states, all species except the house sparrow, rock pigeon, common starling, non-migratory game birds, i.e. pheasants, gray partridge and sage grouse are protected.		
Floodplain Management	N/A Not in a floodplain	The proposed action is NOT a floodplain		
Inventory Species	NONE present on site during visit	The proposed action is not in an area where invasive species are known to occur or where the risk of an invasion exists		
Migratory Birds	Most of the fish and wildlife habitat has burnt a few trees and brush has remained making this essential habitat, cover shelter since the fire.	Work can only be performed Sept 15, thru March 15 th to avoid migratory flight patterns and nesting periods		
Natural Areas	There are no designated natural areas present in or near the planning area	There are no designated natural areas present in or near the planning area		
Prime and Unique Farmlands	NOT Present N/A	This proposal does not convert farmland to nonagricultural use		
Riparian Areas	Riparian areas NOT present	Riparian areas NOT present		
Scenic Beauty	Fire negatively affected the scenic quality of area	The proposed action will not negatively affect the scenic quality of the general landscape or any unique or valuable scenic landscape.		
Wetlands	Wetlands NOT present	Wetlands are not present		
Wild and Scenic Rivers	There is no wild or scenic rivers near the area	There is no wild or scenic rivers near the area		

Completed By: Dawn Afiman

Date: 12/19/2014

Page 5
Approved 7/2005

DSR NO: 02-15-3657
Section 2F Economic

This section must be completed by each alternative considered (attach additional sheets as necessary).

	Damage Factor	Probability Factor (%)	Near Term Damage Reduction
Properties Protected (Private)			
See Attached "Summary of Benefits"			
5087 Via Santana- average value \$1.5 million	.1895	1	284,250
5027 Via Santana- average value \$1.5 million	.1895	1	284,250
5090 Via Santana- average value \$1.5 million	.1215	1	182,250
4991 Via Santana - average value \$1.5 million	.1895	1	284,250
120 Calle Del Prado -value \$1.75 million	.1895	1	331,625
199 Via Inez - \$1.0 million	.1215	1	121,500
95 North Via Los Altos value \$1.25 million	.1895	1	236,875
Properties Protected (Public)			
City streets	No damage value assessed		
		TOTAL	1,725,000.00
None			
Business Losses			
None			
Other			
		Total Near Term Damage Reduction \$	135,000.00
		Net Benefit (Total Near Term Damage Reduction minus Cost from Section 3)	1,590,000.00

Completed By: Dave Krietemeyer

Date: December 19, 2014

Benefit/Cost Ratio = \$1,725,000/130,000 =13.26 USE 13.3

Section 2G Social Consideration

This section must be completed by each alternative considered (attach additional sheets as necessary).

	YES	NO	Remarks
Has there been a loss of life as a result of the watershed impairment?		X	
Is there the potential for loss of life due to damages from the watershed impairment?	X		Homes remain threatened by denuded hillsides and excessive runoff and debris flows.
Has access to a hospital or medical facility been impaired by watershed impairment?	X		
Are there any individuals with disabilities living within watershed impairment?	X		Possible. Unknown at this time.
Has the community as a whole been adversely impacted by the watershed impairment (life and property ceases to operate in a normal capacity)	X		
Is there a lack or has there been a reduction of public safety due to watershed impairment?	X		Homes remain threatened.

Completed By: Dawn Afman & Dave Krietemeyer Date: December 19, 2014

Section 2H Group Representation and Disability Information

This section is completed only for the preferred alternative selected.

Group Representation	Number
White alone, percent, 2010 (a)	80.3%
Black or African American alone, percent, 2010 (a)	1.3%
American Indian and Alaska Native alone, percent, 2010 (a)	0.4%
Asian alone, percent, 2010 (a)	8.7%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone, percent, 2010 (a)	0.1%
Two or More Races, percent, 2010	3.8%
Hispanic or Latino, percent, 2010 (b)	16.8%
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino, percent, 2010	70.2%
White alone, percent, 2010 (a)	80.3%
Black or African American alone, percent, 2010 (a)	1.3%
American Indian and Alaska Native alone, percent, 2010 (a)	0.4%
Asian alone, percent, 2010 (a)	8.7%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone, percent, 2010 (a)	0.1%
Two or More Races, percent, 2010	3.8%
Hispanic or Latino, percent, 2010 (b)	16.8%
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino, percent, 2010	70.2%
White alone, percent, 2010 (a)	80.3%
Black or African American alone, percent, 2010 (a)	1.3%
American Indian and Alaska Native alone, percent, 2010 (a)	0.4%
Asian alone, percent, 2010 (a)	8.7%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone, percent, 2010 (a)	0.1%
Two or More Races, percent, 2010	3.8%

*Data for this information was obtained from <http://www.census.gov/2010census/popmap/>

Census tract(s) Ventura County Census data for Thousand Oaks

Completed By: Dawn Afman Date: December 19, 2014

Section 2I. Required consultation or coordination between the lead agency and/or the RFO and another governmental unit including tribes:

City of Thousand Oaks has responsibility to coordinate with Ventura County Communities of Dos Vientos and the local HOAs, and USDA-NRCS as necessary. Work is located near and may have an effect on a short section of open naturally vegetated channel; consultation with state regulatory agencies may be needed.

NRCS WILL CONSULT WITH OUR CULTURAL RESOURCES SPECIALIST REGARDING PROJECT PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.

Easements, permissions, or permits:

City of Thousand Oaks to obtain all necessary easements and permits.

Mitigation Description:

None identified at this time.

Agencies, persons, and references consulted, or to be consulted:

Persons to consult with the City of Thousand Oaks and their respective DosVientos Home Owners Associations. Work is located on hillside adjacent to homes and drainage control structures. Recommend consultation with California Fish & Game.

DSR NO: 02-15-3657

Section 3 Engineering Cost Estimate

Completed By: Dave Krietemeyer/Elise Miller/Dawn Afman

Date: December 19, 2014

This section must be completed by each alternative considered (attach additional sheets as necessary).

Item No.	Address	Proposed Recovery Measure (including mitigation)	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost (\$)	Amount (\$)
1a	5087 Via Santana	Trash Rack (Large)	1	EA	25,000.00	25,000.00
1b	5087 Via Santana	Debris Catcher (in stream)	20	LF	1,250.00	25,000.00
1c	5087 Via Santana	K-Rail	120	LF	40.00	4,800.00
2a	5027 Via Santana	Trash Rack (Small)	1	EA	7,500.00	7,500.00
2b	5027 Via Santana	2 feet high Sand Bag	55	LF	30	\$1,650.00
3	4991 Via Santana	3 feet high Sand Bag	120	LF	63	7,560.00
4a	199 Via Inez	4 feet high Sand Bag	75	LF	108	8,100.00
4b	199 Via Inez	2 feet high Sand Bag	50	LF	30	1,500.00
5a	95 N. Via Los Altos	3 feet high Sand Bag	75	LF	63	4,725.00
5b	95 N. Via Los Altos	2 feet high Sand Bag	75	LF	30	2,250.00
5c	95 N. Via Los Altos	Trash Rack (Small)	1	EA	7,500.00	7,500.00
6a	120 Calle Del Prado	3 feet high Sand Bag	150	LF	30	4,500.00
6b	120 Calle Del Prado	K-Rail	100	LF	40	4,000.00
7b	120 Calle Del Prado	3 feet high Sand Bag	50	LF	63	3,150.00
8		Mobilization	1	EA	10,000.00	10,000.00
9		Contingency	1		10,000.00	10,000.00
		TOTAL				127,235.00
		Total Installation Cost (Enter in Section 1F)\$		USE		\$130,000.00

Section 4 NRCS EWP Funding Priority

Complete the following section to compute the funding priority for the recovery measures in this application (see instructions on page 10).

Priority Ranking Criteria	Yes	No		Ranking Number Plus Modifier
1. Is this an exigency situation?	X			1
2. Is this a site where there is serious, but not immediate threat to human life?	X			
3. Is this a site where buildings, utilities, or other important infrastructure components are threatened?	X			
4. Is this site a funding priority established by the NRCS Chief?		X		
The following are modifiers for the above criteria			Modifier	
a. Will the proposed action or alternatives protect or conserve federally-listed threatened and endangered species or critical habitat?			n/a	
b. Will the proposed action or alternatives protect or conserve cultural sites listed on the National Register of Historic Places?			n/a	
c. Will the proposed action or alternatives protect or conserve prime or important farmland?			n/a	
d. Will the proposed action or alternatives protect or conserve existing wetlands?			n/a	
a. Will the proposed action or alternatives maintain or improve current water quality conditions?			n/a	
f. Will the proposed action or alternatives protect or conserve unique habitat, including but not limited to, areas inhabited by State-listed species, fish and wildlife management area, or State identified sensitive habitats?			n/a	

Enter priority computation in Section 1A, NRCS Entry, Funding priority number.

Remarks:

Section 5A Findings

Finding: Indicate the preferred alternative from Section 2 (Enter to Section 1E):

Project consists of the installation of three inclined trash racks, one in-stream debris catcher, 220 LF K-Rail placement and approximately 600 LF sandbags for the protection of the Dos Vientos community in the City of Thousand Oaks, Ventura County, CA.

I have considered the effects of the action and the alternatives on the Environmental Economic, Social; the Special Environmental Concerns; and the extraordinary circumstances in the instruction from form NRCS-PDM-20, Damage Survey Report (DSR). I find for the reasons stated below, that the preferred alternative:

- Has been sufficiently analyzed in the EWP PEIS (reference all that apply)
 - Chapter 2.3.1 Restore Stream Channel (Hydraulic) Capacity - Debris
 - Chapter 2.3.5.3 Upland Diversions
 - Chapter 2.3.5.4 Drains, Conveyances, and Outlet Structures
 - Chapter _____
 - Chapter _____

_____ May require the preparation of an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement.
The action will be referred to the NRCS State Office on this date:

NRCS representative of the DSR team

Title: *Deven Olin*
District Conservationist

Date: 1-7-2015

Section 5B Comments:

Section 5C

Sponsor Concurrence:

J. Bruggi

Sponsor Representative

Title: Public Works Director

Date: 1/7/15