

The Holt Group, Inc.
ENGINEERING PLANNING ·SURVEYING

1601 N. IMPERIAL AVE. El Centro, California 92243

(760) 337-3883

NOT TO SCALE

City of Holtville Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvement Project

PROJECT SERVICE AREA MAP

Attachment 10
Exhibit A

THG PROJECT No.116.344

DATE: 02-28-2013

CITY OF HOLTVILLE

121 WEST FIFTH STREET
HOLTVILLE, CALIFORNIA 92250-1285 · (760) 356 ·2912
"THE CARROT CAPITOL OF THE WORLD"

February 28, 2013

Gary B. Bardini, Deputy Director
Integrated Regional Water Management
California Department of Water Resources
PO Box 942836
Sacramento, CA 94236-001

RE: **Integrated Regional Water Management Proposition 84 Round 2**
Letter of Support for Imperial Integrated Regional Water Management Proposal

Dear Mr. Bardini,

The City of Holtville, which is a Disadvantaged Community, is submitting a project funding request under the Imperial Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Proposal for Proposition 84 Round 2 funding. The purpose of this letter is to express our support of the entire Proposal which will result in critical benefits to our Disadvantaged Community as well of some of our neighboring Cities included in the Proposal.

The City of Holtville would be unable to undertake critical wastewater improvements without adversely impacting a very low income community in lieu of the requested subsidies. The grant subsidy through Proposition 84 will not only provide direct financial benefits to a predominantly low income population, but will provide many benefits to the environment and water quality in our community and secondarily to the rest of Imperial County. Our community will further see multiple technological benefits at the Wastewater Treatment Plant that will improve our overall efficiency.

I can further ascertain that comparable benefits will result from the other two projects integrated into the IRWM Proposal. The project in the disadvantaged community of Seeley is proposing construction of stormwater drain improvements in the township which experiences serious flooding. The benefits from the project for the Cities of Imperial, El Centro and the Heber Public Utility District are also widespread through the proposed interconnection of their water systems to increase reliability in the event of a regional water shortage.

Please give our project and thus the entire Proposal your utmost consideration. I thank you in anticipation of your favorable review. I will be more than happy to answer any questions regarding the City of Holtville's portion of the IRWM Proposal and may be contacted at (760) 356-4574 or ameyerhoff@holtville.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Alexander Meyerhoff
City Manager

AM/jga

Cc: Marlene Best, City of Imperial
Laura Fischer, Heber Public Utility District
Ruben Duran, City of El Centro
Bill Brunet, Imperial County

March 19, 2013

To Whom It May Concern:

The City of El Centro is submitting an application for funding under the Prop 84 IRWM Implementation Grant Program. The City's project is for a water supply interconnection with the City of Imperial (our neighbor to the north) and with the Heber Public Utilities District (our neighbor to the south). As a disadvantaged community (DAC), the City of El Centro supports the interconnection with the City of Imperial.

The interconnect project will provide redundancy and emergency water supply during catastrophic events. In the event of an earthquake or other natural disasters, an interconnected water system will allow us to provide potable water supply and firefighting water supply to our residents and neighboring communities. The recent 7.2 magnitude earthquake in 2010 resulted severe damage to one of our water storage tanks. Had other tanks been damaged, our residents would not have had potable water for quite some time. The water interconnect project is vital to the public health, safety and welfare of our communities.

Your favorable review of our funding request is greatly appreciated. If you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to contact me at (760) 337-4540.

Sincerely,

Ruben A. Duran
City Manager

Office of the City Manager
1275 Main Street, El Centro, CA 92243 (760) 337-4540 Fax (760) 352-6177

Heber Public Utility District
1078 Dogwood Rd., Suite 103 • P. O. Box H
Heber, CA 92249
TEL. (760) 482-2440 • FAX (760) 353-9951
www.heber.ca.gov

March 22, 2013

Gary B. Bardini, Deputy Director
Integrated Regional Water Management
California Department of Water Resources
PO Box 942836
Sacramento, CA 94236-001

Regarding: Integrated Regional Water Management Proposition 84 Round 2
Letter of Support for Imperial Integrated Regional Water Management Proposal

This letter is written to express my support for Imperial Integrated Regional Water Management's proposal for Proposition 84 funds for a water inter-connection project between the Cities of Imperial, El Centro and the Heber Public Utility District. As the President of the Heber Public Utility District Board of Directors I serve as the representative for the citizens of Heber, which is a Disadvantaged Community.

The community of Heber would be unable to undertake this critical water inter-connection project without adversely impacting this very low income community. The grant subsidy through Proposition 84 will not only provide direct financial benefits to the Disadvantaged Community of Heber, but also to the City of El Centro, which also qualifies as a Disadvantaged Community with a predominately low income population.

The water inter-connection project will provide a reliable source of potable water to a large population of low income families in case of a regional water shortage. This project is a critical component of a regional plan to ensure the health and safety of our residents during an emergency.

I respectfully request that the Imperial Integrated Regional Water Management's proposal for Proposition 84 funding for this much-needed project be approved. Should you have any questions or need additional information, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Martin L. Nolasco

Martin Nolasco,
President, Heber Public Utility District

U.S. Census Bureau

AMERICAN FactFinder

DP03

SELECTED ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

2007-2011 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Supporting documentation on code lists, subject definitions, data accuracy, and statistical testing can be found on the American Community Survey website in the Data and Documentation section.

Sample size and data quality measures (including coverage rates, allocation rates, and response rates) can be found on the American Community Survey website in the Methodology section.

Although the American Community Survey (ACS) produces population, demographic and housing unit estimates, it is the Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program that produces and disseminates the official estimates of the population for the nation, states, counties, cities and towns and estimates of housing units for states and counties.

Subject	ZCTA5 92273			
	Estimate	Margin of Error	Percent	Percent Margin of Error
EMPLOYMENT STATUS				
Population 16 years and over	1,207	+/-250	1,207	(X)
In labor force	714	+/-192	59.2%	+/-8.9
Civilian labor force	700	+/-191	58.0%	+/-8.9
Employed	637	+/-183	52.8%	+/-9.5
Unemployed	63	+/-44	5.2%	+/-3.5
Armed Forces	14	+/-22	1.2%	+/-1.8
Not in labor force	493	+/-140	40.8%	+/-8.9
Civilian labor force	700	+/-191	700	(X)
Percent Unemployed	(X)	(X)	9.0%	+/-6.2
Females 16 years and over	561	+/-115	561	(X)
In labor force	223	+/-102	39.8%	+/-14.8
Civilian labor force	223	+/-102	39.8%	+/-14.8
Employed	204	+/-95	36.4%	+/-14.3
Own children under 6 years	190	+/-89	190	(X)
All parents in family in labor force	79	+/-65	41.6%	+/-28.0
Own children 6 to 17 years	259	+/-121	259	(X)
All parents in family in labor force	106	+/-70	40.9%	+/-24.9
COMMUTING TO WORK				
Workers 16 years and over	651	+/-184	651	(X)
Car, truck, or van -- drove alone	582	+/-162	89.4%	+/-6.6
Car, truck, or van -- carpooled	0	+/-95	0.0%	+/-5.6
Public transportation (excluding taxicab)	17	+/-28	2.6%	+/-4.4
Walked	0	+/-95	0.0%	+/-5.6
Other means	7	+/-11	1.1%	+/-1.8
Worked at home	45	+/-41	6.9%	+/-5.3
Mean travel time to work (minutes)	20.7	+/-3.2	(X)	(X)
OCCUPATION				
Civilian employed population 16 years and over	637	+/-183	637	(X)

Subject	ZCTA5 92273			
	Estimate	Margin of Error	Percent	Percent Margin of Error
Management, business, science, and arts occupations	115	+/-77	18.1%	+/-12.7
Service occupations	120	+/-60	18.8%	+/-7.5
Sales and office occupations	151	+/-112	23.7%	+/-14.1
Natural resources, construction, and maintenance occupations	61	+/-43	9.6%	+/-7.2
Production, transportation, and material moving occupations	190	+/-100	29.8%	+/-13.0
INDUSTRY				
Civilian employed population 16 years and over	637	+/-183	637	(X)
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining	23	+/-29	3.6%	+/-4.9
Construction	18	+/-19	2.8%	+/-3.0
Manufacturing	14	+/-17	2.2%	+/-2.9
Wholesale trade	45	+/-41	7.1%	+/-5.8
Retail trade	171	+/-116	26.8%	+/-14.7
Transportation and warehousing, and utilities	106	+/-66	16.6%	+/-10.4
Information	0	+/-95	0.0%	+/-5.7
Finance and insurance, and real estate and rental and leasing	0	+/-95	0.0%	+/-5.7
Professional, scientific, and management, and administrative and waste management services	7	+/-11	1.1%	+/-1.7
Educational services, and health care and social assistance	104	+/-56	16.3%	+/-6.9
Arts, entertainment, and recreation, and accommodation and food services	51	+/-51	8.0%	+/-7.3
Other services, except public administration	38	+/-35	6.0%	+/-5.4
Public administration	60	+/-41	9.4%	+/-6.7
CLASS OF WORKER				
Civilian employed population 16 years and over	637	+/-183	637	(X)
Private wage and salary workers	497	+/-172	78.0%	+/-10.7
Government workers	130	+/-67	20.4%	+/-10.3
Self-employed in own not incorporated business workers	10	+/-16	1.6%	+/-2.6
Unpaid family workers	0	+/-95	0.0%	+/-5.7
INCOME AND BENEFITS (IN 2011 INFLATION-ADJUSTED DOLLARS)				
Total households	515	+/-91	515	(X)
Less than $10,000	27	+/-32	5.2%	+/-6.2
$10,000 to $14,999	65	+/-54	12.6%	+/-9.7
$15,000 to $24,999	111	+/-52	21.6%	+/-9.8
$25,000 to $34,999	57	+/-44	11.1%	+/-8.5
$35,000 to $49,999	86	+/-46	16.7%	+/-8.7
$50,000 to $74,999	108	+/-60	21.0%	+/-11.1
$75,000 to $99,999	23	+/-27	4.5%	+/-5.2
$100,000 to $149,999	38	+/-32	7.4%	+/-6.1
$150,000 to $199,999	0	+/-95	0.0%	+/-7.0
$200,000 or more	0	+/-95	0.0%	+/-7.0
Median household income (dollars)	34,432	+/-16,265	(X)	(X)
Mean household income (dollars)	41,921	+/-7,850	(X)	(X)
With earnings	383	+/-83	74.4%	+/-11.3
Mean earnings (dollars)	43,871	+/-8,279	(X)	(X)
With Social Security	159	+/-67	30.9%	+/-11.9
Mean Social Security income (dollars)	13,863	+/-2,621	(X)	(X)
With retirement income	35	+/-26	6.8%	+/-5.1
Mean retirement income (dollars)	38,423	+/-37,811	(X)	(X)
With Supplemental Security Income	39	+/-36	7.6%	+/-6.8
Mean Supplemental Security Income (dollars)	4,110	+/-904	(X)	(X)
With cash public assistance income	33	+/-40	6.4%	+/-7.5

Subject	ZCTA5 92273			
	Estimate	Margin of Error	Percent	Percent Margin of Error
Mean cash public assistance income (dollars)	7,712	+/-3,330	(X)	(X)
With Food Stamp/SNAP benefits in the past 12 months	68	+/-46	13.2%	+/-8.3
Families	399	+/-87	399	(X)
Less than $10,000	20	+/-31	5.0%	+/-7.9
$10,000 to $14,999	39	+/-41	9.8%	+/-9.5
$15,000 to $24,999	80	+/-51	20.1%	+/-12.0
$25,000 to $34,999	8	+/-9	2.0%	+/-2.3
$35,000 to $49,999	86	+/-46	21.6%	+/-11.5
$50,000 to $74,999	105	+/-60	26.3%	+/-13.7
$75,000 to $99,999	23	+/-27	5.8%	+/-6.8
$100,000 to $149,999	38	+/-32	9.5%	+/-7.6
$150,000 to $199,999	0	+/-95	0.0%	+/-9.0
$200,000 or more	0	+/-95	0.0%	+/-9.0
Median family income (dollars)	44,313	+/-10,240	(X)	(X)
Mean family income (dollars)	47,485	+/-9,739	(X)	(X)
Per capita income (dollars)	14,180	+/-2,561	(X)	(X)
Nonfamily households	116	+/-54	116	(X)
Median nonfamily income (dollars)	16,136	+/-9,970	(X)	(X)
Mean nonfamily income (dollars)	16,719	+/-5,489	(X)	(X)
Median earnings for workers (dollars)	21,700	+/-3,551	(X)	(X)
Median earnings for male full-time, year-round workers (dollars)	26,619	+/-3,404	(X)	(X)
Median earnings for female full-time, year-round workers (dollars)	16,399	+/-3,022	(X)	(X)
HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE				
Civilian noninstitutionalized population	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
With health insurance coverage	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
With private health insurance	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
With public coverage	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
No health insurance coverage	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Civilian noninstitutionalized population under 18 years	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
No health insurance coverage	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Civilian noninstitutionalized population 18 to 64 years	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
In labor force:	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Employed:	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
With health insurance coverage	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
With private health insurance	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
With public coverage	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
No health insurance coverage	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Unemployed:	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
With health insurance coverage	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
With private health insurance	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
With public coverage	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
No health insurance coverage	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Not in labor force:	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
With health insurance coverage	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
With private health insurance	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
With public coverage	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
No health insurance coverage	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)

Subject	ZCTA5 92273			
	Estimate	Margin of Error	Percent	Percent Margin of Error
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES AND PEOPLE WHOSE INCOME IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS IS BELOW THE POVERTY LEVEL				
All families	(X)	(X)	17.8%	+/-13.2
With related children under 18 years	(X)	(X)	25.7%	+/-20.4
With related children under 5 years only	(X)	(X)	32.4%	+/-39.6
Married couple families	(X)	(X)	5.5%	+/-6.6
With related children under 18 years	(X)	(X)	8.6%	+/-10.6
With related children under 5 years only	(X)	(X)	8.5%	+/-18.8
Families with female householder, no husband present	(X)	(X)	51.9%	+/-30.8
With related children under 18 years	(X)	(X)	73.1%	+/-32.0
With related children under 5 years only	(X)	(X)	74.1%	+/-53.4
All people	(X)	(X)	22.1%	+/-12.6
Under 18 years	(X)	(X)	37.3%	+/-24.7
Related children under 18 years	(X)	(X)	35.7%	+/-24.4
Related children under 5 years	(X)	(X)	41.7%	+/-31.7
Related children 5 to 17 years	(X)	(X)	32.0%	+/-26.5
18 years and over	(X)	(X)	15.5%	+/-8.1
18 to 64 years	(X)	(X)	13.9%	+/-8.5
65 years and over	(X)	(X)	22.3%	+/-19.6
People in families	(X)	(X)	18.1%	+/-13.5
Unrelated individuals 15 years and over	(X)	(X)	52.3%	+/-21.1

Data are based on a sample and are subject to sampling variability. The degree of uncertainty for an estimate arising from sampling variability is represented through the use of a margin of error. The value shown here is the 90 percent margin of error. The margin of error can be interpreted roughly as providing a 90 percent probability that the interval defined by the estimate minus the margin of error and the estimate plus the margin of error (the lower and upper confidence bounds) contains the true value. In addition to sampling variability, the ACS estimates are subject to nonsampling error (for a discussion of nonsampling variability, see Accuracy of the Data). The effect of nonsampling error is not represented in these tables.

There were changes in the edit between 2009 and 2010 regarding Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and Social Security. The changes in the edit loosened restrictions on disability requirements for receipt of SSI resulting in an increase in the total number of SSI recipients in the American Community Survey. The changes also loosened restrictions on possible reported monthly amounts in Social Security income resulting in higher Social Security aggregate amounts. These results more closely match administrative counts compiled by the Social Security Administration.

Workers include members of the Armed Forces and civilians who were at work last week.

Industry codes are 4-digit codes and are based on the North American Industry Classification System 2007. The Industry categories adhere to the guidelines issued in Clarification Memorandum No. 2, "NAICS Alternate Aggregation Structure for Use By U.S. Statistical Agencies," issued by the Office of Management and Budget.

Census occupation codes are 4-digit codes and are based on the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC). The Census occupation codes for 2010 and later years are based on the 2010 revision of the SOC. To allow for the creation of 2007-2011 and 2009-2011 tables, occupation data in the multiyear files (2007-2011 and 2009-2011) were recoded to 2011 Census occupation codes. We recommend using caution when comparing data coded using 2011 Census occupation codes with data coded using Census occupation codes prior to 2010. For more information on the Census occupation code changes, please visit our website at http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/ioindex/.

While the 2007-2011 American Community Survey (ACS) data generally reflect the December 2009 Office of Management and Budget (OMB) definitions of metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas; in certain instances the names, codes, and boundaries of the principal cities shown in ACS tables may differ from the OMB definitions due to differences in the effective dates of the geographic entities.

Estimates of urban and rural population, housing units, and characteristics reflect boundaries of urban areas defined based on Census 2000 data. Boundaries for urban areas have not been updated since Census 2000. As a result, data for urban and rural areas from the ACS do not necessarily reflect the results of ongoing urbanization.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2007-2011 American Community Survey

Explanation of Symbols:

1. An '*' entry in the margin of error column indicates that either no sample observations or too few sample observations were available to compute a standard error and thus the margin of error. A statistical test is not appropriate.
2. An '-' entry in the estimate column indicates that either no sample observations or too few sample observations were available to compute an estimate, or a ratio of medians cannot be calculated because one or both of the median estimates falls in the lowest interval or upper interval of an open-ended distribution.
3. An '-' following a median estimate means the median falls in the lowest interval of an open-ended distribution.
4. An '+' following a median estimate means the median falls in the upper interval of an open-ended distribution.
5. An '***' entry in the margin of error column indicates that the median falls in the lowest interval or upper interval of an open-ended distribution. A statistical test is not appropriate.
6. An '*****' entry in the margin of error column indicates that the estimate is controlled. A statistical test for sampling variability is not appropriate.
7. An 'N' entry in the estimate and margin of error columns indicates that data for this geographic area cannot be displayed because the number of sample cases is too small.
8. An '(X)' means that the estimate is not applicable or not available.

MICHAEL W. KELLEY
SUPERVISOR—DISTRICT 3
940 MAIN STREET, SUITE 209
EL CENTRO, CA 92243

Board of Supervisors
County of Imperial

BUS: (760) 482-4220
BUS: (760) 482-4308
FAX: (760) 482-4215
E-MAIL: mkelley@co.imperial.ca.us

February 19, 2013

To whom it may concern:

This letter is written to express my support for Imperial County's application for Proposition 84 funds for Drainage Infrastructure Improvements in the Townsite of Seeley. As the District 3 Supervisor for the Imperial County Board of Supervisors, I serve as the representative for the citizens of Seeley.

Seeley is lacking in adequate drainage facilities, and is desperately in need of improvements for its residents. Each time it rains, storm water collects in the streets and creates a hazard for pedestrians – especially for children who must walk to school. They often have to make the choice to either walk in the center of the street – or in the deep mud on the shoulder. Standing water remains for several days, creating an environment for mosquitoes to breed and potentially spread disease. The roads deteriorate rapidly because of the ponding water. Currently, the only remedy is to bring in a water truck that drains water from the streets and moves it to reservoirs.

The County of Imperial adopted the Seeley Area Master Drainage Plan in 2010, which will serve as a guide in bringing Seeley's drainage infrastructure to adequate levels. Seeley is categorized as a Disadvantaged Community, and therefore, funds are limited or non-existent for even the most basic improvements.

I respectfully request that the County of Imperial's application for Proposition 84 funding for this much-needed project be approved. Should you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Michael W. Kelley

Michael W. Kelley, District 3
Imperial County Board of Supervisors