



LARSEN WURZEL
& Associates, Inc.

June 9, 2016

Mr. Kenric Jameson
Reclamation District 900
1420 Merkley Avenue, Suite 4
West Sacramento, CA 95691

Dear Kenric,

Enclosed please find the final report related to the tabulation of the Assessment Ballot Proceeding for the proposed Reclamation District 900 Interior Drainage Operations and Maintenance Assessment dated June 10, 2016.

If you have any questions regarding the information within this report, please do not hesitate to call. We look forward to working with you through the remainder of the formation process.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Scott L. Brown", followed by a horizontal line.

Scott L. Brown, PE
Principal
Larsen Wurzel & Associates, Inc.

Final Report

Reclamation District 900

June 9, 2016

Interior Drainage Operations and Maintenance Assessment Ballot Proceeding Tabulation

Prepared for: Reclamation District 900 Board of Trustees

Prepared by: Scott L. Brown, PE

Larsen Wurzel & Associates, Inc. (LWA) has performed the tasks described in the Ballot Tabulation Procedures for the proposed Interior Drainage Operations and Maintenance Assessment summarized below. These procedures were solely to assist Reclamation District 900 (the “District” or “RD 900”) in tabulating ballots in favor of and opposition to the proposed assessment. The sufficiency of these procedures is solely the responsibility of the District. Consequently, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of these procedures described below either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose.

The procedures related to the Ballot Proceeding for the RD 900 Interior Drainage Operations and Maintenance Assessment performed were as follows:

- 1) A data processing system was prepared for the efficient preparation, production and subsequent tabulation of the ballots.
- 2) Mailed return ballots were delivered directly to LWA’s office located at 2450 Venture Oaks Way, Suite 240, Sacramento, CA 95833. Hand delivered returned ballots were received by the District at its offices where a locked ballot box was provided by LWA. Hand delivered ballots were retrieved by an LWA representative for custody at LWA’s offices throughout the balloting period. All mailed and hand return ballots were stored in a secured location and remained sealed in their return envelopes until the close of the public hearing and the start of the tabulation process.
- 3) LWA attended the Public Hearing at the close of the balloting period. All ballots cast and received prior to the close of the Public Hearing were included within the ballot tabulation.
- 4) LWA directed the canvass of all ballots received from the total potential 10,809 ballots issued pursuant to the criteria outlined within our Ballot Tabulation Plan provided June 6, 2016. In summary, the tabulation criteria included the following steps:
 - i. **Opening / Sorting:** LWA directed the opening and sorting all of the ballots into the following categories:

- Valid Original Ballots (White)
 - Yes Votes
 - No Votes
- Valid Revised Ballots (Blue)
 - Yes Votes
 - No Votes
- Valid Replacement Ballots (Yellow)
 - Yes Votes
 - No Votes
- Invalid Ballots

A ballot was considered valid if it contained a signature matching the name of the property owner on the ballot and a clear indication of a “yes” or “no” vote. Any other ballot was initially considered invalid and subject to review by the District General Manager.

- ii. **Initial Tabulation:** Each ballot had a unique ballot identification bar coded number and ballots were scanned into the ballot tabulation software. As ballots were scanned, random confirmation of the original sorting (yes or no) took place. During the scanning process, ballots were batched into groups of approximately 20 ballots and a unique batch ID was recorded. The original ballots were scanned into the system first, then the revised ballots, followed by the replacement ballots. During this process, any valid revised or replacement ballot vote cast for an original ballot already tabulated was overwritten and the original vote was not counted.

There were two ballot scanning teams (teams AB and CD) made of two ballot scanning stations each (a total of four ballot scanning stations – Stations A, B, C and D). The batched ballots were distributed evenly to each team then evenly to each station, according to the sorted groups.

- iii. **Secondary Tabulation:** Following the initial tabulation, a secondary tabulation was performed to confirm accurate tabulation results. Station A and Station B performed the secondary tabulation of each other’s initial tabulation. Independently, Station C and Station D performed the secondary tabulation of each other’s initial tabulation. The secondary tabulation followed the same procedures as the initial tabulation. Following the secondary tabulation, Station A and Station B each had a tabulation model that included the same batches of ballots. The same was true of Station C and Station D.

To ensure accurate tabulation, the total Valid Yes/Valid No ballot counts and assessment totals of the Original, Revised and Replacements Ballots were reconciled in both tabulation models (i.e. Station A was reconciled to Station B, and Station C was reconciled to Station D).

- iv. **Data Validation:** Once the data entry was completed and all differences from the original and secondary scans were reconciled, preliminary results of the tabulation were tested. 312 of the 2914 ballots received (approximately 11% of the tabulated ballots) were run through a verification process. The physical information on the ballots was compared to the results in the data processing system to ensure that the information in the program matched the physical

ballot information. The results from the verification process matched the data within the software, thus the results were considered certifiable according to the established criteria.

- v. **Invalid Ballots:** Invalid ballots were also scanned into the system to record the count and the weight of invalid ballots cast as well as the reason for invalidation.
- 5) As part of the ballot tabulation calculations, each valid yes or no vote was multiplied by amount of the property owner's proposed assessment indicated on the ballot to determine the weight of each vote.
 - 6) LWA summed all of the valid weighted yes votes and all of the valid weighted no votes in order to determine which response had the most weighted vote.
 - 7) The canvass of the assessment ballots submitted by property owners is now complete and LWA certifies in accordance with the established procedures and criteria enumerated above that the ballots cast were as follows:

Reclamation District 900
Interior Drainage O&M Assessment
 Summary of Ballot Proceeding Tabulation Results

All Ballots

Total Ballots:	10,809
Valid Ballots Returned:	2,581
Invalid Ballots Returned:	34
Total Ballots Returned:	2,615
Ballots Not Returned:	8,194
 Total Assessment of All Ballots: \$	 2,216,782.90
Return of Assessment:	31.43%
Return of Valid Assessment:	30.56%
 Total Ballots Returned:	 23.88%

Valid Ballots

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent of Ballots</u>	<u>Total Assessment</u>	<u>Percent of Valid Total</u>
All Ballots	2,581	100.00%	\$ 677,553.88	100.00%
Yes Votes	1,708	66.18%	\$ 386,964.78	57.11%
No Votes	873	33.82%	\$ 290,589.10	42.89%

Invalid Ballots

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Total Assessment</u>	<u>Percent of Total</u>
All Ballots	34	\$ 19,215.92	100.00%
Yes Votes	5	\$ 5,190.96	27.01%
No Votes	2	\$ 11,446.96	59.57%
Undertimed Votes	27	\$ 2,578.00	13.42%
 Unofficial Ballots	 29	 (of above)	
No Signature	6	(of above)	

A total of 2,615 assessment ballots were returned and received prior to the close of the public hearing on June 6, 2016 at approximately 8:00 PM. Of the assessment ballots returned, 34 were declared invalid in that they were not marked with a "yes" or "no," were marked with both a "yes" and a "no," were not signed, or for some other reason. In addition to this amount, ballots were received that were considered mutilated in that they did not contain the unique marking on the ballot to describe the property for which the ballot represented. Mutilated ballots are not counted within the totals detailed above.

After the ballots were weighted according to the proportional financial obligation of the affected property, the tabulation concluded that 57.11% of the valid ballots were cast in support of District's Assessment. Since a majority protest, as defined by Article XIII D of the California Constitution, did not exist, the Board may take action to approve the formation of the RD 900 Interior Drainage Operations and Maintenance Assessment as described in the Engineer's Report to pay the costs and expenses of the services identified therein.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the Reclamation District 900 and its management and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Larsen Wurzel & Associates, Inc.



Scott L. Brown, PE
Principal

Sacramento, CA
June 9, 2016