Richard E. Nosky, Jr., SBN: 130726 SUPERIOR COURT - STOCK TON City Attorney CITY OF STOCKTON 09 JUL 15 AMIG: 16 425 N. El Dorado Street Stockton, CA 95202 JUNGUEIRO, CLERK Telephone: (209) 937-8333 TRACY DYIO(HOORN Facsimile: (209) 937-8898 DEFUTY Benjamin P. Fay, SBN: 178856 Rick W. Jarvis, SBN: 154479 JARVIS, FAY, DOPORTO & GIBSON, LLP 475 - 14th Street, Suite 260 Oakland, CA 94612 Telephone: (510) 238-1400 Facsimile: (510) 238-1404 9 Attorneys for Defendant CITY ATTORNE CITY OF STOCKTON CITY OF STOCKTON 10 11 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 12 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN 13 14 HOWARD JARVIS TAXPAYERS ASSN.; CASE NO: CV 030686 PATRICK SAMSELL; JAMES WATSON, STIPULATION FOR ENTRY OF JUDGMENT 16 Plaintiffs. 17 18 CITY OF STOCKTON; ADRIAN VAN HOUTEN, in his official capacity as San Complaint Filed: October 10, 2006 19 Joaquin County Auditor/Controller, 20 Defendants. 21 $\cdot 22$ RECITALS 23 In the 1978-79 fiscal year, the City of Stockton began making annual transfers 24 1. from its water and wastewater utility funds into its general fund. The transfers were set at 0.5% 25 of each utility's assets with a 2% inflation factor. 26 In the 2002-03 fiscal year, the transfers from the water and wastewater utility 2. 27 28 funds were increased to 1% of the assets of each utility with a 2% inflation factor. Half of the

CV 030686

- 3. In the 2002-03 fiscal year, the City began making annual transfers from its storm water utility fund into its general fund and its infrastructure reinvestment fund. The transfers were set at 1% of the utility's assets with a 2% inflation factor. Half of each transfer went into the general fund and half went into the infrastructure reinvestment fund.
- 4. The Plaintiffs Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association, Patrick Samsell, and James Watson filed this action contending, among other things, that the transfers violated Proposition 218 on the grounds that the transfers caused utility fees to be used for purposes other than providing the utility services for which the fees were charged. Neither Plaintiffs nor Defendants admit liability or fault, and the City specifically denies the allegations in the complaint and denies that Plaintiffs are entitled to any relief.
- The Defendant Adrian van Houten, named in his official capacity as San Joaquin
 County Auditor/Controller, has not appeared in this action.

PURPOSE

6. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the parties desire to finally settle all issues raised by the complaint, to obtain the Court's approval of the settlement as a reasonable and fair resolution of said issues, and to bind all interested persons to a judgment over which the Court retains jurisdiction for the purpose of enforcing the settlement, pursuant to the provisions of Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6.

STIPULATION

7. NOW, THEREFORE, the Plaintiffs Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association,
Patrick Samsell, and James Watson, together with the Defendant City of Stockton hereby
stipulate and request that the Court enter judgment in accordance with the form of judgment
attached hereto as Exhibit "A." The parties waive any right to appeal from or to otherwise
challenge the judgment. In the event the Court does not approve this stipulation and enter
judgment in accordance therewith, this stipulation and the proposed judgment shall be void, and
of no evidentiary effect in any further proceedings. This stipulation may be signed on separate
sheets.

12

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	8. If the Court approves this stipulation, the Plaintiffs Howard Jarvis Taxpayers					
2	Association, Patrick Samsell, and James Watson will dismiss the Defendant Adrian van Houten					
3	with prejudice by filing a request for dismissal in the form as attached hereto as Exhibit "B."					
4						
5	$A \cdot A \cdot$					
6	Dated: June 22, 2009 Timothy Bittle					
7	Director of Legal Affairs for the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association					
, 8	110Wald Jat vis Taxpayors 218500sation					
9						
10	Dated:					
11	Patrick Samsell					
12						
13						
14	Dated: James Watson					
15						
16						
17	Dated: May 6, 2009 Stally					
18	J. Górdon Palmer, Jr. City Manager of the City of Stockton					
.19						
20						
21	Dated: May 6, 2009					
22	Richard E. Nosky, Jr. City Attorney of the City of Stockton					
23						
24	J:\Clients\154 [City of Stockton]\001 [HJTA v. City of Stockton]\Plead\Stipulation for Entry of Judgment.wpd					
25						
26	` `					
27						
28						

1	8. If the Court approves this stipulation, the Plaintiffs Howard Jarvis Taxpayers					
2	Association, Patrick Samsell, and James Watson will dismiss the Defendant Adrian van Houten					
3	with prejudice by filing a request for dismissal in the form as attached hereto as Exhibit "B."					
4						
5	$A \sim 10^{-6}$					
6	Dated: June 22, 2009 tim Sittle					
7	Timothy Bittle Director of Legal Affairs for the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association					
8						
9	- ~					
10	I T 27 2009 I Patrol Rampel)					
11	Dated: June 27, 2007 Patrick Samsell					
12	1					
13	- 11 hat					
14	Dated: 6-27-01 James Watson					
15						
16						
17	Detail Mary U. COS					
18	J. Górdon Palmer, Jr. City Manager of the City of Stockton					
19	1					
20						
21	Detect National Detect					
22						
23						
2	J:\Clients\154 [City of Stockton]\001 [HJTA v. City of Stockton]\Plead\Stipulation for Entry of Judgment.wpd					
2	J; Chenisti 34 [Chy di Sidekion] ion [[13 17 7 7 5 15] 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5					
2	6					
2	7					
2	8					

	Richard E. Nosky, Jr., SBN: 130726							
2	City Attorney CITY OF STOCKTON							
	425 N. El Dorado Street Stockton, CA 95202							
H	Telephone: (209) 937-8333							
4	Facsimile: (209) 937-8898							
5	Benjamin P. Fay, SBN: 178856 Rick W. Jarvis, SBN: 154479							
6	JARVIS, FAY, DOPORTO & GIBSON, LLP							
7	475 - 14 th Street, Suite 260 Oakland, CA 94612							
8	Telephone: (510) 238-1400 Facsimile: (510) 238-1404							
	• •							
9	Attorneys for Defendant CITY OF STOCKTON							
10								
11	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA							
12	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN							
13								
14	HOWARD JARVIS TAXPAYERS ASSN.;) CASE NO: CV 030686							
15	PATRICK SAMSELL; JAMES WATSON,)							
16	Plaintiffs,)							
	JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO STIPULATION							
17	JUDGWENT PURSUANT TO STITULATION							
18	CITY OF STOCKTON; ADRIAN VAN)							
19	HOUTEN, in his official capacity as San Joaquin County Auditor/Controller,)							
20	Defendants.) Complaint Filed: October 10, 2006							
21								
22	THE ATTENDED AND ASSESSED ASSESSEDANCE ASSESSED ASSESSEDA							
23	THE STATE OF							
24	having negotiated a settlement and having submitted a written stipulation for the entry of							
25	judgment pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6, and good cause appearing therefor,							
26	the Court finds and IT IS HEREBY ORDERED as follows:							
27	1. The City of Stockton shall make all future transfers from its water, wastewater,							
28	and storm water utility funds to its general fund pursuant to the Review of General Fund Cost							

J:\Clients\154 [City of Stockton]\001 [HJTA v. City of Stockton]\Plead\Stipulated Judgment (Final).wpd

REPAYMENT TO WATER FUND 30 YEARS

FISCAL YEAR	BALANCE DUE AS OF JULY 1	INTEREST RATE	PAYMENT ¹	INTEREST	PRINCIPAL
2010-11	7.944,707.55	4.00%	441,772.33	0.00	441,772.33
2010-11	7,502,935,22	4.00%	441,772.33	300,117.41	141,654.92
2012-13	7,361,280.30	4.00%	441,772.33	294,451,21	147.321.12
2013-14	7,213,959.18	4.00%	441,772.33	288,558.37	153,213.96
2014-15	7,060,745.22	4.00%	441,772.33	282,429,81	159,342.52
2015-16	6.901,402.70	4.00%	441,772.33	276,056.11	165,716.22
2016-17	6,735,686.48	4.00%	441,772.33	269,427.46	172,344.87
2017-18	6,563,341.61	4.00%	441,772.33	262,533.66	179,238,67
2018-19	6,384,102.94	4.00%	441,772.33	255,364.12	186,408,21
2019-20	6,197,694.73	4.00%	441,772.33	247,907.79	193,864.54
2020-21	6.003.830.19	4.00%	441,772.33	240,153,21	201,619.12
2021-22	5,802,211.07	4.00%	441,772.33	232,088,44	209,683.89
2022-23	5,592,527.18	4.00%	441,772.33	223,701.09	218,071.24
2023-24.	5,374,455.94	4.00%	441,772.33	214,978.24	226,794.09
2024-25	5,147,661.85	4.00%	441,772.33	205,906.47	235,865.86
2025-26	4,911,795.99	4.00%	441,772.33	196,471.84	245,300.49
2026-27	4,666,495.50	4.00%	.441,772.33	186,659.82	255,112.51
2027-28	4,411,382.99	4.00%	441,772.33	176,455.32	265,317.01
2028-29	4,146,065.98	4.00%	441,772.33	165,842.64	275,929.69
2029-30	3,870,136.29	4.00%	441,772.33	154,805.45	286,966.88
2030-31	3,583,169.41	4.00%	441,772.33	143,326.78	298,445.55
2031-32	3,284,723.86	4.00%	441,772.33	131,388.95	310,383.38
2032-33	2,974,340.48	4.00%	441,772.33	118,973.62	322,798.71
2033-34	2,651,541.77	4.00%	441,772.33	106,061.67	335,710.66
2034-35	2,315,831.11	4.00%	441,772.33	92,633.24	349,139.09
2035-36	1,966,692.02	4.00%	441,772.33	78,667.68	363,104.65
2036-37	1,603,587.37	4.00%	441,772.33	64,143.49	377,628.84
2037-38	1,225,958.53	4.00%	441,772.33	49,038.34	392,733.99
2038-39	833,224.54	4.00%	441,772.33	33,328.98	408,443.35
2039-40	424,781.19	4.00%	441,772.33	16,991.14	424,781.19
•			\$13,253,169.90	\$5,308,462.35	\$7,944,707.55

¹Payments will be recorded as of July 1st.

REPAYMENT TO WASTEWATER FUND 30 YEARS

FISCAL YEAR	BALANCE DUE AS OF JULY 1	INTEREST RATE	PAYMENT1	INTEREST	PRINCIPAL
		1.000/	685,259.81	0.00	685,259.81
2010-11	12,323,516.96	4.00%	685,259.81	465,530.29	219,729.52
2011-12	11,638,257.15	4.00%	685,259.81	456,741.11	228,518.70
2012-13	11,418,527.63	4.00%	685,259.81	447,600.36	237,659.45
2013-14	11,190,008.93	4.00%	685,259.81	438,093.98	247,165.83
2014-15	10,952,349.48	4.00%	685,259.81	428,207,35	257,052.46
2015-16	10,705,183.65	4.00%	•	417,925.25	267,334.56
2016-17	10,448,131.19	4.00%	685,259.81	407,231.87	278,027.94
2017-18	10,180,796.63	4.00%	685,259.81	396,110.75	289,149.06
2018-19	9,902,768.69	4.00%	685,259.81	384,544.79	300,715.02
2019-20	9,613,619.63	4.00%	685,259.81		312,743.63
2020-21	9,312,904.61	4.00%	685,259.81	372,516.18	325,253,37
2021-22	9,000,160.98	4.00%	685,259.81	360,006.44	
2022-23	8,674,907.61	4.00%	685,259.81	346,996.30	338,263.51
2023-24	8,336,644.10	4.00%	685,259.81	333,465.76	351,794.05
2024-25	7,984,850.05	4.00%	685,259.81	319,394.00	365,865.81
2025-26	7,618,984.24	4.00%	685,259.81	304,759.37	380,500.44
2026-27	7,238,483.80	4.00%	685,259.81	289,539.35	395,720.46
2027-28	6,842,763.34	4.00%	685,259.81	273,710.53	411,549.28
2028-29	6,431,214.06	4.00%	685,259.81	257,248.56	428,011.25
2029-30	6,003,202.81	4.00%	685,259.81	240,128.11	445,131.70
2030-31	5,558,071.11	4.00%	685,259.81	222,322.84	462,936.97
2031-32	5,095,134.14	4.00%	685,259.81	203,805.37	481,454.44
2032-33	4,613,679.70	4.00%	685,259.81	184,547.19	500,712.62
2033-34	4,112,967.08	4.00%	685,259.81	164,518.68	520,741.13
2034-35	3,592,225.95	4.00%	685,259.81	143,689.04	541,570.77
2035-36	3,050,655.18	4.00%	685,259.81	122,026.21	563,233.60
2036-37		4.00%	685,259.81	99,496.86	585,762.95
2037-38	, ,	4.00%	685,259.81	76,066.35	609,193.46
2038-39		4.00%	685,259.81	51,698.61	633,561.20
2039-40		4,00%	685,259.81	26,355.84	658,903.97
	:	:	\$20,557,794.30	\$8,234,277.34	\$12,323,516.96

¹Payments will be recorded as of July 1st.

Form Adopted for Mandatory use Judicial Council of California CIV-110 [Rev. January 1, 2007]

REQUEST FOR DISMISSAL

code of Civil Procedure, § 581 et seg.; Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.1390

> American LegalNet, Inc. www.FormsWorkflow.com