SPECIAL MEETING AGENDA
EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS - 350 Main Street

The City Council, with certain statutory exceptions, can only take action upon properly posted and listed agenda items.

Unless otherwise noted in the Agenda, the Public can only comment on City-related business that is within the jurisdiction of the City Council and/or items listed on the Agenda during the Public Communications portion of the Meeting. The time limit for comments is five (5) minutes per person.

Before speaking to the City Council, please come to the podium and state: Your name and residence and the organization you represent, if desired. Please respect the time limits.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact City Clerk, 310-324-2305. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 2013 5:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – Council Member, Marie Fellhauer

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS - (Related to City Business Only - 5 minute limit per person, 30 minute limit total). Individuals who have received value of $50 or more to communicate to the City Council on behalf of another, and employees speaking on behalf of their employer, must so identify themselves before addressing the City Council. Failure to do so is a misdemeanor and punishable by a fine of $250.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. Consideration and possible action regarding (1) adopting a resolution placing a general tax ballot measure on the April 8, 2014 general municipal election (the "Consolidated Tax Measure") that would increase the Utility User Tax ("UUT") rate on non-residential users and impose a UUT on residents; increase the Transient Occupancy Tax ("TOT") rate; impose a parking tax on non-residential parking, except for employee, restaurant and theater parking, and valet parking ("Parking Tax"); reduce the Business License Tax Credit ("BLT Credit"); (2) direct the City Attorney's Office to prepare an impartial analysis of the ballot measure and find the ballot measure to be exempt from review under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"); (3) adopting a resolution regarding ballot arguments for the ballot measure; (4) appointing a council member or members to draft ballot arguments regarding the ballot measure;
and (5) adopting a resolution stating the Council's purpose and intent of using a portion of the funds from the ballot measure, if it passes, on capital improvement projects, if feasible, and allowing the Chamber of Commerce to appoint two members to the Capital Improvement Project Advisory Board. (Fiscal Impact: Increase in general fund revenues in the amount of approximately $6.6 million during the first three years following passage of the ballot measure which would be reduced to approximately $5.9 million thereafter.)

Recommendation — 1) Adopt a resolution placing the Consolidated Tax Measure on the April 8, 2014 general municipal election; 2) Adopt a resolution directing the City Attorney's Office to prepare an impartial analysis of the Consolidated Tax Measure; 3) Adopt a resolution regarding ballot arguments regarding the ballot measure; 4) Appoint a council member or members to draft ballot arguments regarding the ballot measure; 5) Adopt a resolution stating the Council's purpose and intent of using a portion of the funds from the ballot measure, if it passes, on capital improvement projects, if feasible, and allowing the Chamber of Commerce to appoint two members to the Capital Improvement Project Advisory Board; and 6) Take such additional, related, action that may be desirable.

ADJOURNMENT —
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action regarding (1) adopting a resolution placing a general tax ballot measure on the April 8, 2014 general municipal election (the "Consolidated Tax Measure") that would increase the Utility User Tax ("UUT") rate on non-residential users and impose a UUT on residents; increase the Transient Occupancy Tax ("TOT") rate; impose a parking tax on non-residential parking, except for employee, restaurant and theater parking, and valet parking ("Parking Tax"); reduce the Business License Tax Credit ("BLT Credit"); (2) direct the City Attorney's Office to prepare an impartial analysis of the ballot measure and find the ballot measure to be exempt from review under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"); (3) adopting a resolution regarding ballot arguments for the ballot measure; (4) appointing a council member or members to draft ballot arguments regarding the ballot measure; and (5) adopting a resolution stating the Council's purpose and intent of using a portion of the funds from the ballot measure, if it passes, on capital improvement projects, if feasible, and allowing the Chamber of Commerce to appoint two members to the Capital Improvement Project Advisory Board.

(Fiscal Impact: Increase in general fund revenues in the amount of approximately $6.6 million during the first three years following passage of the ballot measure which would be reduced to approximately $5.9 million thereafter.)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1. Adopt a resolution placing the Consolidated Tax Measure on the April 8, 2014 general municipal election;

2. Adopt a resolution directing the City Attorney's Office to prepare an impartial analysis of the Consolidated Tax Measure;

3. Adopt a resolution regarding ballot arguments regarding the ballot measure;

4. Appoint a council member or members to draft ballot arguments regarding the ballot measure;

5. Adopt a resolution stating the Council's purpose and intent of using a portion of the funds from the ballot measure, if it passes, on capital improvement projects, if feasible, and allowing the Chamber of Commerce to appoint two members to the Capital Improvement Project Advisory Board; and

6. Take such additional, related, action that may be desirable.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

September 24, October 1, November 5, 19, 26 and December 3, 2013 Staff Reports with Attachments
Resolutions Identified in Agenda Description
December 3, 2013 Letter from the Chamber of Commerce
Communications Received From Members of the Public
FISCAL IMPACT: Potential

Amount Budgeted: Increase in general fund revenues in the amount of approximately $6.6 million during the first three years following passage of the ballot measure which would be reduced to approximately $5.9 million thereafter

Additional Appropriation: N/A

Account Number(s):

ORIGINATED BY: Mark Hensley, City Attorney

REVIEWED BY: Tracy Weaver, City Clerk and Deborah Cullen, Finance Director

APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

The City was able to balance its budget for fiscal year 2013/2014 based upon receiving two payments totaling approximately $11.5 million from Chevron pursuant to the alternative tax agreement the City entered into with Chevron earlier this year. This is the only year that the City will receive two payments and accordingly it is projected that the City will have a general fund shortfall of approximately $3.6 million for fiscal year 2014/2015 and subsequent fiscal years. Additionally, the City needs approximately $2.0 million per year to fund necessary capital improvement projects.

The City Council has met seven times (September 24, October 1, November 5, 19, 26 and December 3, 2013 and this meeting) to discuss this budget shortfall and the potential of placing a tax measure on the April 2014 general municipal election to address the projected budget shortfalls and the need for capital improvement funds (copies of the staff reports, including attachments, are attached to this staff report). The City Manager also conducted 13 outreach meetings to educate businesses and residents regarding the City’s fiscal condition.

The El Segundo Chamber of Commerce has been engaged in the process through attendance of the Council Meeting and meetings with its membership. On December 3, 2013, the Chamber submitted a letter to the City that set forth a proposal for a tax measure in which the Chamber committed to “participate in a collaborative citywide campaign effort to see passage of the tax proposals we have recommended” if the City supported the Chamber’s proposal. The Chamber’s proposal is to increase the City’s general fund revenues by $6,481,450 per year for the first three years following passage of a tax measure by increasing the UUT on non-residential users by 2.5%, imposing a 2.5% UUT on residents, increasing the TOT by 2%, imposing a parking tax (except on employee, restaurant, theater and valet parking), and reducing the BLT Credit to 20%. After the first three years, the UUT on both residential and non-residential uses would be reduced by .5% and the BLT Credit would be reduced to 10% for purposes of lowering the general fund revenues received from the tax measure to $5,886,225 per year.

After staff received the Chamber’s proposal there was a discrepancy noted regarding the BLT credit. Staff recommended the following changes to achieve the general fund revenues set forth in the Chamber’s initial proposal. Based on the actual BLT credits calculated from the prior year
staff modified the proposal to $6,585,744 reducing the BLT credits in the first three years from 20% to 10% and modifying the revenues to $5,914,112 reducing the BLT credits from 10% to 5% after the first three years. The modification is consistent with Chamber’s intent with regard to the amount of revenues sought through the tax measure except that it is estimated the City would receive approximately $100,000 additional revenues during the first three years following approval of the tax measure and approximately $27,000 additional revenues per year thereafter. These modifications were approved by the Chamber.

In addition to the above, the Chamber’s proposal requested that all of the tax issues be placed on a single ballot measure, an action by the Council to show its intent to utilize a portion of the tax measure funds for capital improvement projects, and to formalize the process whereby two Chamber members are appointed to the City’s Capital Improvement Project Advisory Board. The Chamber also requested that the City not place an advisory measure on the ballot regarding using some of the tax measure funds for the benefit of the El Segundo Unified School District.

At the December 3, 2013, Council Meeting, after receiving public communications and deliberating on the Chamber’s proposal, the Council except for Council Member Atkinson (who advocated for somewhat higher taxes and no reduction in taxes as proposed by the Chamber) directed staff to prepare the documents necessary to place the tax measure on the ballot consistent with the Chamber’s proposal and notice a Special Council Meeting for potentially taking action on the tax measure. The taxes called for the ballot measure are general taxes as they are not being pledged to any particular purpose. Accordingly, a majority vote is necessary to pass the measure.

Attached are the resolutions necessary for placing the tax measure on the April 2014 general municipal election. As has been set forth in prior staff reports, four Council Members must vote to pass the resolution in order to place the tax measure on the ballot. For purposes of meeting the intent of a reducing the BLT Credit and UUT taxes after three years the initial BLT Credit will first be applied for taxable calendar year 2015 and then will be reduced further in 2018. It is not possible to implement the BLT Credit for the 2014 calendar year as the ballot measure will not be voted on until well after the vast majority of the businesses will have paid their 2014 business license taxes. The initial 2.5% increase in the UUT is drafted to take effect on July 1, 2014 and then to be reduced by .5% starting July 1, 2017. The tax measure would allow the City to reduce or suspend taxes by resolution in the event the City’s revenues grow at higher than currently anticipated amounts in future years.

There is also a resolution that would direct the City Attorney’s Office prepare an impartial analysis of the ballot measure. This is discretionary and the Council has the option of adopting or not adopting this portion of the resolution.

Also attached for consideration by the Council is a resolution setting forth the requirements for the submission of ballot arguments. The resolution is generally a restatement of California law. The Council has the discretion to appoint one or more of its members to submit ballot arguments.

Finally, attached for Council’s consideration is a resolution that sets for the Council’s purpose and intent regarding the use of tax measure funds if the ballot measure passes. The resolution calls for 1/3 or approximately $2.0 million dollars to be utilized for capital improvement projects to the extent feasible. This is only an advisory action by the Council as it cannot by resolution
restrict the use of the tax measure funds as they will be general fund revenues that can be used for any lawful municipal purpose. Moreover, given the unpredictability of the economy and expenses that the City may face in upcoming years it may not be feasible to utilize the tax measure funds as proposed by the resolution. The resolution also formalizes the ability of the Chamber to appoint two of its members to the Capital Improvement Advisory Board.
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action to direct staff to prepare the necessary documents to potentially: amend the City’s tax codes for purposes of increasing the City’s revenues, including but not limited to: potentially eliminating the sales tax credit granted to businesses and create a parking lot tax as part of the City’s business license taxes ("BLT"); increasing the utility user tax ("UUT"); increasing the transient occupancy tax ("TOT"); and, imposing a UUT on the residents. Additionally, direct staff as to whether to prepare an advisory ballot measure that would reflect whether or not the voters believe a portion of any proposed tax increase should be provided to the El Segundo Unified School District. (Fiscal Impact: Unknown).

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1. Direct staff to prepare the necessary documents to potentially: amend the City’s tax codes for purposes of increasing the City’s revenues, including but not limited to:
   (a) eliminating the sales tax credit granted to businesses which reduces the amount of BLT the businesses pay and create a parking lot business license tax;
   (b) increasing the utility user tax imposed on businesses;
   (c) increasing the transient occupancy tax;
   (d) imposing a utility user tax on the residents; and
   (e) amending other portions of the City’s tax codes to increase City revenues;

2. Direct staff as to whether or not to prepare an advisory ballot measure that would reflect whether or not the voters believe a portion of any proposed tax increase should be provided to the El Segundo Unified School District.

3. Take other related action.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

Attachment A – UUT and TOT Comparisons with Nearby Cities

FISCAL IMPACT:

Amount Budgeted: $N/A
Additional Appropriation: N/A
Account Number(s): N/A

ORIGINATED BY: Mark Hensley, City Attorney
REVIEWED BY: Deborah Cullen, Director of Finance
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager
BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

At the August 22, 2013, City Council Strategic Planning Workshop, the Council was presented with budget information for fiscal years 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 which shows that the City has had and continues to have a budget that is not structurally balanced. The payments the City receives from Chevron pursuant to agreement entered into within Chevron earlier this year is providing the revenues necessary to balance the 2013/2014 budget. However, based on forecasted revenues and expenditures staff is projecting a budget shortfall of $3,602,802 million for fiscal year 2014/2015 and if the City were to increase expenditures for capital projects recommended by staff the deficit increases to $5,602,802.

The Council was presented with several options for purposes of beginning the discussion of how to balance the City’s budget in future years, including (1) reducing City expenditures by reducing or eliminating City services; (2) contracting out public safety services; or (3) increasing the City’s tax revenues. With regard to the latter option, staff provided Council with an overview of different scenarios for amending the City’s tax codes and how such would increase City revenues. The Council also raised issues such as potentially placing an advisory measure on the ballot to determine if the voters would want some portion of any potential new tax revenues provided to the ESUD. Additionally, Council requested some information with regard to potentially imposing a utility user tax on residents. City taxes are currently only imposed on businesses within the City.

Staff is seeking direction from the Council with respect to what tax measures, if any, that Council wants to place on the April 2014 general municipal election. Council has until January 8, 2014 to adopt the necessary documents to place ballot measure on the April election. However, staff thought it was prudent to place this matter before Council as soon as possible given that staff does not know how long Council may wish to discuss and consider its options and, depending on Council direction, staff needs sufficient time to prepare the necessary documents for Council action. The potential tax increases are proposed to be general taxes (meaning they will be deposited into the City’s general fund and can be used for any lawful local government purpose) and the proposed increases require approval by a majority of the electorate pursuant to Article XIII C of the California Constitution. To place a general tax increase on the general municipal election four of the five Council Members must pass the resolution(s) necessary to place the proposed increase(s) on the ballot.

Utility Users Tax

The City currently imposes a 3% UUT on businesses for electricity, gas, water services and 2% for communication services. As shown on Exhibit A, the City charges less UUT than the surrounding jurisdictions. Staff estimates that for each 1% increase (in all UUT’s combined) the City will collect estimated additional annual revenues of $1,401,204.

If the Council were to impose a UUT on residents, for each 1% of tax imposed on residents electricity, gas and water services the City would collect approximately $342,350 of additional annual revenues.
Transient Occupancy Tax

The City currently imposes an 8% TOT on individuals occupying hotels or motels within the City. Exhibit A reflects that the City charges less, and in some cases substantially less than the surrounding jurisdictions. Staff estimates that for each 1% increase in TOT the City will collect an additional $637,500 in annual revenues.

Business License Taxes

Elimination of Business Sales Tax Credit

The City currently provides businesses with a credit towards their annual business license tax in an amount equal to the sales tax payments the City receives from businesses. If the City eliminates this credit, it is estimated that the City’s annual BLT revenues will increase annually in the amount of $1,100,000.

Imposing a Parking Lot Tax

Imposition of a 10% citywide parking tax would provide up to $1,158,392 in additional business license taxes depending on which of the following taxes were collect:

1. Airport parking (long-term parking) estimate revenue - $295,000;
2. Transient validation and valet parking estimated revenue - $346,404;
3. Monthly tenant parking estimated revenue - $516,900

Advisory Ballot Measure – ESUSD

The Council expressed some interest in potentially putting an advisory ballot measure on the election for purposes of seeing if the voters would like to see some portion of the revenues from any proposed tax increase provided to the ESUSD. The Council can place such a measure on the ballot but it has no binding legal effect and will not require that the City provide any revenues form any increase in tax revenues the School District. However, the Council and future Council can consider the results of such an advisory measures as the Council adopts its annual budget. This would require two separate ballot measures. The questions might look like this:

Measure A:

“SHALL THE ORDINANCE (ORDINANCE NO. 123) AUTHORIZING THE IMPOSITION OF A PARKING TAX AT AN ANNUAL FLAT RATE OF $X DOLLARS ($X) PER PARKING SPACE BE ADOPTED?”

Measure B:

SHALL THE ORDINANCE (ORDINANCE NO. 456) ADVISING THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO REGARDING THE EXPENDITURE OF NEW PARKING TAX REVENUE BE ADOPTED?
Procedural Issues Re Preparation of Ballot Measures

What Specific Amendments/Increases Does Council Want to Place on the Ballot?

Staff needs Council direction regarding which taxes, if any, that four members of the Council can agree on amending and/or increasing. It only takes three members of Council to place the advisory measure on the ballot, but unless four Council Members can agree on the proposed amendments/increases to the City’s tax code, an advisory measure would be moot.

Does Council Want the Proposed Amendments/Increases combined into one ballot measure or does it want separate ballot measures for each proposed amendment/increase?

Council has the option of either combining all of the proposed amendments and/or increases into one ballot measure (except an advisory ballot measure which must be a separate measure) or placing separate ballot measure for each amendment and/or increase on the ballot. This is a policy consideration for the Council. Council may wish to consider whether it wants all of the measures tied together with the understanding if it passes or fails that all of the proposed amendments pass or fail as opposed to having each amendment/increase voted on separately.

An additional consideration is that a ballot measure question can only contain 75 words. Thus, depending on number of amendments/increases that the Council wants to include in the ballot measure then it may become more difficult to specifically describe each amendment/increase than it would be if all of the amendments/increases are placed on the ballot as separate measures. For example, if the Council were to place all of the amendments/increases before the electorate then the ballot question might take the form of one of the two options below:

"SHALL THE ORDINANCE (ORDINANCE NO. 123) ENTITLED "AN INITIATIVE MEASURE AUTHORIZING A ONE PERCENT (1%) INCREASE TO THE UTILITY USER TAX, BUSINESS LICENSE TAX, AND TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAX TO FUND GENERAL MUNICIPAL SERVICES, INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, POLICE PROTECTION AND INVESTIGATIONS, SUPPRESSION OF GANG AND DRUG RELATED CRIMES, REMOVAL OF GRAFFITI, RAPID RESPONSE TO EMERGENCIES, SERVICES TO SENIOR CITIZENS, AND MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR OF CITY STREETS AND LANDSCAPING" BE ADOPTED?" [70 words]

"SHALL THE ORDINANCE ENTITLED "AN INITIATIVE MEASURE AUTHORIZING A 1% INCREASE TO THE UTILITY USER TAX; A 2% INCREASE TO THE BUSINESS LICENSE TAX; AUTHORIZING A 3% TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAX; REPEALING THE BUSINESS INCENTIVE TAX CREDIT; AND ADDING A NEW PARKING TAX TO FUND GENERAL MUNICIPAL SERVICES, INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, POLICE PROTECTION AND INVESTIGATIONS, RAPID RESPONSE TO EMERGENCIES, SERVICES TO SENIOR CITIZENS, AND MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR OF CITY STREETS" BE ADOPTED?" (71 words)
Alternatively, if each is proposed separately then the measures would be virtually identical and read as follows:

"SHALL THE ORDINANCE AMENDING EL SEGUNDO MUNICIPAL CODE
CHAPTER 3-7 TO INCREASE THE UTILITY USER TAXES BY 1% TO
FUND GENERAL MUNICIPAL SERVICES INCLUDING, WITHOUT
LIMITATION, POLICE PROTECTION AND CRIME SUPPRESSION
SERVICES, FIRE PREVENTION AND SUPPRESSION SERVICES, AND
PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES AND SERVICES BE ADOPTED?"

"SHALL THE ORDINANCE AMENDING EL SEGUNDO MUNICIPAL CODE
§ 3-4-3 TO INCREASE THE TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAXES BY 1% TO
FUND GENERAL MUNICIPAL SERVICES INCLUDING, WITHOUT
LIMITATION, POLICE PROTECTION AND CRIME SUPPRESSION
SERVICES, FIRE PREVENTION AND SUPPRESSION SERVICES, AND
PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES AND SERVICES BE ADOPTED?"

"SHALL THE ORDINANCE AMENDING EL SEGUNDO MUNICIPAL CODE
TO ELIMINATE THE BUSINESS LICENSE SALES TAX CREDIT AND
ESTABLISH A PARKING TAX TO FUND GENERAL MUNICIPAL
SERVICES, INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, POLICE PROTECTION
AND INVESTIGATIONS, SUPPRESSION OF GANG AND DRUG RELATED
CRIMES, REMOVAL OF GRAFFITI, AND RAPID RESPONSE TO
EMERGENCIES BE ADOPTED?"

Conclusion

Staff wanted to place this issue before Council well in advance of the cut-off date so that Council would have adequate time to consider its options and staff would have adequate time to prepare the necessary documents, if so directed by Council, to place ballot measures on the April general municipal election.
ATTACHMENT A - UUT & TOT COMPARISONS WITH NEARBY CITIES

GAS, ELECTRIC & WATER UTILITY USERS' TAX

All Charge Residential UUT except for City of El Segundo

Average 7%

TRANIENT OCCUPANCY TAX

Average 12%
NEW BUSINESS

8. Consideration and possible action to direct the staff to conduct a public information program related to the City’s financial situation, economic forecast and options for addressing future budget deficits.

Recommendation – 1) Direct staff to conduct a public information program; 2) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action regarding 1) adoption of resolutions calling for, requesting Los Angeles County services, and adopting regulations for candidate statements for the General Municipal Election, April 8, 2014; 2) approval of a standard professional services agreement with Martin & Chapman Co. for election support and services. (Fiscal Impact: $69,200)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
(1) Adopt resolutions calling for, requesting Los Angeles County services, and adopting regulations for candidate statements for the General Municipal Election, April 8, 2014;
(2) Authorize the City Manager to execute a standard professional services agreement, in a form approved by the City Attorney, with Martin & Chapman Co. to provide election support and services;
3) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
Draft Resolutions
Scope of Services

FISCAL IMPACT: Included in Adopted Budget
Amount Budgeted: $69,200
Additional Appropriation: No
Account Number(s): $29,200 - Elections Division, Various
$40,000 - 001-400-1302-6214, Professional & Technical

ORIGINATED BY: Cathy Domann, Deputy City Clerk II
REVIEWED BY: Tracy Weaver, City Clerk
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:
The General Municipal Election for two (2) City Council seats is to be held April 8, 2014. To proceed with the regulations set forth by Government Code, the proposed resolutions should be adopted before the opening of nominations beginning December 16, 2013 and ending January 13, 2014 (extended date January 15, 2014 if an incumbent does not file).

Additionally, it is requested that the City again enter into a professional services agreement, in an amount not to exceed $40,000, with Martin & Chapman Co. They have provided excellent
election support to El Segundo for over three decades, are well known and trusted for their invaluable election services, supplies, and guidance, and are utilized by over 200 cities, counties and districts in California and Nevada.

Their scope of service includes, but is not limited to, pre-election materials, official ballots, ballot counting equipment, vote by mail ballot tracking system, mailing services, foreign language assistance and translations, legislation updates, professional opinions and election night support. Their Anaheim location allows for timely delivery of supplies, election materials, and on-site support.

Their many years of experience with El Segundo, individualized assistance, and excellent customer service will help ensure a smooth election process.
RESOLUTION NO.

A RESOLUTION PLACING TWO CITY COUNCIL SEATS ON THE APRIL 8, 2014 GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION PURSUANT TO ELECTIONS CODE § 1301.

The City Council of the city of El Segundo resolves as follows:

SECTION 1: Pursuant to Elections Code § 1301, the City Council calls for a general municipal election to be held in the City of El Segundo on Tuesday, April 8, 2014, for the purpose of electing two members of the City Council to four year terms. The exact form of the question to be voted on at the election as it should appear on the ballot is as follows:

"FOR MEMBER OF THE CITY COUNCIL – Vote for two"

SECTION 2: The polls will open at 7 a.m. on election day and remain open until 8 p.m.

SECTION 3: The City Council Chamber, 350 Main Street, El Segundo, is designated the Central Counting Place where all ballots of the election will be tallied.

SECTION 4: The City Clerk is authorized to canvass the returns of the Municipal Election. The election will be held in all respects as if there were only one election, and only one form of ballot will be used.

SECTION 5: The City Clerk is authorized, instructed and directed to procure and furnish any and all official ballots, notices, printed matter and all supplies, equipment and paraphernalia that may be necessary in order to properly and lawfully conduct the election.

SECTION 6: This Resolution will become effective immediately upon adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 5th day of November, 2013.

Bill Fisher, Mayor

ATTEST:
Tracy Weaver, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
Mark D. Hensley, City Attorney
RESOLUTION NO. ______

A RESOLUTION REQUESTING THAT THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS PROVIDE ELECTION SERVICES TO THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO FOR THE GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON TUESDAY, APRIL 8, 2014.

The City Council of the city of El Segundo resolves as follows:

SECTION 1: Pursuant to Elections Code § 10002, the City Council requests that the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors assist the City with its local election scheduled for April 8, 2014.

SECTION 2: The services requested by the City include the following:

A. Listing of County precincts with number of registered voters in each so the City may consolidate election precincts into City voting precincts, and maps of the voting precincts;

B. List of poll workers the County uses for their elections;

C. Computer records of the names and addresses of all eligible registered voters in the City;

D. Voter signature verification services as needed;

E. Provide additional election equipment and assistance to the City in accordance with California law.

SECTION 3: The City will reimburse Los Angeles County for services performed pursuant to this request and upon the City's receipt of a County invoice.

SECTION 4: The City Clerk is directed to forward a certified copy of this Resolution to the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors and the Los Angeles County Clerk's office.

SECTION 5: The City Clerk is directed to certify and adopted this Resolution; record this Resolution in the book of the City's original resolutions, and make a minute of this adoption of the Resolution in the City Council's records and the minutes of this meeting.
SECTION 6: This Resolution will become effective immediately upon adoption and remain effective unless repealed or superseded.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 5th day of November, 2013.

Bill Fisher, Mayor

ATTEST:

Tracy Weaver, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
Mark D. Hensley, City Attorney

By: Karl H. Berger,
Assistant City Attorney
RESOLUTION NO.

A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING REQUIREMENTS FOR CANDIDATE STATEMENTS FILED WITH THE CITY CLERK TO BE INCLUDED WITH VOTER INFORMATION FOR AN ELECTION ON TUESDAY, APRIL 8, 2014.

The City Council of the city of El Segundo resolves as follows:

SECTION 1: Pursuant to Elections Code § 13307, candidates seeking election to office on April 8, 2014 may prepare a candidate's statement on forms provided by the City Clerk.

SECTION 2: Statements filed in accordance with this Resolution may include the following:

A. The candidate's name, age, and occupation; and

B. A statement consisting not more than two hundred (200) words outlining the candidate's education and qualifications for office.

SECTION 3: The candidate's statement must conform with the following:

A. It may not identify the candidate's membership in any political party or activity in partisan political organization;

B. It must be uniform in type and size and must be presented with block paragraphs;

C. It may not include bolding, underlining, italics, asterisks, or other, similar, type of formatting;

D. It must be typewritten using at least a 12 point font;

E. It must be filed in the City Clerk's office with a candidate's nomination papers;

F. Although it may be withdrawn during the time for filing nomination papers and until 5:00 p.m. the next working day after the close of the nomination period, the statement may not be changed.

SECTION 4: Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1973aa-1a., the City Clerk will:

1.
A. Translate all candidate statements into Spanish;

B. Make translated copies of candidate statements publicly available;

SECTION 5: Candidates filing a statement must pay to the City the following:

A. A fee equal to a candidate's pro rata share of the total actual cost for printing, handling, translating, and mailing candidate statements.

B. At the time of filing a statement, the candidate will deposit $870 ($520 if you do not want your statement printed in Spanish in the voter's pamphlet) with the City Clerk which represents the following estimated costs:

1. The cost of printing the statement in the voter's pamphlet in English: $300;

2. The cost of translating the statement into Spanish: $175; and

3. The cost of printing the statement in the voter's pamphlet in Spanish: $300.

C. Should a candidate's actual pro rated cost exceed the amount on deposit with the City Clerk, the candidate will, within thirty (30) days of receiving an invoice, pay the City Clerk any difference between the deposit amount and the actual cost.

D. Should a candidate's actual pro rated cost be less than the amount deposited with the City Clerk, then the City Clerk will refund any overpayment to a candidate within thirty (30) days after the election.

SECTION 6: Candidates may not include any additional materials in the sample ballot package.

SECTION 7: The City Clerk is directed to provide a copy of this Resolution to each candidate, or a candidate's representative, at the time nominating petitions are issued.

SECTION 8: The City Clerk is directed to certify and adopt this Resolution; record this Resolution in the book of the City's original resolutions, and make a minute of this adoption of the Resolution in the City Council's records and the minutes of this meeting.
SECTION 9: This Resolution will become effective immediately upon adoption and remain effective unless repealed or superseded.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 5th day of November, 2013.

__________________________
Bill Fisher, Mayor

ATTEST:

__________________________
Tracy Weaver, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
Mark D. Hensley, City Attorney

By: _______________________
Karl H. Berger,
Assistant City Attorney
EXHIBIT "A"

SCOPE OF SERVICES

Contractor shall render the following services in connection with the City of El Segundo's General Municipal Election to be held on Tuesday, April 8, 2014:

a. The Contractor shall furnish to the City the election services and supplies which shall include, but not be restricted to the following:

- Pre-election, nomination, mail ballot, and precinct supplies
- Reports - voter registration and polling places
- Vote by mail tracking system
- Vote by mail supplies
- Insert and mail permanent vote by mail ballots (optional)
- Voter information pamphlets
- Ballots, including test/duplicate ballots and privacy sleeves
- Ballot counting/election night supplies
- Instruction and procedures manuals
- Forms and notices
- Mailing services
- Delivery services

b. Contractor shall be "on call" by telephone. This means that Contractor shall be available at any time during regular business hours to the Contract Officer, or his/her designee, prior to and during the election, and until the completion of the official canvass of the election, and during the same period to, upon request, appear in person and work in cooperation with the Contract Officer, or his/her designee, upon any election task or problems which may arise.

c. Contractor shall furnish additional working forms, outlines, check lists and schedules which will aid the Contract Officer, or his/her designee, in keeping track of procedural details of the election. Such documents shall include, but are not limited to, forms, outlines, check lists and schedules identified in Contractor's "Election Handbook", "Order Form for Cities Conducting Own Election", and "City Information Fact Sheet Regarding Your Upcoming Election".

d. Contractor shall prepare and mail the Voter Information Pamphlets to all eligible voters in the city no later than 21 days prior to the election.

e. Contractor shall secure the services of qualified foreign language translators to ensure that all relevant election materials comply with the federal Voting Rights Act and state election laws.

f. Contractor shall otherwise provide such special and unique services, in close cooperation with the Contract Officer, or his/her designee, as may be necessary for the successful conduct of the election.
EXHIBIT "B"

SCHEDULE OF COMPENSATION

1. Compensation for supplies provided and services rendered pursuant to the terms of this contract shall not exceed $40,000.

2. Payment will be made in two installments by the City, upon the completion of the delivery of the supplies and the furnishing of the required services for the election and subsequent to the City's receipt of an invoice from Contractor.
   A. The first installment shall compensate Contractor for the candidate statement portion of the sample ballot pamphlet.
   B. The second installment shall compensate Contractor for all other services rendered by Contractor upon completion of the election.

3. In the event that more or less supplies are actually furnished than is shown in this Agreement, the varied amount of such supplies will be billed accordingly. Estimated pamphlet prices are based on the number of registered voters and the election materials will be provided to voters in English.
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action to direct staff to prepare the necessary documents to potentially place ballot measures on the April 2014 election to amend the City’s tax codes for purposes of increasing the City’s revenues, including but not limited to: potentially eliminating the sales tax credit granted to businesses and create a parking lot tax as part of the City’s business license taxes (“BLT”); increasing the utility user tax (“UUT”); increasing the transient occupancy tax (“TOT”); and, imposing a UUT on the residents. Additionally, direct staff as to whether to prepare an advisory ballot measure that would reflect whether or not the voters believe a portion of any proposed tax increase should be provided to the El Segundo Unified School District. (Fiscal Impact: Unknown).

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1. Direct staff to prepare the necessary documents to potentially place ballot measures on the April 2014 election to amend the City’s tax codes for purposes of increasing the City’s revenues, including but not limited to:
   (a) eliminating the sales tax credit granted to businesses which reduces the amount of BLT the businesses pay and create a parking lot business license tax;
   (b) increasing the utility user tax imposed on businesses;
   (c) increasing the transient occupancy tax;
   (d) imposing a utility user tax on the residents; and
   (e) amending other portions of the City’s tax codes to increase City revenues;

2. Direct staff as to whether or not to prepare an advisory ballot measure that would reflect whether or not the voters believe a portion of any proposed tax increase should be provided to the El Segundo Unified School District.

3. Take other related action.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

Attachment A – UUT and TOT Comparisons with Nearby Cities
Attachment B – Survey results and comments—All responses
Attachment C – Survey results and comments—Registered Voters

FISCAL IMPACT:

Amount Budgeted: $N/A
Additional Appropriation: N/A
Account Number(s): N/A

ORIGINATED BY: Mark Hensley, City Attorney
REVIEWED BY: Deborah Cullen, Director of Finance
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager
BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

At the August 22, 2013, City Council Strategic Planning Workshop, the Council was presented with budget information for fiscal years 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 which shows that the City has had and continues to have a budget that is not structurally balanced. The payments the City receives from Chevron pursuant to agreement entered into within Chevron earlier this year is providing the revenues necessary to balance the 2013/2014 budget. However, based on forecasted revenues and expenditures staff is projecting a budget shortfall of $3,602,802 million for fiscal year 2014/2015 and if the City were to increase expenditures for capital projects recommended by staff the deficit increases to $5,602,802.

The Council was presented with several options for purposes of beginning the discussion of how to balance the City’s budget in future years, including (1) reducing City expenditures by reducing or eliminating City services; (2) contracting out public safety services; or (3) increasing the City’s tax revenues. With regard to the latter option, staff provided Council with an overview of different scenarios for amending the City’s tax codes and how such would increase City revenues. The Council also raised issues such as potentially placing an advisory measure on the ballot to determine if the voters would want some portion of any potential new tax revenues provided to the ESUD. Additionally, Council requested some information with regard to potentially imposing a utility user tax on residents. City taxes are currently only imposed on businesses within the City.

On September 25, 2013 staff made a presentation to Council for consideration and possible action to direct staff to prepare documents for potential tax increases. During this meeting there was consensus from Council to direct staff to prepare a public information program related to the City’s financial situation. Staff was instructed to coordinate dates, times and venues for the public information meetings with as many community groups and citizenry as possible. Included in this list were all Commission, Committee and Board meetings. Council also asked that staff create a survey that can be handed out at each meeting to gauge community/business feedback.

A financial presentation with details regarding the City’s financial position and 3-year forecast was prepared. Included in this presentation were the options and potential tax increases that were previously presented to Council. In an effort to disseminate this information to all residents a video was created and made available on the City’s website and the local cable channel. Additionally, 3 outreach meetings were scheduled for the general public, (two weekday meetings and one weekend meeting) and a letter was mailed to all residents that have a water billing account with details (time/place) for the scheduled outreach meetings. The City also ran 2 advertisements in the El Segundo Herald and flyers with outreach information were made available at all City facilities.

Since September 25th the City Manager has made this presentation at 13 meetings and conducted surveys at each of these venues. The community groups include the Friends of the Library, Park Vista, Rotary and Kiwanis clubs and the Boards and Commissions include Recreation and Parks, Planning Commission and El Segundo Board of Education. Approximately 170 individuals have completed the survey consisting of 10 questions/options related to demographics, tax increases and City services. The results of the survey showed that generally the individuals
participating were satisfied with City services and a majority supported a potential tax increase. See attached for complete results and comments, including the actual surveys.

Staff is seeking direction from the Council with respect to what tax measures, if any, that Council wants to place on the April 2014 general municipal election. Council has until January 8, 2014 to adopt the necessary documents to place ballot measure on the April election. However, staff thought it was prudent to place this matter before Council as soon as possible given that staff does not know how long Council may wish to discuss and consider its options and, depending on Council direction, staff needs sufficient time to prepare the necessary documents for Council action. The potential tax increases are proposed to be general taxes (meaning they will be deposited into the City’s general fund and can be used for any lawful local government purpose) and the proposed increases require approval by a majority of the electorate pursuant to Article XIII C of the California Constitution. To place a general tax increase on the general municipal election four of the five Council Members must pass the resolution(s) necessary to place the proposed increase(s) on the ballot.

Utility Users Tax

The City currently imposes a 3% UUT on businesses for electricity, gas, water services and 2% for communication services. As shown on Exhibit A, the City charges less UUT than the surrounding jurisdictions. Staff estimates that for each 1% increase (in all UUT’s combined) the City will collect estimated additional annual revenues of $1,401,204.

If the Council were to impose a UUT on residents, for each 1% of tax imposed on residential electricity, gas and water services the City would collect approximately $342,350 of additional annual revenues.

Transient Occupancy Tax

The City currently imposes an 8% TOT on individuals occupying hotels or motels within the City. Exhibit A reflects that the City charges less, and in some cases substantially less than the surrounding jurisdictions. Staff estimates that for each 1% increase in TOT the City will collect an additional $637,500 in annual revenues.

Business License Taxes

Elimination of Business Sales Tax Credit

The City currently provides businesses with a credit towards their annual business license tax in an amount equal to the sales tax payments the City receives from businesses. If the City eliminates this credit, it is estimated that the City’s annual BLT revenues will increase annually in the amount of $1,100,000.

Imposing a Parking Lot Tax
Imposition of a 10% citywide parking tax would provide up to $1,158,392 in additional business license taxes depending on which of the following taxes were collect:

1. Airport parking (long-term parking) estimate revenue - $295,000;
2. Transient validation and valet parking estimated revenue - $346,404;
3. Monthly tenant parking estimated revenue - $516,900

Advisory Ballot Measure – ESUSD

The Council expressed some interest in potentially putting an advisory ballot measure on the election for purposes of seeing if the voters would like to see some portion of the revenues from any proposed tax increase provided to the ESUSD. The Council can place such a measure on the ballot but it has no binding legal effect and will not require that the City provide any revenues form any increase in tax revenues the School District. However, the Council and future Council can consider the results of such an advisory measures as the Council adopts its annual budget. This would require two separate ballot measures. The questions might look like this:

Measure A:

“SHALL THE ORDINANCE (ORDINANCE NO. 123) AUTHORIZING THE IMPOSITION OF A PARKING TAX AT AN ANNUAL FLAT RATE OF $X DOLLARS ($X) PER PARKING SPACE BE ADOPTED?”

Measure B:

SHALL THE ORDINANCE (ORDINANCE NO. 456) ADVISING THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO REGARDING THE EXPENDITURE OF NEW PARKING TAX REVENUE BE ADOPTED?

Procedural Issues Re Preparation of Ballot Measures

What Specific Amendments/Increases Does Council Want to Place on the Ballot?

Staff needs Council direction regarding which taxes, if any, that four members of the Council can agree on amending and/or increasing. It only takes three members of Council to place the advisory measure on the ballot, but unless four Council Members can agree on the proposed amendments/increases to the City’s tax code, an advisory measure would be moot.

Does Council Want the Proposed Amendments/Increases combined into one ballot measure or does it want separate ballot measures for each proposed amendment/increase?

Council has the option of either combining all of the proposed amendments and/or increases into one ballot measure (except an advisory ballot measure which must be a separate measure) or placing separate ballot measure for each amendment and/or increase on the ballot. This is a policy consideration for the Council. Council may wish to consider whether it wants all of the measures tied together with the understanding if it passes or fails that all of the proposed amendments pass or fail as opposed to having each amendment/increase voted on separately.
An additional consideration is that a ballot measure question can only contain 75 words. Thus, depending on number of amendments/increases that the Council wants to include in the ballot measure then it may become more difficult to specifically describe each amendment/increase than it would be if all of the amendments/increases are placed on the ballot as separate measures. For example, if the Council were to place all of the amendments/increases before the electorate then the ballot question might take the form of one of the two options below:

"SHALL THE ORDINANCE (ORDINANCE NO. 123) ENTITLED "AN INITIATIVE MEASURE AUTHORIZING A ONE PERCENT (1%) INCREASE TO THE UTILITY USER TAX, BUSINESS LICENSE TAX, AND TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAX TO FUND GENERAL MUNICIPAL SERVICES, INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, POLICE PROTECTION AND INVESTIGATIONS, SUPPRESSION OF GANG AND DRUG RELATED CRIMES, REMOVAL OF GRAFFITI, RAPID RESPONSE TO EMERGENCIES, SERVICES TO SENIOR CITIZENS, AND MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR OF CITY STREETS AND LANDSCAPING" BE ADOPTED?"
[70 words]

"SHALL THE ORDINANCE ENTITLED "AN INITIATIVE MEASURE AUTHORIZING A 1% INCREASE TO THE UTILITY USER TAX; A 2% INCREASE TO THE BUSINESS LICENSE TAX; AUTHORIZING A 3% TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAX; REPEALING THE BUSINESS INCENTIVE TAX CREDIT; AND ADDING A NEW PARKING TAX TO FUND GENERAL MUNICIPAL SERVICES, INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, POLICE PROTECTION AND INVESTIGATIONS, RAPID RESPONSE TO EMERGENCIES, SERVICES TO SENIOR CITIZENS, AND MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR OF CITY STREETS" BE ADOPTED?" (71 words)

Alternatively, if each is proposed separately then the measures would be virtually identical and read as follows:

"SHALL THE ORDINANCE AMENDING EL SEGUNDO MUNICIPAL CODE CHAPTER 3-7 TO INCREASE THE UTILITY USER TAXES BY 1% TO FUND GENERAL MUNICIPAL SERVICES INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, POLICE PROTECTION AND CRIME SUPPRESSION SERVICES, FIRE PREVENTION AND SUPPRESSION SERVICES, AND PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES AND SERVICES BE ADOPTED?"

"SHALL THE ORDINANCE AMENDING EL SEGUNDO MUNICIPAL CODE § 3-4-3 TO INCREASE THE TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAXES BY 1% TO FUND GENERAL MUNICIPAL SERVICES INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, POLICE PROTECTION AND CRIME SUPPRESSION SERVICES, FIRE PREVENTION AND SUPPRESSION SERVICES, AND PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES AND SERVICES BE ADOPTED?"
"SHALL THE ORDINANCE AMENDING EL SEGUNDO MUNICIPAL CODE TO ELIMINATE THE BUSINESS LICENSE SALES TAX CREDIT AND ESTABLISH A PARKING TAX TO FUND GENERAL MUNICIPAL SERVICES, INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, POLICE PROTECTION AND INVESTIGATIONS, SUPPRESSION OF GANG AND DRUG RELATED CRIMES, REMOVAL OF GRAFFITI, AND RAPID RESPONSE TO EMERGENCIES BE ADOPTED?"

Conclusion

Staff wanted to place this issue before Council well in advance of the cut-off date so that Council would have adequate time to consider its options and staff would have adequate time to prepare the necessary documents, if so directed by Council, to place ballot measures on the April general municipal election.
ATTACHMENT A -
UUT & TOT COMPARISONS WITH NEARBY CITIES

GAS, ELECTRIC & WATER UTILITY USERS' TAX
All Charge Residential UUT except for City of El Segundo

Average 7%

TRANSENT OCCUPANCY TAX
Average 12%

8%
Q1 Are you an El Segundo Resident, Employee or Owner of an El Segundo Business?

Answered: 160  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident of El Segundo</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee or Owner of an El Segundo Business</td>
<td>26.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 160

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Other (please specify)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local (Immediate) Resident</td>
<td>11/7/2013 1:51 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work in El Segundo, Employee.</td>
<td>11/7/2013 1:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Involved</td>
<td>11/7/2013 1:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Have done business with the City.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:32 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Non-resident</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:08 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Home-based business.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:38 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Apartment Building Owner</td>
<td>10/24/2013 9:24 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2 How long have you been a resident of El Segundo?

Answered: 145  Skipped: 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 yrs</td>
<td>11.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 yrs</td>
<td>13.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 yrs</td>
<td>11.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+ yrs</td>
<td>63.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 145
City of El Segundo

Q3 Are you a registered voter in El Segundo?

Answered: 157  Skipped: 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4 What is your gender?

Answered: 160  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>69.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5 What age group are you in?

Answered: 158  Skipped: 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>8.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>26.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>27.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>43.04%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 158
Q6 Are you satisfied with the level of service provided in the following areas?

Answered: 156  Skipped: 4

- Police Services
- Fire Services
- Recreation and Parks Services
- Library Services

8/17
City of El Segundo

Condition of Streets and Sidewalks

Condition of Public Buildings

Overall City Services

Very Satisfied Satisfied No Opinion Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied Total Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Services</td>
<td>66.46%</td>
<td>30.67%</td>
<td>1.29%</td>
<td>1.29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Services</td>
<td>66.46%</td>
<td>30.12%</td>
<td>2.89%</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Parks</td>
<td>81.48%</td>
<td>39.47%</td>
<td>6.88%</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## City of El Segundo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Services</td>
<td>44.37%</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of Streets and Sidewalks</td>
<td>13.54%</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall City Services</td>
<td>33.13%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                        | 17.88%     | 27           |
| Condition of Public Buildings | 23.86%     | 35           |

|                        | 3.31%      | 5            |
|                        | 1.32%      | 2            |

|                        | 2.85%      | 4            |
|                        | 11.04%     | 17           |

|                        | 2.25%      | 5            |
|                        | 1.33%      | 2            |

|                        | 3.25%      | 6            |
|                        | 2.85%      | 4            |

|                        | 33.13%     | 81           |

|                        | 62.34%     | 96           |

|                        | 3.25%      | 6            |

|                        | 1.33%      | 2            |

|                        | 3.25%      | 6            |

|                        | 2.85%      | 4            |

|                        | 2.85%      | 4            |

|                        | 2.25%      | 5            |

|                        | 1.33%      | 2            |

|                        | 3.25%      | 6            |

|                        | 2.85%      | 4            |

|                        | 2.85%      | 4            |

|                        | 2.25%      | 5            |

|                        | 1.33%      | 2            |

|                        | 3.25%      | 6            |
Q7 Given the City's financial situation, do you believe the City should:

Answered: 156  Skipped: 4

- Reduce the Size of the City...
- Further reduce Employee...
- Consider Contracting for County...
- Consider Contracting for County...
## City of El Segundo

### Consider Contracting for County Services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the Size of the City Workforce</td>
<td>18.83%</td>
<td>21.71%</td>
<td>25.06%</td>
<td>28.32%</td>
<td>18.78%</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further reduce Employee Salaries and Benefits</td>
<td>20.87%</td>
<td>22.57%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19.33%</td>
<td>14.08%</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider Contracting for County Services for Fire</td>
<td>11.26%</td>
<td>18.54%</td>
<td>6.61%</td>
<td>31.13%</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider Contracting for County Services for Sheriff</td>
<td>3.97%</td>
<td>12.56%</td>
<td>10.60%</td>
<td>30.46%</td>
<td>42.88%</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider Contracting for County Services for Library</td>
<td>6.07%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>19.33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21.35%</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Taxes</td>
<td>27.33%</td>
<td>41.33%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>9.33%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Increase Taxes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
- The chart illustrates the percentage distribution of responses for various city services and tax increase options.
- The data is represented in color-coded bars, with each color indicating a different level of support.
- The table provides a detailed breakdown of responses for each service option, showing the percentage of support, neither, oppose, and strongly oppose for each category.

**10/17**
Q8 Based on the information provided, what is your opinion on the following tax measures:

Answered: 155  Skipped: 5
## City of El Segundo

### Implement a Parking Tax

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36.24%</td>
<td>37.58%</td>
<td>11.41%</td>
<td>9.40%</td>
<td>6.84%</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Increase in TOT (Hotel Visitor Tax)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54.55%</td>
<td>29.32%</td>
<td>6.49%</td>
<td>6.49%</td>
<td>3.26%</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Increase Business UUT (Utility Tax)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41.06%</td>
<td>33.77%</td>
<td>11.92%</td>
<td>10.88%</td>
<td>2.65%</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Implement a New Residential UUT (Utility Tax)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35.33%</td>
<td>26.89%</td>
<td>16.79%</td>
<td>13.83%</td>
<td>5.92%</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Eliminate Business License Tax Credit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30.67%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10.67%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ece
Q9 Do you have any suggestions for how the City can raise revenues?

Answered: 58  Skipped: 102

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Higher taxes on Chevron. Bring new business to El Segundo (e.g. Smokey Hollow revitalization).</td>
<td>11/13/2013 9:02 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Upgrade downtown businesses, buildings and parking to make it more accommodating to all. Plus make sure Chevron is paying their share ongoing.</td>
<td>11/13/2013 8:52 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Include the School District</td>
<td>11/13/2013 8:27 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hold events at El Segundo beach, charge entry and charge parking at event.</td>
<td>11/7/2013 2:08 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bring Park &amp; Rec fees to compare with Manhattan Beach and other cities.</td>
<td>11/7/2013 2:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Could we re-structure fire dept. ~ keep local, but more joint response agreements? or combo employee/volunteer? Charge residents trash fee or have them pay trash collection companies directly.</td>
<td>11/7/2013 1:57 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>You have a tough job. Thankel</td>
<td>11/7/2013 1:54 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Raise other fees --&gt; plandcheck permits --&gt; Rec/Park fees --&gt; Sponsoring events by corporations.</td>
<td>11/7/2013 1:52 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sports Venue - Maple / Nash - Douglas Area</td>
<td>11/7/2013 1:51 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Increase income taxes.</td>
<td>11/7/2013 1:48 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pay for trash. Have 401k with .25 City match same as private business.</td>
<td>11/7/2013 1:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>One possibility is if we are to implement a new residential UUT that it happens when a property is sold and the new buyer would be subject to a fixed UUT from then on. So currently, everyone does not have to pay new tax. Only new residents are subject to it when they buy property in El Segundo.</td>
<td>11/6/2013 3:25 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>--&gt; Increase business growth (retail) on Main Street and Plaza El Segundo --&gt; Recruit new businesses to have open houses, advertise, co-sponsor events, engage in the community. [Increase UUT: 1% &amp; 3%]</td>
<td>10/29/2013 4:18 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I think schools need to cover the cost of staffing provided by City. Increase fees for filming in El Segundo. [This person wrote under #8 --&gt; Eliminate Business License Tax Credit, &quot;Partial&quot;]</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:48 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Tax plunger, tax tennis courts, handbell courts, per hour.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:43 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Charge for trash - residential.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:41 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Make available secondary street signs such as &quot;Mike Gordon Parkway&quot; to businesses ie: El Segundo Boulevard &quot;Chevron Parkway&quot; etc.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:35 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Rent golf course. Sell the sand on the beach! It replaces itself.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:34 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sell property (lease?)</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Residents pay for residential trash pickup. TOT - Raise 2%; Trash pickup paid by residents. Utility - 2% across the board.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:32 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Vote for a parcel tax on every piece of property in El Segundo - commercial and private.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:19 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I'm all for solving the problems as much as possible via taxes on visitors, ie: TOT &amp; parking taxes. Also, are proposed economic development improvements accounted for?</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:18 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Residential Responsibilities...Raise in Taxes...-&gt; Metered parking on Main, Richmond, &amp; Grand.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:13 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Aggressively pursue expanding the tax base via attracting more businesses (&quot;Silicon Beach&quot; in Smokey Hollow) - Variety, variety, variety. -Encourage residents to upgrade their houses.</td>
<td>10/26/2013 8:38 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Aggressively develop new business to move to the City.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:34 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>See above and charge for trash collection.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Try to attract more businesses and diversify businesses as well as increase taxes by a small amount over many payers, residential and business.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:28 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Consider taxes listed above.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:28 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City of El Segundo

29. Enforce business license requirements within the City. Have employees with certain groups pay more for free benefits they receive. Quit waiving fees for all the non-profit groups in the City. Charge residents for garbage collection, but exclude apartment and condo units.

30. Need major P.R. campaign effort to inform public on need to support utility taxes.


32. Establish some kind of parking /mooring fee for all ships that offload their crude 1/2 mile off the City coast. Require residents to pay trash.

33. Residents need to pay fair share of City services expense.

34. Use residents need to pay more (trash, uut, other taxes). Employees have been drastically cut, more cuts will just reduce further services.

35. Increase taxes. [TOT, UUT, Residential UUT, Parking Tax & Eliminate Business License Tax Credit]. Citizens pay for their trash collection.

36. 1. Residential Trash Tax 2. Hotel Occupancy Tax

37. Increase Chevron Tax to be equal to surrounding Oil Refineries.

38. Have residents pay for trash pickup.

39. *Increase Hotel tax *More retail by Plaza El Segundo? *Outsource golf course *Increase parking tickets fines *Put parking meters in on Main St. *Increase UUT, lease parking spaces for fee on Sepulveda areas. *Use City parking garage by 99cent store for leased LAX blk *Use Chevron taxes *Charge for all services used (PD & FD) if person broke the law.

40. Residents need to pay more for their services.

41. Manage the money correctly. The taxes are not competitive with other South Bay Cities. They don't seem to be having this problem. Bad business decisions on your part. Why would you lower the taxes when everything naturally increases?

42. Reduce expenditures why raise taxes when City has probably been mismanaged over the years.

43. Outsource

44. TOT is way too cheap! Should be at least 12%. Business tax + Residential utility tax should be increased. Red-card fees, look at reduced health care costs for the City employees.

45. TAKE THE UUT EXCEPTION FOR ALL APARTMENT UNITS 4 AND DOWN 7010 UNITS NOT PAYING. REVISIT TRASH COLLECTION FEES IF IT RAISES INCOME FOR CITY.

46. Ask people with low long-term taxes to pay higher tax (or demand?). THAT WOULD BE ME, BY THE WAY!

47. Unfortunately across the board tax increases with prudent cuts.

48. Contact Byron and Eva Sweeney for more ideas of economic and CREATIVE DEVELOPMENT as they did with the ES Museum of Art & their fire station development.

49. - Increase Parke & Rec fees

50. Tax Retirees

51. Make filming -> film industry more attractive - filming - studios.

52. *All of the above. *Sell excess equipment. *Ensure salaries are equivalent to other cities. *Treat retirement benefits to retirees like businesses (eliminate via payout).

53. charge for trash collection attract more businesses encourage shopping local

54. Don't touch employees anymore. Increase taxes

55. ALL Residents, single, multi, etc pay for trash pickup.

56. Improve development of land. Increase some form of property taxes.

57. Increase user fees at Parke/Rec.

58. Add a 1/4 or 1/2 cent/dollar city sales tax.

10/24/2013 2:27 PM
10/24/2013 2:26 PM
10/24/2013 2:24 PM
10/24/2013 2:22 PM
10/24/2013 2:19 PM
10/24/2013 2:15 PM
10/24/2013 2:14 PM
10/24/2013 1:48 PM
10/24/2013 1:45 PM
10/24/2013 1:42 PM
10/24/2013 1:40 PM
10/24/2013 9:56 AM
10/24/2013 9:47 AM
10/24/2013 9:24 AM
10/24/2013 9:19 AM
10/23/2013 3:02 PM
10/23/2013 2:44 PM
10/23/2013 2:32 PM
10/23/2013 7:40 AM
10/23/2013 7:29 AM
10/21/2013 3:44 PM
10/21/2013 3:41 PM
10/21/2013 3:39 PM
10/21/2013 3:37 PM
10/21/2013 3:32 PM
10/21/2013 2:58 PM
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## Q10 Do you have any suggestions for how the City can reduce expenses?

**Answered: 54  Skipped: 106**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cut management for Fire/Police. We don't need two Police Captains, etc...</td>
<td>11/13/2013 8:38 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limit or reduce police and fire department salaries, benefits, pension. Also, reduce top management positions.</td>
<td>11/13/2013 8:35 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Street sweep: eliminate or reduce frequency. Do we have to have two lifeguards with pool when high school is using it?</td>
<td>11/7/2013 2:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reduce pensions.</td>
<td>11/7/2013 1:54 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lower administrative costs (salaries/benefits). Reduce size of Police force.</td>
<td>11/7/2013 1:51 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dial-a-ride?</td>
<td>11/7/2013 1:46 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pay to pick up trash. Negotiate payment of retirement benefits.</td>
<td>11/7/2013 1:46 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Simplify systems within City. Use technology.</td>
<td>11/7/2013 1:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Instead of laying off people, they can change to part-time employees.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 4:56 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>→ Can a group create a fund raising arm for major projects such as UHIF? Annual Library fees would be OK with me! (Family)</td>
<td>10/29/2013 4:18 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sell or lease land or parking lot on northeast corner of Main and Grand. That is a ton of space just used for Firefighters to park. Charge higher fees for non-residents to use City facilities (Park &amp; Rec).</td>
<td>10/29/2013 4:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Where I worked they draw a line in the sand &amp; said — all new hires would not receive retiree medical benefits.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:48 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Retire the exorbitant salaries $250k + of bosses.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:43 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>No pensions for City employees.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:39 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Reduce salaries and pensions.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Cut out some special events - Parks &amp; Rec. Reduce expenses for trips, conferences, and seminars including Police and Fire.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:32 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Form a blue ribbon committee to look at possible reducing $ busse - dog park - trash fee, etc, etc, less to schools.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:29 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I'm glad we're a full service City. I appreciate the cuts that have been made, I think that cost control needs to remain in focus (limiting raises &amp; benefits) within maintaining current staffing levels.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 3:18 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Automate as many services as possible. Install solar (PV &amp; Thermal) on all City buildings. Add a windmill next to the water tower or above the power station / Hyperion ridge.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:38 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Allow more position vacated not to be filled with full time employees. Look to outsource non-resident facing departments</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:34 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Include Chevron in the elimination of the business license tax credit. Don't commit to supporting a pool for Water USD.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Eliminate life time benefits for everyone.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:26 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Does the city need a fleet of buses for shuttle services. Why purchase all the fire equipment vehicles (ladder truck, search and rescue trailer, etc) when they do is sit, or go to garage for repairs.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:24 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Close down the swimming pool. Cut the number of City workers.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:18 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1. Look closely at how to contain costs in safety area. In new norm, how do we cut the fat so to speak. Primarily since it appears to be most expensive item in E.S. 2. How an independent entity evaluate the City for ideas on how to run City more efficiently.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:13 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. No.</td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>Date/Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Motorcycle - Gone 1 Fire Station</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:11 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Vote for a Republican conservative in all areas of Federal, State, County, and City government!!!</td>
<td>10/24/2013 4:03 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Library and fire department.</td>
<td>10/24/2013 2:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Reduce pensions.</td>
<td>10/24/2013 2:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Go county fire and county library.</td>
<td>10/24/2013 2:25 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Eliminate fire dept. L.A. County can do just as good of a job.</td>
<td>10/24/2013 2:24 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td><em>Regionalize city services</em> Eliminate medical benefits to City Council Members *Eliminate special events paid for by City - ie: July 4th, that generate unnecessary costs, especially overtime cost.</td>
<td>10/24/2013 2:22 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1. Take away lifetime medical for City Council. 2. Start regionalizing more City services throughout Southbay. (ie: animal control)</td>
<td>10/24/2013 2:19 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td><em>Charge residents trash fees</em> Raise tax by 1% *Implement parking tax</td>
<td>10/24/2013 2:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Eliminate lifetime medical benefits for City Council.</td>
<td>10/24/2013 2:14 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Outsource City Services ie: Maintenance, Street Division, Vehicle Maintenance</td>
<td>10/24/2013 2:12 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Drop the library and bring it back when you can afford it.</td>
<td>10/24/2013 2:07 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>I will need more information, but I believe - better management could reduce cost without the need to raise taxes</td>
<td>10/24/2013 1:42 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>DO NOT TAX BUSINESSES OUT OF BUSINESS! FUND RAISERS?? RAISE RENT ON SENIOR HOUSING. OPEN EXPENSIVE SENIOR HOUSING AS REVENUE. FLAT E.S. TAX ON ALL RESIDENTIAL &amp; ANY HOUSING.</td>
<td>10/24/2013 9:24 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Reduce Pensions</td>
<td>10/24/2013 9:18 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Number of employees and compensation both seem high.</td>
<td>10/23/2013 3:11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Pensions for the police/fire &amp; Top ES Mgmt is too high. Under #7, Reduce the Size of the City Workforce, this person wrote, &quot;Police &amp; Fire&quot;. Under #7 =&gt; Further reduce Employee Salaries and Benefits, this person wrote, &quot;Police, Fire, Upper Mgmt&quot;.</td>
<td>10/23/2013 3:09 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Reconsider County Fire Research County Library</td>
<td>10/23/2013 2:57 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>EMPLOYEE SALARIES AND BENEFITS NEED TO BE REDUCED TO PAY LEVEL OF PRIVATE INDUSTRY. EL SEGUNDO DOES NOT HAVE A REVENUE PROBLEM. IT HAS A SPENDING PROBLEM.</td>
<td>10/23/2013 2:56 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Further reduce Employee Salaries and Benefits, this person wrote: &quot;Especially FD &amp; PD&quot;. That is the City's job to figure out, but the way to go.</td>
<td>10/23/2013 2:35 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Reduce retiree health expenses think Obamacare for them reduce pensions -</td>
<td>10/23/2013 2:32 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Across the board cuts to balance expenses to revenue.</td>
<td>10/23/2013 2:29 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Redesign out sourcing of fire services</td>
<td>10/21/2013 3:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>eliminate retirement benefits for those with less than 30 years service</td>
<td>10/21/2013 3:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Reduce retirement benefits. Reduce size of fire department.</td>
<td>10/21/2013 3:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Comments are spot on. The unions have too much say - limit union contributions to campaigns.</td>
<td>10/21/2013 3:36 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Severely cut or eliminate all pensions</td>
<td>10/21/2013 3:32 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Reduce the budget to Recreation and Parks - used by a limited number of residents.</td>
<td>10/21/2013 3:02 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[Dissatisfied with condition of City swimming pool].</td>
<td>10/29/2013 4:18 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Looked like revenue is highest it has been, &amp; projected to increase. Now there is a deficit. How do we control our expense?</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:49 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Increase TOT by only 1%.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:41 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strongly support increase in TOT by 2% and strongly support implementation of new residential UUT by 2%.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:32 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Condition of Streets &amp; Sidewalks &quot;could be improved&quot;.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:38 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Wish Library was open Fridays! Need to know more about (contracting for County services for Fire/Sheriff) to make an informed decision.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:26 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Why is the Library going to reopen on Fridays for 9 months only? Then layoff 3 new hires, 1 full time emp. part time. It seems like re-opening on Fridays is waste of money and personnel.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:21 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>[Staff] have already paid a lot in the last round. Police Services are more important than Fire.</td>
<td>10/24/2013 2:24 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Don't like the City closed on Fridays.</td>
<td>10/24/2013 2:10 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>NONE - FEDERAL, STATE, COUNTY, CITY, PROPERTY TAX, SALES, EXCISE TAXES AND ALL ADDED FEES TAKE 50% OF MY INCOME, ENOUGH IS ENOUGH. Under #10, &quot;Are you satisfied...&quot; → Condition of Streets &amp; Sidewalk, this person wrote, &quot;DEPENDS ON VARIOUS STREETS&quot;.</td>
<td>10/23/2013 2:56 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Note on #6 &quot;Are you satisfied...&quot; → Library Services, this person wrote, &quot;w/ Fri hours&quot;</td>
<td>10/23/2013 2:53 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Under #6 → Rec &amp; Parks + Library Services, this person wrote, &quot;Schedule of classes &amp; facilities is limited. Under #7 → Consider Contracting for County Services for Library, this person wrote, &quot;unless it means closing school libraries&quot;.</td>
<td>10/23/2013 2:48 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1 Are you an El Segundo Resident, Employee or Owner of an El Segundo Business?

Answered: 128  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident of El Segundo</td>
<td>99.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee or Owner of an El Segundo Business</td>
<td>20.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 128

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Other (please specify)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Home-based business</td>
<td>10/26/2013 8:38 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apartment Building Owner</td>
<td>10/24/2013 9:24 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2 How long have you been a resident of El Segundo?

Answered: 128  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 yrs</td>
<td>7.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 yrs</td>
<td>12.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 yrs</td>
<td>12.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+ yrs</td>
<td>67.87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 128
Q3 Are you a registered voter in El Segundo?

Answered: 128  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4 What is your gender?

Answered: 128  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>57.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5 What age group are you in?

Answered: 127  Skipped: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>7.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>18.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>26.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>47.24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 127
Q6 Are you satisfied with the level of service provided in the following areas?

Answered: 126  Skipped: 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>16.80%</th>
<th>46.90%</th>
<th>11.48%</th>
<th>3.28%</th>
<th>0.82%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Services</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of Streets and Sidewalks</td>
<td>16.39%</td>
<td>36.52%</td>
<td>8.84%</td>
<td>34.43%</td>
<td>2.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of Public Buildings</td>
<td>16.80%</td>
<td>49.50%</td>
<td>20.60%</td>
<td>12.60%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall City Services</td>
<td>28.80%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>0.68%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City of El Segundo

Q7 Given the City's financial situation, do you believe the City should:

Answered: 124  Skipped: 4

- Reduce the Size of the City...
- Further reduce Employee...
- Consider Contracting for County...
- Consider Contracting for County...

9/17
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the Size of the City Workforce</td>
<td>11.48%</td>
<td>22.96%</td>
<td>24.59%</td>
<td>27.05%</td>
<td>13.93%</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further reduce Employee Salaries and Benefits</td>
<td>22.50%</td>
<td>23.33%</td>
<td>24.17%</td>
<td>20.83%</td>
<td>9.17%</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider Contracting for County Services for Fire</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>18.00%</td>
<td>8.20%</td>
<td>31.97%</td>
<td>31.15%</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider Contracting for County Services for Sheriff</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>9.17%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider Contracting for County Services for Library</td>
<td>5.83%</td>
<td>27.50%</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
<td>25.83%</td>
<td>23.33%</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Taxes</td>
<td>26.05%</td>
<td>44.54%</td>
<td>8.46%</td>
<td>7.56%</td>
<td>12.45%</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q8 Based on the information provided what is your opinion on the following tax measures:

Answered: 123  Skipped: 5

- Increase in TOT (Hotel Visitor Tax)
- Increase Business UUT (Utility Tax)
- Implement a New Resident...
- Eliminate Business License Tax...
### City of El Segundo

#### Implement a Parking Tax

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase in TOT (Hotel Visitor Tax)</td>
<td>56.10%</td>
<td>27.64%</td>
<td>7.32%</td>
<td>5.69%</td>
<td>3.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Business UUT (Utility Tax)</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement a New Residential UUT (Utility Tax)</td>
<td>33.98%</td>
<td>28.93%</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>13.22%</td>
<td>6.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate Business License Tax Credit</td>
<td>33.06%</td>
<td>30.56%</td>
<td>22.31%</td>
<td>10.74%</td>
<td>4.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement a Parking Tax</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
<td>38.66%</td>
<td>10.92%</td>
<td>10.08%</td>
<td>5.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Higher taxes on Chevron, bring new business to El Segundo (e.g., Smokey Hollow revitalization).</td>
<td>11/13/2013 9:02 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Upgrade downtown businesses, buildings and parking to make it more accommodating to all. Plus make sure Chevron is paying their share ongoing.</td>
<td>11/13/2013 8:52 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Include the School District</td>
<td>11/13/2013 8:27 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hold events at El Segundo beach, charge entry and charge parking at event.</td>
<td>11/7/2013 2:06 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bring Park &amp; Rec fees to compare with Manhattan Beach and other cities.</td>
<td>11/7/2013 2:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Could we re-structure fire dept. - keep local, but more joint response agreements? or combo employee/volunteer? Charge residents trash fee or have them pay trash collection companies directly.</td>
<td>11/7/2013 1:57 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>You have a tough job. Thank!</td>
<td>11/7/2013 1:54 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Raise other fees -&gt; plan check/permits -&gt; Rec/Park fees -&gt; Sponsoring events by corporations.</td>
<td>11/7/2013 1:52 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Increase income taxes.</td>
<td>11/7/2013 1:46 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>One possibility is IF we are to implement a new residential UUT that it happens when a property is sold and the new buyer would be subject to a fixed UUT from thereon forward. So currently, everyone does not have to pay new tax. Only new residents are subject to it when they buy property in El Segundo.</td>
<td>11/6/2013 3:25 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-&gt; Increase business growth (retail) on Main Street and Plaza El Segundo -&gt; Recruit new businesses to have open houses, advertise, co-sponsor events, engage in the community. [increase UUT: 1% &amp; 3%]</td>
<td>10/29/2013 4:18 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I think schools need to cover the cost of staffing provided by City. Increase fees for filming in El Segundo. [This person wrote under #8 -&gt; Eliminate Business License Tax Credit, &quot;Partial&quot;]</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:48 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Tax plunge, tax tennis courts, handball courts, per hour.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:43 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Rent golf course. Sell the sand on the beach! It replaces itself.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:34 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sell property (lease?)</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:33 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Vote for a parcel tax on every piece of property in El Segundo - commercial and private.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:19 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I'm all for solving the problems as much as possible via taxes on visitors, ie: TOT &amp; parking taxes. Also, are proposed economic development improvements accounted for?</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:16 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Residential Responsibilities... Raise in Taxes... -&gt; Metered parking on Main, Richmond, &amp; Grand.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:13 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Aggressively pursue expanding the tax base via attracting more businesses ([&quot;Smokey Beach&quot;] in Smokey Hollow) - Variety, variety, variety. Encourage residents to upgrade their houses.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:36 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Aggressively develop new business to move to the City.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:34 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>See above and charge for trash collection.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:30 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Try to attract more businesses and diversify businesses as well as increase taxes by a small amount over many payers, residential and business.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:28 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Consider taxes listed above.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:26 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Enforce business license requirements within the City. Have employees withing certain groups pay more for free benefits they receive. Quit waiving fees for all the non-profit groups in the City. Charge residents for garbage collection, but exclude apartment and condo units.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:24 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Need major P.R. campaign effort to inform public on need to support utility taxes.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:22 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Bring in new business. Lower business taxes and restrictions on businesses.</td>
<td>10/24/2013 4:03 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Us residents need to pay more (trash, util, other taxes). Employees have been drastically cut, more cuts will just reduce further services.</td>
<td>10/24/2013 2:24 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>*Increase Hotel tax. More retail by Plaza El Segundo? *Outsource golf course *Increase parking ticket fines. *Put parking meters in on Main St. *Increase UUT, lease parking spaces for fee on Sepulveda areas. *Use City parking garage by 99 cent store for leased LAX pig. *Use Chevron taxes *Charge for all services used (PD &amp; FD) if person broke the law.</td>
<td>10/24/2013 2:10 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Reduce expenditures - why raise taxes when City has probably been mismanaged over the years.</td>
<td>10/24/2013 1:42 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Outsource</td>
<td>10/24/2013 1:40 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>TOT is way too cheap! Should be at least 12%. Business tax + Residential utility tax should be increased. Red-card fees, look at reduced health care costs for the City employees.</td>
<td>10/24/2013 9:56 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>TAKE THE UUT EXCEPTION FOR ALL APARTMENT UNITS 4 AND DOWN 7010 UNITS NOT PAYING. REVISIT TRASH COLLECTION FEES IF IT RAISES INCOME FOR CITY.</td>
<td>10/24/2013 9:47 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Ask people with low long-term taxes to pay higher tax (or demand?). (THAT WOULD BE ME, BY THE WAY!)</td>
<td>10/24/2013 9:24 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Unfortunately, across the board tax increases with prudent cuts.</td>
<td>10/24/2013 9:19 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Contact Bryan and Eva Sweeney for more ideas of economic and CREATIVE DEVELOPMENT as they did with the ES Museum of Art &amp; their fire station development.</td>
<td>10/23/2013 3:02 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>- Increase Parks &amp; Rec fees</td>
<td>10/23/2013 2:44 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Tax Retirees</td>
<td>10/23/2013 2:32 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Make filming -&gt; film industry more attractive - filming - studios.</td>
<td>10/23/2013 7:40 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>*All of the above. *Sell excess equipment. *Ensure salaries are equivalent to other cities. *Treat retirement benefits to retirees like businesses (eliminate via payout).</td>
<td>10/23/2013 7:29 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Charge for trash collection attract more businesses encourage shopping local</td>
<td>10/21/2013 3:44 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Don't touch employees anymore. Increase taxes</td>
<td>10/21/2013 3:41 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>ALL Residents, single, multi, etc pay for truck pickup.</td>
<td>10/21/2013 3:39 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Improve development of lands. Increase some form of property taxes.</td>
<td>10/21/2013 3:37 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Increase user fees at Parks/Rec.</td>
<td>10/21/2013 3:32 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Add a 1/4 or 1/2 cent/dollar city sales tax.</td>
<td>10/21/2013 2:58 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10 Do you have any suggestions for how the City can reduce expenses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cut management for Fire/Police. We don't need two Police Captains, etc...</td>
<td>11/13/2013 8:38 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limit or reduce police and fire department salaries, benefits, pension. Also, reduce top management positions.</td>
<td>11/13/2013 8:35 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Street sweep: eliminate or reduce frequency. Do we have to have two lifeguards with pool when high school is using it?</td>
<td>11/7/2013 2:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reduce pensions.</td>
<td>11/7/2013 1:54 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>dial-a-ride?</td>
<td>11/7/2013 1:48 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pay to pick up trash. Negotiate payment of retirement benefits.</td>
<td>11/7/2013 1:46 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Instead of laying off people, they can change to part-time employees.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 4:56 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>--&gt; Can a group create an endowment fund for the Fire Department or a fund raising arm for major projects such as Varno School? Annual Library fees would be OK with me! (Family)</td>
<td>10/29/2013 4:16 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sell off or lease land or parking lot on northeast corner of Main and Grand. That is a ton of space just used for Firefighters to park. Charge higher fees for non-residents to use City facilities (Police &amp; Rec.).</td>
<td>10/29/2013 4:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Where I worked they draw a line in the sand and said - all new hires would not receive retiree medical benefits.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:48 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Retire the exorbitant salaries $250k + of bosses.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:43 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>No pensions for City employees.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:39 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Reduce salaries and pensions.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Form a blue ribbon committee to look at possible reducing # buses -- dog park -- trash fee, etc. etc. Less to schools.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:29 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I'm glad we're a full service City. I appreciate the cuts that have been made. I think that cost control needs to remain in focus (limiting raises &amp; benefits) within maintaining current staffing levels.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:16 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Re-position Fire &amp; Police Staffing. --&gt; Beach Cities Shared Services.</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:13 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Automate as many services as possible. Install solar (PV &amp; Thermal) on all City buildings. Add a windmill next to the water tower or above the power station / Hyperion ridge.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:35 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Allow more position vacated not to be filled with full time employees. Look to outsource non-resident facing departments.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:34 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Include Chevron in the elimination of the business license tax credit. Don't commit to supporting a pool for Wiseburn USD.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Eliminate life time benefits for everyone.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:26 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Does the city need a fleet of buses for shuttle services? Why purchase all the fire equipment vehicles (ladder truck, search and rescue trailer, etc) when all they do is sit, or go to garage for repairs.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:24 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Close down the swimming pool. Cut the number of City workers.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:18 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1. Look closely at how to contain costs in safety area. In new norm, how do we cut the fat so to speak. Primarily since it appears to be the most expensive item in E.S. 2. How an independent entity evaluate the City for ideas on how to run City more efficiently.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:13 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Motorcycle - Gone 1 Fire Station</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:11 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Vote for a Republican conservative in all areas of Federal, State, County, and City government!</td>
<td>10/24/2013 4:02 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Reduce pensions.</td>
<td>10/24/2013 2:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Eliminate fire dept. L.A. County can do just as good of a job.</td>
<td>10/24/2013 2:24 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>Date and Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1. Take away lifetime medical for City Council. 2. Start regionalizing more City services throughout Southbay. (ie: animal control)</td>
<td>10/24/2013 2:19 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Outsource City Services ie: Maintenance, Street Division, Vehicle Maintenance</td>
<td>10/24/2013 2:12 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I will need more information, but I believe – better management could reduce cost without the need to raise taxes.</td>
<td>10/24/2013 1:42 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>DO NOT TAX BUSINESSES OUT OF BUSINESS! FUND RAISERS?! RAISE RENT ON SENIOR HOUSING. OPEN EXPENSIVE SENIOR HOUSING AS REVENUE. FLAT E.S. TAX ON ALL RESIDENTIAL &amp; ANY HOUSING.</td>
<td>10/24/2013 9:24 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Reduce Pensions</td>
<td>10/24/2013 9:18 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Number of employees and compensation both seem high.</td>
<td>10/23/2013 3:11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Pensions for the police/fire &amp; Top ES Mgmt is too high. Under #7, Reduce the Size of the City Workforce, this person wrote, &quot;Police &amp; Fire&quot;. Under #7 --&gt; Further reduce Employee Salaries and Benefits, this person wrote, &quot;Police, Fire, Upper Mgmt&quot;.</td>
<td>10/23/2013 3:09 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Further reduce Employee Salaries and Benefits, this person wrote: &quot;Especially FD &amp; PD&quot;. That is the City's job to figure out, but the way to go.</td>
<td>10/23/2013 2:35 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Reduce retiree health expenses think Obamacare for them reduce pensions -</td>
<td>10/23/2013 2:32 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Across the board cuts to balance expenses to revenue.</td>
<td>10/23/2013 7:29 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Reconsider out sourcing of fire services</td>
<td>10/21/2013 3:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>eliminate retirement benefits for those with less than 30 years service</td>
<td>10/21/2013 3:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Reduce retirement benefits. Reduce size of fire department.</td>
<td>10/21/2013 3:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Comments are spot on. The unions have too much away - limit union contributions to campaigns.</td>
<td>10/21/2013 3:36 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Severely cut or eliminate all pensions.</td>
<td>10/21/2013 3:32 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Reduce the budget to Recreation and Parks - used by a limited number of residents.</td>
<td>10/21/2013 3:02 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[Unsatisfied with condition of City swimming pool(s).]</td>
<td>10/29/2013 4:18 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Looked like revenue is highest it has been, &amp; projected to increase. Now there is a deficit. How do we control our expense?</td>
<td>10/29/2013 3:49 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Condition of Streets &amp; Sidewalks &quot;could be improved&quot;.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:38 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wish Library was open Fridays. Need to know more about (contracting for County services for Fire/Sheriff) to make an informed decision.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:28 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Why is the Library going to reopen on Fridays for 8 months only? Then layoff 3 new hires, 1 full time emp. part time. It seems like reopening on Fridays is waste of money and personnel.</td>
<td>10/28/2013 8:21 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>[Staff] have already paid a lot in the last round. Police Services are more important than Fire.</td>
<td>10/24/2013 2:24 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Don't like the City closed on Fridays.</td>
<td>10/24/2013 2:10 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Note on #6 &quot;Are you satisfied...&quot; --&gt; Library Services, this person wrote, &quot;w/ Fri hours&quot;</td>
<td>10/23/2013 2:53 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Under #6 --&gt; Rec &amp; Parks + Library Services, this person wrote, &quot;Schedule of classes &amp; facilities is limited. Under #7 --&gt; Consider Contracting for County Services for Library, this person wrote, &quot;unless it means closing school libraries&quot;.</td>
<td>10/23/2013 2:48 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action to direct staff to prepare the necessary documents to potentially place ballot measures on the April 2014 election to amend the City’s tax codes for purposes of increasing the City’s revenues, including but not limited to: potentially eliminating the sales tax credit granted to businesses and create a parking lot tax as part of the City’s business license taxes (“BLT”); increasing the utility user tax (“UUT”); increasing the transient occupancy tax (“TOT”); and, imposing a UUT on the residents. (Fiscal Impact: Unknown).

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
1. Direct staff to prepare the necessary documents to potentially place ballot measures on the April 2014 election to amend the City’s tax codes for purposes of increasing the City’s revenues, including but not limited to:
   (a) eliminating the sales tax credit granted to businesses which reduces the amount of BLT the businesses pay and create a parking lot business license tax;
   (b) increasing the utility user tax imposed on businesses;
   (c) increasing the transient occupancy tax;
   (d) imposing a utility user tax on the residents; and
   (e) amending other portions of the City’s tax codes to increase City revenues.

2. Take other related action.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
1. November 19, 2013 City Council Staff Report with:
   a) Attachment A – UUT and TOT Comparisons with Nearby Cities
   b) Attachment B – Survey results and comments-All responses
   c) Attachment C – Survey results and comments-Registered Voters

2. Staff presentation to Council at the November 19, 2013 City Council Meeting

FISCAL IMPACT:
Amount Budgeted: $N/A
Additional Appropriation: N/A
Account Number(s): N/A

ORIGINATED BY: Mark Hensley, City Attorney
REVIEWED BY: Deborah Cullen, Director of Finance
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager
BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

The Council has held meetings on September 25, October 1, and November 19, 2013 to discuss potential tax measure to place on the April 2014 election as well as providing direction to the City Manager regarding a public outreach/education process regarding the City’s financial condition. Attached is the staff report from November 19, 2013, which contains a detailed account of the City’s financial condition, the public outreach process and the various options available to Council regarding potential tax measures.

At the November 19th staff presented the Council with the survey results of the public outreach meetings and included in this presentation were policy questions regarding tax measures. (see attached staff report and attachments). During this meeting Council considered a total tax (without determining how it would be imposed) of between $5 million and $7.4 million. The Chamber of Commerce requested that it be given a week to take these numbers back to its members and provide a proposal from the business community regarding the City placing tax measures on the April 2014 election. The Council agreed but recognized the relatively short window of time it has to direct staff as to how it wants to proceed. Accordingly, this Special Meeting is being held so that the Council can consider the Chamber’s proposal and potentially provide direction to staff.
How does the City Address its Current Financial Situation?
(Registered Voters Survey Results)
How Satisfied are you with City Services?  (Registered Voters Survey Results)
Demographics

OF THE 160 SURVEYS COMPLETED:

• 85% are Residents of the City of El Segundo
• 70% have lived in the City over 10 years
• 63% have lived in the City over 16 years
• 81.5% are registered voters in El Segundo
• 60% Men; 40% Women
• 70% over 50 years of age
• 43% over 60 years of age
Public Outreach

Financial presentation with details regarding the City’s financial position and 3-year forecast was prepared for the public; a letter was mailed to all residents that have a water billing account with details (time/place) for the scheduled outreach meetings

- 13 meetings conducted with surveys; three of these were public outreach meetings targeting the general public.

- Two advertisements in the El Segundo Herald and flyers with outreach information were made available at all City facilities.

- A video was created and made available on the City’s website and the local cable channel.

- Approximately 160 individuals have completed the survey consisting of 10 questions/options related to demographics, tax increases and City services.
EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL

MEETING DATE: December 3, 2013

AGENDA STATEMENT

AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action to direct staff to prepare the necessary documents to potentially place ballot measures on the April 2014 election to amend the City’s tax codes for purposes of increasing the City’s revenues, including but not limited to: potentially eliminating the sales tax credit granted to businesses and create a parking lot tax as part of the City’s business license taxes (“BLT”); increasing the utility user tax (“UUT”); increasing the transient occupancy tax (“TOT”); and, imposing a UUT on the residents. (Fiscal Impact: Unknown).

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1. Direct staff to prepare the necessary documents to potentially place ballot measures on the April 2014 election to amend the City’s tax codes for purposes of increasing the City’s revenues, including but not limited to:
   
   (a) eliminating the sales tax credit granted to businesses which reduces the amount of BLT the businesses pay and create a parking lot business license tax;
   
   (b) increasing the utility user tax imposed on businesses;
   
   (c) increasing the transient occupancy tax;
   
   (d) imposing a utility user tax on the residents; and
   
   (e) amending other portions of the City’s tax codes to increase City revenues.

2. Take other related action.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

Attachment A - November 26, 2013 Staff Report  
Attachment B - November 19, 2013 Staff Report with following attachments:  
Attachment C – UUT and TOT Comparisons with Nearby Cities  
Attachment D – Survey results and comments—All responses  
Attachment E – Survey results and comments—Registered Voters

FISCAL IMPACT:

Amount Budgeted: $N/A  
Additional Appropriation: N/A  
Account Number(s): N/A

ORIGINATED BY: Mark Hensley, City Attorney  
REVIEWED BY: Deborah Cullen, Director of Finance  
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:
The Council has held meetings on September 25, October 1, November 19, 2013 and will be holding a meeting on November 26, 2013, to discuss potential tax measure to place on the April 2014 election as well as providing direction to the City Manager regarding a public outreach/education process regarding the City’s financial condition. Attached are the staff reports from the November 19 and November 26, 2013, meetings which contains a detailed account of the City’s financial condition, the public outreach process and the various options available to Council regarding potential tax measures.

At the November 19th staff presented the Council with the survey results of the public outreach meetings and included in this presentation were policy questions regarding tax measures. (see attached staff report and attachments). During this meeting Council considered a total tax (without determining how it would be imposed) of between $5 million and $7.4 million. The Chamber of Commerce requested that it be given a week to take these numbers back to its members and provide a proposal from the business community regarding the City placing tax measures on the April 2014 election. The Council agreed but recognized the relatively short window of time it has to direct staff as to how it wants to proceed. Accordingly, a Special Meeting is being on November 26, 2013 so that the Council can consider the Chamber’s proposal and potentially provide direction to staff.

This meeting will be to continue the consideration of potential tax measures by the Council and to direct staff, if Council did not do so at the November 26 meeting, regarding the potential preparation of tax measures for the April 2014 election. If Council provides direction to prepare the tax ballot measures, Staff is recommending another Special Meeting later this week or early next week for Council to take the necessary actions to place the measures on the April 2014 election.
RESOLUTION NO. _______

A RESOLUTION PLACING A BALLOT MEASURE N-INITIATIVE ON THE APRIL 8, 2014 BALLOT PURSUANT TO ARTICLE XIIIC, § 2(B), OF THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION; ELECTIONS CODE § 9222; AND GOVERNMENT CODE §§ 53723 AND 53724 REGARDING TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAXES; USER UTILITY TAXES; AN AIRPORT PARKING TAX; AND BUSINESS LICENSE TAX (COLLECTIVELY, THE "CONSOLIDATED TAX MEASURE").

The City Council of the city of El Segundo resolves as follows:

SECTION 1: Pursuant to Article XIIIC, § 2(b), of the California Constitution; Elections Code § 9222; and Government Code §§ 53723 and 53724, the City Council places an initiative ("ordinance") on the ballot for a special municipal election to be held in the city of El Segundo on Tuesday, April 8, 2014.

SECTION 2: A copy of the ordinance to be considered by the voters is attached as Exhibit "A," and is incorporated by reference. This ordinance is approved by the City Council through adoption of this Resolution. The ballot measures will be designated as Measure A on the ballot.

SECTION 3: The City Council finds that additional tax revenue is required based upon the following facts and circumstances, as well as the written and oral information presented at the Council Meeting before the time the Council approved this Resolution:

A. The City's general fund expenditures would have exceeded the City's incoming general fund revenues in fiscal years 2013/2014 by approximately $8.5 million but for the use of one-time funds by the City. It is projected that the City's general fund expenditures will exceed the City's general fund revenues by approximately $3.6 million for fiscal year 2014/2015 and that this budget shortfall will continue for subsequent fiscal years. The City's fiscal condition has been negatively impacted by the unprecedented challenges in the worldwide and national financial markets and the chronic economic recession in the national, state, regional and local economies.

B. The recession significantly decreased the City's revenue sources and negatively impacted expenses requiring the City to institute various austerity measures including a flexible hiring freeze, elimination of 62 full-time positions, and expenditure curtailments for critical equipment and capital projects. Additionally, the City through labor negotiations achieved short terms savings of an average of $2.1 million per year, but rising
retirement costs have now eliminated these savings.

C. The City is advised to expect a major increase to its mandated contribution to the Public Employees Retirement System in fiscal year 2014-2015.

D. The City has decreased its unreserved/undesignated General Fund balance by 3% and has decreased its Equipment Replacement Fund balance by 25% since fiscal year 2009-2010.

E. The region, state, and nation are underwent one of the worst economic downturns in the history of our Nation and while financial forecasts have improved, it is anticipated that it will take several more years of significant economic growth before the City’s financial condition strengthens.

F. The California Constitution prohibits the City from enacting new taxes without voter approval which prevents the City from generating new revenues to offset losses.

G. The City Manager has recommended comprehensive action to increase selected revenues including transient occupancy and utility user taxes, while controlling expenditures by reducing employee compensation, reducing full-time positions, modifying staffing schedules for municipal services, modifying terms and conditions of employment; reorganizing departmental functions, reducing equipment expenditures, and curtailing various capital projects to eliminate an anticipated $3.6 million deficit in the General Fund.

SECTION 4: Pursuant to Elections Code §§ 9222 and 13119 the exact form of the question to be voted on at the election as it should appear on the ballot is as follows:

| SHALL THE CONSOLIDATED TAX MEASURE WHICH INCREASES TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAXES ON LODGING BY 2%; INCREASES UTILITY USER TAXES ON BUSINESSES BY 2.5%; IMPOSES A 2.5% UTILITY USER TAX ON RESIDENTS; REDUCES BUSINESS LICENSE TAX CREDITS; AND IMPOSES A NEW BUSINESS LICENSE TAX ON COMMERCIALLY OPERATED PARKING LOTS (EXCEPT EMPLOYEE, AND RESTAURANT, HOTEL, THEATER AND RETAIL PATRON, AND VAILIDATED PARKING) FOR ALL CITY SERVICES BE ADOPTED? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
SECTION 5: The City Clerk is directed to forward a copy of this Resolution to the City Attorney for purposes of preparing a Title and Summary in accordance with the Elections Code.

SECTION 6: Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1973aa-1a., the City Clerk will:

A. Translate all ballot statements into Spanish;

B. Make translated copies of ballot statements publicly available.

SECTION 7: The polls will open at 7 a.m. on election day and remain open until 8 p.m.

SECTION 8: The City Council Chamber, 350 Main Street, El Segundo, is designated the Central Counting Place where all ballots of the election will be tallied.

SECTION 9: The City Clerk is authorized to canvass the returns of the Municipal Election. The election will be held in all respects as if there were only one election, and only one form of ballot will be used.

SECTION 10: The City Clerk is authorized, instructed and directed to procure and furnish any and all official ballots, notices, printed matter and all supplies, equipment and paraphernalia that may be necessary in order to properly and lawfully conduct the election.

SECTION 11: In accordance with Government Code § 53724 this Resolution must be adopted upon a two-thirds (2/3) vote and will become effective immediately upon adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this ___ day of December, 2013.

Bill Fisher, Mayor
ATTEST:

______________________________
Tracy Weaver, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
MARK D. HENSLEY, City Attorney

By: __________________________
   Karl H. Berger,
   Assistant City Attorney
ORDINANCE NO. ______

A BALLOT MEASURE AMENDING EL SEGUNDO MUNICIPAL CODE (“ESMC”) § 3-4-3 AS TO TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAXES; AMENDING ESMC §§ 3-7-1, 3-7-2, 3-7-3(A), 3-7-4(A), 3-7-5, 3-7-6(A) RELATING TO USER UTILITY TAXES; AMENDING ESMC § 4-2-3 RELATING TO BUSINESS LICENSE TAX CREDITS; AMENDING ESMC § 4-3-34 AS TO BUSINESS LICENSE TAXES FOR PARKING LOTS; AND ADDING ESMC § 3-4-16 ALLOWING THE CITY COUNCIL TO SUSPEND, REDUCE, AND RESTORE IMPOSITION OF TAXES BY RESOLUTION.

The people of the city of El Segundo do hereby ordain as follows:

SECTION 1: This Ordinance may be referred to as the “Consolidated Tax Measure.”

SECTION 2: ESMC § 3-4-3 is amended to read as follows:

“3-4-3 : IMPOSITION; RATE:

A. Tax Imposed: For the privilege of occupancy in any hotel, each transient must pay a maximum tax of ten percent (10%) of the rent charged by the operator.”

SECTION 3: A new § 3-4-16 is added to the ESMC to read as follows:

“3-4-16: TAX REDUCTIONS AND SUSPENSIONS:

The city council may suspend, reduce, and restore imposition of taxes by resolution following a public hearing.”

SECTION 4: The following terms set forth in ESMC § 3-7-1 are amended and added, as applicable, to read as follows:

“COGENERATOR: Any service user, including an electrical corporation, employing cogeneration technology for producing power from other than a conventional power source for the generation of electricity.

RESIDENTIAL SERVICE USER: Any service user that is a natural person residing within a dwelling unit in the city’s jurisdiction.

NON-RESIDENTIAL SERVICE USER: Any service user that does not fall included within the definition of a Residential Service User, including but not limited to retail, commercial, industrial, and professional and non-professional office uses.”
"SERVICE USER: Except as otherwise provided, any person required to pay a tax imposed by this chapter."

SECTION 5: The term "commercial or industrial utility user" set forth in ESMC § 3-7-1 is repealed. All instances of the term "commercial or industrial utility user" set forth in ESMC Chapter 3-7 are replaced with the term "service user" as defined by this Ordinance.

SECTION 6: ESMC § 3-7-2 is amended to read as follows:

"3-7-2 EXEMPTIONS:

A. Nothing in this chapter may be construed as imposing a tax upon any person when imposition of such tax upon that service user would be in violation of the constitution of the United States or that of the state or upon the city or any of its departments, agencies, boards or commissions or upon the El Segundo unified school district, Centinela Valley union high school district and the Wisebum school district, or upon any other person when imposition of such tax upon that person would be in violation of the constitution of the United States or the constitution of the state. The tax administrator will prepare a list of the service users exempt from the provisions of this chapter by virtue of this section and furnish a copy thereof to each service supplier.

B. The taxes imposed by this chapter do not apply to "lifeline" residential service users. To qualify as a "lifeline" residential service user, a person must meet the following criteria:

1. Be a natural person; and

2. Be a qualified participant in the California Alternate Rates for Energy ("CARE") program established by Public Utilities Code §§ 739.1 and 739.2 as determined by the most recent California Public Utility Commission decisions; or

3. Be qualified in accordance with rules and procedures established by city council resolution following a public hearing. The City Council is specifically authorized to establish rules and procedures to implement the intent of this Section.

C. The exemption as a "lifeline" residential service user will first be recognized on the next full billing cycle after the date of approval.
D. Persons who would otherwise qualify, but are provided utility services through a master meter serving multiple housing units, are not eligible for the "lifeline" residential service user exemption.

SECTION 7: Beginning July 1, 2014, ESMC § 3-7-3(A) is amended to read as follows:

"3-7-3 : ELECTRICITY USERS TAX:

A. Tax Imposed: A tax is imposed upon every service user in the city using electrical energy in the city. For non-residential service users, the maximum tax imposed by this section is at the rate of five and one-half percent (5.5%) of the charges made for such energy and must be paid by the service user paying for such energy. The maximum rate after June 30, 2018 for non-residential service users is reduced to five percent (5%). For residential service users, the maximum tax imposed by this section is at the rate of two and one-half percent (2.5%) of the charges made for such energy and must be paid by the service user paying for such energy. The maximum rate after June 30, 2018, for residential service users is reduced to two percent (2%). "Charges" includes charges made for: 1) metered energy; and 2) minimum charges for service, including customer charges, services charges, demand charges, standby charges and annual and monthly charges, fuel cost adjustments, etc."

SECTION 8: Beginning July 1, 2014, ESMC § 3-7-4(A) is amended to read as follows:

"3-7-4 : TAX ON COGENERATED ELECTRICITY:

A. Tax Imposed: A tax is imposed upon every service user in the city using cogenerated electrical energy in the city. Except for residential service users, the maximum tax imposed by this section is at the rate of five and one-half percent (5.5%) of the value of the cogenerated energy. The maximum rate after June 30, 2018 for non-residential service users is reduced to five percent (5%). For residential service users, the maximum tax imposed by this section is at the rate of two and one-half percent (2.5%) of the value of the cogenerated energy. The maximum rate after June 30, 2018, for residential service users is reduced to two percent (2%). The value is equal to the price an electrical corporation, serving the city, would pay to purchase electrical energy from a cogenerator. The cogenerator must install and maintain an appropriate utility type metering system which will enable compliance with this section."

SECTION 9: Beginning July 1, 2014, ESMC § 3-7-5 is amended to read as follows:

"3-7-5 : GAS USERS TAX:
A. Tax Imposed: A tax is imposed upon every service user in the city, other than a gas corporation regulated by the Public Utilities Commission that is engaged in the business of selling natural gas to the public, using natural gas in the city that is delivered through mains or pipes. For non-residential service users, the maximum tax imposed by this section is at the rate of five and one-half percent (5.5%) of the charges made for such gas and must be paid by the service user paying for such gas. The maximum rate after June 30, 2018 for non-residential service users is reduced to five percent (5%). For residential service users, the maximum tax imposed by this section is at the rate of two and one-half percent (2.5%) of the charges made for such gas and must be paid by the service user paying for such gas. The maximum rate after June 30, 2018, for residential service users is reduced to two percent (2%). "Charges" includes: 1) gas which is delivered through mains of pipes; and 2) minimum charges for services, including customer charges, service charges, and annual and monthly charges.

B. Excluded from the base on which the tax imposed in this section is computed are: 1) charges made for natural gas which is to be resold and delivered through mains or pipes; 2) charges made for natural gas sold for use in production or distribution of water by a public utility or governmental agency; 3) charges made by a natural gas public utility for natural gas used and consumed in the conduct of the business of natural gas public utilities; 4) charges made for natural gas used in the propulsion of a motor vehicle, as that phrase is defined in the state vehicle code, utilizing natural gas; and 5) charges related to late payments and returned checks.

C. Collection; Time For Filing Return: The tax imposed by this section is collected from the service user by the person selling the natural gas. The person selling the natural gas, on or before the twentieth of each calendar month, commencing on the twentieth day of the calendar month after the effective date hereof, make a return to the tax administrator stating the amount of taxes billed during the preceding calendar month. At the time such returns are filed, the person selling the natural gas must remit tax payments to the tax administrator in accordance with schedules established or approved by the tax administrator.

D. The tax imposed by this section is not intended to apply to natural gas not purchased from third party vendors and natural gas used for nonutility purposes.

1. For the purposes of this subsection, the phrase "natural gas not purchased from third party vendors" means natural gas which is produced and owned by the same legal entity where ownership is not the result of a sale or purchase transaction.
2. For the purposes of this subsection, the phrase "natural gas used for non-utility purposes" means natural gas which is a component part of a manufactured product produced by an entity which is subject to the utility users tax.

SECTION 10: Beginning July 1, 2014, ESMC § 3-7-6(A) is amended to read as follows:

"3-7-6 : WATER USERS TAX:

A. Tax Imposed: A tax is imposed upon every service user in the city using water which is delivered though mains or pipes. For non-residential service users, the maximum tax imposed by this section is at the rate of five and one-half percent (5.5%) of the charges made for such water and must be paid by the service user paying for such water. The maximum rate after June 30, 2018 for non-residential service users is reduced to five percent (5%). For residential service users, the maximum tax imposed by this section is at the rate of two and one-half percent (2.5%) of the charges made for such water and must be paid by the service user paying for such water. The maximum rate after June 30, 2018, for residential service users is reduced to two percent (2%)."

SECTION 11: Beginning July 1, 2014, ESMC § 3-7-7(A) is amended to read as follows:

"3-7-7 : COMMUNICATION SERVICES USER TAX:

A. Tax Imposed: A tax is imposed upon every service user in the city using communication services. For non-residential service users, the maximum tax imposed by this section is four and one-half percent (4.5%) of the charges made for such services and must be collected from the service user by the communication services supplier or its billing agent. The maximum rate after June 30, 2018 for non-residential service users is reduced to four percent (4%). For residential service users, the maximum tax imposed by this section is two and one-half percent (2.5%) of the charges made for such services and must be collected from the service user by the communication services supplier or its billing agent. The maximum rate after June 30, 2018, for residential service users is reduced to two percent (2%). There is a rebuttable presumption that communication services billed to a billing or service address in the city are used, in whole or in part, within the city's boundaries and such services are taxable under this chapter. If the billing address of the service user is different from the service address, the service address of the service user must be used for purposes of imposing the tax. "Charges" includes the value of any other
services, credits, property of every kind or nature, or other consideration provided by the service user in exchange for the communication services."

SECTION 12: A new § 3-7-19 is added to the ESMC to read as follows:

"3-7-19: TAX REDUCTIONS AND SUSPENSIONS:

The city council may suspend, reduce, and restore imposition of taxes by resolution following a public hearing."

SECTION 13: ESMC § 4-2-3(C) is amended to read as follows:

"4-2-3: TAX REDUCTION; TAX CREDIT:

* * *

C. Percentage Of Tax: For taxes collected for taxing periods commencing on or after January 1, 2015, the tax credit referred to in subsection B of this section, will equal up to ten percent (10%) of the sales or use tax generated by the business and received by the city during the twelve (12) month period ending on June 30 preceding the date the tax is due. For taxes collected for the taxing period commencing on or after January 1, 2018, the tax credit referred to in subsection B of this section, will equal up to five percent (5%) of the sales or use tax generated by the business and received by the city during the twelve (12) month period ending on June 30 preceding the date the tax is due.

* * *

SECTION 14: Beginning July 1, 2014, ESMC § 4-2-34 is amended in its entirety to read as follows:

"4-2-34: PARKING LOTS.

A business license tax is imposed upon every person engaged in the business of operating a parking lot in the city for vehicles in the amount of ten percent (10%) of the annual gross receipts generated from the operation of the parking lot. "Gross receipts" means gross income, as defined in the Internal Revenue Code. "Gross receipts" does not include amounts received under a commercial lease whether or not received as rent or separately assessed. The business license tax imposed by this section does not apply to gross receipts attributable to employee; theater patron; restaurant patron; retail patron; hotel patron; and validated (whether self or valet) parking, for business establishments located within the City."
SECTION 15: INTERPRETATION. This Initiative must be interpreted so as to be consistent with all federal and state laws, rules, and regulations. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, part, or portion of this Initiative is held to be invalid or unconstitutional by a final judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision does not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Initiative. The voters declare that this Initiative, and each section, sub-section, sentence, clause, phrase, part, or portion thereof, would have been adopted or passed irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, sub-sections, sentences, clauses, phrases, part, or portion is found to be invalid. If any provision of this Initiative is held invalid as applied to any person or circumstance, such invalidity does not affect any application of this Initiative that can be given effect without the invalid application.

SECTION 16: SEVERABILITY. If any portion of this Initiative is held by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, the remainder of the initiative and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances will not be affected thereby. We the People indicate our strong desire that: (i) the City Council use its best efforts to sustain and reenact that portion, and (ii) the City Council implement this Initiative by taking all steps possible to cure any inadequacies or deficiencies identified by the court in a manner consistent with the express and implied intent of this Initiative, and then adopting or reenacting such portion as necessary or desirable to permit the planning and development of the Project.

SECTION 17: CONSTRUCTION. This Initiative must be broadly construed in order to achieve the purposes stated in this Initiative. It is the intent of the voters that the provisions of this Initiative be interpreted or implemented by the City and others in a manner that facilitates the purposes set forth in this Initiative.

SECTION 18: ENFORCEABILITY. Repeal of any provision of the El Segundo Municipal Code does not affect any penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred before, or preclude prosecution and imposition of penalties for any violation occurring before this Ordinance's effective date. Any such repealed part will remain in full force and effect for sustaining action or prosecuting violations occurring before the effective date of this Ordinance.

SECTION 19: VALIDITY OF PREVIOUS CODE SECTIONS. If this entire Ordinance or its application is deemed invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, any repeal or amendment of the ESMC or other city ordinance by this Ordinance will be rendered void and cause such previous ESMC provision or other the city ordinance to remain in full force and effect for all purposes.

SECTION 20: EFFECTIVE DATE. This Initiative will enact and impose a general tax. Accordingly, it will be submitted to a general election on April 8, 2014 for voter approval. If a majority of voters vote in favor of this Initiative, it will become valid and binding ten days after the date that the City Council certifies the election results in accordance with Elections Code § 9217.
The Mayor will sign this Initiative and the City Clerk will attest and certify to the passage and adoption of this Ordinance if a majority of the voters voting in the City's general election on April 8, 2014 approve the proposition asking whether the voters approve this Initiative.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this ___ day of ________, 2013.

__________________________________
Bill Fisher, Mayor

ATTEST:

_________________________________
Tracy Weaver,
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
MARK D. HENSLEY, City Attorney

By: __________________________________
Karl H. Berger, Assistant City Attorney
RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE CITY ATTORNEY TO PREPARE AN IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF THE BALLOT MEASURE REGARDING THE CONSOLIDATED TAX MEASURE.

The City Council of the city of El Segundo resolves as follows:

SECTION 1: Pursuant to Elections Code § 9280, the City Clerk is directed to transmit a copy of the ballot measure regarding the Consolidated Tax Measure to the City Attorney for an impartial analysis.

SECTION 2: Upon receiving the ballot measure, the City Attorney is directed to prepare an impartial analysis of the measure showing its effect, if any, on existing law and the operation of the measures. Such analysis must not be more than 500 words.

SECTION 3: The City Clerk is directed to have the City Attorney's analysis printed before the arguments for and against the measures. Immediately below the impartial analysis, in not less than 10 point bold type, the City Clerk should have the following language printed: "The above statement is an impartial analysis of Measure A." If you desire a copy of the legislation affected by this measure, please call the City Clerk’s office at (310) 524-2307 and a copy will be mailed at no cost to you."

SECTION 4: This Resolution will remain effective until superseded by a subsequent resolution.

SECTION 5: This Resolution will become effective immediately upon adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this ___ day of December 2013.

Bill Fisher, Mayor

ATTEST:

Tracy Weaver, City Clerk

Approved as to form:
Mark D. Hensley, City Attorney

By:
Karl H. Berger, Assistant City Attorney
RESOLUTION NO. ___

A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING REQUIREMENTS FOR BALLOT ARGUMENTS FILED WITH THE CITY CLERK TO BE INCLUDED WITH VOTER INFORMATION FOR THE GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION ON APRIL 8, 2014.

The City Council of the city of El Segundo resolves as follows:

SECTION 1: Pursuant to Elections Code § 9281, qualified voters may submit arguments for and against the ballot measure(s), in addition to rebuttal arguments, for the April 8, 2014, General Municipal Election.

SECTION 2: Arguments filed in accordance with this Resolution must comply with the following requirements in accordance with Elections Code §§ 9282, 9283, 9285, and 9286:

A. Arguments must be in writing and not exceed three hundred (300) words except for rebuttal argument which may not exceed two hundred and fifty (250) words;

B. Arguments may be submitted by the City Council; any councilmember authorized to submit an argument by the City Council; any individual voter eligible to vote on the measures; any bona fide association of citizens; or any combination of voters and associations;

C. Arguments must be typewritten in at least a 12 point font;

D. Arguments may not include underlining, italics, asterisks, or other, similar, type of formatting;

E. Arguments must be accompanied by the printed name and signature or printed names and signatures of the person or persons submitting it, or, if submitted on behalf of an organization, the name of the organization and the printed name and signature of at least one of its principal officers.

F. If more than five (5) signatures accompany an argument, only the first five (5) will be printed.

G. Arguments for or against the ballot measures must be received in the City Clerk's office not later than 14 days after the City Council calls for an election. Rebuttal arguments must be received not later than 10 days after the Arguments submittal deadline.
SECTION 3: Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1973aa-1a., the City Clerk will:

A. Translate all ballot statements into Spanish;

B. Make translated copies of ballot statements publicly available.

SECTION 4: This Resolution will remain effective until superseded by a subsequent resolution.

SECTION 5: This Resolution will become effective immediately upon adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this ___ day of December, 2014.

Bill Fisher,
Mayor

ATTEST:

Tracy Weaver, City Clerk

Approved as to form:
MARK D. HENSLEY, City Attorney

By: Karl H. Berger, Assistant City Attorney
RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION IDENTIFYING THE CURRENT COUNCIL’S STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND INTENT FOR WHICH TAX REVENUE GENERATED FROM THE CONSOLIDATED TAX MEASURE SHOULD BE EXPENDED TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE; AND AMENDING THE MEMBERSHIP FOR THE EL SEGUNDO CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

The City Council of the City of El Segundo does resolve as follows:

SECTION 1: The City Council finds and declares that:

A. On April 8, 2014, voters will consider whether to approve the Consolidated Tax Measure placed on the ballot by the City Council;

B. The City Council believes that it is in the public interest to adopt this Resolution to set forth its purpose and intent for the use of the funds and its desire that future Councils also use the funds in the same manner, to the extent possible, if the voters approve the Consolidated Tax Measure which is

1. Approximately 1/3 or $2.0 million of the revenues generated from the Consolidated Tax Measure will be allocated for capital improvement projects identified by the City;

2. Businesses should be shareholders in the expenditure of such monies. Consequently, it is important that the Chamber of Commerce participate in making recommendations for how tax revenue received as a result of the Consolidated Tax Measure should be spent; and

3. The taxes approved by voters in the Consolidated Tax Measure be reduced during such times that the City, based upon increase of other general fund revenues, is able to operate the City without use of the Consolidated Tax Measure funds.

C. As shown throughout the City Council’s discussion regarding the Consolidated Tax Measure, asking businesses and residents to pay more in taxes is undesirable. The City Council anticipates that if the economic recovery is maintained and the City continues to reduce costs to the extent possible while maintaining acceptable level of services that it provides to residents and businesses, the tax burden can be reduced within three years.

-1-
SECTION 2: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM. The City Manager and City Council must, as part of preparing and adopting budgets for upcoming fiscal years, to the extent feasible designate 1/3 or $2.0 million of the revenues received from the Consolidated Tax Measure for the City’s capital improvement program as recommended by the Capital Improvement Program Advisory Committee ("CIPAC"), approved by the Planning Commission pursuant to Government Code § 65103, and implemented by the City Council in accordance with its budget resolution. It is the Council’s purpose and intent that it and future Councils not use 1/3 or $2.0 million of monies from the Consolidated Tax Measure to the extent feasible for any other purpose including, without limitation, employee salaries or benefits.

SECTION 3: CIPAC. To help ensure that revenue from the Consolidated Tax Measure is properly allocated in accordance with this Resolution to the extent feasible, the City Council amends the CIPAC membership and allows the Chamber of Commerce to select two individuals to be included on the CIPAC.

SECTION 4: This Resolution is exempt from review under the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code §§ 2100, et seq., “CEQA”) and CEQA regulations (14 California Code of Regulations §§ 15000, et seq.) because it establishes rules and procedures to implement government funding mechanisms; does not involve any commitment to a specific project which could result in a potentially significant physical impact on the environment; and constitutes an organizational or administrative activity that will not result in direct or indirect physical changes in the environment. Accordingly, this Resolution does not constitute a “project” that requires environmental review (see specifically 14 CCR § 15378(b)(4-5)).

SECTION 5: This Resolution must be interpreted so as to be consistent with all federal and state laws, rules, and regulations. If any section, sub-section, sentence, clause, phrase, part, or portion of this Resolution is held to be invalid or unconstitutional by a final judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision does not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Resolution. If any provision of this Resolution is held invalid as applied to any person or circumstance, such invalidity does not affect any application of this Resolution that can be given effect without the invalid application.

SECTION 6: If any portion of this Resolution is held by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, the remainder of the Resolution and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances will not be affected thereby.

SECTION 7: This Resolution must be broadly construed in order to achieve the purposes stated in this Resolution. It is the City Council’s intent that the provisions of this Resolution be interpreted or implemented by the City and others in a manner that facilitates the purposes set forth in this Resolution.
SECTION 8: This Resolution will become effective if and when the Consolidated Tax Measure becomes effective in accordance with applicable law. It will remain effective unless subsequently amended or repealed by the City Council.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this ____ day of __________, 2013.

Bill Fisher, Mayor

ATTEST:

Tracy Weaver,
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
MARK D. HENSLEY, City Attorney

By: ___________________________________________
   Karl H. Berger, Assistant City Attorney
December 3, 2013

Honorable City Councilmembers
City of El Segundo
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

RE: FOLLOW UP BALLOT PROPOSAL

Dear Mayor & Councilmembers:

The El Segundo Chamber of Commerce appreciated the robust and detailed discussion the City Council held at its meeting last Tuesday night. The dialogue was very informative and it has helped us to refocus our efforts. As we’ve said before, a Chamber of Commerce is not in the business of advocating for tax increases, but we fully understand the urgency to rectify the unsustainable financial course the City finds itself on.

Additionally, we do not want to give the impression that we are negotiating with the City Council. We have worked to provide this follow up proposal in hopes that the City Council will find it beneficial and that together we can move forward in support of a tax initiative on the April 2014 election.

The El Segundo Chamber of Commerce proposes a phased tax increase:

1) Years 1 to 3: raise $6.5 million annually in new tax revenue for the City

We recommend that this is reached through the following:

- UUT 2.5% increase on business: $3,503,000
- UUT 2.5% on residents: $855,700
- TOT 2% increase: $1,275,000
- Airport Parking tax: $295,000
- BLT Credit reduction to 20% $552,750

$6,481,450

2) Year 4 forward: raise $5.9 million annually in tax revenue for the City

We recommend that this is reached through the following:

- UUT 2% increase on business: $2,802,450
- UUT 2% increase on residents: $684,700
- TOT 2% increase: $1,275,000
- Airport Parking Tax: $295,000
- BLT Credit reduction to 10% $829,125

$5,886,225

Note: increases are against today’s current rates

427 Main Street • El Segundo, CA 90245 • 310.322.1220 • Fax 310.322.6880
Email: info@elsegundochamber.org
Our proposal provides a front loading in the first three years to help the City meet some of its capital improvement needs, while in the fourth and subsequent years the City will be able to meet its combined operational and capital shortfalls as currently projected.

We hope that this new tax base, combined with a strengthening of the City’s economic development efforts, will ensure the financial stability of El Segundo for decades to come. And, down the road, should the fiscal picture improve significantly, we would hope a future City Council would suspend unnecessary taxes and or we will petition a future City Council to consider such a suspension of some of these tax increases.

As we move forward together we believe the following points are important:

1) The issue of taxes should be placed on a single ballot question. We are all in this together and a single ballot question to raise taxes for the future of El Segundo is much easier than a menu of choices. If a single ballot question is not selected than we ask that the Business/Residential UUT be placed together as a single ballot question and the TOT/Airport Parking Tax/BLT Credit Reduction be combined in another ballot question.

2) The Chamber would appreciate the City Council’s action on introducing and passing an ordinance to bifurcate and protect the capital improvement funds placed on the ballot. This would avoid the need for an additional “advisory vote” on the ballot and would allow all of us to campaign in support of the April ballot with protections already in place, understanding of course that these protections can be reversed by a future vote of the City Council.

3) The Chamber would appreciate the City Council’s additional action to codify the already existing practice of having two business community members on the City’s Capital Improvement Project Advisory Committee. We would ask that the ordinance or resolution by the Council stipulate that the Chamber will recommend the two business community members to the City Council.

4) The Chamber appreciates the City Council’s past direction to remove consideration of the “advisory vote” on school funding percentages and we also appreciate the City’s constant diligence in revisiting its costs structure, including but not limited to employee service contracts, overall operating expenses and fees charged for services.

Finally, the Chamber will participate in a collaborative citywide campaign effort to seek passage of the tax proposals we have recommended.

Again, we thank you for time and your significant effort in working with the Chamber to craft a proposal that works for everyone involved.

Sincerely,

Sandy Jacobs
Chairman of the Board

cc: City Clerk Tracy Weaver
City Manager Greg Carpenter
Attached is Public Communication received from Mike Robbins in the City Clerk’s Office related to the December 3, 2013 City Council Agenda, Item #1.

A paper copy has been placed in your mailboxes at City Hall.

Thank you,
Mona S
From: Mike Robbins <mikerobbins2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 5:30 PM
To: ALL ELECTED OFFICIALS; Domann, Cathy
Cc: Mike Robbins
Subject: My Public Communications for the 12/3/2013 El Segundo City Council Meeting
Attachments: 2013-12-03-Email-Mike Robbins-ESCC-Written Mtg Public Communications.pdf
Subject: Written public communications for December 3, 2013, 7:00 P.M. Regular City Council meeting
From: Mike Robbins (MikeRobbins2@yahoo.com)
To: AllCouncilAndClerks@ElSegundo.org; CDomann@ElSegundo.org; MShilling@ElSegundo.org;
Cc: MikeRobbins2@yahoo.com;
Bcc: 
Date: Tuesday, December 3, 2013

December 3, 2013

Re: Written Public Communications – 7:00 PM.

To: El Segundo City Council, City Clerk, Deputy City Clerk.

From: Michael D. Robbins, long time El Segundo resident.

Here is my written public communications for the December 3, 2013, 7:00 P.M. Regular El Segundo City Council meeting.

Please distribute it to the entire City Council and the City Clerk, City Manager, and City Attorney, and post it on the official City web site at ElSegundo.org on the City Council Agendas web page, http://www.ElSegundo.org/depts/elected/agendas.asp, as is customary.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Michael D. Robbins
MikeRobbins2@yahoo.com

PublicSafetyProject.org
http://PublicSafetyProject.org/

YouTube.com/user/PublicSafetyProject
http://www.YouTube.com/user/PublicSafetyProject

This written public communication for the December 3, 2013 7:00 P.M. Regular El Segundo City Council meeting addresses Unfinished Business Item C1, and expresses my opposition to that agenda item.
Unfinished Business Item C-1:

Ballot Measure(s) for the April 2014 city election to raise city taxes on residents on businesses.

First, I urge everyone who owns property in the city to review their property tax bill and be sure to pay it by the December 10 delinquency date to avoid a large penalty. Payments must be postmarked by December 10 to be considered on time.

Also, look at all the add-on items on the tax bill, especially voter-approved increases, and the total for the entire year, which is the sum of both installments, and ask yourself if you agree with those on the City Council who claim we are not paying enough property taxes.

Property taxes are in addition to our state and federal income taxes, Social Security and Medicare taxes, and sales taxes.

A majority on the El Segundo City Council proposes to raise city taxes on residents and businesses. However, the customers pay the business taxes which are passed on to them as a cost of doing business.

The present and past city councils have done far too little to reign in and roll back the wildly excessive and unsustainable city employee salaries, benefits, and pensions. These taxes will not solve the underlying problem, and the city council will keep coming back for more taxes until it solves the underlying problem.

Please vote "NO" on all ballot measures to raise taxes and create new taxes.

That concludes my public communications for the December 3, 2013, 7:00 P.M. El Segundo City Council meeting.
Attached is Public Communication received from the El Segundo Chamber of Commerce in the City Clerk’s Office related to the December 3, 2013 City Council Agenda, Item #1.

A sealed envelope from the Chamber with the attached letter has been placed in your mailboxes at City Hall.

Thank you,
Mona F. Shilling
Deputy City Clerk I
City of El Segundo
City Clerk’s Office
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
Work Phone Number: (310) 524-2307
Work email Address: mshilling@elsegundo.org
December 3, 2013

Honorable City Councilmembers
City of El Segundo
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

RE: FOLLOW UP BALLOT PROPOSAL

Dear Mayor & Councilmembers:

The El Segundo Chamber of Commerce appreciated the robust and detailed discussion the City Council held at its meeting last Tuesday night. The dialogue was very informative and it has helped us to refocus our efforts. As we’ve said before, a Chamber of Commerce is not in the business of advocating for tax increases, but we fully understand the urgency to rectify the unsustainable financial course the City finds itself on.

Additionally, we do not want to give the impression that we are negotiating with the City Council. We have worked to provide this follow up proposal in hopes that the City Council will find it beneficial and that together we can move forward in support of a tax initiative on the April 2014 election.

The El Segundo Chamber of Commerce proposes a phased tax increase:

1) Years 1 to 3: raise $6.5 million annually in new tax revenue for the City

We recommend that this is reached through the following:

- UUT 2.5% increase on business: $3,503,000
- UUT 2.5% on residents: $855,700
- TOT 2% increase: $1,275,000
- Airport Parking tax: $295,000
- BLT Credit reduction to 20% $552,750

$6,481,450

2) Year 4 forward: raise $5.9 million annually in tax revenue for the City

We recommend that this is reached through the following:

- UUT 2% increase on business: $2,802,450
- UUT 2% increase on residents: $684,700
- TOT 2% increase: $1,275,000
- Airport Parking Tax $295,000
- BLT Credit reduction to 10% $829,125

$5,886,225

Note: increases are against today’s current rates

427 Main Street • El Segundo, CA 90245 • 310.322.1220 • Fax 310.322.6880
Email: info@elsegundochamber.org
Our proposal provides a front loading in the first three years to help the City meet some of its capital improvement needs, while in the fourth and subsequent years the City will be able to meet its combined operational and capital shortfalls as currently projected.

We hope that this new tax base, combined with a strengthening of the City’s economic development efforts, will ensure the financial stability of El Segundo for decades to come. And, down the road, should the fiscal picture improve significantly, we would hope a future City Council would suspend unnecessary taxes and or we will petition a future City Council to consider such a suspension of some of these tax increases.

As we move forward together we believe the following points are important:

1) The issue of taxes should be placed on a single ballot question. We are all in this together and a single ballot question to raise taxes for the future of El Segundo is much easier than a menu of choices. If a single ballot question is not selected than we ask that the Business/Residential UUT be placed together as a single ballot question and the TOT/Airport Parking Tax/BLT Credit Reduction be combined in another ballot question.

2) The Chamber would appreciate the City Council’s action on introducing and passing an ordinance to bifurcate and protect the capital improvement funds placed on the ballot. This would avoid the need for an additional “advisory vote” on the ballot and would allow all of us to campaign in support of the April ballot with protections already in place, understanding of course that these protections can be reversed by a future vote of the City Council.

3) The Chamber would appreciate the City Council’s additional action to codify the already existing practice of having two business community members on the City’s Capital Improvement Project Advisory Committee. We would ask that the ordinance or resolution by the Council stipulate that the Chamber will recommend the two business community members to the City Council.

4) The Chamber appreciates the City Council’s past direction to remove consideration of the “advisory vote” on school funding percentages and we also appreciate the City’s constant diligence in revisiting its costs structure, including but not limited to employee service contracts, overall operating expenses and fees charged for services.

Finally, the Chamber will participate in a collaborative citywide campaign effort to seek passage of the tax proposals we have recommended.

Again, we thank you for time and your significant effort in working with the Chamber to craft a proposal that works for everyone involved.

Sincerely,

Sandy Jacobs
Chairman of the Board

cc: City Clerk Tracy Weaver
     City Manager Greg Carpenter
Attached is Public Communication received from the El Segundo Chamber of Commerce in the City Clerk’s Office related to the November 26, 2013 SPECIAL City Council Agenda, Item #1.

Thank you,
Mona F. Shilling
Deputy City Clerk
City of El Segundo
City Clerk’s Office
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
Work Phone Number: (310) 524-2307
Work email Address: mshilling@elsegundo.org
November 26, 2013

Honorable City Councilmembers
City of El Segundo
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

RE: BALLOT PROPOSAL FOR AN EL SEGUNDO UUT & TOURISM TAX

Dear Mayor & Councilmembers:

The El Segundo Chamber of Commerce has appreciated the constructive public dialogue that has taken place over the last two months concerning the City’s financial future. When this process began, the Chamber outlined three principles to help guide the City’s budget deliberations:

1) Businesses will do more;
2) The City needs to do more;
3) El Segundo residents need to also participate.

We are pleased that the community education effort undertaken by the City has helped to raise awareness amongst residents and for the first time in the City’s history, a residential tax on utilities has been actively advanced. Additionally, we are pleased by the City’s own efforts to investigate how City operations can be run more cost effectively while also looking at city fees for services. It is now time for the business community to do its part.

We do not want to see El Segundo’s financial reserves being decimated, thereby threatening its solvency. We fully understand the urgency to rectify this unsustainable financial course the City finds itself on. At the same time, we believe that one of the important definitions of “business friendly” is how a City applies its tax policy. Supporting new taxes is not a core activity for a Chamber of Commerce and in fact our mission is to advocate for lower taxes so our businesses can grow and create more jobs.

At last week’s City Council meeting, once again, new numbers were presented to the Council and public by City staff. There were also wide ranging comments by some Councilmembers. The business community does not support a “tax and spend” mentality.

THE SHORTFALL TARGET

As we approach a review of the latest projections the City staff has put forward, we question the “additional funds” of $4.4 million a year over five years as well as $3.8 million for “one-time projects.” While we well understand that there are deferred rehabs and repairs needed, this request totals over $25 million in new taxes alone. The business community cannot support fully funding these wish lists through new taxes.
What we can and will support is the City’s request to meet its operational shortfall through new taxes. It is projected that this shortfall will range from $3.5 million to $3.8 million annually. While we have varying views on salaries, benefits and contract obligations, these are the domain of the City staff and our elected officials to negotiate and manage. We will support new taxes to cover the City’s operational shortfall in the range of $3.5 million to $3.8 million.

We will also support the City’s annual “capital infrastructure” shortfall, but we believe the $2 million amount used by City staff is not entirely accurate. For example, the “enhanced aquatic program” is shown as an $800,000 annual expense. We believe that this is high and will not be the amount required once the City/Wiseburn pool complex is completed and has been up and operational for a few years. We feel the “capital infrastructure” shortfall is more in the range of $1.5 million.

In summary, we see the City’s ongoing operational and capital expenditure shortfall being in the range of $5 million to $5.8 million and it is that target we are proposing to help the City meet.

NEW TAXES

The El Segundo Chamber of Commerce proposes a phased tax increase:

1) **Years 1 to 3: raise $6.8 million annually in new tax revenue for the City**

   The Chamber has front loaded the first three years in taxes to enable the City to address some of its “wish list” deferred maintenance items. This will require the City to prioritize what is absolutely required. This is the same type of decision making businesses undertake every day.

2) **Year 4 and 5: raise $5,057,600 annually in tax revenue for the City**

   This amount meets the City’s operational and capital expenditure shortfall, but the picture should be even better because:

   - The City’s enhanced economic development efforts will bring in more than the projected $350,000 annually—we believe that amount is closer to $750,000 annually once new development that has been approved is opened plus new economic development efforts that are on the horizon are implemented.
   - The City is pursuing with the County how to increase the City’s $0.06 in property tax revenue and if successful (understanding the fix may take two or three years) this will help significantly in providing new income to meet the City’s deferred rehab and repairs plus other priorities.
   - As stated above, we believe the costs associated with the City/Wiseburn pool are inflated and within three years the pool should be operating on a much better financial footing than has been projected.
   - And the City’s continued efforts to contain costs and levy increased fees for services that are aligned with neighboring cities will also help.
   - The additional $5,057,600 in taxes would continue forward until the end of year five when the tax increases would expire and tax rates would return to current levels.

The El Segundo Chamber of Commerce believes this is a balanced and reasonable approach to new taxes.
TWO SEPARATE BALLOT MEASURES

We propose that these new taxes are raised through two separate ballot measures on April 2014 municipal election:

1) Utility Tax

For years 1 to 3, we propose a 3 percentage point increase (representing a 100% increase to business) in the City’s UUT (4% for telephone). This would be levied on both business & residents raising $5,230,650 annually ($4,203,600 from businesses and $1,207,050 from residents). This increase would sunset at the end of year three. And in years four and five, UUT would be at a 2% increase from today’s rate. This will provide $3,487,100 in tax revenue.

- Using a 3% UUT, we project that large residential homes will pay $75/year and for a small condominium the tax would be approximately $35/year. Surely our residents can afford less than $100/year in new taxes to ensure the City continues to operate at the current levels of service.
- It’s important to point out that the business community’s UUT will rise to 6% over the first three years while residents will be at 3%, as residents currently do not pay a UUT.
- The UUT will go down in year four and five when the UUT rate sunsets to 5% for business and 2% for residents.
- By combining the business & residential UUT on a single ballot it sends a clear message that “we are in this together” in helping to meet the City’s economic needs.

2) Tourism Tax

We propose to raise the City’s TOT tax by 2% to generate $1,275,000 annually in new revenue and to also create an Airport Parking Tax which is projected by the City to raise an additional $295,000 annually.

- The regional hotel environment is very competitive and extremely price sensitive. An increase in the TOT means that El Segundo hotels will be restricted in their ability to raise their own room rates as visitors look at the total price of a room, not how the charges are distributed.
- Los Angeles has the LA Convention & Visitors Bureau, plus Gateway to LA, promoting their hotels to gain conventions and hotel stays as well as creating amenities like a beach shuttle service for hotel guests.
- In Manhattan Beach, its City Council voted last year to provide funding to its Chamber of Commerce to develop a visitor’s bureau to promote the City as a destination.
- El Segundo has nothing that compares to these efforts. With the TOT increase will the City now start to better promote El Segundo hotels?
- Additionally, the TOT is a “hidden tax” on our local businesses that generate significant room nights for El Segundo hotels.
- It is important that the City not judge TOT by a comparison chart between different cities as other cities provide hotels with incentives and help in attracting visitors, while El Segundo does not.

WHY BLT CREDIT IS CRITICAL

Why have we not touched the idea of cancelling out the current Business License Tax (“BLT”) credit? We have not touched the “BLT” because it is a significant economic development tool and lynchpin to why
El Segundo was selected as the first “most business friendly city in LA County.” The City’s own economic development materials and website trumpet El Segundo’s “business license sales-use tax credit.” Why would the City want to do away with one of its greatest tools for ongoing economic development?

Please allow us to explain the significance of the BLT credit.

The current credit was put in place to incentivize those businesses that generate sales in our City. For example, for every dollar in sales, the City receives $0.09 cents in taxes/revenues. The current BLT sales tax credit reduces that to $0.08 cents as an incentive to keep the business and its sales in El Segundo.

Removing that one penny would make El Segundo’s sales taxes equal to the City of Los Angeles. We don’t think that is an economic development plus in recruiting businesses to our City. And obviously, if El Segundo removes the BLT credit other municipalities who compete for El Segundo’s sales revenues would promote this and work to create their own incentives to exploit the City’s mistake.

Since the BLT revenue is generated based on the total “sales amount” of a transaction those companies with large sales would suffer the most. Companies that generate large sales are also the ones employing more people. Sales and employment are tied together. We don’t want to force our large employers to look elsewhere nor do we want our small vendors to suffer. If the BLT credit is overturned, what would stop large businesses from finding vendors in another city with lower sales taxes?

The BLT is an economic development tool as well as a job generator and that’s why we have left it in place.

**IMPORTANT CLOSING POINTS**

In closing, we would like to offer a few final and important points.

First, the Chamber’s desire to see infrastructure improvements is sincere and that is why we would request the ballot language include a “lock box” for capital improvement revenues so that the amount set aside for capital infrastructure cannot be raided for things like salary increases or other operational costs.

Second, given that the Chamber is focused on infrastructure improvements we would ask that the ballot language include that two business community members—selected by the Chamber of Commerce—be given seats on the City’s Capital Improvement Project Advisory Committee and that the Committee be vested with the ability to ensure that taxes raised for capital improvements go to capital improvements and not ongoing City operational costs.

Again, we thank you for the constructive dialogue that will result in a solid economic future for El Segundo.

Sincerely,

Sandy Jacobs
Chairman of the Board

[Signature]

[Signature]

President & CEO

cc: City Clerk Tracy Weaver
City Manager Greg Carpenter
Domann, Cathy

From: Carpenter, Greg
Sent: Monday, November 25, 2013 11:13 AM
Subject: FW: El Segundo's Property Tax Share - Easy Reader 11/21/2013

See response below to Mr. Johnson

From: Carpenter, Greg
Sent: Monday, November 25, 2013 11:02 AM
To: 'DickCRJ@aol.com'
Subject: RE: El Segundo's Property Tax Share - Easy Reader 11/21/2013

Mr. Johnson,

I appreciate and share your concerns. Prior to Proposition 13, Cities were able to set their individual property tax rates. Proposition 13 took this ability away and standardized the methodology for assessment, increases and collection. What was not standardized was the apportionment of property taxes to cities. Instead, the legislation assumed that Cities had been operating with their individual tax rates and therefore could continue to provide services at those rates. El Segundo was a low tax City in 1978 and our rate was set very low. The legislature did eventually adjust the share for no and low property tax cities but only moved the percentage to 7% and some of that share has been reduced so we are not at 6.3%. The City Council received a report on the history of the City's property tax rate at their July 16, 2013 meeting. If you're interested you can review the report on the City's website (Under City Council agendas/July 16 City Council meeting/item 14).

This approach did not take into account the changing nature of municipal revenues and the changing nature of providing municipal services. We would like this inequity to be addressed and are researching our options. We are told that it will take legislation and will involve reducing the share of taxes received by other agencies so this may be an uphill fight but you're right about it being too important to ignore.

Regards,

Greg Carpenter

From: DickCRJ@aol.com [mailto:DickCRJ@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 21, 2013 8:58 PM
To: Carpenter, Greg
Cc: Fisher, Bill (Mayor); Jacobson, Carl (Mayor Pro Tem); Fuentes, Suzanne (Mayor Pro Tem);
letters@heraldpublications.com; judy@easyreadernews.com; Easy Reader 1
Subject: El Segundo's Property Tax Share - Easy Reader 11/21/2013

Dear Mr. Carpenter:

I am very puzzled with respect to El Segundo's meager share of our commercial & residential property tax dollar ($0.06 Vs $.11 for the South Bay average and, as much as $.15 for Manhattan Beach). In Mark McDermott's article in today's Easy Reader you attribute this huge percentage differential on the "freezing" of El Segundo's then unusually low property tax rates by the 1978 CA Proposition 13. However, that, in itself, in no way explains the much lower percentage of our property tax revenue accruing to El Segundo. Each penny per dollar of property tax revenue represents ~ one million dollars of revenue to our city. Consequently, if El Segundo were afforded the average South Bay rate of $.11, our projected budget shortfall would be eliminated without benefit of additional tax revenues!
I do not understand the formula which renders El Segundo's share of our property tax revenues so shamefully substandard. Please explain this unbalanced distribution in quantitative terms. The subject article asserts that a modification in CA State law/regulations would be necessary to realize an equitable property tax share accruing to El Segundo. Even if so, I suggest El Segundo vigorously pursue this avenue for fiscal relief! The potential monetary benefit to our city is clearly too overwhelming to simply ignore. Please advise.

C. Richard Johnson
1221 E. Oak Avenue
El Segundo, CA 90245
I am not sure why Deborah's email did not come through before, but so you know, this response does address the point being raised. The cosmetic technical definition of a fee vs. a tax is not an issue or at question. (North Carolina clearly saw through this technicality (i.e. a distinction without a difference) when they passed state law making sure both cable and satellite customers paid the exact same total % of the combined FF/taxes on video revenue.)

The real issue being raised is that the land line video subscribing citizens of El Segundo, in substance, will be writing out a larger check to cover an even greater proportion of the cost of city services (i.e. providing a larger subsidy to their neighbors) who receive video through a company that neither collects nor remits revenue/taxes back to the city of El Segundo.

This approach makes an unfair situation even more unfair. That is what I am asking the city council to consider before taking action to increase the present disparity.

Sorry for the additional clarification, but after reading the response, I was concerned that others may have misunderstood the point that I am trying to shed light on.

Respectfully,

Lee

---

From: Cullen, Deborah [mailto:DCullen@elsegundo.org]
Sent: Thursday, November 21, 2013 5:04 PM
To: sctippy@aol.com
Cc: *ALL CITY COUNCIL; Carpenter, Greg
Subject: RE: UUT taxes and the fairness issue on local residents

I am responding on behalf of the City Manager and City Council to you email below.

The City imposes Franchise Fees on gas, electric and cable television for the use City streets and pipelines. If the City were to propose a tax measure for residential Utility User Tax (UUT) and that measure passed the utilities would collect the tax from their customers and remit the tax to the City. The utility would not be paying a UUT.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Deborah Cullen
Director of Finance
City of El Segundo

-----Original Message-----
From: sctippy <sctippy@aol.com>
To: allcouncil <allcouncil@elsegundo.org>
Sent: Thu, Nov 21, 2013 11:13 am
Subject: UUT taxes and the fairness issue on local residents
I read the El Segundo this morning on page 6 (10/12/13) edition re UUT taxes. UUT taxes are passed on to local subscribers e.g. video subscribers for Time Warner Cable, Verizon & AT&T. Directv/Dish residents do pay UUT. This is the case already with franchise fees as well. (Other states do not double "tax" video customers.)

Landline cable customers do not use any more of the city services than satellite customers. The Minnesota Star Tribune reported that already 98% of franchise fees redounded (on a net basis above the cost of incremental cost to "manage the rights of way") as going into city general fund.

I do hope the city council considers the fairness of a double "taxation" of customers getting video through a landline. Increasing their costs, beyond the fairness issue, just shifts more customers to a long term service where the city gets neither franchise fees, nor UUT. (You sort of kill the golden goose that lays the egg, so to speak.)

As a long term El Segundo resident, I thought you should understand the various situation this causes. I am sure the folks at Time Warner, AT&T of Verizon could provide enlightenment as well.

Do you think it is fair for landline video customers to be "double taxed" to pay for more general services while satellite customers have neither tax/fee passed through?

Thanks for thinking this disparity through.

310-848-3033
I haven't heard anything back from any city council members, but here are some more thoughts. (BTW, I am a former Ernst & Young auditor, CPA with 30 years of Telecom experience in multiple cities and states.)

In general fees are supposed to bear some connection to cost. (There are some excellent references to this on the web to this point.) Franchise Fees have already blown way past this and UUT just adds to the incremental revenue financed by land based Telecom subscribers. (You can say FF is not financed by these subscribers, but that is a form over substance position. Where do Telecom companies get their fees to send to the city? Of course, it is directly added to the customer bill at the same rate and on the basis as it is being assessed and it is definitely financed by those customers.) So my comments are in the context of "Let's keep it real", not a phony position, which is hard to say with a straight face, about how cable customers don't really pay the franchise fees (or a UUT) to the city.

Increasing Telecom fees/taxes (be it FF or UUT Telecom) just increases the bottom line total bill customer cost for folks who don't use any more city services than satellite customers use. I have not heard whether any of you think that is fair, but obviously it just pushes that many more customers to subscribe a service (satellite) where the city gets nothing. (BTW, that also means fewer viewers of the local ES community channels.)

I do think it would be good if we can get to place North Carolina is. They were astute enough to know there is not a connection between FF and cost to manage rights of way. They ended up passing a law where satellite and cable (AT&T, Verizon, TWC) and their customers are charged the exact same rate FF's. California is already to the extreme of one side of the disparity, North Carolina is the extreme (100% equality) to the other side after the law held up to all legal challenges brought by the satellite companies.

The brilliance of North Carolina's substance over form law is that no matter where customers migrate, the combined state/local city government gets the same revenue for same revenue customer spend.

El Segundo appears to be poised to, in effect, have its land based video residents have pay for an even greater mix of city services, on a per customer basis, than their next door neighbors that have a dish, which contributes zero revenue to the city.

If El Segundo wants to be fair to all of its citizens, it may want to consider excluding Telecom video from its UUT expansion plan.

Lee
310-648-8151 (land)
310-648-3033 (cell)

-----Original Message-----
From: scotty@aol.com
To: allcouncil<allcouncil@elsegundo.org>
Sent: Thu, Nov 21, 2013 11:13 am
Subject: UUT taxes and the fairness issue on local residents

I read the El Segundo this morning on page 6 (10/12/13) edition re UUT taxes. UUT taxes are passed on to local subscribers e.g. video subscribers for Time Warner Cable, Verizon & AT&T. Directv/Dish residents do pay UUT. This is the case already with franchise fees as well. (Other states do not double "tax" video customers.)

Landline cable customers do not use any more of the city services than satellite customers. The Minnesota Star Tribune reported that already 98% of franchise fees redounded (on a net basis above the cost of incremental cost to "manage the rights of way") as going into city general fund.
I do hope the city council considers the fairness of a double "taxation" of customers getting video through a landline. Increasing their costs, beyond the fairness issue, just shifts more customers to a long term service where the city gets neither franchise fees, nor UUT. (You sort of kill the golden goose that lays the egg, so to speak.)

As a long term El Segundo resident, I thought you should understand the various situation this causes. I am sure the folks at Time Warner, AT&T of Verizon could provide enlightenment as well.

Do you think it is fair for landline video customers to be "double taxed" to pay for more general services while satellite customers have neither tax/fee passed through?

Thanks for thinking this disparity through.

310-848-3033
I am responding on behalf of the City Manager and City Council to you email below.

The City Imposes Franchise Fees on gas, electric and cable television for the use City streets and pipelines. If the City were to propose a tax measure for residential Utility User Tax (UUT) and that measure passed the utilities would collect the tax from their customers and remit the tax to the City. The utility would not be paying a UUT.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Deborah Cullen
Director of Finance
City of El Segundo

From: scippy@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, November 21, 2013 11:13 AM
To: *ALL CITY COUNCIL
Subject: UUT taxes and the fairness issue on local residents

I read the El Segundo this morning on page 6 (10/12/13) edition re UUT taxes. UUT taxes are passed on to local subscribers e.g. video subscribers for Time Warne Cable, Verizon & AT&T. Directv/Dish residents do pay UUT. This is the case already with franchise fees as well. (Other states do not double “tax” video customers.)

Landline cable customers do not use any more of the city services than satellite customers. The Minnesota Star Tribune reported that already 98% of franchise fees redounded (on a net basis above the cost of incremental cost to "manage the rights of way") as going into city general fund.

I do hope the city council considers the fairness of a double "taxation" of customers getting video through a landline. Increasing their costs, beyond the fairness issue, just shifts more customers to a long term service where the city gets neither franchise fees, nor UUT. (You sort of kill the golden goose that lays the egg, so to speak.)

As a long term El Segundo resident, I thought you should understand the various situation this causes. I am sure the folks at Time Warner, AT&T of Verizon could provide enlightenment as well.

Do you think it is fair for landline video customers to be "double taxed" to pay for more general services while satellite customers have neither tax/fee passed through?

Thanks for thinking this disparity through.

310-848-3033
I read the El Segundo this morning on page 6 (10/12/13) edition re UUT taxes. UUT taxes are passed on to local subscribers e.g. video subscribers for Time Warner Cable, Verizon & AT&T. Directv/Dish residents do pay UUT. This is the case already with franchise fees as well. (Other states do not double "tax" video customers.)

Landline cable customers do not use any more of the city services than satellite customers. The Minnesota Star Tribune reported that already 98% of franchise fees redounded (on a net basis above the cost of incremental cost to "manage the rights of way") as going into city general fund.

I do hope the city council considers the fairness of a double "taxation" of customers getting video through a landline. Increasing their costs, beyond the fairness issue, just shifts more customers to a long term service where the city gets neither franchise fees, nor UUT. (You sort of kill the golden goose that lays the egg, so to speak.)

As a long term El Segundo resident, I thought you should understand the various situation this causes. I am sure the folks at Time Warner, AT&T of Verizon could provide enlightenment as well.

Do you think it is fair for landline video customers to be "double taxed" to pay for more general services while satellite customers have neither tax/fee passed through?

Thanks for thinking this disparity through.

310-848-3033
Sandy Jacobs, ES Chamber hand delivered the attached for all Council and CM.

Mishia Jennings
Executive Assistant
to the City Council
310-524-2302
mjennings@elsegundo.org

-----Original Message-----
From: donotreply@elsegundo.org [mailto:donotreply@elsegundo.org]
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2013 11:14 AM
To: Jennings, Mishia
Subject:

TASKalfa 6550cl
[00:c0:ee:88:9b:36]

------------------------
Honorable Councilmembers  
City of El Segundo  
350 Main Street  
El Segundo, CA 90245

Re: Item C.2. On Tuesday's Council Agenda

Dear Honorable Councilmembers:

The El Segundo Chamber of Commerce continues to appreciate the constructive public dialogue that has been occurring around the issue of potentially placing a ballot measure on the April 2014 election to amend the City’s tax code.

We are grateful for the public education effort that has been made by the Council and City Staff to inform both residents and business owners of the economic issues facing our City.

We are writing today to raise our strong opposition to an item for consideration on Tuesday’s Council Agenda: the idea of an advisory ballot measure that would direct some portion of the revenues from any proposed tax increase provided to the El Segundo Unified School District.

The El Segundo business community has a long and significant history of supporting our public schools. The El Segundo Education Foundation, which has raised millions of dollars over the years for our schools, is funded largely by contributions from area businesses. The business community is proud of its record of support for El Segundo public schools.

While we strongly support our schools, we believe an advisory vote to direct tax money to the School District is poor public policy. This action would not only set a bad precedent, it would virtually tie the City Council’s hands.

The City continues to provide direct and indirect financial support of our schools valued at over $1 million annually. This significant support does not require an advisory vote to continue, it requires a vote of the City Council. We urge you not to place an advisory ballot measure before the voters.

Sincerely,

Sandy Jacobs  
Chairman of the Board

Marsha Hansen  
President & CEO

cc: City Clerk Tracy Weaver  
City Manager Greg Carpenter

427 Main Street • El Segundo, CA 90245 • 310.322.1220 • Fax 310.322.6880  
Email: info@elsegundochamber.org
Hello Council Members,

During last nights meeting Council-member Fellhauer and Atkinson brought up town hall meetings and how to get the word out to voters regarding the vote on taxes and the open discussions.

It occurred to me that El Segundo, as a city, has very little social media presence online. I'd like to help remedy that by helping as a social media liaison between the council and the voters online.

Twitter, Facebook and YouTube are all fantastic ways to reach people. Especially young adult demographics who, as Mr. Atkinson put it, don't grasp the severity of our cities situation.

As a filmmaker and city employee for El Segundo TV, I am also capable of creating a video explaining the taxes, votes and town halls that could air on the cities YouTube, Facebook, Twitter and local cable network.

Let me know if you are interested in pursuing social media as a way to hear the voices of those who can't attend the meetings. I would be happy to come in and discuss the value of social media to anyone interested in listening.

I'd also like to add that I am in favor of whatever it takes to get this city back to a healthy financial future, whether that be raising taxes on property, adding a parking lot tax or turning our fire department into LA fire. I also believe it is a great idea to charge apartment complexes or property with more than three homes on it an additional trash tax as Council-member Fellhauer suggested.

Thank you for your time and service.

---

Ty Leisher
Director & Screenwriter
BAMIProduced.
310.256.8656

Bullets An Original Crime Series
Hello,

My name is Cindy Beckett and was just reading the survey for the upcoming meetings regarding the proposed tax increases. I realize that was just a sample, but just as a suggestion, it may be important to include the demographics of who is attending the meetings and completing the surveys. Needs of young families with children, i.e. those participating in the schools long term and and community events and services may vary from those who are retired, with no children or adult children. Seeking those differences may shed additional perspective. Just thought this might be helpful.

Thanks so much,

Cindy Beckett, M.A.
Program Support Services
(949) 633-9696
Cbevaluate@aol.com

Sent from my iPad
Hello Council Members,

During last nights meeting Council-member Fellhauer and Atkinson brought up town hall meetings and how to get the word out to voters regarding the vote on taxes and the open discussions.

It occurred to me that El Segundo, as a city, has very little social media presence online. I'd like to help remedy that by helping as a social media liaison between the council and the voters online.

Twitter, Facebook and YouTube are all fantastic ways to reach people. Especially young adult demographics who, as Mr. Atkinson put it, don't grasp the severity of our cities situation.

As a filmmaker and city employee for El Segundo TV, I am also capable of creating a video explaining the taxes, votes and town halls that could air on the cities YouTube, Facebook, Twitter and local cable network.

Let me know if you are interested in pursuing social media as a way to hear the voices of those who can't attend the meetings. I would be happy to come in and discuss the value of social media to anyone interested in listening.

I'd also like to add that I am in favor of whatever it takes to get this city back to a healthy financial future, whether that be raising taxes on property, adding a parking lot tax or turning our fire department into LA fire. I also believe it is a great idea to charge apartment complexes or property with more than three homes on it an additional trash tax as Council-member Fellhauer suggested.

Thank you for your time and service.

---

Ty Leisher
Director & Screenwriter
BAMProduced.
310.256.8656

Bullets An Original Crime Series