AGENDA
EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
COUNCIL CHAMBERS - 350 Main Street

The City Council, with certain statutory exceptions, can only take action upon properly posted and listed agenda items. Any writings or documents given to a majority of the City Council regarding any matter on this agenda that the City received after issuing the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the City Clerk’s office during normal business hours. Such Documents may also be posted on the City’s website at www.elsegundo.org and additional copies will be available at the City Council meeting.

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 portions of the Meeting. Additionally, the Public can comment on any Public Hearing item on the Agenda during the Public Hearing portion of such item. 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.

Members of the Public may place items on the Agenda by submitting a Written Request to the City Clerk or City Manager’s Office at least six days prior to the City Council Meeting (by 2:00 p.m. the prior Tuesday). The request must include a brief general description of the business to be transacted or discussed at the meeting. Playing of video tapes or use of visual aids may be permitted during meetings if they are submitted to the City Clerk two (2) working days prior to the meeting and they do not exceed five (5) minutes in length.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact City Clerk, 524-2305. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

REGULAR MEETING OF THE EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
TUESDAY, MARCH 3, 2015 – 5:00 PM

5:00 P.M. SESSION

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

PUBLIC COMMUNICATION – (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 prior to addressing the City Council. Failure to do so shall be a misdemeanor and punishable by a fine of $250.
SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS:

CLOSED SESSION:
The City Council may move into a closed session pursuant to applicable law, including the Brown Act (Government Code Section §54960, et seq.) for the purposes of conferring with the City's Real Property Negotiator; and/or conferring with the City Attorney on potential and/or existing litigation; and/or discussing matters covered under Government Code Section §54957 (Personnel); and/or conferring with the City's Labor Negotiators; as follows:

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – EXISTING LITIGATION (Gov't Code §54956.9(d) (3)): -2- matter

1. City of El Segundo vs. City of Los Angeles, et.al. LASC Case No. BS094279
2. Hooper vs. City of El Segundo, LASC Case No. BC 540995

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION

Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to Government Code §54956.9(d) (2) and (3): -0- matter.

Initiation of litigation pursuant to Government Code §54956.9(c): -0- matter.

DISCUSSION OF PERSONNEL MATTERS (Gov't Code §54957): -0- matter

APPOINTMENT OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEE (Gov't. Code § 54957): -0- matter

PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT (Gov't Code § 54957) -0- matter
CONFERENCE WITH CITY'S LABOR NEGOTIATOR (Gov't Code §54957.6): -8-matters

1. Employee Organizations: Police Management Association; Police Officers Association; Police Support Services Employees Association; Fire Fighters Association; Supervisory and Professional Employees Association; City Employees Association; Executive Management Group (Unrepresented Group); Management/Confidential Group (Unrepresented Group)

Agency Designated Representative: Steve Filarsky and City Manager

CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR (Gov't Code §54956.8): -0-matters
AGENDA
EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
COUNCIL CHAMBERS - 350 Main Street

The City Council, with certain statutory exceptions, can only take action upon properly posted and listed agenda items. Any writings or documents given to a majority of the City Council regarding any matter on this agenda that the City received after issuing the agenda packet, are available for public inspection in the City Clerk's office during normal business hours. Such Documents may also be posted on the City's website at www.elsegundo.org and additional copies will be available at the City Council meeting.

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 portions of the Meeting. Additionally, the Public can comment on any Public Hearing item on the Agenda during the Public Hearing portion of such item. 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.

Members of the Public may place items on the Agenda by submitting a Written Request to the City Clerk or City Manager's Office at least six days prior to the City Council Meeting (by 2:00 p.m. the prior Tuesday). The request must include a brief general description of the business to be transacted or discussed at the meeting. Playing of video tapes or use of visual aids may be permitted during meetings if they are submitted to the City Clerk two (2) working days prior to the meeting and they do not exceed five (5) minutes in length.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact City Clerk, 524-2305. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

REGULAR MEETING OF THE EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
TUESDAY, MARCH 3, 2015 - 7:00 P.M.

7:00 P.M. SESSION

CALL TO ORDER

INVOCATION – Wes Harding, The Bridge

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – Council Member Fellhauer
PRESENTATIONS

b) Proclamation – March is Red Cross Month.
c) Presentation – Upcoming Southern California Gas Pipeline Safety Project.

ROLL CALL

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 prior to addressing the City Council. Failure to do so shall be a misdemeanor and punishable by a fine of $250. While all comments are welcome, the Brown Act does not allow Council to take action on any item not on the agenda. The Council will respond to comments after Public Communications is closed.

CITY COUNCIL COMMENTS – (Related to Public Communications)

A. PROCEDURAL MOTIONS

Consideration of a motion to read all ordinances and resolutions on the Agenda by title only.

Recommendation – Approval.

B. SPECIAL ORDERS OF BUSINESS (PUBLIC HEARING)
1. Consideration and possible action to open public hearing and receive evidence regarding a modification of Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 (approved in 2013) adopted as part of the Corporate Campus Specific Plan development project. If approved, the Project would: 1) reduce the project site area from 23.87 acres to 13 acres; 2) approve the creation of 24 lots compared to the previously approved 32 lots; and 3) limit the project to the Phase 1 area that is under construction (Eleven project) consisting of 217,637 square feet of office and retail uses on the proposed 13 acres. A Finding of Consistency with the certified Final Environmental Impact Report (previously approved by the City Council in 2013) and Addendum to the FEIR is proposed for the requested modification to the vesting tentative map. Applicant CDC Mar Campus, LLC.  
(Fiscal Impact: None)  
Recommendation – 1) Open the Public Hearing; 2) Take testimonial and documentary evidence; 3) Discussion; 4) Adopt a resolution approving the Project; 5) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

2. Consideration and possible action to direct staff to carry out various activities in preparation for the potential name change of Sepulveda Blvd. to Pacific Coast Highway in the City of El Segundo.
(Fiscal Impact: None)  
Recommendation – 1) Direct staff to carry out various activities in preparation of the potential name change of Sepulveda Blvd. to Pacific Coast Highway within the City of El Segundo city limits; 2) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

D. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS AND BOARDS

E. CONSENT AGENDA

All items listed are to be adopted by one motion without discussion and passed unanimously. If a call for discussion of an item is made, the item(s) will be considered individually under the next heading of business.
3. **Warrant Numbers 3004724 through 3004924 on Register No. 10 in the total amount of $1,686,767.57 and Wire Transfers from 2/2/2015 through 2/15/2015 in the total amount of $2,910,481.42.**

   Recommendation – Approve Warrant Demand Register and authorize staff to release. Ratify Payroll and Employee Benefit checks; checks released early due to contracts or agreement; emergency disbursements and/or adjustments; and wire transfers.

4. **Regular City Council Meeting Minutes of February 17, 2015.**

   Recommendation – Approval.

5. **Consideration and possible action to renew the General Services Agreement between the City of El Segundo and County of Los Angeles for an additional five years commencing on July 1, 2015, would allow the City to access, on an as-needed basis, municipal support services performed by the County, such as traffic signal maintenance and other public works activities.**

   *(Fiscal Impact: None)*

   Recommendation – 1) Authorize the Mayor to sign the General Services Agreement in a form approved by the City Attorney; 2) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

6. **Consideration and possible action to receive and file this report regarding emergency work to repair dwelling units at the Park Vista Senior Housing Facility due to water intrusion without the need for bidding in accordance with Public Contracts Code §§ 20168 and 22050 and El Segundo Municipal Code (“ESMC”) §§ 1-7-12 and 1-7A-4.**

   *(Fiscal Impact: $50,000.00)*

   Recommendation – 1) Receive and file this report regarding emergency work to repair dwelling units at the Park Vista Senior Housing Facility due to water intrusion without the need for bidding in accordance with Public Contracts Code §§ 20168 and 22050 and El Segundo Municipal Code (“ESMC”) §§ 1-7-12 and 1-7A-4; 2) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

7. **Consideration and possible action to accept as complete the 2013-2014 Furnishing and Application of Slurry Seal on Various Streets, Project No. PW 13-15.**

   *(Fiscal Impact: $729,882.45)*

   Recommendation – 1) Accept work as complete; 2) Authorize the City Clerk to file a Notice of Completion in the County Recorder’s Office; 3) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.
8. Consideration and possible action to authorize the appropriation of existing designated funds accrued in prior fiscal years to purchase computer hardware, software and peripherals for use at City facilities in an amount not to exceed $233,600.
\( \text{Fiscal Impact: } $233,600.00 \)

Recommendation – 1) Authorize staff to appropriate existing designated funds accrued in prior fiscal years to purchase computer hardware, software and peripherals in an amount not to exceed $233,600; 2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

9. Consideration and possible action regarding a request for the expansion of on-site sale and consumption of alcohol at an existing movie theater which currently has an active Type 47 ABC License at 831 South Nash Street (ArcLight Cinemas). Applicant: Art Rodriguez
\( \text{Fiscal Impact: N/A} \)

Recommendation – 1) Receive and file this report without objecting to the expansion of alcohol service for on-site sale of beer, wine and distilled spirits for on-site consumption at an existing movie theater at 831 South Nash Street; 2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

10. Consideration and possible action to approve Final Vesting Parcel Map No. 71788, a three (3) lot commercial subdivision located at 888, 892 and 898 North Sepulveda Boulevard.
\( \text{Fiscal Impact: N/A} \)

Recommendation – 1) Approve and accept Final Vesting Parcel Map No. 71788; 2) Authorize the appropriate City Official to sign and record said Map; 3) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

11. Consideration and possible action to reorganize the Economic Development Program to transfer reporting of budgeting responsibilities from the Planning and Building Safety Department to the City Manager’s Office, and authorize the City Manager to fill the vacant existing at-will classification of Economic Development Manager.
\( \text{Fiscal Impact: } $50,000.00 - $60,000.00 \)

Recommendation – 1) Approve the reorganization and budget transfers necessary and authorize the City Manager to fill the vacant Economic Development Manager position; 2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

F. NEW BUSINESS
12. Consideration and possible action to select a pool design option and funding plan for the new outdoor Aquatics Facility to be located at Wiseburn High School.
(Fiscal Impact: To Be Determined)

Recommendation – 1) Select a pool design option; 2) Discuss potential funding plans for the excess construction costs under obligation of the City; 3) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

G. REPORTS – CITY MANAGER

H. REPORTS – CITY ATTORNEY

I. REPORTS – CITY CLERK

J. REPORTS – CITY TREASURER

K. REPORTS – CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

Council Member Fellhauer –

Council Member Atkinson –

Council Member Dugan -

Mayor Pro Tem Jacobson –

Mayor Fuentes –
13. Consideration and possible action to authorize the City Manager to enter into an agreement in a form approved by the City Attorney with NexLevel Information Technology, Inc. for technology strategic planning services at a cost not to exceed $48,840.
(Fiscal Impact: $48,840.00)

Recommendation – 1) Authorize the City Manager to enter into an agreement in a form specified by the City Attorney with NexLevel Information Technology, Inc. for technology strategic planning services at a cost not to exceed $48,840; 2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS – (Related to City Business Only – 5 minute limit per person, 30 minute limit total) Individuals who have receive 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 prior to addressing the City Council. Failure to do so shall be a misdemeanor and punishable by a fine of $250. While all comments are welcome, the Brown Act does not allow Council to take action on any item not on the agenda. The Council will respond to comments after Public Communications is closed.

MEMORIALS –

CLOSED SESSION

The City Council may move into a closed session pursuant to applicable law, including the Brown Act (Government Code Section §54960, et seq.) for the purposes of conferring with the City’s Real Property Negotiator; and/or conferring with the City Attorney on potential and/or existing litigation; and/or discussing matters covered under Government Code Section §54957 (Personnel); and/or conferring with the City’s Labor Negotiators.

REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN IN CLOSED SESSION (if required)

ADJOURNMENT

POSTED:

DATE: 2.25.15

TIME: 2:15 pm

NAME: Tracy Weaver
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WHEREAS, Arbor Day was founded by J. Sterling Morton and first celebrated in the United States in 1872 as a special day for the planting of trees. In the State of California, Arbor Day has been observed since 1911 to enhance appreciation and knowledge of the State's natural wonders; and

WHEREAS, El Segundo Arbor Day celebrations have been presented annually since 1988 by local youth of TREE MUSKETEERS, and as a result of our City's commitment to its community forest, El Segundo has been named a Tree City USA since 2003; and

WHEREAS, Arbor Day is a time to recognize the value of our community's trees that clean the air, reduce noise, absorb smells, produce life sustaining oxygen, prevent erosion, help conserve energy and water, increase property values, enhance the economic vitality of business areas, beautify our community, and wherever trees are planted, they are a source of joy and spiritual renewal that bring people together as neighbors; and

WHEREAS, TREE MUSKETEERS in partnership with the City of El Segundo, its conscientious business citizens, service clubs and residents tall or small will plant and care for trees in Memory Row and Trees to the Sea along Imperial Highway on March 7, 2015 at 9:30 AM in observance of California Arbor Day; and

WHEREAS, This Arbor Day project further signifies the City of El Segundo's commitment to the community, the environment, and the fight against global warming.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Mayor and members of the City Council of the City of El Segundo, California, join with communities across the State of California in proclaiming March 7, 2015 as California Arbor Day and invite all citizens to join TREE MUSKETEERS or to otherwise honor all trees and the young people of our community for the important roles they play in improving our hometown quality of life.

Mayor Suzanne Fuentes
Mayor Pro Tem Carl Jacobson
Council Member Dave Atkinson
Council Member Marie Fellhauer
Council Member Michael Dugan
Proclamation

City of El Segundo, California

WHEREAS, since 1943 the President of the United States has proclaimed March as Red Cross Month; and

WHEREAS, Red Cross Month is a month-long observance recognizing the American Red Cross as a true reflection of the humanitarian and volunteer spirit and calls on Americans to make a donation, volunteer, take a class or give blood; and

WHEREAS, The American Red Cross Los Angeles Region uses this opportunity to educate communities about the services provided to the public each and every day; and

WHEREAS, in 2014 the Red Cross Los Angeles Region provided disaster relief assistance to 600 families and supported 2,016 clients by providing shelter, food, emotional support and other necessities; and

WHEREAS, the Red Cross is chartered by Congress to provide family communications and other support to active duty members of the military and has done so for 130 years; and

WHEREAS, in 2014 nearly 125,473 individuals locally were trained in CPR, First Aid, aquatics, babysitting, wilderness First Aid, and water safety courses; and

WHEREAS, we encourage individuals, families and businesses to prepare themselves for disasters by getting an emergency kit, making a plan, and being informed through preparedness education classes; and

WHEREAS, across Southern California, the American Red Cross provided 400,000 potentially lifesaving blood products for patients in need in 2014; and

WHEREAS, 4,470 volunteers helped provide direct service to the community locally; and

WHEREAS, thanks to the support of the Los Angeles community, the Red Cross is there when needed most down to the street, across the country and around the world.

NOW, THEREFORE, on this 3rd day of March, 2015, the Mayor and Members of the City Council of the City of El Segundo, California, in recognition of the importance of volunteering your time, making a donation, taking a class or giving blood hereby proclaim the month of March as RED CROSS MONTH, and urge all citizens to show their support to the American Red Cross Los Angeles Region.

Mayor Suzanne Fuentes
Mayor Pro Tem Carl Jacobson
Council Member Dave Atkinson
Council Member Marie Fellhauer
Council Member Michael Dugan
Presentation
Upcoming Southern California Gas Pipeline Safety Project.
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action to open a public hearing and receive evidence regarding a modification of Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 (approved in 2013) adopted as part of the Corporate Campus Specific Plan development project. If approved, the Project would: 1) reduce the project site area from 23.87 acres to 13 acres; 2) approve the creation of 24 lots compared to the previously approved 32 lots; and 3) limit the project to the Phase 1 area that is under construction (Elevon project) consisting of 217,637 square feet of office and retail uses on the proposed 13 acres. A Finding of Consistency with the certified Final Environmental Impact Report (previously approved by the City Council in 2013) and Addendum to the FEIR is proposed for the requested modification to the vesting tentative map. Applicant CDC Mar Campus, LLC. (Fiscal Impact: None)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1. Open the Public Hearing;
2. Take testimonial and documentary evidence;
3. Discussion;
4. Adopt a Resolution approving the Project; and/or
5. Alternatively, discuss and take other possible related action to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

1. Draft Resolution including Findings of Consistency with the General Plan and Addendum to the FEIR and Conditions of Approval
2. Exhibit “A” Site Plan
3. Exhibit “B” Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 as currently approved
4. Exhibit “C” Proposed Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287
5. Planning Commission Staff Report dated February 12, 2015, and Planning Commission Resolution No. 2768 with conditions of approval and the Findings of Consistency with the General Plan and Addendum to the FEIR.
6. Project Plans

FISCAL IMPACT: None

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

ORIGINATED BY: Kimberly Christensen, AICP, Planning Manager
REVIEWED BY: Sam Lee, Director of Planning and Building Safety
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager
I. BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

The City Council approved the Corporate Campus development project in 2002 (the "Original Project"). The Original Project (EA-548) allowed development of up to 2,175,000 square feet of office, light industrial, retail, restaurant, health club, hotel/conference, medical/dental office, and day care uses on a 46.5 acre site. Building heights range from low-rise (1-2 story) to mid-rise (4-6 stories). The Original Project has a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of .99. The Original Project Site (46.5-acres) boundaries are Atwood Way to the north, Douglas Street to the west, Nash Street to the west, and Mariposa Avenue to the south (the "Site"). The Original Project includes internal private streets for circulation purposes. The approval also included a subdivision (Vesting Tentative Map No. 53570) for a maximum of 26 parcels.

On December 3, 2013 the City Council approved a 625,205 square-foot development project (the "Revised Project") that would be developed in 3 phases under Environmental Assessment No. EA-1021, Specific Plan Amendment No. SPA 13-02, Subdivision No. SUB 13-05 (Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287) to create 32 lots, and Development Agreement No. DA 13-01, which modified a portion of the Original Project’s 46.5 acre area approved in EA-548 in 2002 (See attached Site Plan Exhibit “A”). An Addendum to the previously Certified Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) was prepared for EA-1021 which was approved.

The Applicant is proposing to modify the previous 2002 and 2013 approvals. The new project would modify Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 (the “New Project”) to reduce the area of the map to include only the development of the Elevon Project which is comprised of 217,637 square feet of office and retail uses located in 17 two-story buildings (currently designated as “Phase 1” of the Revised Project). This Elevon Project is currently under construction; it would not change if the New Project is approved.

The Phase 2 area of the previously approved vesting tentative map was sold by the Applicant to EVA Airways and the Phase 3 area is pending sale to the Lakers. The Applicant retains ownership of the Elevon Project. Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 approved in 2013 has not been recorded by the Applicant. The New Project would omit the Phase 2 and Phase 3 areas from Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287. Consequently, the Phase 2 and the Phase 3 areas will remain a part of the original subdivision recorded for the Corporate Campus Specific Plan area (Vesting Tract Map No. 53570). If the New Project is approved, the Applicant will proceed with recording a modified Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 with the County of Los Angeles.

II. Project Applications

The applications include the following:

1) **Environmental Assessment No. EA-1091** - An Addendum to the certified Final Environmental Impact Report was approved by the City Council in 2013. The New
Project does not require a new environmental document pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15168(c)(2) since the New Project would not result in any new or increased environmental impacts or require new mitigation measures. A Notice of Consistency with the EIR and Addendum to the FEIR is proposed for the requested modification to the vesting tentative map.

2) **Subdivision No. SUB 14-11 (Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287)** – The New Project proposes a subdivision modification to reduce the area of the subdivision and the number of lots from 32 to 24.

If the New Project is approved, the modified Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 would reduce the area from 23.87 acres to 13 acres and would be comprised of 24 lots that will only include the Phase 1 “Elevon” Project (see attached Exhibit “C”).

The proposed tentative map modification will not impact the proposed building layout, size, or configuration of the Elevon Project and it will comply with the conditions of approval for the Corporate Campus Specific Plan, as amended, relative to lot size, lot frontage, and access.

III. **Analysis**

Please refer to Sections IV and V of the Planning Commission Staff Report for a detailed discussion of the project analysis and findings.

IV. **Environmental Review/Certified EIR and Addendum**

On January 2, 2002, the City Council certified the Final Environmental Impact Report and adopted a Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program. On November 19, 2013, the City Council approved an Addendum to the FEIR for the proposed Project under EA-1021. The City prepared a Notice of Consistency with the General Plan and Addendum to the FEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15168(c)(2) and on February 12, 2015, the Planning Commission recommended that the City Council find that a new environmental document is not required for the proposed project modifications pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15168(c)(2) since the proposed changes to the vesting tentative map would not result in any new or increased environmental impacts or require new mitigation measures.

V. **Application Findings**

In order to approve the project, the City Council must take certain actions related to the proposed project related to the environmental review and Subdivision. The required findings for each application are discussed in detail in the attached draft Resolution. Staff believes that the City Council may make the required findings to adopt the Finding of Consistency and to approve the Subdivision.

VI. **Planning Commission Hearing and Public Input**
On February 12, 2015, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the proposed amendment to Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287. The Planning Commission received public testimony from the applicant. The Planning Commission did not receive any testimony from the public regarding the proposed project. After conducting the hearing and receiving documentary information, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2768, recommending that City Council approve the modification to the Vesting Tentative Map.

**VII. Conclusion and Recommendation**

Planning staff believes that the proposed Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 meets the mandatory findings as set forth in the staff report and recommends that the City Council adopt the attached draft Resolution approving Environmental Assessment No. EA-1091 approving the Finding of Consistency for the project and approving Subdivision No. SUB 14-11 (Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287) with conditions.
RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION APPROVING A FINDING OF CONSISTENCY AND APPROVING SUBDIVISION NO. SUB 14-11 (VESTING TENTATIVE MAP NO. 72287) FOR THE MODIFICATION OF VESTING TENTATIVE MAP NO. 72287 AFFECTING THE CORPORATE CAMPUS PROJECT AREA.

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

SECTION 1: The City Council finds and declares that:

A. On October 15, 2014, CDC Mar Campus LLC, Inc. (the "Applicant") filed applications for an Environmental Assessment No. EA-1091 and Subdivision No. Sub 14-11 (Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287) to modify a previously approved Vesting Tentative Map (No. 72287) regulating the Corporate Campus project area (the "Project"). The Project would reduce the land area from 23.87 acres to 13 acres and reduce the number of lots from 32 lots to 24 lots. The remaining land (10.87 acres) is subject to the requirements of Vesting Tentative Map No. 53570 (the original subdivision for the entire 46.5-acre Corporate Campus Specific Plan Area);

B. The Project was reviewed by the City's Planning and Building Safety Department for, in part, consistency with the General Plan, Corporate Campus Specific Plan, and conformity with the El Segundo Municipal Code ("ESMC");

C. In addition, the City reviewed the project's environmental impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code §§ 21000, et seq., "CEQA"), the regulations promulgated thereunder (14 Cal. Code of Regulations §§15000, et seq., the "CEQA Guidelines"), and the City's Environmental Guidelines (City Council Resolution No. 3805, adopted March 16, 1993);

D. The Planning and Building Safety Department completed its review and scheduled a public hearing regarding the project before the Planning Commission for February 12, 2015;

E. On February 12, 2015, the Commission opened a public hearing to receive public testimony and other evidence regarding the applications including, without limitation, information provided to the Commission by City Staff, public testimony, and representatives of CDC Mar Campus LLC. Following the public hearing, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2768 recommending that the City Council approved the project;
F. This Resolution and its findings are made based upon the testimony and evidence presented to the City Council at its March 3, 2015 public hearing including, without limitation, the staff report submitted by the Planning and Building Safety Department.

SECTION 2: Factual Findings and Conclusions. The City Council finds that the following facts exist and makes these conclusions:

A. The proposed subdivision is proposed on an approximately 23.87-acre portion of the 46.5-acre Corporate Campus Project site located in the northeast portion of the City of El Segundo. The proposed subdivision would create 24 lots.

B. The 46.5-acre project site (Corporate Campus Project Site) which includes the 23.87 acres in the proposed revised Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287, has a Corporate Campus land use designation and the zoning designation is the Corporate Campus Specific Plan. The FAR for the Corporate Campus land use designation is 0.99:1 and would permit up to 2,175,000 square feet of development. The Revised Project included approximately 625,205 square feet of new commercial office and retail development that will be developed at a 0.60:1 FAR.

C. The modification of Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 under SUB No. 14-11 will reduce the land area from 23.87 acres to 13 acres and will only include the Phase 1 area of the previously approved Revised Project. Phase 1 is comprised of the 217,637 square-foot Elevon project. The Elevon Project will not be affected by the proposed modifications to Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 relative to building location, building size, and setbacks. The Elevon Project will be developed with a FAR of 0.38:1. The lots proposed under the modified Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 will meet the development standards under the CCSP for lot size, lot frontage, and will have a maximum of 24 lots.

D. The Corporate Campus Specific Plan Zone allows for the transfer of density rights within the development area to insure that the overall density of the site is consistent with the Corporate Specific Plan Zoning. Any donor parcels for FAR purposes will have covenants recorded stating the maximum FAR permitted on the parcel.

E. Ingress and egress will not be affected and will continue to be provided from driveways with direct access from Douglas Street, Maple Avenue, Mariposa Avenue, and through driveways that have access through the existing internal private streets.

F. Parking will continue to be located on surface parking lots for all development phases including the new Phase 1 area under modified
Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 and will meet the City’s parking requirements.

G. EA-1091 and SUB No. 14-11 (Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287) must comply with the Conditions of Approval established for the Original Project and Revised Project as approved in 2002 by Planning Commission Resolution No. 2517, City Council Resolution No. 4241, and Ordinance No. 1345 and as amended in 2013 by Planning Commission Resolution No. 2739, City Council Resolution No. 4582, and Ordinance 1492, and as further amended in Planning Commission Resolution No. 2768 and in this Resolution.

SECTION 3: Environmental Assessment. The City Council makes the following environmental findings:

A. The City Council certified a Final EIR (FEIR) on January 2, 2002 for the Corporate Campus project.

B. The City Council approved an Addendum to the FEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15090 on December 3, 2013 as none of the conditions in CEQA Guidelines § 15162 requiring a subsequent or supplemental EIR were determined to be present. No new significant effects will result from the revised project. No significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the FEIR in accordance with CEQA Guidelines § 15164(a).

C. In accordance with § 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines, the record on which the City’s findings are based is located at the Planning and Building Safety Department, City of El Segundo, 350 Main Street, El Segundo, California 90245. The custodian of records is the Director of Planning and Building Safety.

D. The City determined through findings that a new environmental document is not required for the proposed modification to Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15168(c)(2) as the proposed modifications to the modified Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 would not result in any new or increased environmental impacts or require new mitigation measures already established in the Certified FEIR and Addendum to the Certified FEIR that were previously approved.

E. Because of the facts identified in this Resolution, the environmental review requires that a Finding of Consistency with the General Plan and Addendum to the Certified FEIR be completed in order for the project to be approved.
SECTION 4: General Plan and Specific Plan. The proposed project conforms with the General Plan as follows:

A. The General Plan contains a number of relevant Goals, Objectives, and Policies. The Original and Revised Project listed a number of Goals, Objectives, and Policies that were consistent with the Economic Development Element, Land Use Element, Circulation Element, Open Space and Recreation Element, Conservation, Air Quality Element, Noise Element, and Public Safety Element of the General Plan. The modification of Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 will not affect the project's ability to meet the established Goals, Objectives, and Policies of the General Plan.

B. The modification of the Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 will only affect parcel configuration and the number of lots created. The proposed revised subdivision will be subject to the same conditions of approval previously established under City Council Resolution No. 4241 and 4582 respectively and Ordinance No. 1345 and Ordinance No. 1482 with a few added conditions to ensure compliance with the requirements of the General Plan and the Corporate Campus Specific Plan.

SECTION 5: Subdivision. The City Council cannot make any of the findings for denial set forth in ESMC § 14-1-6 for the following reasons:

A. The proposed modified map is consistent with applicable general and specific plans as specified in Government Code § 65451. As set forth in Section 4, this project meets the goals and objectives of the General Plan.

B. The design of the proposed subdivision is consistent with applicable general and specific plans. As set forth in Section 4, this project meets the goals and objectives of the General Plan.

C. The site is physically suitable for the type of development. As set forth in Section 4, this project meets the goals and objectives of the General Plan.

D. The site is physically suitable for the proposed density of development. The proposed project is for the construction of a 217,637 square-foot commercial office and retail development.

E. The design of the subdivision or the proposed improvements are unlikely to cause substantial damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat. The proposed project site is located in an urbanized area. The new commercial office and retail development is not likely to result in any substantial environmental damage or cause injury to fish or wildlife or their habitat.
F. The design of the subdivision or type of improvements is unlikely to cause serious public health problems. There is no evidence demonstrating that the proposed new commercial office and retail development is likely to cause any serious public health problem.

G. The design of the subdivision or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through or use of property within the proposed subdivision. The subdivision of the property for the new commercial office and retail development will not conflict with any known easements located at, or near the property.

SECTION 6: Approvals.

A. Subject to the existing conditions established under Resolution No. 4582 and Ordinance No. 1492 and the additional conditions in attached Exhibit “A,” the City Council approves a Finding of Consistency, with the General Plan and Addendum to the Certified FEIR, attached as Exhibit “B,”

B. Subject to the existing conditions previously established under Resolution No. 4582 and Ordinance No. 1492 and the additional conditions in attached Exhibit “A,” the City Council approves Environmental Assessment No. EA-1091 and Subdivision No. SUB 14-11 (Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287).

SECTION 7: Reliance on Record. Each and every one of the findings and determinations in this Resolution are based on the competent and substantial evidence, both oral and written, contained in the entire record relating to the project. The findings and determinations constitute the independent findings and determinations of the Planning Commission in all respects and are fully and completely supported by substantial evidence in the record as a whole.

SECTION 8: Limitations. The City Council’s analysis and evaluation of the project is based on the best information currently available. It is inevitable that in evaluating a project that absolute and perfect knowledge of all possible aspects of the project will not exist. One of the major limitations on analysis of the project is the City Council and Planning Commission’s lack of knowledge of future events. In all instances, best efforts have been made to form accurate assumptions. Somewhat related to this are the limitations on the City’s ability to solve what are in effect regional, state, and national problems and issues. The City must work within the political framework within which it exists and with the limitations inherent in that framework.

SECTION 9: Summaries of Information. All summaries of information in the findings, which precede this section, are based on the substantial evidence in the record. The absence of any particular fact from any such summary is not an indication that a particular finding is not based in part on that fact.
SECTION 10: This Resolution will remain effective until superseded by a subsequent resolution.

SECTION 11: According to the El Segundo Municipal Code, a copy of this Resolution shall be mailed to CDC Mar Campus, LLC and to any other person requesting a copy.

SECTION 12: This Resolution is the City Council's final decision and will become effective immediately upon adoption.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 3rd day of March, 2015.

Suzanne Fuentes, Mayor

ATTEST:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES ) SS
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO )

I, Tracy Weaver, City Clerk of the City of El Segundo, California, do hereby certify that the whole number of members of the City Council of said City is five; that the foregoing Resolution No. ____ was duly passed, approved and adopted by said City Council at a regular meeting held on the ____ day of March, 2015, approved and signed by the Mayor, and attested to by the City Clerk, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Tracy Weaver, City Clerk

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

By: Karl H. Berger, Assistant City Attorney
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CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. ___ EXHIBIT “A”

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

In addition to all applicable provisions of the El Segundo Municipal Code (“ESMC”) and such previous conditions of approval for the Project that are applicable, CDC Mar Campus, LLC, and its successor-in-interest, agrees that it will comply with the following provisions as conditions for the City’s approval of Environmental Assessment No. EA-1091 and Subdivision No. SUB 14-11 (Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287) (“Project Conditions”).

1. The project must comply with the conditions of approval in Council Resolution No. 4582 and Council Ordinance No. 1492.

2. The vesting tentative map will expire pursuant to Government Code § 66452.6 and ESMC § 14-1-12.

INDEMNIFICATION

3. CDC Mar Campus, LLC agrees to indemnify and hold the City harmless from and against any claim, action, damages, costs (including, without limitation, attorney’s fees), injuries, or liability, arising from the City’s approval of Environmental Assessment No. EA-1091 and Subdivision No. SUB 14-11 (Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287). Should the City or any representative of the City be named in any suit, or should any claim be brought against it by suit or otherwise, whether the same be groundless or not, arising out of the City approval of Environmental Assessment No. EA-1091 and Subdivision No. SUB 14-11 (Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287), CDC Mar Campus, LLC agrees to defend the City (at the City’s request and with counsel satisfactory to the City) and will indemnify the City for any judgment rendered against it or any sums paid out in settlement or otherwise. For purposes of this section, “the City” includes the City of El Segundo’s elected officials, appointed officials, officers, and employees.

4. CDC Mar Campus, LLC must acknowledge receipt and acceptance of the Project Conditions by executing the acknowledgement below.

By signing this document, CDC Mar Campus, LLC certifies that it has read, understood, and agrees to the Project Conditions listed in this document.

Richard C. Lundquist, President
CDC Mar Campus, LLC

Leonard E. Blakeley, Jr.
Executive Vice President and Secretary
CDC Mar Campus, LLC

{If Corporation or similar entity, need two officer signatures or evidence that one signature binds the company}
FINDING OF CONSISTENCY WITH GENERAL PLAN AND ADDENDUM TO THE FEIR FOR THE CORPORATE CAMPUS SPECIFIC PLAN DEVELOPMENT

CITY OF EL SEGUNDO

MODIFICATION OF VESTING TENTATIVE MAP NO. 72287 TO AMEND MAP TO REDUCE THE AREA FROM 23.87 ACRES TO 13 ACRES AND REDUCE THE NUMBER OF LOTS FROM 32 LOTS TO 24 LOTS IN THE CORPORATE CAMPUS SPECIFIC PLAN (CCSP) ZONE

March 2015

The City of El Segundo has received applications proposing to amend Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 to reduce the area of the tentative map from 23.87 acre to 13 acres and reduce the number of lots from 32 lots to 24 lots in the Corporate Campus Specific Plan (CCSP) Zone. Applications are Environmental Assessment No. EA-1091 and Subdivision No. SUB 14-11 (Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287).

The proposal to modify the vesting tentative map constitutes a “project” under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Thus, environmental review is required pursuant to CEQA (Public Resources Code §§ 21000 et seq.), the State CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal. Code of Regs. §§ 15000, et seq.), and the City of El Segundo CEQA Guidelines. This document serves as the project environmental documentation pursuant to CEQA.

Background

In 1992, El Segundo adopted a comprehensive update of its General Plan, which included the required elements. The 1992 General Plan and its subsequent amendments set forth policy for land use development in El Segundo and within its sphere of influence. Additionally, on January 2, 2002, the El Segundo City Council certified the FEIR, entitled El Segundo Corporate Campus Project Development Final Environmental Impact Report and adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations as Section 4 of City Council Resolution No. 4241 for the El Segundo Corporate Campus development. Further, the El Segundo City Council and on December 2, 2013 adopted an Addendum to the FEIR and re-adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations as Section 3 of City Council Resolution No. 4852.

The circumstances, impacts, and mitigation requirements identified in the General Plan EIR and the certified FEIR and Addendum for the Corporate Campus development remain applicable to the proposed amendments and the amendments do not raise any new issues and do not cause the level of impacts identified in the General Plan EIR to be exceeded. Specifically, the Addendum will allow for the development of up 930,025 and the modified tentative map will not impact the 930,025 square feet of development. Amending the tentative map to reduce the map area and the number lots will not impact the project or the subdivision requirements as set forth in the certified FEIR and Addendum for the Corporate Campus development.

Exhibit B

Finding of Consistency
Relationship of the Modified Vesting Tentative Map to the General Plan

The proposed amendment to the vesting tentative map will not impact the project's ability to implement the goals, objectives, and policies and programs outlined in the 1992 General Plan, which include the Economic Development Element, Land Use Element, Circulation Element, Open Space and Recreation Element, Conservation, Air Quality Element, Noise Element, and Public Safety Element of the General Plan. The maximum floor area ratio (FAR) within the Corporate Campus Specific Plan is limited to 0.99:1. The amendment to the tentative map does not propose any changes to the FAR limits established for the project and will be developed with a FAR of 0.38:1. Adoption of the proposed amendment to Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 will not provide for any new development beyond the previous approvals nor beyond that anticipated by land use policy set forth in the 1992 General Plan Update and the subsequent 2005 update of the Land Use Element.

Specifically, the proposed amendment to Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 is consistent with all the goals, objectives, and policies and programs of the General Plan's Economic Development Element, Land Use Element, Circulation Element, Open Space and Recreation Element, Conservation, Air Quality Element, Noise Element, and Public Safety Element.

Environmental Analysis

The proposed amendment to Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 is consistent with the FEIR, entitled El Segundo Corporate Campus, certified by the City Council on January 2, 2002 and the Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted as Section 4 of City Council Resolution No. 4241 and by the Addendum to the FEIR and re-adopted Statement of Overriding Considerations as Section 3 of City Council Resolution No. 4852, which was adopted on December 2, 2013.

CEQA Guidelines § 15168(c)(2) states that if a project is proposed which has been the subject of a prior certified EIR or adopted Negative Declaration, and "if the [City] finds that pursuant to Guidelines § 15162, no new effects could occur or new mitigation measures would be required, the [City] can approve the activity as being within the scope of the project covered by the program EIR, and no new environmental document would be required."

Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines defines the conditions under which a subsequent EIR would be required for a project as follows:

1. Substantial changes are proposed in the project which require major revisions of the EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

2. Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to
involved in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; and/or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was adopted, shows any of the following:

1. The revised project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR;
2. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
3. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
4. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

As stated above, the proposed amendment to Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 will not result in any land use policy change; thus, the project will not facilitate the creation of any additional development beyond that anticipated and accounted for at build-out by current land use policy in the General Plan or the approved FEIR and Addendum for the Corporate Campus development. The proposed amendments will not result in any new environmental effect not already considered in the approved FEIR and Addendum.

Findings

Based on the above analysis, the City Council makes the following findings:

1. In 1992, the City of El Segundo adopted a comprehensive General Plan update and certified a Final EIR.

2. In 2002, the City of El Segundo certified a Final EIR and adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Corporate Campus development.

3. In 2013, the City of El Segundo adopted an Addendum to the Final EIR and re-adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Corporate Campus development.

4. On February 12, 2015, the City of El Segundo Planning Commission recommended that the City Council find that a new environmental document is not required for the proposed project modifications pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15168(c)(2) since these changes would not result in any new or increased environmental impacts or require new mitigation measures.

5. The proposed modification to Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 will not facilitate the
creation of any development beyond that anticipated and accounted for by the adopted General Plan or the certified Final EIR and Addendum for the Corporate Campus development. The Corporate Campus Specific Plan sets a maximum FAR of 0.99:1 and the certified Final EIR and Addendum to the FEIR for the Corporate Campus development sets a maximum building area of 930,025 square feet, which will not be impacted as a result of the modification to the vesting tentative map. The proposed amendments consist of reducing land area within Tentative Vesting Map No. 72287 and reducing the amount of lots and will not result in additional floor area as the amendment does change or alter any buildings either proposed or existing.

6. The proposed amendment is limited to modifications to the vesting tentative map.

7. Adoption of proposed modification to Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 will not result in any new or increased environmental effects, and no new mitigation measures are required.

8. Pursuant to Section 151689(c)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, no new environmental documentation is required for adoption of the amendments to the ESMC.
Exhibit "B"

Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287
Approved December, 2013 EA-1021
32 Lots
23.87 Acres
Exhibit "C"

Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287
EA-1091 and SUB 14-11
24 Lots
13 Acres

NOTE: For reduced size prints, original scale is in inches
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO

PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

PUBLIC HEARING: February 12, 2015

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment No. EA-1091 and Subdivision No. SUB 14-11 (Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287)

APPLICANT: CDC Mar Campus LLC – William Messori

PROPERTY OWNER: CDC Mar Campus LLC – William Messori

REQUEST: Request to modify a Vesting Tentative Map affecting the Corporate Campus project area by reducing the number of lots from 32 lots to 24 and the area reduced from 23.87 acres to 13 acres.

PROPERTY INVOLVED: 710 North Nash Street (Area bounded by Maple Ave to the north, Campus Drive to the south, Douglas Street to the east, and Campus Square West to the west)

I. Introduction

In 2002, the City Council approved the Corporate Campus development project (the "Original Project"). The Original Project (EA-548) allows development of up to 2,175,000 square feet of office, light industrial, retail, restaurant, health club, hotel/conference, medical/dental office, and day care uses, along with public recreational facilities and a City fire station and retail on a 46.5 acre site. Building heights range from low-rise (1-2 story) to mid-rise (4-6 stories). The Original Project has a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of .99. The Original Project Site (46.5–acres) boundaries are Atwood Way to the north, Douglas Street to the east, Nash Street to the west, and Mariposa Avenue to the south (the "Site"). The Original Project includes internal private streets for circulation purposes. The application included a subdivision (Vesting Tentative Map No. 53570) for a maximum of 26 parcels.

On December 3, 2013 the City Council approved a 625,205 square-foot development project (the "Revised Project") that would be developed in 3 phases under Environmental Assessment No. EA-1021, Specific Plan Amendment No. SP 13-02, Subdivision No. SUB 13-05 (Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287), and Development Agreement No. DA 13-01, which modified a portion of the Original Project’s 46.5 acre area approved in EA-548 in 2002. An Addendum to the previously Certified Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) was prepared for EA-1021 and was also approved.
Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 was comprised of 23.87 acres and 32 parcels and the Revised Project was going to be developed in three phases (Phase 1: 13 acres; Phase 2: 5.87 acres; and Phase 3: 5 acres). Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 has not been recorded. The Applicant is proposing to modify Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 to reduce the area of the map to only include the development of Phase 1 (the "Eleven Project"). The Eleven Project which is comprised of 217,637 square feet of office and retail uses located in 17 two-story buildings and is currently under construction will not change as a result of the proposed modification to the vesting tentative map. The proposed revised tentative map will include 13 acres and it will be comprised of 24 lots. The Phase 3 area of the vesting tentative map has been sold to EVA Airways and the Phase 2 area is pending sale by the applicant to the Lakers.

The applicant is requesting the change to the map because the parcel boundaries along Campus Drive in the existing approval do not align with the parcel boundaries of the area of land that the applicant is selling to the Lakers which encompasses the block bounded by Campus Drive to the north, Mariposa Avenue to the south, Parkview Drive South to the west, and Douglas Street to the east exclusive of the City's Fire Station No. 2 parcel. If the requested subdivision modification is not approved it would delay the schedule for processing the Lakers project and require processing an additional tentative map. If the modified map boundaries are approved, the Phase 2 and Phase 3 areas will remain part of the original subdivision (Vesting Tentative Map No. 53570).

II. Recommendation

Planning staff recommends that the Planning Commission conduct a public hearing; consider the documentary and testimonial evidence including this report; and then adopt Resolution No. 2768 (Exhibit 1) recommending that the City Council approve Environmental Assessment No. EA-1091 and Subdivision No. SUB 14-11 (Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287).

III. Project Description

The Project consists of the following:

1. Environmental Assessment No. EA-1091 - An Addendum to the certified Final Environmental Impact Report was approved by the City Council in 2013. The proposed modification to the vesting tentative map to reduce the area and number of lots would not require a new environmental document pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines § 15168(c)2 since the proposed modifications to Vesting Map No. 72287 would not result in any new or increased environmental impacts or require new mitigation measures. A Notice of Consistency with the EIR and Addendum to the FEIR is proposed for the requested modification to the vesting tentative map.

2. Subdivision No. SUB 14-11 (Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287) - A subdivision modification request is proposed involving a reduction in the area and the number of parcels from 32 to 24:
a) The previously approved Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 was comprised of 23.87 acres within the 46.5 acre CCSP area and created 32 lots and;
b) Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 superseded Tract Map No. 53570 for the 23.87 acre portion of the site and the total lot count within the 46.5 acre CCSP area was 46 lots, which included existing, proposed development, and future development.

If approved, the Project would allow the applicant to record the tentative map with the County of Los Angeles reflecting what is currently under construction (the Elevon Project) on the lots owned by the Applicant and proposed under the modified vesting tentative map.

IV. Analysis

The parcels in the proposed 13-acre modified subdivision are bounded by Campus Square West to the west, Douglas Street to the east, Maple Avenue to the north, and Campus Drive to the south. The proposed modified Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 will retain the same centerline to the street boundary for lots abutting the private streets within the project site.

The surrounding properties are a mix of heavy industrial, vacant land, and multi-story office buildings. The surrounding land uses and zoning are described as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North: Office/Retail/Restaurant</td>
<td>CCSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South: Vacant Land/Soccer Field/Fire Station</td>
<td>CCSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East: Manufacturing (Northrop Grumman)</td>
<td>MU-N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West: Hyatt Place Hotel and Vacant Land</td>
<td>CCSP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the lots proposed under modified Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 will with the required minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet and the minimum frontage as required by the CCSP. The CCSP has a maximum FAR of 0.99, however, individual parcels are permitted to exceed the 0.99 FAR by transferring development rights for FAR from other parcels within the CCSP area. Four of the lots (Lot Nos. 2, 3, 13, and 15) will be developed with an FAR that exceeds the .99 FAR. Any transfer of floor area from one parcel to another parcel will be recorded by covenant as required in the CCSP. The overall FAR for the 13-acre modified Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 will be 0.38:1.

Findings for Denial of a Subdivision

ESMC § 14-1-6 allows the Planning Commission to deny a request for a subdivision map only if it makes any of the findings consistent with Government Code § 66474. Based upon the administrative record, it does not appear that any facts would support findings for denial (see findings in attached draft Resolution) for the proposed modification of Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287. The vesting tentative map would expire twenty-four months after approval or conditional approval but may be extended for a period not to exceed five years, pursuant to Government Code § 66452.6 and
ESMC § 14-1-12. The development rights expire when the vesting tentative map expires unless a final map is approved before the expiration date.

V. Zoning, General Plan, and Specific Plan Consistency

The El Segundo General Plan land use and zoning designation for the Project Site is Corporate Campus Specific Plan. The proposed modification of Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 involves the adjustment of property lines and will not impact compliance with the development standards for the project that was previously approved Under EA-1021 in 2013. In addition, the proposed modification to Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 does not propose to add any new floor area to the previously approved project and thus will remain consistent with CCSP zone development standards and the relevant Element Goals, Objectives and Policies of the City of El Segundo General Plan as specified in the attached draft resolution.

VI. Environmental Review

On January 2, 2002, the City Council certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) and adopted a Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program. On November 19, 2013, the City Council approved an addendum to the FEIR for the proposed Project under EA-1021.

CEQA Guidelines § 15168(c)(2) states that if a project is proposed which has been the subject of a prior certified EIR or adopted Negative Declaration, and "If the City finds that pursuant to Guidelines § 15162, no new effects could occur or new mitigation measures would be required, the [City] can approve the activity as being within the scope of the project covered by the program EIR, and no new environmental document would be required."

The proposed modification to Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 is consistent with the FEIR, certified by the City Council on January 2, 2002 and the Addendum to the Certified FEIR adopted by the City Council on November 19, 2013. None of the elements set forth in Public Resources Code § 21166 or CEQA Guidelines § 15162 exists since the proposed modification to Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 does not result in changes in uses and development standards and would therefore not result in a new significant impact to the environment or require new mitigation measures. Accordingly, no subsequent or supplemental Environmental Impact Report, Mitigated Negative Declaration or Addendum is required to be prepared before approving the modification to Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287. Staff has prepared a Notice of Consistency for the project.

VII. Conclusion

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the proposed project, subject to the conditions contained in Draft Resolution No. 2768.
VIII. Exhibits

1. Draft Planning Commission Resolution No. 2768
2. Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287

Prepared by: Louis Morales, Planning Consultant

Kimberly Christensen, AICP, Planning Manager
Planning and Building Safety Department

Sam Lee, Director
Planning and Building Safety Department
RESOLUTION NO. 2768

A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. EA-1091 AND SUBDIVISION NO. SUB 14-11 (VESTING TENTATIVE MAP NO. 72287) FOR THE MODIFICATION OF VESTING TENTATIVE MAP NO. 72287 AFFECTING THE CORPORATE CAMPUS PROJECT AREA.

The Planning Commission of the City of El Segundo does resolve as follows:

SECTION 1: The Planning Commission finds and declares that:

A. On October 15, 2014, CDC Mar Campus LLC, Inc. (the "Applicant") filed applications for an Environmental Assessment No. EA-1091 and Subdivision No. Sub 14-11 (Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287) to modify a previously approved Vesting Tentative Map (No. 72287) regulating the Corporate Campus project area (the "Project"). The Project would reduce the land area from 23.87 acres to 13 acres and reduce the number of lots from 32 lots to 24 lots. The remaining land (10.87 acres) is subject to the requirements of Vesting Tentative Map No. 53570 (the original subdivision for the entire 46.5-acre Corporate Campus Specific Plan Area);

B. The Project was reviewed by the City’s Planning and Building Safety Department for, in part, consistency with the General Plan, Corporate Campus Specific Plan, and conformity with the El Segundo Municipal Code (“ESMC”);

C. In addition, the City reviewed the project’s environmental impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code §§ 21000, et seq., “CEQA”), the regulations promulgated thereunder (14 Cal. Code of Regulations §§15000, et seq., the “CEQA Guidelines”), and the City’s Environmental Guidelines (City Council Resolution No. 3805, adopted March 16, 1993);

D. The Planning and Building Safety Department completed its review and scheduled a public hearing regarding the project before the Planning Commission for February 12, 2015;

E. On February 12, 2015, the Commission opened a public hearing to receive public testimony and other evidence regarding the applications including, without limitation, information provided to the Commission by City Staff, public testimony, and representatives of CDC Mar Campus LLC;

F. This Resolution and its findings are made based upon the testimony and evidence presented to the Commission at its February 12, 2015 public
hearing including, without limitation, the staff report submitted by the Planning and Building Safety Department.

SECTION 2: Factual Findings and Conclusions. The Planning Commission finds that the following facts exist and makes these conclusions:

A. The proposed subdivision is proposed on an approximately 23.87-acre portion of the 46.5-acre Corporate Campus Project site located in the northeast portion of the City of El Segundo. The proposed subdivision would create 24 lots.

B. The 46.5-acre project site (Corporate Campus Project Site) which includes the 23.87 acres in the proposed revised Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287, has a Corporate Campus land use designation and the zoning designation is the Corporate Campus Specific Plan. The FAR for the Corporate Campus land use designation is 0.99:1 and would permit up to 2,175,000 square feet of development. The Revised Project included approximately 625,205 square feet of new commercial office and retail development that will be developed at a 0.60:1 FAR.

C. The modification of Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 under SUB No. 14-11 will reduce the land area from 23.87 acres to 13 acres and will only include the Phase 1 area of the previously approved Revised Project. Phase 1 is comprised of the 217,637 square-foot Elevon project. The Elevon Project will not be affected by the proposed modifications to Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 relative to building location, building size, and setbacks. The Elevon Project will be developed with a FAR of 0.38:1. The lots proposed under the modified Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 will meet the development standards under the CCSP for lot size, lot frontage, and will have a maximum of 24 lots.

D. The Corporate Campus Specific Plan Zone allows for the transfer of density rights within the development area to insure that the overall density of the site is consistent with the Corporate Specific Plan Zoning. Any donor parcels for FAR purposes will have covenants recorded stating the maximum FAR permitted on the parcel.

E. Ingress and egress will not be affected and will continue to be provided from driveways with direct access from Douglas Street, Maple Avenue, Mariposa Avenue, and through driveways that have access through the existing internal private streets.

F. Parking will continue to be located on surface parking lots for all development phases including the new Phase 1 area under modified Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 and will meet the City's parking requirements.
G. The modification of Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 will not require any new conditions of approval or require the amendment or modification of existing conditions of approval. EA-1091 and SUB No. 14-11 (Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287) must comply with the Conditions of Approval established for the Original Project and Revised Project as approved in 2002 by Planning Commission Resolution No. 2517, City Council Resolution 4241, and Ordinance No. 1345 and as amended in 2013 by Planning Commission Resolution No. 2739, City Council Resolution No. 4582, and Ordinance 1492.

SECTION 3: Environmental Assessment. The Planning Commission makes the following environmental findings:

A. The City Council certified a Final EIR (FEIR) on January 2, 2002 for the Corporate Campus project.

B. The City Council approved an Addendum to the FEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15090 on December 3, 2013 as none of the conditions in CEQA Guidelines § 15162 requiring a subsequent or supplemental EIR were determined to be present. No new significant effects will result from the revised project. No significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the FEIR in accordance with CEQA Guidelines § 15164(a).

C. In accordance with § 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines, the record on which the Planning Commission's findings are based is located at the Planning and Building Safety Department, City of El Segundo, 350 Main Street, El Segundo, California 90245. The custodian of records is the Director of Planning and Building Safety.

D. The Planning Commission finds that a new environmental document is not required for the proposed modification to Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15168(c)(2) as the proposed modifications to the modified Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 would not result in any new or increased environmental impacts or require new mitigation measures already established in the Certified FEIR and Addendum to the Certified FEIR that were previously approved.

E. Because of the facts identified in this Resolution, the environmental review requires that a Finding of Consistency with the General Plan and Addendum to the Certified FEIR be completed in order for the project to be approved.

SECTION 4: General Plan and Specific Plan. The proposed project conforms with the General Plan as follows:
A. The General Plan contains a number of relevant Goals, Objectives, and Policies. The Original and Revised Project listed a number of Goals, Objectives, and Policies that were consistent with the Economic Development Element, Land Use Element, Circulation Element, Open Space and Recreation Element, Conservation, Air Quality Element, Noise Element, and Public Safety Element of the General Plan. The modification of Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 will not affect the project's ability to meet the established Goals, Objectives, and Policies of the General Plan.

B. The modification of the Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 will only affect parcel configuration and the number of lots created. The proposed revised subdivision will be subject to the same conditions of approval previously established under City Council Resolution No. 4241 and 4582 respectively and Ordinance No. 1345 and Ordinance No. 1482 with a few added conditions to ensure compliance with the requirements of the General Plan and the Corporate Campus Specific Plan.

SECTION 5: Subdivision. The Planning Commission cannot make any of the findings for denial set forth in ESMC § 14-1-6 for the following reasons:

A. The proposed modified map is consistent with applicable general and specific plans as specified in Government Code § 65451. As set forth in Section 4, this project meets the goals and objectives of the General Plan.

B. The design of the proposed subdivision is consistent with applicable general and specific plans. As set forth in Section 4, this project meets the goals and objectives of the General Plan.

C. The site is physically suitable for the type of development. As set forth in Section 4, this project meets the goals and objectives of the General Plan.

D. The site is physically suitable for the proposed density of development. The proposed project is for the construction of a 217,637 square-foot commercial office and retail development.

E. The design of the subdivision or the proposed improvements are unlikely to cause substantial damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat. The proposed project site is located in an urbanized area. The new commercial office and retail development is not likely to result in any substantial environmental damage or cause injury to fish or wildlife or their habitat.

F. The design of the subdivision or type of improvements is unlikely to cause serious public health problems. There is no evidence demonstrating that
the proposed new commercial office and retail development is likely to cause any serious public health problem.

G. The design of the subdivision or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through or use of property within the proposed subdivision. The subdivision of the property for the new commercial office and retail development will not conflict with any known easements located at, or near the property.

SECTION 6: Recommendations.

A. Subject to the existing conditions established under Resolution No. 4582 and Ordinance No. 1492 and the additional conditions in attached Exhibit “A,” the Planning Commission recommends that the City Council adopt a Finding of Consistency, with the General Plan and Addendum to the Certified FEIR, attached as Exhibit “B.”

B. Subject to the existing conditions previously established under Resolution No. 4582 and Ordinance No. 1492 and the additional conditions in attached Exhibit “A,” the Planning Commission recommends that the City Council approve Environmental Assessment No. EA-1091 and Subdivision No. SUB 14-11 (Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287).

SECTION 7: Reliance on Record. Each and every one of the findings and determinations in this Resolution are based on the competent and substantial evidence, both oral and written, contained in the entire record relating to the project. The findings and determinations constitute the independent findings and determinations of the Planning Commission in all respects and are fully and completely supported by substantial evidence in the record as a whole.

SECTION 8: Limitations. The Planning Commission’s analysis and evaluation of the project is based on the best information currently available. It is inevitable that in evaluating a project that absolute and perfect knowledge of all possible aspects of the project will not exist. One of the major limitations on analysis of the project is the Planning Commission’s lack of knowledge of future events. In all instances, best efforts have been made to form accurate assumptions. Somewhat related to this are the limitations on the City’s ability to solve what are in effect regional, state, and national problems and issues. The City must work within the political framework within which it exists and with the limitations inherent in that framework.

SECTION 9: Summaries of Information. All summaries of information in the findings, which precede this section, are based on the substantial evidence in the record. The absence of any particular fact from any such summary is not an indication that a particular finding is not based in part on that fact.
SECTION 10: This Resolution will remain effective until superseded by a subsequent resolution.

SECTION 11: According to the El Segundo Municipal Code, a copy of this Resolution shall be mailed to CDC Mar Campus, LLC and to any other person requesting a copy.

SECTION 12: This Resolution is the Planning Commission's final decision and will become effective immediately upon adoption.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 12th day of February, 2015.

David Wagner, Chairperson
City of El Segundo Planning Commission

ATTEST:

__________________________
Sam Lee, Secretary

__________________________
Wagner
Baldino
Newman
Nicol
Nisley

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

By: _______________________
Karl H. Berger, Assistant City Attorney
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PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. _____ EXHIBIT "A"

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

In addition to all applicable provisions of the El Segundo Municipal Code ("ESMC") and such previous conditions of approval for the Project that are applicable, CDC Mar Campus, LLC, and its successor-in-interest, agrees that it will comply with the following provisions as conditions for the City's approval of Environmental Assessment No. EA-1091 and Subdivision No. 14-11 (Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287) ("Project Conditions").

1. The project must comply with the conditions of approval in Council Resolution No. 4582 and Council Ordinance No. 1492.

2. The vesting tentative map will expire pursuant to Government Code § 66452.6 and ESMC § 14-1-12.

INDEMNIFICATION

3. CDC Mar Campus, LLC agrees to indemnify and hold the City harmless from and against any claim, action, damages, costs (including, without limitation, attorney's fees), injuries, or liability, arising from the City's approval of Environmental Assessment No. EA-1091 and Subdivision No. SUB 14-11 (Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287). Should the City or any representative of the City be named in any suit, or should any claim be brought against it by suit or otherwise, whether the same be groundless or not, arising out of the City approval of Environmental Assessment No. EA-1091 and Subdivision No. SUB 13-05 (Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287), CDC Mar Campus, LLC agrees to defend the City (at the City's request and with counsel satisfactory to the City) and will indemnify the City for any judgment rendered against it or any sums paid out in settlement or otherwise. For purposes of this section, "the City" includes the City of El Segundo's elected officials, appointed officials, officers, and employees.

4. CDC Mar Campus, LLC must acknowledge receipt and acceptance of the Project Conditions by executing the acknowledgement below.

By signing this document, CDC Mar Campus, LLC certifies that it has read, understood, and agrees to the Project Conditions listed in this document.

Richard C. Lundquist, President
CDC Mar Campus, LLC

Leonard E. Blakeley, Jr.
Executive Vice President and Secretary
CDC Mar Campus, LLC

{If Corporation or similar entity, need two officer signatures or evidence that one signature binds the company}
FINDING OF CONSISTENCY WITH GENERAL PLAN AND ADDENDUM TO THE
FEIR FOR THE CORPORATE CAMPUS SPECIFIC PLAN DEVELOPMENT

CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
MODIFICATION OF VESTING TENTATIVE MAP NO. 72287 TO AMEND MAP TO
REDUCE THE AREA FROM 23.87 ACRES TO 13 ACRES AND REDUCE THE
NUMBER OF LOTS FROM 32 LOTS TO 24 LOTS IN THE CORPORATE CAMPUS
SPECIFIC PLAN (CCSP) ZONE

February 2015

The City of El Segundo has received applications proposing to amend Vesting Tentative
Map No. 72287 to reduce the area of the tentative map from 23.87 acre to 13 acres and
reduce the number of lots from 32 lots to 24 lots in the Corporate Campus Specific Plan
(CCSP) Zone. Applications are Environmental Assessment No. EA-1091 and Subdivision
No. SUB 14-11 (Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287)

The proposal to modify the vesting tentative map constitutes a "project" under the
California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Thus, environmental review is required
pursuant to CEQA (Public Resources Code §§ 21000 et seq.), the State CEQA Guidelines
This document serves as the project environmental documentation pursuant to CEQA.

Background

In 1992, El Segundo adopted a comprehensive update of its General Plan, which included
the required elements. The 1992 General Plan and its subsequent amendments set forth
policy for land use development in El Segundo and within its sphere of influence.
Additionally, on January 2, 2002, the El Segundo City Council certified the FEIR, entitled
El Segundo Corporate Campus Project Development Final Environmental Impact Report
and adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations as Section 4 of City Council
Resolution No. 4241 for the El Segundo Corporate Campus development. Further, the El
Segundo City Council and on December 2, 2013 adopted an Addendum to the FEIR and
re-adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations as Section 3 of City Council
Resolution No. 4852.

The circumstances, impacts, and mitigation requirements identified in the General Plan
EIR and the certified FEIR and Addendum for the Corporate Campus development remain
applicable to the proposed amendments and the amendments do not raise any new issues
and do not cause the level of impacts identified in the General Plan EIR to be exceeded.
Specifically, the Addendum will allow for the development of up 930,025 and the modified
tentative map will not impact the 930,025 square feet of development. Amending the
tentative map to reduce the map area and the number lots will not impact the project or the
subdivision requirements as set forth in the certified FEIR and Addendum for the Corporate
Campus development.
Relationship of the Modified Vesting Tentative Map to the General Plan

The proposed amendment to the vesting tentative map will not impact the project’s ability to implement the goals, objectives, and policies and programs outlined in the 1992 General Plan, which include the Economic Development Element, Land Use Element, Circulation Element, Open Space and Recreation Element, Conservation, Air Quality Element, Noise Element, and Public Safety Element of the General Plan. The maximum floor area ratio (FAR) within the Corporate Campus Specific Plan is limited to 0.99:1. The amendment to the tentative map does not propose any changes to the FAR limits established for the project and will be developed with a FAR of 0.38:1. Adoption of the proposed amendment to Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 will not provide for any new development beyond the previous approvals nor beyond that anticipated by land use policy set forth in the 1992 General Plan Update and the subsequent 2005 update of the Land Use Element.

Specifically, the proposed amendment to Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 is consistent with all the goals, objectives, and policies and programs of the General Plan’s Economic Development Element, Land Use Element, Circulation Element, Open Space and Recreation Element, Conservation, Air Quality Element, Noise Element, and Public Safety Element.

Environmental Analysis

The proposed amendment to Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 is consistent with the FEIR, entitled El Segundo Corporate Campus, certified by the City Council on January 2, 2002 and the Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted as Section 4 of City Council Resolution No. 4241 and by the Addendum to the FEIR and re-adopted Statement of Overriding Considerations as Section 3 of City Council Resolution No. 4852, which was adopted on December 2, 2013.

CEQA Guidelines § 15168(c)(2) states that if a project is proposed which has been the subject of a prior certified EIR or adopted Negative Declaration, and “[i]f the [City] finds that pursuant to Guidelines § 15162, no new effects could occur or new mitigation measures would be required, the [City] can approve the activity as being within the scope of the project covered by the program EIR, and no new environmental document would be required.”

Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines defines the conditions under which a subsequent EIR would be required for a project as follows:

1. **Substantial changes are proposed in the project which require major revisions of the EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;**

2. **Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to**
involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; and/or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was adopted, shows any of the following:

1. The revised project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR;

2. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

3. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

4. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

As stated above, the proposed amendment to Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 will not result in any land use policy change; thus, the project will not facilitate the creation of any additional development beyond that anticipated and accounted for at build-out by current land use policy in the General Plan or the approved FEIR and Addendum for the Corporate Campus development. The proposed amendments will not result in any new environmental effect not already considered in the approved FEIR and Addendum.

Findings

Based on the above analysis, the City Council makes the following findings:

1. In 1992, the City of El Segundo adopted a comprehensive General Plan update and certified a Final EIR.

2. In 2002, the City of El Segundo certified a Final EIR and adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Corporate Campus development.

3. In 2013, the City of El Segundo adopted an Addendum to the Final EIR and re-adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Corporate Campus development.

4. The proposed modification to Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 will not facilitate the creation of any development beyond that anticipated and accounted for by the adopted General Plan or the certified Final EIR and Addendum for the Corporate Campus development. The Corporate Campus Specific Plan sets a maximum FAR of 0.99:1 and the certified Final EIR and Addendum to the FEIR for the Corporate Campus development sets a maximum building area of 930,025 square feet, which will not be impacted as a result of the modification to the vesting tentative map. The proposed
amendments consist of reducing land area within Tentative Vesting Map No. 72287 and reducing the amount of lots and will not result in additional floor area as the amendment does change or alter any buildings either proposed or existing.

5. The proposed amendment is limited to modifications to the vesting tentative map.

6. Adoption of proposed modification to Vesting Tentative Map No. 72287 will not result in any new or increased environmental effects, and no new mitigation measures are required.

7. Pursuant to Section 151689(c)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, no new environmental documentation is required for adoption of the amendments to the ESMC.
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2015-03-03 CC AGENDA PACKET
ITEM #1 - ATTACHMENT #6
AVAILABLE IN CITY CLERK'S OFFICE
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action to direct staff to carry out various activities in preparation for the potential name change of Sepulveda Blvd. to Pacific Coast Highway in the City of El Segundo. (Fiscal Impact: None)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
1. Direct staff to carry out various activities in preparation of the potential name change of Sepulveda Blvd. to Pacific Coast Highway within the City of El Segundo city limits.
2. Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
None

FISCAL IMPACT: None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Budgeted:</th>
<th>$0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Appropriation:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Number(s):</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORIGINATED BY: Stephanie Katsouleas, Public Works Director
REVIEWED BY: Stephanie Katsouleas, Public Works Director
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

In the fall of 2013, staff was directed to investigate what would be required by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in order to change the name of Sepulveda Blvd. to Pacific Coast Highway. Caltrans first confirmed that changing the street name is feasible because Sepulveda Blvd. is already officially designed as Highway 1 (i.e., Pacific Coast Highway) by the California State Legislature, the governing body that oversees naming of the state’s highway systems. In pursuit of an official name change, Caltrans also indicated that the City would need to take several preliminary steps, including conducting outreach to and receiving support from a majority of affected property/business owners (due to the name/address change), approving the request for a name change through a City Council formal action (e.g., resolution of support) and submitting a formal request to Caltrans. The agency also indicated that submitting a request in concert with Manhattan Beach would be desirable for consistency purposes.

Staff presented an overview of the qualifying criteria at a joint City Council/Economic Development Advisory Committee (EDAC) meeting held on October 23, 2013. At that meeting staff was directed to bring the item back to the full City Council for consideration and direction. On November 19, 2019 staff was given direction to proceed with a preliminary survey to gauge support among businesses and property owners along the Sepulveda corridor and to outreach to
Manhattan Beach to determine whether it is interested participating with El Segundo in a joint application to Caltrans. In the spring of 2014, staff sent out 509 survey mailers to businesses and property owners, and set up a survey monkey website for respondents to utilize in lieu of returning the surveys. Staff also hosted a community workshop on May 6, 2014 whereupon only three organizations attended. In all, 86 survey responses were received, representing a 17% response rate. Their responses are listed in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sepulveda Blvd. Name Change Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Monkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (86)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the respondents, four were property owners, 73 were business owners, five were property managers and four declined to state their category.

Survey information was presented to the joint City Council/Economic Development Advisory Committee in the summer of 2014, but no formal action was taken or recommendation given at that time. However, recently EDAC raised the name-change possibility again and requested that staff seek City Council approval to proceed with the steps necessary to implement the renaming of Sepulveda Blvd. to Pacific Coast Hwy. Staff is therefore seeking direction from City Council on whether to proceed with this request. Necessary steps expected include:

1. Expanding survey efforts to ensure that a majority of property owners are reached and support the name change, as required by CalTrans. Detailed outreach to achieve a high response rate will require additional support beyond the City resources currently available.
2. Working with the post office to gather specific information about the lead time needed for implementation.
3. Submitting a formal request to CalTrans with a resolution of support adopted by City Council.
4. Establishing an implementation schedule and conducting detailed outreach to business owners about the pending name change.
5. Coordinating signage installation.

In all, staff estimates that this process will take approximately 12-18 months to complete given the lead time we expect businesses will want to ensure that costs and impacts to them are minimized. The post office allows for up to 18 months of transition time when street names are changed, which will help businesses minimize costs in planning for the transition.
## CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
### WARRANTS TOTALS BY FUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>GENERAL FUND</td>
<td>276,558.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>TRAFFIC SAFETY FUND</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>STATE GAS TAX FUND</td>
<td>11,352.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>ASSOCIATED RECREATION ACTIVITIES FUND</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>ASSET FORFEITURE FUND</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>COMM. DEVEL. BLOCK GRANT</td>
<td>2,945.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>PROP &quot;A&quot; TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>37.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>PROP &quot;C&quot; TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>AIR QUALITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>HOME SOUND INSTALLATION FUND</td>
<td>1,299,523.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>HYPERION MITIGATION FUND</td>
<td>37.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>TOA ARTICLE 3 - S8 821 BIKeway FUND</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>MTA GRANT</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>C.O.P.S. FUND</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>L.A.W.A. FUND</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>ASSESSMENT DISTRICT #73</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND</td>
<td>2,187.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>INFRASTRUCTURE REPLACEMENT FUND</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>FACILITIES MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>1,091.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>WATER UTILITY FUND</td>
<td>30,819.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>WASTEWATER FUND</td>
<td>38,357.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>GOLF COURSE FUND</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT</td>
<td>3,869.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>LIABILITY INSURANCE</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>WORKERS COMP. RESERV./INSURANCE</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701</td>
<td>RETIRED EMP. INSURANCE</td>
<td>611.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>EXPENDABLE TRUST FUND - DEVELOPER FEES</td>
<td>277.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703</td>
<td>EXPENDABLE TRUST FUND - OTHER</td>
<td>18,448.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708</td>
<td>OUTSIDE SERVICES TRUST</td>
<td>41.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL WARRANTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,686,787.57</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

Information on actual expenditures is available in the Director of Financial's office in the City of El Segundo.

I certify as to the accuracy of the Demands and the availability of fund for payment therefor.

For Approval: Regular checks held for City council authorization to release.

**CODES:**

**R** = Computer generated checks for all non-emergency/urgency payments for materials, supplies and services in support of City Operations

For Ratification:

**A** = Payroll and Employee Benefit checks

**B - F** = Computer generated Early Release disbursements and/or adjustments approved by the City Manager. Such as: payments for utility services, petty cash and employee travel expense reimbursements, various refunds, contract employee services consistent with current contractual agreements, instances where prompt payment discounts can be obtained or late payment penalties can be avoided or when a situation arises that the City Manager approves.

**H** = Handwritten Early Release disbursements and/or adjustments approved by the City Manager.

---

**FINANCE DIRECTOR**

**CITY MANAGER**

**DATE:** 2/23/15

**DATE:** 2 - 24 - 15

---

**VOID CHECKS DUE TO ALIGNMENT:**

N/A

**VOID CHECKS DUE TO INCORRECT CHECK DATE:**

**VOID CHECKS DUE TO COMPUTER SOFTWARE ERROR:**

**NOTES**

---

**Signature:** [Signature]

---
## CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
### PAYMENTS BY WIRE TRANSFER
#### 2/2/15 THROUGH 2/15/15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Payee</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/2/2015</td>
<td>IRS</td>
<td>230,094.36</td>
<td>Federal 941 Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2/2015</td>
<td>Employment Development</td>
<td>3,318.46</td>
<td>State SDI payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2/2015</td>
<td>Employment Development</td>
<td>47,446.41</td>
<td>State PIT Withholding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4/2015</td>
<td>Cal Pers</td>
<td>103,211.02</td>
<td>EFT Retirement Misc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4/2015</td>
<td>Cal Pers</td>
<td>269,732.86</td>
<td>EFT Retirement Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4/2015</td>
<td>Cal Pers</td>
<td>1,488.80</td>
<td>EFT Retirement Safety-Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4/2015</td>
<td>Cal Pers</td>
<td>8,786.16</td>
<td>EFT Retirement Misc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5/2015</td>
<td>Cal Pers</td>
<td>459,381.17</td>
<td>EFT Health Payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5/2015</td>
<td>Lane Donovan Golf Ptr</td>
<td>21,348.79</td>
<td>Payroll Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/6/2015</td>
<td>Health Comp</td>
<td>1,291.15</td>
<td>Weekly claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/10/2015</td>
<td>West Basin</td>
<td>1,621,780.37</td>
<td>H2O payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/13/2015</td>
<td>Health Comp</td>
<td>1,097.80</td>
<td>Weekly claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/13/2015</td>
<td>Manufacturers &amp; Traders</td>
<td>24,440.04</td>
<td>457 payment Vantagepoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/13/2015</td>
<td>Manufacturers &amp; Traders</td>
<td>477.31</td>
<td>ROTH IRA payment Vantagepoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/13/2015</td>
<td>Manufacturers &amp; Traders</td>
<td>5,356.55</td>
<td>401 payment Vantagepoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/13/2015</td>
<td>US Bank - Trust Acct</td>
<td>6,868.09</td>
<td>PARS payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/13/2015</td>
<td>South Bay Credit Union</td>
<td>12,630.38</td>
<td>Payroll credit union deduction pmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/13/2015</td>
<td>Nationwide NRS EFT</td>
<td>40,280.26</td>
<td>EFT 457 payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/13/2015</td>
<td>Nationwide NRS EFT</td>
<td>1,665.15</td>
<td>EFT 401a payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/13/2015</td>
<td>State of CA EFT</td>
<td>1,229.14</td>
<td>EFT Child support payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/15-2/6/15</td>
<td>Workers Comp Activity</td>
<td>18,538.00</td>
<td>SCRMA checks issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/15-2/13/15</td>
<td>Workers Comp Activity</td>
<td>30,019.15</td>
<td>SCRMA checks issued</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2,910,481.42**

### DATE OF RATIFICATION: 2/17/15
### TOTAL PAYMENTS BY WIRE: 2,910,481.42

Certified as to the accuracy of the wire transfers by:

Deputy City Treasurer II  
Date  
2/17/15

Director of Finance  
Date  
2/18/15

City Manager  
Date  
2/24/15

Information on actual expenditures is available in the City Treasurer's Office of the City of El Segundo.
REGULAR MEETING OF THE EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2015 – 5:00 PM

5:00 P.M. SESSION

CALL TO ORDER – Mayor Pro Tem Jacobson at 5:01PM

ROLL CALL

Mayor Fuentes - Present
Mayor Pro Tem Jacobson - Present
Council Member Atkinson - Present
Council Member Fellhauer - Present
Council Member Dugan - Present

PUBLIC COMMUNICATION – (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 prior to addressing the City Council. Failure to do so shall be a misdemeanor and punishable by a fine of $250.

Mayor Fuentes announced that Council would be meeting in closed session pursuant to the items listed on the Agenda.

SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS:

CLOSED SESSION:

The City Council may move into a closed session pursuant to applicable law, including the Brown Act (Government Code Section §54960, et seq.) for the purposes of conferring with the City’s Real Property Negotiator; and/or conferring with the City Attorney on potential and/or existing litigation; and/or discussing matters covered under Government Code Section §54957 (Personnel); and/or conferring with the City’s Labor Negotiators; as follows:

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – EXISTING LITIGATION (Gov’t Code §54956.9(d) (3): -1- matter

1. City of El Segundo vs. City of Los Angeles, et.al. LASC Case No. BS094279

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION

Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to Government Code §54956.9(d) (2) and (3): -0- matter.

Initiation of litigation pursuant to Government Code §54956.9(c): -0- matter.
DISCUSSION OF PERSONNEL MATTERS (Gov't Code §54957): -0- matter

APPOINTMENT OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEE (Gov't. Code § 54957): -0- matter

PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT (Gov't Code § 54957) -0- matter

CONFERENCE WITH CITY'S LABOR NEGOTIATOR (Gov't Code §54957.6): -8- matters

1. Employee Organizations: Police Management Association; Police Officers Association; Police Support Services Employees Association; Fire Fighters Association; Supervisory and Professional Employees Association; City Employees Association; Executive Management Group (Unrepresented Group); Management/Confidential Group (Unrepresented Group)

   Agency Designated Representative: Steve Filarsky and City Manager

CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR (Gov't Code §54956.8): -0- matters

Council recessed at 6:45 PM
REGULAR MEETING OF THE EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2015 - 7:00 P.M.

7:00 P.M. SESSION

CALL TO ORDER – Mayor Fuentes at 7:01 PM

INVOCATION – Lee Carlile, Pastor, United Methodist Church

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – Council Member Dugan

PRESENTATIONS

a.) Proclamation read by Mayor Fuentes proclaiming El Segundo to be a Host Town for the 2015 Special Olympics World Games. Laura Levinthal, Program Director, received the Proclamation.

b) Presentation by Crista Binder, City Treasurer and Dino Marsocci, Deputy City Treasurer II, of the Quarterly Report for the City’s Investment Portfolio.

ROLL CALL

Mayor Fuentes - Present
Mayor Pro Tem Jacobson - Present
Council Member Atkinson - Present
Council Member Fellhauer - Present
Council Member Dugan - Present

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 prior to addressing the City Council. Failure to do so shall be a misdemeanor and punishable by a fine of $250. While all comments are welcome, the Brown Act does not allow Council to take action on any item not on the agenda. The Council will respond to comments after Public Communications is closed.

Samantha Cano, President of Tree Musketeers, invited everyone to Arbor Day on Saturday, March 7 from 9:30 AM to 12:30 PM. Please visit www.treemusketeers.com for more information.

Debbie Lee, resident, spoke concerning Park Vista and the behavior of the Senior Housing Board towards the residents of Park Vista.

Teresa Campbell, resident of Park Vista, concerned with the recent rent increases at Park Vista and the current Senior Housing Board’s actions towards the residents of Park Vista.

Donna Cummings, resident of Park Vista, concerned with the recent rent increases at Park Vista and read a letter by MaryJane Clutter on the same subject.
Sally Biller, resident of Park Vista, presented a petition signed by the residents of Park Vista who strongly oppose the recommendation by the Senior Housing Board of Park Vista to increase rents.

Kim Thoman, resident and President of the PTA Council, asked the Council to review the score card used to determine fee waiver percentages.

Mike Corenman, resident of Park Vista, concerned with the recent rent increases and the Senior Housing Board’s actions towards the residents of Park Vista.

Dr. Anthony Mendez, resident, commented on the Agenda process and the Treasury presentation.

Jeanette Ringus, resident of Park Vista, concerned with the recent rent increases at Park Vista.

Julia Cohen, resident, concerned with the recent up tick of robberies in our City. Would like to know what we can do as a City and residents to help prevent this increase.

CITY COUNCIL COMMENTS – (Related to Public Communications)

Captain Evanski, answered questions for Council concerning the increase in crime.

A. PROCEDURAL MOTIONS

Consideration of a motion to read all ordinances and resolutions on the Agenda by title only.

MOTION by Mayor Pro Tem Jacobson, SECONDED by Council Member Fellhauer to read all ordinances and resolutions on the agenda by title only. MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE. 5/0.

B. SPECIAL ORDERS OF BUSINESS (PUBLIC HEARING)

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

D. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS AND BOARDS

E. CONSENT AGENDA

All items listed are to be adopted by one motion without discussion and passed unanimously. If a call for discussion of an item is made, the item(s) will be considered individually under the next heading of business.

1. Approve Warrant Numbers 3004570 through 3004723 on Register No. 9 in the total amount of $582,701.20 and Wire Transfers from 1/19/2015 through 2/1/2015 in the total amount of $1,028,110.12. Authorized staff to release. Ratified Payroll and employee Benefit checks; checks released early due to contracts or agreement; emergency disbursements and/or adjustments; and wire transfers.

3. Authorize the City Manager to award a standard Public Works Contract No. 4811 in a form approved by the City Attorney to Vantage Utility Services, Inc. for fiber optic conduit and cable installation, project no. PW 14-08 in the amount of $745,155 and Issue Change Order #1 to reduce the contract by $434,529 for a project total of $310,626. Account number amended by City Manager, Greg Carpenter. (Fiscal Impact: $372,752.00 (includes 20% contingency))

4. Approve the purchase of a Palo Alto enterprise network firewall with three years of support from DZ Solutions, Contract No. 4812, in the amount of $99,678. (Fiscal Impact: $99,678.00)

5. Adopt Resolution No. 4903 approving Plans and Specifications for Construction of American with Disabilities Act (ADA) Sidewalk Ramps (CDBG Project) and authorize staff to advertise the project for receipt of construction bids. Project No. PW 14-09. (Fiscal Impact: $53,933.00 in CDBG grant funds)

6. PULLED BY COUNCIL MEMBER

7. Authorize the City Manager to execute a 10-year License Agreement No. 4813 in a form approved by the City Attorney with Girl Scouts of Greater Los Angeles to continue utilizing Camp Eucalyptus. (Fiscal Impact: None)

8. Approve staff's recommendation to provide affordable health coverage to staff as mandated by the Affordable Care Act (ACA) and adopt Resolution No. 4904 establishing the monthly health contribution for unrepresented hourly employees considered full-time under the Affordable Care Act. (Fiscal Impact: $36,960.00 annually)

9. Authorize the City Manager to enter into an amendment No. 4729A, to a contract with Innovative Interfaces, Inc. in a form approved by the City Attorney to extend the Encore subscription rate after the first year for an additional four years (five years total) to enhance the existing Library's Circulation and Online Catalog System, Millennium, and the recently approved upgrade to the Sierra version from Innovative Interfaces, Inc. (Fiscal Impact: $59,973.00 over four years)

10. Waive second reading and adopt Ordinance No. 1504 to amend El Segundo Municipal Code Chapter 4-10 and ESMC §§ 15-5F-2 and 15-5F-5 concerning regulation of massage establishments within the City of El Segundo. Applicant: City of El Segundo (Fiscal Impact: None)
11. Authorize the City Manager to execute a 3-year License Agreements, No. 4814 El Segundo AYSO, No. 4815 El Segundo Babe Ruth Baseball league, No. 4816 El Segundo Girls Softball, No. 4817 El Segundo Inline hockey Association, No. 4818 El Segundo Little League, No. 4819 El Segundo Lacrosse League, No. 4820 South Bay Youth sports 9ES Flag Football), and No. 4821 El Segundo United States Youth Volleyball League, in a form approved by the City Attorney with El Segundo Youth Sports Organizations to implement the Youth Sports per Player Fee for the utilization of City athletic fields.
   (Fiscal Impact: None. Estimated Revenues of $35,000.00 included in the FY 14-15 Budget)

12. Receive and file this report regarding emergency work to repair dwelling units at the Park Vista Senior Housing Facility due to water intrusion without the need for bidding in accordance with Public Contracts Code §§ 20168 and 22050 and El Segundo Municipal Code ("ESMC") §§ 1-7-12 and 1-7A-4.
   (Fiscal Impact: $50,000.00)

13. PULLED BY STAFF. ITEM WILL BE BROUGHT BACK AT A FUTURE MEETING.

14. PULLED BY STAFF. ITEM WILL BE BROUGHT BACK AT A FUTURE MEETING.

15. PULLED BY STAFF. ITEM WILL BE BROUGHT BACK AT A FUTURE MEETING.

MOTION by Council Member Fellhauer, SECONDED by Council Member Dugan to approve Consent Agenda items 1, 2, 3 as amended, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12. Items 13, 14 and 15 pulled by staff. MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE. 5/0

PULLED ITEM

6. Consideration and possible action regarding the El Segundo Senior Housing Corporation 2015 Annual Budget for the Park Vista Apartments located at 614 East Holly.
   (Fiscal Impact: None

Council Discussion

Meredith Petit, Recreation and Parks Director, answered Council questions.

Mark Hensley, City Attorney, answered Council questions.
MOTION by Council Member Fellhauer, SECONDED by Council Member Atkinson to approve the El Segundo Senior Housing Corporation 2015 Annual Budget for the Park Vista Apartments located at 614 East Holly.  MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.  5/0

F.  NEW BUSINESS

(Fiscal Impact: None)

Deborah Cullen, Finance Director, gave a presentation.

Council discussion


17.  Consideration and possible action regarding an appeal from the El Segundo Council of Parents and Teachers, Inc., to adjust their given score indicating the fee waiver percentage for city support services associated with the Run for Education.  
(Fiscal Impact: $3,183.00)

Meredith Petit, Recreation and Parks Director, briefed Council on this item.

Council discussion

MOTION by Council Member Dugan, SECONDED by Council Member Fellhauer, to approve a 2 point increase to the El Segundo Council of Parents and Teachers, Inc. score card, which will adjust their score for fee waiver percentages.  MOTION PASSED BY VOICE VOTE.  4/1 Yes: Dugan, Fellhauer, Fuentes and Jacobson.  No: Atkinson

G. REPORTS – CITY MANAGER – mentioned he will advise the Finance Department to adjust the budget accordingly for the appeal from the Council of PTA’s.

H. REPORTS – CITY ATTORNEY - None

I. REPORTS – CITY CLERK - None

J. REPORTS – CITY TREASURER – presented earlier in the meeting.

K. REPORTS – CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

Council Member Fellhauer – None
Council Member Atkinson – Thanked everyone for coming out to the meeting tonight.

Council Member Dugan – Apologized for missing the last Council Meeting, he was supporting his wife while she received her Masters of Photography.

Mayor Pro Tem Jacobson – None

Mayor Fuentes –

18. Consideration and possible action to appoint Mayor Pro Tem Carl Jacobson and Councilmember Dave Atkinson to serve on the Richmond Street Design Committee.
    (Fiscal Impact: None)

Council discussion

MOTION by Council Member Dugan, SECONDED by Mayor Pro Tem Jacobson to appoint Mayor Pro Tem Carl Jacobson and Councilmember Dave Atkinson to serve on the Richmond Street Design Committee. MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE. 5/0

19. Consideration and possible action to adopt a resolution in support of the Los Angeles Air Force Base and the Space and Missile Systems Center continuing its mission and operation in the City of El Segundo.
    (Fiscal Impact: None)

Council discussion

MOTION by Mayor Pro Tem Jacobson, SECONDED by Council Member Fellhauer to adopt Resolution No. 4905 in support of the Los Angeles Air Force Base and the Space and Missile Systems Center continuing its mission and operation in the City of El Segundo. MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE. 5/0

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS – (Related to City Business Only – 5 minute limit per person, 30 minute limit total) Individuals who have receive 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 prior to addressing the City Council. Failure to do so shall be a misdemeanor and punishable by a fine of $250. While all comments are welcome, the Brown Act does not allow Council to take action on any item not on the agenda. The Council will respond to comments after Public Communications is closed.

None
MEMORIALS – None

ADJOURNMENT at 9:06 PM

Tracy Weaver, City Clerk
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action to renew the General Services Agreement between the City of El Segundo and County of Los Angeles for an additional five years commencing on July 1, 2015, would allow the City to access, on an as-needed basis, municipal support services performed by the County, such as traffic signal maintenance and other public works activities. (Fiscal Impact: None)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1. Authorize the Mayor to sign the General Services Agreement in a form approved by the City Attorney;
2. Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

Draft General Services Agreement between the City of El Segundo and the County of Los Angeles

FISCAL IMPACT: None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Budgeted:</th>
<th>$0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Appropriation:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Number(s):</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORIGINATED BY: Floriza Rivera, Principal Civil Engineer
REVIEWED BY: Stephanie Katsouleas, Public Works Director
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

The County of Los Angeles periodically provides miscellaneous services on behalf of the City of El Segundo on an "as-needed" basis. Examples of such services include the City's ongoing service agreement with the County for traffic signal maintenance and the availability to access County road crews should the need ever arise for emergency street repairs. To facilitate the City's ability to access such services, the City and County have traditionally entered into a series of five-year General Services Agreements (GSA) that ensures that the City has access to County-provided services whenever it is necessary. The standard GSA has no costs associated with it. It provides the legal mechanism and framework whereby the City has access to County services on an "as-needed" basis. The current agreement expires on June 30, 2015. Staff recommends maintenance of the agreement in order to maintain continuing access to the vast pool of services potentially provided by the County of Los Angeles.
GENERAL SERVICES AGREEMENT

THIS GENERAL SERVICES AGREEMENT ("Agreement"), dated for purposes of reference only, June 1, 2015, is made by and between the County of Los Angeles, hereinafter referred to as the "County", and the City of El Segundo, hereinafter referred to as the "City."

RECITALS:

(a) The City is desirous of contracting with the County for the performance by its appropriate officers and employees of City functions.

(b) The County is agreeable to performing such services on the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth.

(c) Such contracts are authorized and provided for by the provisions of Section 56½ of the Charter of the County of Los Angeles and Section 51300, et seq., of the Government Code.

THEREFORE, THE PARTIES MUTUALLY AGREE AS FOLLOWS:

1. The County agrees, through its officers, agents and employees, to perform those City functions, which are hereinafter provided for.

2. The City shall pay for such services as are provided under this Agreement at rates to be determined by the County Auditor-Controller in accordance with the policies and procedures established by the Board of Supervisors.

These rates shall be readjusted by the County Auditor-Controller annually effective the first day of July of each year to reflect the cost of such service in accordance with the policies and procedures for the determination of such rates as adopted by the Board of Supervisors of County.
3. No County agent, officer or department shall perform for said City any function not coming within the scope of the duties of such officer or department in performing services for the County.

4. No service shall be performed hereunder unless the City shall have available funds previously appropriated to cover the cost thereof.

5. No function or service shall be performed hereunder by any County agent, officer or department unless such function or service shall have been requested in writing by the City on order of the City Council thereof or such officer as it may designate and approved by the Board of Supervisors of the County, or such officer as it may designate, and each such service or function shall be performed at the times and under circumstances which do not interfere with the performance of regular County operations.

6. Whenever the County and City mutually agree as to the necessity for any such County officer or department to maintain administrative headquarters in the City, the City shall furnish at its own cost and expense all necessary office space, furniture, and furnishings, office supplies, janitorial service, telephone, light, water, and other utilities. In all instances where special supplies, stationery, notices, forms and the like must be issued in the name of the City, the same shall be supplied by the City at its expense.

It is expressly understood that in the event a local administrative office is maintained in the City for any such County officer or department, such quarters may be used by the County officer or department in connection with the performance of its duties in territory outside the City and adjacent thereto provided, however, that the performance of such outside duties shall not be at any additional cost to the City.
7. All persons employed in the performance of such services and functions for the City shall be County agent, officer or employee, and no City employee as such shall be taken over by the County, and no person employed hereunder shall have any City pension, civil service, or other status or right.

For the purpose of performing such services and functions, and for the purpose of giving official status to the performance hereof, every County agent, officer and employee engaged in performing any such service or function shall be deemed to be an agent, officer or employee of said City while performing service for the City within the scope of this agreement.

8. The City shall not be called upon to assume any liability for the direct payment of any salary, wages or other compensation to any County personnel performing services hereunder for the City, or any liability other than that provided for in this agreement.

Except as herein otherwise specified, the City shall not be liable for compensation or indemnity to any County employee for injury or sickness arising out of his employment.

9. The parties hereto have executed an Assumption of Liability Agreement approved by the Board of Supervisors on December 27, 1977 and/or a Joint Indemnity Agreement approved by the Board of Supervisors on October 8, 1991. Whichever of these documents the City has signed later in time is currently in effect and hereby made a part of and incorporated into this agreement as set out in full herein. In the event that the Board of Supervisors later approves a revised Joint Indemnity Agreement and the City executes the revised agreement, the subsequent agreement as of its effective date shall supersede the agreement previously in effect between the parties hereto.
10. Each County agent, officer or department performing any service for the City provided for herein shall keep reasonably itemized and in detail work or job records covering the cost of all services performed, including salary, wages and other compensation for labor; supervision and planning, plus overhead, the reasonable rental value of all County-owned machinery and equipment, rental paid for all rented machinery or equipment, together with the cost of an operator thereof when furnished with said machinery or equipment, the cost of all machinery and supplies furnished by the County, reasonable handling charges, and all additional items of expense incidental to the performance of such function or service.

11. All work done hereunder is subject to the limitations of the provisions of Section 23008 of the Government Code, and in accordance therewith, before any work is done or services rendered pursuant hereto, an amount equal to the cost or an amount 10% in excess of the estimated cost must be reserved by the City from its funds to insure payment for work, services or materials provided hereunder.

12. The County shall render to the City at the close of each calendar month an itemized invoice which covers all services performed during said month, and the City shall pay County therefore within thirty (30) days after date of said invoice.

    If such payment is not delivered to the County office which is described on said invoice within thirty (30) days after the date of the invoice, the County is entitled to recover interest thereon. Said interest shall be at the rate of seven (7) percent per annum or any portion thereof calculated from the last day of the month in which the services were performed.

13. Notwithstanding the provisions of Government Code Section 907, if such payment is not delivered to the County office which is described on said invoice within
thirty (30) days after the date of the invoice, the County may satisfy such indebtedness, including interest thereon, from any funds of any such City on deposit with the County without giving further notice to said City of County's intention to do so.

14. This Agreement shall become effective on the date herein-above first mentioned and shall run for a period ending June 30, 2020, and at the option of the City Council of the City, with the consent of the Board of Supervisors of County, shall be renewable thereafter for an additional period of not to exceed five (5) years.

15. In the event the City desires to renew this Agreement for said five-year period, the City Council shall not later than the last day of May 2020, notify the Board of Supervisors of County that it wishes to renew the same, whereupon the Board of Supervisors, not later than the last day of June 2020, shall notify the City Council in writing of its willingness to accept such renewal. Otherwise such Agreement shall finally terminate at the end of the aforesaid period.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph herein-above set forth, the County may terminate this Agreement at any time by giving thirty (30) days' prior written notice to the City. The City may terminate this Agreement as of the first day of July of any year upon thirty (30) days' prior written notice to the County.

16. This Agreement is designed to cover miscellaneous and sundry services which may be supplied by the County of Los Angeles and the various departments thereof. In the event there now exists or there is hereafter adopted a specific contract between the City and the County with respect to specific services, such contract with respect to specific services shall be controlling as to the duties and obligations of the parties anything herein to the contrary notwithstanding, unless such special contract adopts the provisions hereof by reference.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Agreement to be executed by their duly authorized officers.

Executed this ____________ day of __________________________ 2015.

The City of El Segundo,

By __________________________
Mayor

ATTEST:

City Clerk

THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

By __________________________
Deputy

By __________________________
Mayor of the Board

ATTEST:

PATRICK OGAWA
Acting Executive Officer/Clerk
of the Board of Supervisors

By __________________________
Deputy

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

MARK J SALADINO
County Counsel

By __________________________
Deputy
EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL

AGENDA STATEMENT

MEETING DATE: March 3, 2015
AGENDA HEADING: Consent Agenda

AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action to receive and file this report regarding emergency work to repair dwelling units at the Park Vista Senior Housing Facility due to water intrusion without the need for bidding in accordance with Public Contracts Code §§ 20168 and 22050 and El Segundo Municipal Code ("ESMC")§ 1-7-12 and 1-7A-4. (Fiscal Impact: $50,000.00)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

(1) Receive and file this report regarding emergency work to repair dwelling units at the Park Vista Senior Housing Facility due to water intrusion without the need for bidding in accordance with Public Contracts Code §§ 20168 and 22050 and El Segundo Municipal Code ("ESMC")§ 1-7-12 and 1-7A-4.

(2) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

None

FISCAL IMPACT: Included in Adopted Budget

Amount Budgeted: $50,000.00
Additional Appropriation: No
Account Number(s): 405-400-0000-6215 (Facilities Maintenance: Repairs and Maintenance)

ORIGINATED BY: Stephanie Katsouleas, Director of Public Works

REVIEWED BY: Gregg Kovasevich, Assistant City Attorney

APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

Emergency work to repair three dwelling units at the Park Vista Senior Housing Facility due to water intrusion caused by improperly sloped decks is still underway. Surveying was completed in January and designs for the repair, are due to the Engineering Department by the end of February. Once approved, bidding and award of the construction portion of the project will commence, which is imminent.

Public Contracts Code § 22050 (c) requires that the City Council receive updates at every regularly scheduled meeting until the emergency repair is completed. Therefore, staff recommends that City Council receive and file this report on the status of the emergency repair to address the water intrusion issues at Park Vista Senior Housing Facility.
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action to accept as complete the 2013-2014 Furnishing and Application of Slurry Seal on Various Streets, Project No. PW 13-15 (Fiscal Impact: $729,882.45)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
1. Accept the work as complete.
2. Authorize the City Clerk to file a Notice of Completion in the County Recorder's Office.
3. Alternatively, discuss and take other possible actions related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
Notice of Completion

FISCAL IMPACT: Included in Adopted Budget

| Amount Budgeted: | $744,418.86 |
| Additional Appropriation: | No |
| Account Number(s): | 001-400-8203-8357 ($24,000 Parking in-Lieu) |
| | 106-400-8203-8357 ($459,118.86 Gas Tax) |
| | 110-400-8203-8357 ($141,300 Measure R) |
| | 114-400-8203-8357 ($120,000 Prop C) |

ORIGINATED BY: Arianne Bola, Senior Engineer Associate
REVIEWED BY: Stephanie Katsouleas, Public Works Director
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

On June 17, 2014, City Council awarded a Public Works contract to American Asphalt South, Inc. for slurry sealing of the streets, alleyways, and 11 city parking lots. The project included the following locations:

- Streets and alleyway areas bounded by the west City boundary, Sheldon St., Mariposa Ave. and El Segundo Blvd.
- Rosecrans Ave. between Alma Ave. and Sepulveda Blvd.
- Vista del Mar between Grand Ave. and 45th St.
- City Hall Parking lot
- City Hall Employee’s Parking lot
- Fire/Police Parking lot
- Water Division Parking lot
- Maintenance Yard Parking lot
- Richmond St. Parking lot
- Library Parking lot
• Main St. Parking lot
• Guaymas Way Parking lot
• South Recreation and Parks Parking lot
• Grand Ave. Parking lot.

Three months prior to the project award, the City Council was presented with four Richmond Street design concepts to enhance the availability of parking on Richmond Street, between El Segundo Boulevard and Holly Street. City Council directed staff to implement two design options, one concurrent with this project (striping reconfiguration) and another at a future date when additional funding would be allocated to complete a larger project (including sidewalk, curb and gutter restoration work.)

As part of implementing the first Richmond Street design option, City staff directed the contractor to reconfigure the striping on Richmond Street in October 22, 2014 after the slurry seal has hardened enough to be striped. The striping change included installing angled parking and curb stops on the west side of Richmond Street and eliminating parallel parking on the east side of the street. Two way traffic is maintained and the striping modification resulted in the addition of 19 parking spaces over three blocks. Shortly thereafter, the City received several complaints regarding the angled parking, in particular at the north end of 300 block of Richmond Street. The City Council then directed staff to restore the striping configuration at the 300 block of Richmond Street back to its original parallel parking. This work was completed on December 6, 2014.

Slurry Seal Construction began on September 15, 2014, and was completed by American Asphalt South, Inc. on February 5, 2015. A final inspection for American Asphalt South’s work has been performed and it was determined that the project was completed per the plans and specifications and to the satisfaction of the Public Works Department. The final project costs are as follows:

**Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$647,320.75</td>
<td>Original Contract Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 82,561.70</td>
<td>Final Construction Change Orders and Contingencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$729,882.45</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Final Project Budget Cost</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remaining $14,536.41 will be disencumbered and returned to the Gas Tax Fund for future projects. Staff recommends that City Council accept the work performed by American Asphalt South, Inc. as complete and authorize the City Clerk to file a Notice of Completion with the County Recorder’s Office.
NOTICE OF COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECT

Project Name: Slurry Seal on Various Streets Project
Project No. : PW 13-15       Contract No. 4628

Notice is hereby given pursuant to State of California Civil Code Section 3093 et seq that:

1. The undersigned is an officer of the owner of the interest stated below in the property hereinafter described.

2. The full name of the owner is: City of El Segundo

3. The full address of the owner is: City Hall, 350 Main Street, El Segundo, CA, 90245

4. The nature of the interest of the owner is: Public Facilities

5. A work of improvement on the property hereinafter described was field reviewed by the City Engineer on February 5, 2015. The work done was: Slurry Seal Resurfacing

6. On March 3, 2015, City Council of the City of El Segundo accepted the work of this contract as being complete and directed the recording of this Notice of Completion in the Office of the County Recorder.

7. The name of the Contractor for such work of improvement was: American Asphalt South, Inc.

8. The property on which said work of improvement was completed is in the City of El Segundo, County of Los Angeles, State of California, and is described as follows: City streets in the area bounded by Sheldon Street, Mariposa Avenue, El Segundo Boulevard and west City boundary.

9. The street address of said property is: None

Dated: __________________________

Stephanie Katsouleas
Public Works Director

VERIFICATION

I, the undersigned, say: I am the Director of Public Works/City Engineer of the City El Segundo, the declarant of the foregoing Notice of Completion; I have read said Notice of Completion and know the contents thereof; the same is true of my own knowledge.

I declare under penalty of perjury the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on ________________, 2015 at El Segundo, California.

___________________________________________
Stephanie Katsouleas
Public Works Director
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action to authorize the appropriation of existing designated funds accrued in prior fiscal years to purchase computer hardware, software and peripherals for use at City facilities in an amount not to exceed $233,600. (Fiscal Impact: $233,600)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

(1) Authorize staff to appropriate existing designated funds accrued in prior fiscal years to purchase computer hardware, software and peripherals in an amount not to exceed $233,600.

(2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

FISCAL IMPACT: Included in Adopted Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Budgeted:</th>
<th>$233,600</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Appropriation:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Number(s):</td>
<td>$233,600 (001-400-2508-XXXX Computer Purchase Refresh)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORIGINATED BY: Larry Klingaman, Information Systems Manager

REVIEWED BY: Mitch Tauser, Chief of Police

APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

Prior to 2011, each department individually managed the replacement of desktop and laptop computers. Beginning in 2012, Information Systems consolidated the management of desktops and laptops throughout the City. A $384.00 service charge per system is designated for each department in the general fund for this multi-year program. This program is designed to fund the acquisition, maintenance and management of the city’s computer systems.

Fiscal Year 2013/14 Review

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 13/14 Beginning Balance</td>
<td>$230,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>($112,362)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$115,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 14/15 Beginning Balance</td>
<td>$233,638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff recommends City Council authorize the appropriation of existing designated funds accrued in prior fiscal years to purchase computer hardware, software and peripherals for use at City facilities in an amount not to exceed $233,600.
EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA STATEMENT

AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action regarding a request for the expansion of on-site sale and consumption of alcohol at an existing movie theater which currently has an active Type 47 ABC License at 831 South Nash Street (ArcLight Cinemas). Applicant: Art Rodriguez (Fiscal Impact: N/A)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
1. Receive and file this report without objecting to the expansion of alcohol service for on-site sale of beer, wine and distilled spirits for on-site consumption at an existing movie theater at 831 South Nash Street; and/or
2. Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
1. Crime and Arrest Statistics by Reporting Districts (RD)  
2. Police Reporting Districts Map  
3. Planning Commission Staff Report, dated February 12, 2015  

FISCAL IMPACT: None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Budgeted:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Appropriation:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Number(s):</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORIGINATED BY: Kimberly Christensen, AICP, Planning Manager
REVIEWED BY: Sam Lee, Planning and Building Safety Director
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

I. Background
In 1995, the City Council directed staff to bring all future Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) licenses to it for review. For alcohol sales at retail establishments, California regulations require a 30-day review and comment period after notifying local police and planning departments. The grounds of a protest, if any, should relate to public health, safety or welfare concerns. Based upon previous Council direction, staff is providing background information regarding this application.
II. Analysis

According to the most recent Crime and Arrest statistics report prepared by the Police Department, the subject movie theater is located in Reporting District (RD) 319. Based on the June – December 2014 reported data prepared by the Police Department, the district had a total of 26 Part I crimes and 11 felony and misdemeanor arrests. “Part I crimes” include criminal homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft and arson. The RD is considered a high crime area, however, because the theater was conditioned to include security guards on-site during the hours of operation, the Police Department and the Planning and Building Safety Department do not object to the expansion of alcohol sales for on-site consumption within the existing movie theater.

The project site is comprised of two parcels and is developed with two mixed-use commercial buildings which total 145,000 square feet in area. The project site contains surface parking, a parking structure, office, retail, restaurants and a movie theater. The movie theater has a total number of 2,349 seats within 16 auditoriums, a café with an outdoor dining area, concession stands, and a bar with a lounge area adjacent to Auditorium No. 7. The existing development at the site was approved by City Council Resolution No. 3917, adopted in 1995, which amended Precise Plan No. 12-72. In 2010, the City approved Environmental Assessment No. EA-883 and Administrative Use Permit No. AUP 10-07 for the existing on-site sale and consumption of beer, wine and distilled spirits at a 1,485 square-foot café, a 725 square-foot outdoor dining area, a 305 square-foot bar/lounge area, and Auditorium No. 7 within the movie theater. The applicant requests the approval for the sale of alcoholic beverages from an existing café, a bar counter, a lounge area, concession stands, new portable stands, new portable bars or new fixed bars, and to allow servers to cater to patrons in all 16 auditoriums at their seats within the movie theater.

The project site is in the Urban Mixed Use South (MU-S) Zone. Cafés are permitted uses in the MU-S Zone in accordance with ESMC §15-5F-2. The existing movie theater was allowed by the amendment of Precise Plan No. 12-72 which was adopted by the City Council through Resolution No. 3917, and on-site sale and consumption of alcohol is permitted with the approval of an Administrative Use Permit in accordance with ESMC §15-5F-4(C) and ESMC § 15-22-5.

The proposed hours of operation for the movie theater are 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m., Monday through Sunday. The proposed hours of alcohol service are 10:00 a.m. to 1:30 a.m., Monday through Sunday. On-site consumption of alcohol will occur in conjunction with food service within the movie theater. In addition, the menu that will be available for customers will be subject to the Director’s approval to ensure that the use is operationally consistent with a restaurant use rather than a bar.

The proposed use as conditioned will not be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare. Conditions of approval Nos. 5, 12, 14, 15 and 16 will help reduce the potential for public drunkenness, drunk driving, and related impacts by: a) requiring staff serving alcohol to be trained on alcohol responsibility and applicable laws, b) requiring posted signs identifying Taxicab phone numbers, c) requiring posted signs reminding customers who intend to drink onsite to have designated drivers, and d) requiring the applicant to have readily identifiable personnel to monitor and control the behavior of customers inside the building and outside in the
parking lot and other open areas onsite. For these reasons, as conditioned, the proposed use will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, or materially injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity.

On February 12, 2015, the Director of Planning and Building Safety approved the AUP application for the expansion of alcohol service (EA No. 1089, AUP No. 13-08), with conditions of approval. The Director’s decision was forwarded to the Planning Commission and, on February 12, 2015, the Planning Commission Received and Filed the Director’s decision.

Distinct and separate from the City’s AUP process, ABC also has mandatory findings that must be met, and conducts site inspections before approving the expansion of alcohol service.

III. Conclusion

Planning staff recommends that the Council Receive and File this report without objecting to the expansion of alcohol service at an existing theater with an active Type 47 ABC license at 831 South Nash Street, or alternatively discuss and take another action related to this item.
REPORTED PERIOD: JULY – DECEMBER, 2014

PART I & II CRIMES AND ARRESTS BY REPORTING DISTRICT (RD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORTING DISTRICT</th>
<th>PART I &amp; II CRIMES</th>
<th>FELONY/MISD ARRESTS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>AVERAGE BY RD PERCENTAGE +/-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>+132%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>+89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>+32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>+37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>+79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>+89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>+95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>+11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>+53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>+100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>+68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>+63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>+200%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>+74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>+16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>+132%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>+226%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>+95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTALS             | 699                | 282                 | 981   |                             |

Number of Reporting Districts = 53
Average # of Part I & II Crimes per Reporting District = 13
Average # of Felony/Misdemeanor Part I & II Crime Arrests per Reporting District = 5
Average # of Crimes and Arrests per Reporting District = 19
(Results from 07/01/2015 through 12/31/2015)

High Crime Area per B&P Code Section 23958.4 = >20%
I. INTRODUCTION

The Director of Planning and Building Safety issued the following decisions:

1) **Approved - Environmental Assessment No. EA-1096 and Administrative Use Permit No. (AUP) 14-06**

Administrative Use Permit by the Director of Planning and Building Safety regarding a request to allow a monument sign to exceed the maximum height of six feet.

Address: 831 South Nash Street
Applicant: Toni Reina
Property Owner: Continental Rosecrans Nash, LLC

The applicant's request is an adjustment from the provisions of El Segundo Municipal Code (ESMC) §§ 15-18-8(D) to allow the construction of an internally illuminated monument sign that exceeds the maximum permitted height of six feet. The proposed monument sign is 16'-5" tall by 10'-10" wide, with a total face area of 117 square feet. The monument sign will direct the public to parking for ArcLight Cinemas. The sign is proposed in the public.
right-of-way. The property is subject to Precise Plan No. PP 12-72; as part of the precise plan, the City Council delegated authority to the Director of Planning and Building Safety to approve a "Master Sign Plan" for the property. The sign is replacing another sign previously approved by the Director under the "Master Sign Plan" and also in the public right-of-way.

2) Approved - Environmental Assessment No. EA-1089 and Administrative Use Permit No. AUP 14-08

Administrative Use Permit by the Director of Planning and Building Safety regarding the expansion of alcohol service to all 16 auditoriums for an existing theater (ArcLight Cinemas) with an existing active Type 47 Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) License.

Address: 831 South Nash Street
Applicant: Art Rodriguez and Associates
Property Owner: Continental Rosecrans Nash, LLC

The proposed project will allow an expansion of on-site sale and consumption of alcohol from an existing café and bar to all 16 auditoriums at ArcLight Cinemas with an existing active Type 47 ABC License. Alcoholic beverages (beer, wine and distilled spirits) will be sold from the café, a bar counter, a lounge area adjacent to the bar, and servers who will cater to patrons in all 16 auditoriums.

The proposed hours of operation for the theater complex are 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m., Monday through Sunday. The proposed hours for the sale of alcohol for the 16 auditoriums, a café, an outdoor dining area, and a bar with a lounge area are 10:00 a.m. to 1:30 a.m. Monday through Sunday.

II. RECOMMENDATION

Receive and File.

III. EXHIBITS

A. Environmental Assessment No. EA-1096 and Administrative Use Permit No. AUP 14-06 Director Decision Letter dated February 5, 2015 for the property at 831 South Nash Street and plans.
B. Environmental Assessment No. EA-1089 and Administrative Use Permit No. AUP 14-08 Director Decision Letter dated February 5, 2015 for the property at 831 South Nash Street and plans.
Paul Samaras, Principal Planner
Department of Planning & Building Safety

Sam Lee, Director
Department of Planning & Building Safety
February 12, 2015

Art Rodriguez & Associates
709 E. Colorado Boulevard, # 200
Pasadena, CA 91101

RE: Environmental Assessment No. EA-1089 and Administrative Use Permit No. AUP 14-08 (REVISED)

To allow the expansion of alcohol service (on-site sale and consumption of beer, wine and distilled spirits) to all 16 auditoriums at an existing movie theater (ArcLight Cinemas) with an existing active Type 47 Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) License.

Address: 831 South Nash Street

Dear Mr. Rodriguez:

The purpose of this letter is to inform you that, in accordance with El Segundo Municipal Code (ESMC) Chapter 15-22, the Planning Division reviewed your application for the above-referenced project and the Director of Planning and Building Safety APPROVED Environmental Assessment No. EA-1089 and Administrative Use Permit No. 14-08 for the expansion of alcohol service (on-site sale and on-site consumption of beer, wine, and distilled spirits) to all 16 auditoriums of an existing, 65,000 square-foot movie theater (ArcLight Cinemas) located at 831 South Nash Street with an existing active Type 47 Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) License. The Director did not identify a reason to oppose the expansion of alcohol service to all 16 auditoriums, the existing concession stands, new portable stands, or new portable bars, or new fixed bars within the movie theater. The following are the findings and facts in support of each finding for this decision:
FINDINGS AND FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS:

Environmental Assessment No. EA-1089

Finding 1

- The proposed project is exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Pursuant to 14 California Code of Regulations § 15301 as a Class 1 categorical exemption (Existing Facilities).

Facts in Support of Finding 1

The applicant requests an expansion of alcohol service to all 16 auditoriums, existing concession stands, new portable stands, or new portable bars, or new fixed bars within an existing movie theater (ArcLight Cinemas) located at 831 South Nash Street in the Urban Mixed-Use South (MUS) Zone. The project site is comprised of two parcels and is developed with two mixed-use commercial buildings which total 145,000 square feet in area. The project site contains surface parking, a parking structure, office, retail, restaurants and a movie theater. The movie theater has a total number of 2,349 seats within the 16 auditoriums, a café with an outdoor dining area, concession stands, and a bar/lounge area. The existing development at the site was approved by City Council Resolution No. 3917, adopted in 1995, which amended Precise Plan No. 12-72. In 2010 the City approved Environmental Assessment No. EA-883 and Administrative Use Permit No. AUP 10-07 for the existing on-site sale and consumption of beer, wine and distilled spirits at a 1,485 square-foot café, a 725 square-foot outdoor dining area, a 305 square-foot bar/lounge area, and Auditorium No. 7 within the movie theater. The applicant requests the approval for the sale of alcoholic beverages from an existing café, a bar counter, a lounge area, concession stands, new portable stands, or new portable bars, or new fixed bars, and to allow servers to cater to patrons in all 16 auditoriums at their seats within the movie theater. The proposed expansion of alcohol service for an existing movie theater, results in a minor alteration in the operation of an existing building. The project site is in an urbanized area surrounded by commercial uses with adequate access. There are adequate utilities and public services to serve the project. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to have any significant impacts with regard to traffic, noise, air quality or water quality.

Administrative Use Permit No. AUP 14-08

Finding 1

- There is compatibility of the particular use on the particular site in relationship to other existing and potential uses within the general area in which the use is proposed to be located.
Facts in Support of Finding 1

1. Cafés are permitted uses in the Urban Mixed Use South (MU-S) Zone, and the movie theater was allowed by the amendment of Precise Plan No. 12-72 and the adoption of City Council Resolution No. 3917. The proposed expansion of alcohol service to all 16 auditoriums, concession stands, new portable stands, or new portable bars, or new fixed bars will be compatible with the existing movie theater and other restaurant uses already on-site and in the surrounding area.

2. The General Plan Land Use designation for the site is Urban Mixed Use South and the zoning for the site is Urban Mixed Use South (MU-S). Cafés are permitted uses in the Urban Mixed Use South (MU-S) Zone in accordance with ESMC §15-5F-2, the existing movie theater was allowed by the amendment of Precise Plan No. 12-72, and on-site sale and consumption of alcohol is permitted with the approval of an Administrative Use Permit in accordance with ESMC §15-5F-4(C) and ESMC § 15-22-5.

3. The surrounding land uses include: manufacturing, restaurants, office, parking and retail uses. The proposed expansion of alcohol service from a cafe and bar to all 16 auditoriums within an existing movie theater is similar and compatible with the surrounding uses.

4. The El Segundo Planning Commission is scheduled to Receive and File the Administrative Use Permit request on February 12, 2015.

Finding 2

- The proposed use is consistent and compatible with the purpose of the Zone in which the site is located.

Facts in Support of Finding 2

1. The General Plan Land Use designation for the site is Urban Mixed Use South.

2. The zoning designation of the property is Urban Mixed Use South (MU-S). Cafés are permitted uses in this Zoning District in accordance with §15-5F-2, and the movie theater was allowed by the amendment of Precise Plan No. 12-72 and the adoption of City Council Resolution No. 3917. The proposed expansion of alcohol service (on-site sale and consumption of beer and wine at an existing café and bar counter to all 16 auditoriums within a movie theater, concession stands, new portable stands, or new portable bars, or new fixed bars) with an existing active Type 47 ABC License, requires an Administrative Use Permit in accordance with ESMC §15-5F-4(C) and ESMC § 15-22-5.
3. The purpose of the Urban Mixed Use South (MU-S) Zone is to provide areas where a mixture of compatible commercial offices, research and development, service, retail and hotel uses can locate and develop in a mutually beneficial manner. It is the intent of the Urban Mixed Use South (MU-S) Zone to have several types of uses within a single building. The inclusion of alcoholic beverage sales from the existing concession stands, new portable stands, or new portable bars, or new fixed bars, and all 16 auditoriums will serve to enhance the experience for movie theater patrons and will be accessory to the existing movie theater (ArcLight Cinemas) operating at the site.

4. The surrounding land uses include: manufacturing, restaurants, office, parking and retail uses. The proposed expansion of alcohol service from a café, bar, concession stands, new portable stands, or new portable bars, or new fixed bars, and within all 16 auditoriums at an existing movie theater is consistent with the purpose of the zone and is compatible with the surrounding uses.

Finding 3

- The proposed location and use and the conditions under which the use would be operated or maintained will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, or materially injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity.

Facts in Support of Finding 3

1. The café, bar counter/lounge area, concession stands, new portable stands, or new portable bars, or new fixed bars, and 16 auditoriums are located inside an existing commercial movie theater within the Urban Mixed Use South (MU-S) Zone. The movie theater meets all of the development standards of the MU-S Zone and Precise Plan No. 12-72, and sufficient parking will be provided on-site in compliance with ESMC Chapter 15-15.

2. The surrounding land uses include: manufacturing, restaurants, office, parking and retail uses. The MU-S Zone allows on-site sale and consumption of alcohol with the approval of an Administrative Use Permit.

3. The proposed hours of operation for the movie theater are 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m., Monday through Sunday. The proposed hours of alcohol service for the 16 auditoriums, concession stands, new portable stands, or new portable bars, or new fixed bars, a café, an outdoor dining area, and a bar with a lounge area are 10:00 a.m. to 1:30 a.m., Monday through Sunday. Food service will be available during the hours alcoholic beverages are sold at the movie theater within the 16 auditoriums, concession stands, new portable stands, or new portable bars, or new fixed bars, a café, an outdoor dining area and a bar with a lounge area. The theater may stay open 30 minutes after the last movie showing. However, alcohol sales will cease by 1:30 a.m.
4. The café and theater must maintain an active State of California Alcohol and Beverage Control (ABC) license for on-site sale and consumption of alcohol (Type 47).

5. The proposed use as conditioned will not be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare. Conditions of approval Nos. 5, 12, 14, 15 and 16 will help reduce the potential for public drunkenness, drunk driving, and related impacts by: a) requiring staff serving alcohol to be trained on alcohol responsibility and applicable laws, b) requiring posted signs identifying Taxicab phone numbers, c) requiring posted signs reminding customers who intend to drink onsite to have designated drivers, d) and requiring the applicant to have readily identifiable personnel to monitor and control the behavior of customers inside the building and outside in the parking lot and other open areas onsite. For these reasons, as conditioned, the proposed use will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, or materially injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity.

Finding 4

• Potential impacts that could be generated by the proposed use, such as noise, smoke, dust, fumes, vibration, odors, traffic, and hazards have been recognized and mitigated.

Facts in Support of Finding 4

1. The proposed expansion of alcohol service will not create any new impacts that would not be normally associated with the operation of an existing movie theater containing 16 auditoriums, concession stands, new portable stands, or new portable bars, or new fixed bars, a café, an outdoor dining area, and a bar with a lounge area.

2. The existing movie theater is located in a predominantly commercial/retail area and is not adjacent to any residential uses. The proposed hours of operation for alcohol service for 16 auditoriums, concession stands, new portable stands, or new portable bars, or new fixed bars, a café, an outdoor dining area, and a bar with a lounge area will not increase noise, fumes, vibration, or odors that would be normally associated with an existing movie theater.

3. Conditions of approval Nos. 5, 12, 14, 15 and 16 will help mitigate potential traffic and other hazards caused by patrons driving under the influence of alcohol.

4. The expansion of on-site sale of beer, wine and distilled spirits for on-site consumption at an existing movie theater with an active Type 47 ABC License is proposed in an area that is not environmentally sensitive and would not be hazardous.
Finding 5

The State Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control has issued or will issue a license to sell alcohol to the applicant.

Facts in Support of Finding 5

1. The applicant currently has and must maintain a license from the State of California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (Type No. 47).

DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND BUILDING SAFETY DEPARTMENT ACTION

Based on these findings and facts in support of these findings, the Director of Planning and Building Safety APPROVES the proposed project, subject to the following conditions:

1. The proposed hours of operation for the movie theater are 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m., Monday through Sunday. The proposed hours of alcohol service for the 16 auditoriums, café, outdoor dining area, bar, and its lounge area are limited to 10:00 a.m. to 1:30 a.m., Monday through Sunday. Food service is required during the hours alcoholic beverages are sold at the movie theater within the 16 auditoriums, café, outdoor dining area, bar, and its lounge area. The theater may stay open 30 minutes after the last movie showing. However, alcohol sales must cease by 1:30 a.m. Any change to the hours of operation or the hours that alcohol may be served is subject to review and approval by the Director of Planning and Building Safety.

2. The food service menu or menus for the 16 auditoriums, concession stands, new portable stands, or new portable bars, or new fixed bars, and a bar with a lounge area, must be substantially similar to each other and consist primarily of meals as defined by California Business and Professions Code § 23038. Popcorn, chips, peanuts and other similar snacks are not considered meals. The applicant must submit a copy of the food service menu or menus for all areas where alcohol is served to the Director of Planning and Building Safety for review and approval before alcohol service is extended to all 16 auditoriums. Any subsequent changes to the approved menu or menus are subject to the Director's review and approval.

3. The 16 auditoriums within the movie theater will contain a maximum combined total number of 2,349 seats.

4. Any subsequent modification to the project as approved, including the floor plan and areas where alcohol will be served, and/or the conditions of approval, must be referred to the Director of Planning and Building Safety or designee for
approval and a determination regarding the need for Planning Commission
review of the proposed modification.

5. Taxicab phone numbers must be posted in a conspicuous location at all times in
the area(s) where alcohol is served to customers.

6. The premises must be maintained in a litter and graffiti-free manner. Any graffiti
that should appear on the premises must be removed within 48 hours.

7. The applicant must maintain all licenses required by the Alcoholic Beverage
Control Act (Business & Professions Code §§ 23300 et seq.). The applicant must
maintain a Type 47 license.

8. The movie theater operations must comply with ESMC §§ 7-2-1, et seq.
regulating noise and vibration.

9. The Planning and Building Safety Department and the Police Department must
be notified of any change of ownership of the approved use in writing within 10
days of the completion of the change of ownership. A change in project
ownership may be cause to schedule a hearing before the Planning Commission
regarding the status of the administrative use permit.

10. The applicant must comply with all regulations of the Alcoholic Beverage Control
Act and the regulations promulgated by the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board
including, without limitation, the regulations set forth in 4 Cal. Code of Regs. §§
55, et seq.

11. The applicant must post a sign in a clear and conspicuous location listing a
phone number at which a responsible party may be contacted during all open
hours of the establishment to address any concerns of the community regarding
noise in the theater, outdoor dining area, and parking lot. Said contact's name
and phone number must also be available to all of the theater staff at all times.

12. The applicant must, at all times, display a Designated Driver sign of at least
ten inches by ten inches (10" X 10") in the 16 auditoriums, the bar with a lounge
area, a café, concession stands, new portable stands, or new portable bars, or
new fixed bars, and an outdoor dining area at eye level. The sign must be
worded in a way that reminds patrons who are consuming alcohol to designate a
non-drinking driver.

13. There must be no exterior advertising of any kind or type, including advertising
directed to the exterior from within, promoting or indicating the availability of
alcoholic beverages. Interior displays of alcoholic beverages which are clearly
visible to the exterior constitute a violation of this condition.
14. The licensee and employees selling alcoholic beverages to patrons must complete a training program offered by the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) on alcohol responsibility and the law. The training must be offered to new employees on a quarterly basis.

15. All employees hired to sell alcoholic beverages must provide evidence that they have either:

a. Completed training from the State of California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC), Long Beach/Lakewood District Office administered Licensee Education on Alcohol and Drugs (LEAD) Program; or,

b. Completed an approved equivalent (LEAD) training program administered by the ABC, Long Beach/Lakewood District Office to ensure proper distribution of alcoholic beverages safely, responsibly and to adults of legal age. Any future employee designated to sell alcoholic beverages on behalf of the licensee or applicant must obtain a certificate proving completion of the (LEAD) training; and

c. The licensee or applicant must confirm with the Planning and Building Safety Director, or designee, within fifteen (15) days of the Director's decision as to the approval of the application, or by final project approval, that a date certain has been scheduled with the local ABC Office to complete the LEAD training program.

d. Within thirty (30) days of taking said course, the employees, or responsible employer must deliver each required certificate showing completion to the Police Department.

16. The applicant must have readily identifiable personnel to monitor and control the behavior of customers inside the building premises. Staff must monitor activity outside in the parking lot and any adjacent property under the establishment's control to ensure the areas are generally free of people and are cleared of patrons and their vehicles one-half hour after closing.

17. The City may, in its discretion, take action to review this Administrative Use Permit, including without limitation, adding conditions or revoking the permit, to enforce applicable regulations of the ESMC or this Administrative Use Permit.

18. If complaints are received regarding excessive noise, parking availability, lighting, building access, and the like associated within the theater, the café and the outdoor patio area, the City may, in its discretion, take action to review the Administrative Use Permit, including without limitation, adding conditions or revoking the permit.

19. The outdoor seating area for dining must comply with ESMC § 15-2-16.
20. The building must not be occupied by more persons than allowed by the California Building Code, as adopted by the ESMC.

21. The building and any outdoor seating must comply with California Building and Fire Code requirements, as adopted by the ESMC.

22. The applicant must maintain grease interceptors for the restaurant subject to approval by the Fire Department.

23. The Applicant agrees to indemnify and hold the City harmless from and against any claim, action, damages, costs (including, without limitation, attorney's fees), injuries, or liability, arising from the City's approval of Environmental Assessment No. EA-1089 for Administrative Use Permit No. AUP 14-08, except for such loss or damage arising from the City's sole negligence or willful misconduct. Should the City be named in any suit, or should any claim be brought against it by suit or otherwise, whether the same be groundless or not, arising out of the City approval of EA-1089 or AUP 14-08, the Applicant agrees to defend the City (at the City's request and with counsel satisfactory to the City) and will indemnify the City for any judgment rendered against it or any sums paid out in settlement or otherwise. For purposes of this section “the City” includes the City of El Segundo's elected officials, appointed officials, officers, and employees.

PLANNING COMMISSION

This determination was received and filed by the Planning Commission at its February 12, 2015 meeting. Please be advised that this does not conclude the review process. The City Council will determine whether or not to protest the expansion of alcohol service with the existing ABC License (Type 47) at its meeting on March 3, 2015. Should you have any questions, please contact Project Planner Maria Baldenegro at (310) 524-2341.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Sam Lee, Director
Department of Planning and Building Safety

By signing this document, Alex Rose (property owner), and Jill Saperstein (applicant) certify that they have read, understands, and agree to the Project Conditions listed in this document.

Jill Saperstein, Secretary
Pacific Theaters Exhibition Corporation (Applicant)
EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA STATEMENT

AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action to approve Final Vesting Parcel Map No. 71788, a three (3) lot commercial subdivision located at 888, 892 and 898 North Sepulveda Boulevard. (Fiscal Impact: N/A)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
1. Approve and accept Final Vesting Parcel Map No. 71788;
2. Authorize the appropriate City Official to sign and record said Map; and/or
3. Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
None

FISCAL IMPACT: N/A

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

ORIGINATED BY: Kimberly Christensen, AICP, Planning Manager
REVIEWED BY: Sam Lee, Director of Planning and Building Safety
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

Background and Discussion
On April 1, 2014, the City Council held a public hearing on the proposed subdivision located at 888, 892 and 898 Sepulveda Boulevard and subsequently approved Vesting Parcel Map No. 71788 and Resolution No. 4867 approving Environmental Assessment No. EA-997.

The Final Vesting Parcel Map conforms to the Tentative Map and has been reviewed and approved by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. City staff has determined that Final Vesting Parcel Map No. 71788 is in substantial conformance with the General Plan and applicable zoning and building ordinances.

The Final Vesting Parcel Map is now ready for approval by the City Council. After approval, it will be recorded in the County Recorder's Office.
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EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL  MEETING DATE: March 3, 2015
AGENDA ITEM STATEMENT  AGENDA HEADING: Consent Agenda

AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action to reorganize the Economic Development Program to transfer reporting and budgeting responsibilities from the Planning and Building Safety Department to the City Manager’s Office, and authorize the City Manager to fill the vacant existing at-will classification of Economic Development Manager (fiscal impact: $50,000-60,000 in FY 15/16)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1. Approve the reorganization and budget transfers necessary and authorize the City Manager to fill the vacant Economic Development Manager position; or
2. Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
Classification specification for Economic Development Manager position

FISCAL IMPACT: $

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Budgeted:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Appropriation:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Number(s):</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PREPARED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager
APPROVED BY:

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:

Economic Development is among the City’s strategic objectives as it is essential to promoting new development, business retention, business attraction, job creation and increasing municipal revenues to support municipal services. The City has staffed and organized this role in a wide variety of ways in recent years from the highest levels in the organization such as an Assistant City Manager, or Economic Development Department Head to lower levels such as a staff-level Analyst position. And there have been periods of time when the role has not been served by a specific employee and has instead been an “additional duty” of existing staff to perform. From an organizational stand point, the role has also been assigned in different ways, from being in the City Manager’s Department, the Planning and Building Department and an independent Economic Development Department.

The Economic Development Analyst position is currently vacant and it is appropriate to evaluate and consider the appropriate role, level of authority, and reporting responsibility of this function within the organization. After careful consideration, the City Manager’s recommendation is that the program be moved from the Planning and Building Safety Department to the City Manager’s office and be staffed with a Manager level position. The
rationale for this recommendation includes:

- Experience over the last two years has shown that there is the need for higher level, more independent decision-making and authority more consistent with a management level position.

- A number of projects in this program involve coordination among multiple departments where a management level employee working under the direction of the City Manager could more effectively coordinate and complete work efforts.

- A management level employee, working in the City Manager’s office would more effectively impress upon prospective business persons the importance and emphasis that the City places on the Economic Development Program.

- Transferring the Economic Development Program from Planning and Building Safety will allow that Department to increase their focus on the increased level of planning and development activity currently occurring.

The Class Specification for the Economic Development Manager position is attached and generally describes the duties and responsibilities of the position. More specifically, this person will be responsible for the following:

- Primary staff liaison to the Economic Development Advisory Council (EDAC)
- Including coordination and preparation of the EDAC agenda with the EDAC Chair.
- Development and implementation of an enhanced business outreach and retention program with existing El Segundo Businesses including.
- Development and execution of an enhanced business attraction program to assist the city in filling vacant office and retail facilities and promoting opportunities for new development.
- Manage the public relations and advertising contract with Paolucci Salling and Martin (PSM) and any other public relations and marketing efforts.
- Coordinate activities with, and the El Segundo Chamber of Commerce, area real estate professionals, the Los Angeles Economic Development Corporation and other real estate and business groups.
- Serve as the City’s point of contact for large-scale development projects during the initial planning and coordination phases.
- Assist the City Manager as necessary.

The Economic Development Manager position is an “at-will” position within the Management Confidential series. The salary range for this position is currently $7951.97 to $9665.67 per month while the salary range for the Economic Development Analyst position is $5692.15 to $6918.85 per month. The plan is to leave the Economic Development Analyst position vacant so there is adequate salary savings in this budget year to address the added cost associated with this request. Should the Council approve the request, the added cost for a full year is approximately $50,000 to 60,000.
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Definition: As an at-will employee, under general direction, plans, coordinates and manages activities of the Economic Development Division.

Essential Functions: Essential functions, as defined under the Americans with Disabilities Act, may include the following duties and responsibilities, knowledge, skills and other characteristics. This list of duties and responsibilities is ILLUSTRATIVE ONLY, and is not a comprehensive listing of all functions and tasks performed by positions in this class.

Characteristic Duties and Responsibilities:

Plans, manages and coordinates all program activities related to business recruitment and retention for the City; prepares and administers the Division’s budget; establishes and maintains effective working relationships with the local real estate community and business organizations; develops and implements advertising campaigns; administers contracts for services from external resources.

Manages and coordinates activities of the Economic Development Advisory Council; ensures coordination of efforts and interests with City Council, the Planning Commission, Downtown Revitalization Sub-Committee and other groups and constituencies.

Coordinates Division activities with other programs, departments or staff to ensure program delivery according to appropriate policies, procedures and specifications.

Resolves discrepancies or procedural problems and responds to program management and/or program delivery questions ensuring necessary follow-up occurs; controls program records for operational and budget accountability.

Confers with and advises staff and program participants by providing advice, problem solving assistance, answers to questions and interpretation of program goals and policy.

Provides leadership, program development, administration and coordination of Division programs and services; serves as liaison with the community, professional groups and other external contacts and resources for the City.

Hires, directs work efforts and evaluates staff; provides for and/or conducts staff development; establishes work methods and standards; initiates corrective and/or disciplinary action and responds to grievances and complaints according to established personnel policies and procedures and in consultation with Human Resources.
Knowledge, Skills and Other Characteristics:

Knowledge of principles and practices of community and economic development.
Knowledge of principles, practices and trends of marketing and real estate development
Knowledge of contract development and administration.
Knowledge of municipal organization and administration.
Knowledge of budget preparation and administration.
Knowledge of automated business computing systems.
Knowledge of the principles and practices of effective leadership, management and supervision.
Knowledge of project management principles and practices.

Skill in program development, implementation and evaluation.
Skill in assessing objectives and operational requirements to develop and implement appropriate operational plans, policies and procedures.
Skill in supervising and evaluating staff.
Skill in managing special projects, activities and programs.
Skill in conducting research and preparing clear, concise and comprehensive reports.
Skill in preparing complex financial and statistical reports.
Skill in understanding and applying complex regulations, procedures and guidelines.
Skill in communicating effectively orally and in writing.
Skill in using personal computers and job related software.
Skill in working under pressure, handling significant problems and tasks that arise simultaneously and/or unexpectedly.
Skill in establishing and maintaining effective working relationships with staff, other City employees, and the public.

Qualifications:

Bachelor's degree in Business, Marketing, Economics, Public Administration or a closely related field; and five (5) years of professional marketing experience, including two (2) years of supervisory experience; or an equivalent combination of education and experience.
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action to select a pool design option and funding plan for the new outdoor Aquatics Facility to be located at Wiseburn High School.
(Fiscal Impact: To Be Determined)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
1. Select a pool design option;
2. Discuss potential funding plans for the excess construction costs under obligation of the City; and,
3. Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS: None

FISCAL IMPACT: To Be Determined

| Amount Budgeted: | $1,802,376 |
| Additional Appropriation: | Yes |
| Account Number(s): | 702-267-0000-1267 - Aquatics Trust Account |

PREPARED BY: Meredith Petit, Director of Recreation & Parks

REVIEWED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:

In May 2013, the City of El Segundo and Wiseburn School District entered into a Settlement Agreement that calls for Wiseburn to commit $6,000,000 to the construction of an aquatics facility and the City to operate and maintain the facility into the future. According to the agreement, the City would also be responsible for any design and construction costs in excess of $6,000,000.

On June 15, 2014, staff presented the City Council with two aquatics facility design options under consideration by the Pool Design Committee. Design Option 1, a 50-meter by 25-yard outdoor competition pool with limited additional amenities, was estimated to cost $6,000,000. Design Option 2, estimated at $8,400,000, included a 54-meter by 25-meter outdoor competition pool, a 25-yard additional pool, bleachers, two moveable bulkheads, sports lighting, and other amenities that would provide for more versatility in aquatics programming.

For the next several months, the consulting firm Isaac Sports Group conducted the Aquatics Facility Programming, Design and Financial Analysis. Stu Issac of the Isaac Sports Group met with various stakeholder group including city officials and school administrators and personnel from both El Segundo Unified School District and Wiseburn School District. Mr. Isaac presented the findings and conclusions of the report to the City Council on February 3, 2015. Within the report, Mr. Isaac included projected costs for three conceptual pool designs, identified as “Base”, “Upgrade”, and “Hybrid.”
The Base Option is a single all deep 50-meter by 25-yard pool that meets the basic needs of the Wiseburn High School and El Segundo High School Swimming and Water Polo program, training, and competition needs. The preliminary projected total project costs of the Base Option (2015 pricing) is $7,117,200.

The Upgrade Option expands the main competition pool to 54-meters by 25-meters with two 2-meter bulkheads and 3 diving boards. It also includes a 75-foot by 35-foot shallow warm-water teaching/fitness pool which can support greater community access and use, including significant revenue generating programs. The Upgrade Option can also host additional meets and tournaments that can generate operating revenue and economic impact for the community. The preliminary projected total project costs of the Base Option (2015 pricing) is $10,207,624.

A Hybrid Option was created based on the programming needs and goals combined with the cost and operating financial analysis. The Hybrid design makes the following changes from the Upgrade Option:

- Reduce pool size to 51.2-meters by 25-yards
- Reduce to one 1.2-meter (4 foot) bulkhead
- Eliminates the diving element, reducing depth (no project stakeholders expressed an interest or need for the diving elements)
- Slightly reduce permanent seating capacity

The Hybrid design retains the same size teaching/fitness pool and the same program support amenities as the Upgrade Option. These changes have virtually no impact on training space, daily programming, and community access compared to the Full Upgrade Option. It does reduce the event capacity and the overall size of meet that can be hosted, but the actual limiting factors on events are actually the size of the warm-up pool and overall space and seating. The event loss will only be in hosting meets that are slightly smaller and the inability to host a Southern California Swimming/USA Swimming regional meet every two to three years. The preliminary projected total project costs of the Base Option (2015 pricing) is $8,950,929.

The preliminary projected costs include hard construction costs and all other soft costs, inspections, architectural and design fees, overhead, equipment and owner cost. The costs of the project have increased since original cost estimates in 2013 based on cost escalation, more refined design detail, and largely due to some unexpected site issues concerning methane mitigation and the possible need to move a storm drain to accommodate the site plan. These site issues alone account for approximately $500,000, although the storm drain issue is still being addressed by the Wiseburn School District and their architect.

The *Aquatics Facility Programming, Design and Financial Analysis* also focused on the financial performance of the entire City aquatics programs and facilities, including the Urho Saari Swim Stadium. Using expense and revenue projections for the three design options and projecting future programs, expansion of existing programs, and event/rental demand, the report concluded that the Base Option would have an overall impact of about an $80,000 increase to the annual operating budget. Both the Hybrid Option and the Upgrade Option, however, show an estimated decrease in the aquatics operating budget, about a $40,000 decrease for the Upgrade Option and $35,000 decrease for the Hybrid Option. The report concludes that the Hybrid Option appears to be the most cost effective facility, program, and operating model resulting in no net increase in the overall El Segundo aquatic facility and operating budgets while considering the additional City cost of construction in excess of the $6,000,000 contribution from Wiseburn.
The findings from the *Aquatics Facility Programming, Design and Financial Analysis* were presented to the Recreation and Parks Commission on February 18, 2015. The overall consensus from the Commission was that, given the information that was presented in the report, the Base Option appears to not be suitable for program flexibility, revenue-generating opportunities, or stable annual operating costs. The Commission would like to see the City Council move forward with the project by either selecting one of the Hybrid or Upgrade options.

Additionally, the Recreation and Parks Commission expressed that the overall design decision should be based more on the current and future needs of the community and less on the initial construction cost. They want to ensure that the City makes the best decision and caution against making the decision too swiftly. It is important to the Recreation and Parks Commission that the community members are informed. Lastly, some members of the Commission were concerned that the revenue projections seemed optimistic and want to point out that the revenue projections in the study are contingent upon increased fees, significant program expansion, and the implementation of creative programming that has never been explored in El Segundo. For the projections to become actual, all components will have to align, alluding to some unknown degree of risk.

Staff is requesting direction from the City Council on the selection of a pool design option. The Wiseburn School District is prepared to move forward with obtaining the appropriate permits to continue moving forward to construction. With a commitment from the City, the Wiseburn School District will also proceed with detailed architectural drawings. Additionally, the City Council should discuss a funding plan to support the costs in excess of Wiseburn’s $6,000,000 commitment.

Currently, the Aquatics Trust Account has approximately $1,800,000, which is approved for the construction of the new Aquatics Center, to renovate the Plunge, or some combination thereof. Additional funding alternatives can include one or more of the following: (1) negotiate additional funding from Wiseburn School District; (2) request a contribution from El Segundo Unified School District; (3) reprioritize the current FY14/15 capital projects plan; (4) postpone the increased percentage of the reserve and/or economic uncertainty funds; (5) seek sponsors/donors; and, (6) initiate a community fundraising effort.
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action to authorize the City Manager to enter into an agreement in a form approved by the City Attorney with NexLevel Information Technology, Inc. for technology strategic planning services at cost not to exceed $48,840. (Fiscal Impact: $48,840)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

(1) Authorize the City Manager to enter into an agreement in a form specified by the City Attorney with NexLevel Information Technology, Inc. for technology strategic planning services at cost not to exceed $48,840.

(2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

Avasant Proposal
NexLevel Proposal
Evaluation Criteria and Scoresheet

FISCAL IMPACT: Budget Adjustment Required

| Amount Budgeted:  | $0 |
| Additional Appropriation: | Yes $48,840 |
| Account Number(s): | 001-400-2505-6214 |

ORIGINATED BY: Larry Klingaman, Information Systems Manager
REVIEWED BY: Mitch Tavera, Chief of Police
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

At the December 16, 2014, City Council Meeting, Information Systems was approved to reclassify three existing positions into two full time staff positions. At the same meeting, Mayor Fuentes expressed a desire to have an outside agency evaluate the Information Systems Division.

Staff contacted two companies that perform strategic and tactical planning services specifically for municipal agencies and information systems consultation. Staff conducted interviews with Avasant on January 6th, and Nexlevel on January 15th. During these interviews, staff gave an overview of the current technology and staffing utilized by the division, existing and planned projects citywide, and current governance. Both companies provided background information about their respective companies and acquired additional information about the City, the technology division, and the status of our current and planned projects. Each company subsequently submitted a formal proposal.
Staff reviewed the proposals and found that both companies have performed the identified services for numerous years, both have considerable experience with information systems strategies and processes, and both want to create a long term partnership with the City. Staff found that both companies actively participate in municipal technology user groups and have consultants local to the Los Angeles area. The corporate headquarters of Avasant is located in El Segundo and the primary consultants from NexLevel are located nearby in Orange County, Ca.

Additionally, the variance between the two companies for the total project cost was minimal:

- Avasant - $50,000 (*Discounted* $175/hour; plus travel and miscellaneous expenses which are expected to be minimal due to their location within the City of El Segundo)
- NexLevel - $48,840 ($165/hour; all inclusive)

The primary difference between the two companies is the size of their typical clients. Avasant is a global organization with large clients including the City of Los Angeles, the City of San Diego, the County of Orange and the State of California. Although Nexlevel has also performed work for larger organizations including Los Angeles and San Diego County, they recently performed strategic planning services for similar sized cities including Ontario, Manhattan Beach, Beverly Hills and Rancho Palos Verdes.

Another differentiating factor was that the proposal from Nexlevel was designed to be staged. The first stage of the project would involve documenting the current technology infrastructure, interviewing City staff to understand how existing technology resources are utilized and learn about upcoming technology needs, then analyzing and benchmarking the results. This stage would provide all of the information necessary to generate a technology strategic plan and cost $27,390.

The second stage of the project involves Nexlevel strategizing with staff to formalize the technology strategic plan. Nexlevel would facilitate a prioritization workshop to generate consensus on a project list to include in the plan. The end product of the workshop includes a prioritized list of projects and timeline as deliverables. In addition, Strategic Plan enabling factors such as training, staffing, budget, governance, project management and change management would be identified and recommendations made. This stage would culminate with the publishing of a formal technology strategic plan at a cost of $21,450.

By completing both stages, the City would obtain a complete technology strategic plan similar to the one that Nexlevel recently completed for Manhattan Beach. Benefits of this plan include a unified approach to IT Service Management, Citywide prioritization of technology projects, and optimization of cost and operational efficiencies related to technology within the City.

Recognizing that a technology strategic plan is not a static document, Staff recommends creating a long term relationship with the consultant. This relationship would involve revisiting the strategic document periodically to evaluate the progress and identify any mid-course adjustments that may be necessary or beneficial. These amendments would then be incorporated into the strategic plan, keeping it both current and relevant. If the City decides to establish a relationship
for long term assistance, based on respective hourly rates, future time and material consulting services from NexLevel would cost considerably less.

Staff recommends the City Council authorize the City Manager to enter into an agreement in a form approved by the City Attorney with NexLevel Information Technology, Inc. for technology strategic planning services at cost not to exceed $48,840.
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Based in Los Angeles, California, Avasant experts have performed over 1,000 engagements across 40+ countries within four primary disciplines.

> **Digital Enterprise Services** – Today’s enterprises require strategies for Social Media, Mobility, Analytics and Cloud services. These tool sets are critical for driving e-commerce, sales and critical business operations. Avasant assists organizations in their Digital strategy with the goal of identifying key partners and technologies to drive business outcomes.

> **Sourcing Advisory** – Avasant assists public and private sector clients with navigating the complex transaction lifecycle of securing critical IT, Operations and Business Process outsourced services from global Tier 1 – 3 service providers by leveraging best practice methodologies, service level frameworks and financial analysis aligned and linked to their unique strategy, objectives and outcomes.

> **Globalization Advisory** – Avasant assists governments and the supporting provider ecosystem of emerging markets with targeted economic development solutions designed to foster job growth, education, policy optimization, infrastructure development and global market awareness.

> **Business & IT Transformation** – Avasant assists organizations with transforming critical internal IT and Operational elements to drive efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery, capabilities acquisition and cost savings based upon their unique strategy, objectives and outcomes.
### About Avasant

**Industry & Domain Expertise. Representative Clients...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy &amp; Utilities</th>
<th>- Calpine Corporation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Fluor Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Irvine Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- KBR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- NiSource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Southern California Edison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sempra Energy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HealthCare &amp; Life Sciences</th>
<th>- Alberta Health Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Allergan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Amgen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Edwards Life Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Intermountain Health Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mayo Clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Novartis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- CDPHP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>- Ghana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Jamaica Trade and Invest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- USAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- USTDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Belize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Haiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Columbia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Profits</th>
<th>- AARP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Brookings Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Outsourcing Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rockefeller Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- World Vision International</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Banking, Financial Services &amp; Insurance</th>
<th>- Argo Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Alliance Data Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Bank of New York Mellon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Credit Suisse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Diebold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Norges Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Russell Investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Symetra Financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Toyota Financial Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- XL Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Inter-American Develop Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The World Bank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media &amp; Entertainment</th>
<th>- Pioneer Electronics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- QW Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sony Pictures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sony Music</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retail, Manufacturing &amp; Distribution</th>
<th>- Advance Auto Parts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- PetSmart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sephora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- REI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Kroger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- AAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sony Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sony Electronics, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Toyota Motor Sales</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Sector</th>
<th>- State of California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- City of Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- City of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- County of Orange, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Avasant’s public sector consulting practice has many years of experience supporting the state and local government IT sourcing initiatives. Specifically, Avasant has strong experience with local government structure, regulatory compliance, procurement and legal functions, unions, communications, and political organizations. Avasant also testifies as an expert for its clients in support of strategic IT initiatives. Avasant has built its public sector practice and customized our methodology to achieve success in delivering on performance and cost objectives established by our clients. Our recent City engagements in State and Local Government include the following entities.
## Proposed Engagement Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Estimated Project Duration</th>
<th>Rate Type</th>
<th>Professional Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT Environment Assessment and Strategic Plan Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Project Initiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Data Collection and Interviews</td>
<td>10 weeks</td>
<td>Fixed Fee</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Current State Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Analyze Gaps and Recommendation Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Develop IT Strategic Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pricing Assumptions:

- Fees for the engagement are fixed at $50,000 plus approved travel and miscellaneous expenses.
- City will be billed separately for travel and miscellaneous expenses. Avasant travel expenses must be approved by the City. Travel expenses are expected to be less than 5% of the project fixed fee.
- Avasant assumes interviews and workshops can be efficiently scheduled to optimize the overall project schedule. This will be reviewed and refined during the Project Initiation phase of the engagement.
- A discounted rate of $175 per hour for work beyond week 10 will be assessed for City related delays to the timeline or for work outside the initial scope.
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Project Outcomes

Project Outcomes for City of El Segundo

• Accurate understanding of the City’s current IT environment.

• Identification of current strengths, weaknesses, risk areas and opportunities for cost savings / service enhancements

• Summation of future IT environment necessary to support City’s anticipated services and business objectives for next 3-5 years

• Gap analysis of current state IT environment versus required future state IT environment

• Road Map providing prioritized view of necessary changes and investments needed to achieve the desired future state IT environment. Road Map will cover changes to IT infrastructure, application portfolio, organizational and governance structures.

• IT Strategic Plan that is aligned with the City’s business / services strategy providing underlying principles and direction for the City’s IT department in areas that include technical infrastructure, application portfolio, data security, enterprise digital services, organizational structure, staffing and internal / external governance parameters.
The City’s Strategic Plan will include the following:

- Identification of needed improvements to technology infrastructure, software, network bandwidth, data security, disaster recovery capabilities, and future needs for technology applications.
- Prioritized application and infrastructure requirements based on identified City needs and goals.
- Opportunities to utilize evolving enterprise digital technologies and services.
- Recommendations for appropriate staffing levels, governance structures necessary to support current and future IT environments.
- Budget projections, identifying both one-time and recurring expenses, for achieving a staged implementation of the IT plan.
The City can expect the following approach and solution characteristics when working with Avasant:

- Experts leveraging decades of IT and domain knowledge and experience similar clients
- A fully collaborative approach that elicits input and “buy in” from all stakeholder groups
- A mature strategic plan development methodology based on consulting best practices that have been “honed” over a hundred of similar engagements
- Established templates and scripts that maximize the value of participant input while minimizing time away from daily job responsibilities
- Utilization of Avasant’s proprietary research library that consists of relevant industry benchmarks, metrics and service levels, documented best practices and delivery models that consider evolving technologies and services
- Performance of the full scope of work and submission of deliverables within the stated timeline
- Actionable recommendations and associated road map that are fully aligned with the business’ strategic plan
Avasant proposes engagement timeline to accomplish the project objectives. We are projecting a 10 week engagement to fulfill the scope and present the **final roadmap deliverable**. A revised detailed project plan will be developed as a part of the project initiation phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT INITIATION</th>
<th>Wk 1</th>
<th>Wk 2</th>
<th>Wk 3</th>
<th>Wk 4</th>
<th>Wk 5</th>
<th>Wk 6</th>
<th>Wk 7</th>
<th>Wk 8</th>
<th>Wk 9</th>
<th>Wk 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop Deliverables Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Project Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Kickoff Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATA COLLECTION AND INTERVIEWS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data and Information Gathering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and IT Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify the IT Strategic Goals, Drivers, and Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT STATE ASSESSMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT and Business Alignment Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery and Process Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Base Case Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUTURE STATE DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Future State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT and Business Alignment Confirmation Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current State Gap Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current State Risk and SWOT Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop High Level Future State Options Based on Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELP IT STRATEGY, ROADMAP AND COMMUNICATION PLAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Findings, Analysis, and Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop IT Strategic Roadmap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Executive Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Avasant’s methods, practices, tools and templates have been refined based on decades of experience across a wide array of clients worldwide.

Avasant will utilize our mature IT Assessment methodology, tools and templates that are based on the collective experience gained through decades of similar engagements.

- Based on industry known best practices including ITIL 2011 for Service Management, COBIT 5.0 for operational control and governance and ISO 27001 for information security.
- Avasant’s methodology is modular with individual tracks. The templates and tools are tailored to assess and evaluate each area identified by the City.

Our approach results in accurate, high value project deliverables and actionable recommendations for state and local government clients.
Project Initiation Key Steps:

- Develop Project Plan and refine key project timeline dates and resources
- Conduct kick-off session to review and clarify project objectives, scope, approach, and deliverables
- Identify interview (data gathering) participants
- Establish responsibilities of project team participants

Project Initiation - Results:

- Kickoff for the engagement with key stakeholders and the project core team
- Established project goals, objectives, timelines, communication plan and deliverables
Solution Approach: IT Environment Assessment and Strategic Plan
Data Collection And Interviews

Professional Services for Strategic Planning Approach

Data Collection - Key Steps
- Collect current and future state IT environment information
- Interview IT and business stakeholders
- Establish IT and business Strategic Goals and Drivers

Data Collection - Results
- Accurate picture of current IT environment covering people, processes, technology and cost.
- Understanding of current and future requirements for key IT stakeholders
- Set of City IT strategic goals and drivers that will be the basis for the IT Strategic Plan
Solution Approach: IT Environment Assessment and Strategic Plan

Current State Assessment

Professional Services for Strategic Planning Approach

Current State Assessment - Key Steps
- Process and Governance assessment to understand IT process capability maturity as compared to industry leading best practices
- Organizational assessment of staff in IT service management roles
- Technology assessment to review complexity and capacity
- Cost assessment versus current market pricing

Current State Assessment - Results
- Validated view of the current state IT environment including a high level assessment of the IT processes, organizational, technology and cost components of the environment
- Strength, weakness, opportunity, threats and risk assessment
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Solution Approach: IT Environment Assessment and Strategic Plan

Future State Design

Future State Design - Key Steps

- Define Future State
- Conduct business alignment workshop

Future State Design - Results

- Development of a future IT environment based on the City’s IT Strategic Goals and Drivers and aligned with the City’s business goals
## Solution Approach: IT Environment Assessment and Strategic Plan

### Analyze Gaps and Recommendation Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gaps and Options Key Steps</th>
<th>Gaps and Options - Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Contrast City's current IT environment to City's desired future state</td>
<td>- Report identifying gaps between City's IT Current State and its desired Future State IT environment in areas of technology, people (organization), processes and cost of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identify gaps between current IT environment to City's desired future state</td>
<td>- Recommended steps to mitigate identified gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Develop recommendations to close gaps</td>
<td>- A Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats profile for each assessment area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Prioritized recommendations to transition to City's desired future state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4. Representative Engagement Team

References
Proposed Engagement Team

Mr. Guapo has extensive experience assisting public and private sector clients with all aspects of the IT strategy development, IT financial analysis, IT organizational assessment and design, infrastructure and applications portfolio analysis, IT services and technology sourcing strategy. Prior to joining Avasant, Mr. Guapo was a Director in Gartner Consulting’s Strategic IT Sourcing and State and Local Government practices.

Relevant Engagements
County of Orange, CA: Engagement Manager for an engagement that included assessment of the current IT environment, development of a cost savings-focused IT strategy for IT infrastructure service areas, stakeholder surveys and interviews, financial / base case analysis, and a SWOT / risk analysis for infrastructure and applications development and maintenance services

California Judicial Council: Engagement Manager for an engagement that included an SOW gap analysis to identify gaps in client’s SOWs and SLAs and recommendations and best practices for future IT services, development of a full suite of IT infrastructure SOWs (Data Center, Data Network, Desktop Support, and Service Desk) and associated service levels, and preparation of an RFP package for renegotiation with incumbent service provider

Other state and local government engagements include:
- City of Los Angeles, CA
- City of Kansas City, MI
- City of Indianapolis Public Schools
- City of San Mateo, CA
- City of Santa Cruz, CA
- City of Danville, Virginia
- State of Arkansas
Mr. McCracken has more than 15 years of experience working with clients in all aspects of IT strategy development, IT financial analysis, infrastructure and applications portfolio analysis and IT services. Prior to joining Avasant, Mr. McCracken was Vice President of Managed Services within SAIC’s Commercial Business Services Group which included overseeing all managed service engagements with SAIC’s state and local government and commercial market clients.

Relevant Engagements

City of Los Angeles: Mr. McCracken was the client partner for an engagement that included assessment of the current IT environment and development of a IT strategy for IT infrastructure services and enterprise applications. The engagement included stakeholder surveys and interviews, financial/base case analysis, and a SWOT/risk analysis for infrastructure and applications maintenance services. Avasant

County of Orange: Avasant assessed Orange County’s current IT environment for company wide IT operations covering IT infrastructure, enterprise applications, network, data operations and computing services. The assessment focused on cost benchmarking, evaluating risk, sourcing opportunities, go to market alternatives. The risk assessment focused on human capital, legal, financial, security, transition, communication, technology and performance risk elements for each sourcing alternative. Mr. McCracken followed this engagement with workshops to train County service delivery managers to manage service providers working under the new delivery model.

Other relevant projects include: State of Texas – Health and Human Services Commission, City of San Diego
David Gallup, Manager, Avasant: Mr. Gallup is a Senior Manager for Avasant and brings with him 9 years of consulting experience in both public sector and commercial IT infrastructure and applications projects. Recent public sector projects include:

State of California Judicial Council – Mr. Gallup, as the project manager, conducted an assessment to identify gaps in client’s SOWs and SLAs in current outsourced environment, and recommended best practices for future IT services.

County of Orange, CA – Mr. Gallup, as project manager, assessed the County’s IT environment developed a cost savings-focused strategy for IT infrastructure service areas. The assessment included development and execution of stakeholder surveys and interviews, financial / base case analysis, and SWOT / risk analyses.

City of San Diego – Mr. Gallup performed an assessment and developed a cost savings-focused strategy for Data Center, Network, Voice and Application Development and Maintenance service areas, including conducting stakeholder interviews, base case and sourcing scenario financial analysis, and sourcing scenario risk analyses.

Detailed Resumes available upon request
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5. References
Reference – City of Los Angeles

IT Assessment and Strategic Plan:
Avasant assessed the City’s current IT environment for it’s central IT agency and all departments and agencies within the city including the City TV station (Channel 35) and city information center 311 (except LADWP, LAWA).

• The assessment covered infrastructure, enterprise and business applications, support services

• The assessment focused on operational readiness, risk, alignment with business objectives in the context of Strategic Approach, Human Capital, Technology and Cost.

• The engagement output included job classifications review, best practice guidelines for security, comparison to peer cities, service level analysis, cost-benefit and SWOT analyses, pricing models, risk analysis, a deficiency mitigation roadmap and City-wide Strategic Technology Services Plan

• Engagement included interviews with city departments, CAO, Mayor’s office, CLA, some city council members

• Avasant testified at IT Operating Committee Hearing, IT and General Services Committee Hearing.
IT Assessment and Sourcing Strategy:
Avasant assessed Orange County's current IT environment for company wide IT operations covering IT infrastructure, enterprise applications, network, data operations and computing services

- The assessment focused on cost benchmarking, evaluating risk, sourcing opportunities, go to market alternatives
- Risk assessment focused on human capital, legal, financial, security, transition, communication, technology and performance risk elements for each sourcing alternative.
- The engagement output included sourcing scope recommendations, go-to-market alternatives/ scenario analysis, transition approached and timelines, summary of financial benefits, sourcing strategy summary and roadmap
January 29, 2015

Mr. Larry Klingaman
Information Systems Manager
City of El Segundo
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

RE: Information Systems Assessment & Strategic Plan Project

Dear Mr. Klingaman,

NexLevel Information Technology, Inc. (NexLevel) respectfully submits this proposal letter to the City of El Segundo to assist the City in developing an IS Assessment and short term (3-Year) Strategic Plan that identifies and prioritizes the City’s technology projects for the next 24 - 36 months. NexLevel developed our proposal based on information we received during conversations over the past several weeks and from information gathered from the City’s website and budget. Provided as a part of this letter is a proposal which we believe meets your short-term needs for an immediate assessment of IS operations, along identification of necessary technology projects over the next 36 months.

Our Company

Founded in 1999, NexLevel is a California-based management consulting firm that helps public sector clients plan, procure, implement, and manage complex technology solutions. NexLevel was founded on providing top tier senior level consulting planning, procurement, and project management services to public agencies, and these services remain at our core 16 years later.

Our Experience

NexLevel’s track record includes supporting over 70 cities, counties, districts, and state agencies. As it relates specifically to the City’s current needs, we have completed more than 35 California local government technology assessment and strategic plan projects. Regional clients for which we provided similar services include the cities of Manhattan Beach, Huntington Beach, Ontario, and Glendale. These recent related projects benefit the City through hands-on experience with the business and operational challenges facing similar sized municipalities, as well as a strong knowledge of the technologies successfully implemented. Attachment A – Qualifications provides additional information about NexLevel.

Our Team

NexLevel proposes a team of consultants with the relevant experience to meet the needs of this important project. The use of a team approach benefits the City by enabling us to run activities and tasks in parallel under accelerated timelines. In addition, it provides the City with increased depth of knowledge and expertise.

Mr. Patrick Griffin, Managing Consultant will serve as the Engagement Manager and a subject matter expert. Supporting Mr. Griffin will be NexLevel Managing Consultants Cindy Abbott, Linda Lang, and Mike Stein.
Our Methodology and Approach

NexLevel is proposing an approach that addresses the City's short-term objectives of reviewing current IS service delivery and resource levels, identifying immediate technology concerns, and providing a foundation for future technology endeavors. The proposed methodology is an abbreviated approach to the methods we use to complete a 5-year IT Strategic Technology plan. The proposed 3-Year IS Strategic Plan provides the City a strong foundation and starting point to expand on future technology related initiatives as future demands dictate.

A cornerstone of NexLevel's assessment and planning methodology is the focus and emphasis on the involvement and interaction with the department users of technology and those setting the business direction for the City. To develop the City's 3-Year IS Strategic Plan, NexLevel will incorporate input from key users and stakeholders, as well as the City's IS staff.

NexLevel is familiar with the challenges and issues that can arise in developing such plans. For example, we are skilled in managing multiple, and often conflicting, stakeholder visions, missions, goals, objectives, needs, and priorities. Our proposed methodology considers project prioritization and includes processes to help manage competing priorities to ensure the IS Strategic Plan reflects the true business and operational needs of the City. We pride ourselves in helping organizations develop plans that are realistic and attainable in terms of available budget, resources and time.

To complete the 3-Year IS Strategic Plan for the City, NexLevel will complete the following three tasks:

♦ Initiate
♦ Analyze
♦ Strategize

In the following paragraphs, we provide a detailed description of each task, as well as key activities and deliverables for each task.

Task 1 - Initiate

The primary purpose of Task 1 is to prepare for and initiate the project under a well-defined project plan and schedule, and to ensure alignment of expectations (i.e. purpose, timeline, resources, activities, etc.) among all project participants. To accomplish this, it requires planning and coordination between NexLevel and the City's Project Manager, as well as communication outreach activities to all City staff that will be involved in the project.

The following table identifies each activity and associated deliverables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No.</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Planning Meeting</td>
<td>NexLevel will meet with the City's Project Sponsor and Project Manager to review and confirm the following project components:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Project objectives, scope of work, and schedule</td>
<td>Project Work Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Project status and update requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Project risks and risk mitigation strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Project issue management methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Identification of staff to be involved in the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Task 2 - Analyze

In developing a realistic and attainable 3-Year IS Strategic Plan, it is necessary to first have a comprehensive and realistic understanding of the current IS infrastructure and support resources. Secondly, the City must have an accurate understanding of how departments are using technology today to support operations, and whether that technology is meeting the City’s needs. Task 2 includes the activities that allow for the collection and verification of information to provide the foundation for the IS Strategic Plan.

The following table lists each activity and identifies key deliverables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No.</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.1      | IS Service Management Review            | NexLevel’s IS Service Management Review evaluates the effectiveness of the City’s IS infrastructure and support organization in supporting the future needs of the City by reviewing six key operational dimensions including:

  * Technology Governance
  * Service Delivery
  * Business Technology Applications
  * Security
  * Infrastructure
  * Administration

The primary purpose of the review is to understand the strengths and weaknesses of the City’s technology management and support. The current environment provides the foundation upon which the IS Strategic Plan is built. | Working Papers for Strategic Plan  
Potential Projects for Strategic Plan |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No.</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.2     | Business Technology Review| NexLevel will facilitate a series of on-site workshops with City departments to identify the current technology environment within each organization, barriers to full utilization of those technologies, and planned uses and expansion of technology in the next 24 - 36 months. The workshops will be held for each department and attended by department managers and key staff as directed by the City. NexLevel anticipates the following workshops:  
  - City Manager’s Office  
  - City Treasurer  
  - City Clerk  
  - Finance  
  - Police  
  - Fire  
  - Library  
  - Recreation and Parks  
  - Planning and Building Safety  
  - Public Works  
  - Human Resources                                                                 | Working Papers for Strategic Plan  
                                                                                | Potential Projects for Strategic Plan                                              |
| 2.3     | Gap Analysis              | NexLevel will compile an IT Assessment Report, which will include a written overview of the current state of the City’s IS systems and practices. This assessment will summarize IS strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT), as well as potential solutions for the City’s consideration. The Gap Analysis will include all the findings obtained from Tasks 2.1 and 2.2. NexLevel will provide the City a Draft IT Assessment Report for review and comment. If necessary, NexLevel will meet with staff to further elaborate and /or discuss the contents of the IT Assessment Report. Once all the feedback is obtained, NexLevel will publish and distribute a Final IT Assessment Report. | IT Assessment Report (Draft)  
                                                                                | IT Assessment Report (Final)                                                        |
Task 3 - Strategize

The purpose of Task 3 is to prioritize projects that need to be included in the 3-Year IT Strategic Plan. NexLevel brings the City proven methods and tools to ensure identified projects are well defined, understood by the stakeholders, and prioritized using agreed upon criteria. During this task, NexLevel will facilitate a Project Prioritization Workshop that uses a multi-step process to arrive at a City-wide prioritization of identified projects that will provide the basis for the IT Roadmap.

We detail the Strategize activities and deliverables in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No.</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Project Formalization</td>
<td>NexLevel will consolidate the information from Activities 2.1 and 2.2 to create a recommended project portfolio listing. The projects will be designed to serve the City’s immediate and short-term needs. Each recommended project will include the following information: project description, cost estimates, implementation timeframes, and criteria to prepare for project prioritization. As necessary, NexLevel will conduct research of benchmarks and comparisons to similar implementation approaches used by similar sized agencies.</td>
<td>Recommended Project Portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Prioritization Workshop Preparation</td>
<td>NexLevel will prepare a packet of information for City staff that will participate in the project prioritization workshop. The package will include project information, as well as a description of the project prioritization workshop methods.</td>
<td>Prioritization Workshop Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>City-wide Prioritization Workshop</td>
<td>NexLevel uses our proprietary “Blue Wall” approach to arrive at a prioritized list of projects that will be included in the 3-Year IS Strategic Plan. The Blue Wall approach involves a facilitated multi-step prioritization methodology that encourages staff participation and collaboration. The workshop is designed to help drive consensus to obtain City-wide prioritization of projects. The end result of the workshop will be a prioritized list of projects assigned to a timeframe. In addition, the workshop is designed to identify IS Strategic Plan enabling factors which are defined as key elements that must be in place or occur to allow the plan to be a success. Examples of enabling factors could include training, staffing, budget, governance, project management, change management.</td>
<td>Prioritized Project Portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Publish 3-Year IS Strategic Plan</td>
<td>NexLevel will incorporate work products from previous tasks as the foundation for the development of the 3-Year IS Strategic Plan. A draft of the Strategic Plan will be distributed to staff for review. Once NexLevel has received City feedback on the Draft 3-Year IS Strategic Plan, NexLevel will revise and update the document.</td>
<td>Draft and Final 3-Year IS Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schedule

NexLevel understands that the City is interested in beginning this project once approvals are in place. NexLevel is prepared to begin the project upon notification to proceed, and we anticipate that it will entail approximately 12-16 weeks from start to completion. Completion of the project within this timeframe is dependent on NexLevel having timely access to key City staff.

Level of Effort and Pricing

Based on our past experience in working with similar size municipalities, we estimate this project will require 296 hours. NexLevel is proposing a time and materials approach for billing our services at an all-inclusive (includes all travel and overhead) hourly bill rate of $165. NexLevel will only bill the City for the actual hours expended, and we commit to a total not-to-exceed price for this project of $48,840. Should the City wish to embark only on Phases 1 and 2 of the project (Initiate and Analyze phases), the not-to-exceed cost for these first two phases is $27,390, with the final Strategize phase being $21,450 to complete.

If you have any questions about the information contained in this letter proposal, please feel free to contact Patrick Griffin or me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Terry Hackelman
Managing Principal
Attachment A - Company Qualifications

Headquartered in the Sacramento, California area, NexLevel is a management consulting firm that helps public sector clients enhance their use of information technology. Since 1999, NexLevel has worked with more than 70 California state and local government agencies to complete IT Assessments, IT Strategic Plans, IT Governance, GIS Strategic Plans, Network Assessments, IT Service Level Assessments, Policy / Procedure Documentation development, Project Management Organization implementations, Feasibility Studies, Request for Proposal (RFP) development and Procurement Management efforts. Figure 1 illustrates NexLevel’s full range of IT services.

![NexLevel Services Diagram](image)

**Figure 1 - NexLevel Services**

Since our inception, NexLevel has invested in and developed toolkits (methodologies, processes, tools, and supporting processes) designed specifically for the unique needs and requirements of California local government entities. NexLevel consultants consistently improve and expand the knowledge base included in these toolkits based on real life experience with our clients. More importantly, we share these toolkits with our clients and leave them behind so they can be used to support future projects.

**Experience**

As shown in the table below, NexLevel has a strong record of accomplishment in providing technology consulting services for California public sector clients. This includes the successful completion of more than 35 IT Strategic Plans for public sector organizations in California. A significant number of our client projects are of similar scope and size to what the City is seeking. In addition, many clients have a similar organizational structure and technical infrastructure to that of the City.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>California Cities and Counties</th>
<th>IT Strategic Plans</th>
<th>IT/GIS Assessments</th>
<th>IT Policies &amp; Procedures</th>
<th>Project Management</th>
<th>IT Governance</th>
<th>Disaster Recovery Planning</th>
<th>System Selection &amp; Procurements</th>
<th>Other Management Consulting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Chino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Clovis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Costa Mesa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fairfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fremont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Folsom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Glendale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Irvine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lake Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lakewood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Quinta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Long Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Manhattan Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Newport Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Novato</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Ontario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Orange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Palmdale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Paso Robles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pico Rivera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pismo Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pomona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Rancho Palos Verdes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Ridgecrest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Riverside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Bernardino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Rosa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Stockton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Walnut Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Westminster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Truckee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Special Districts</td>
<td>IT Strategic Plans</td>
<td>IT/GIS Assessments</td>
<td>IT Policies &amp; Procedures</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>IT Governance</td>
<td>Disaster Recovery Planning</td>
<td>System Selection &amp; Procurements</td>
<td>Other Management Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chino Valley Independent Fire District</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Contra Costa Sanitation District</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Diablo Sanitation District</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Municipal Water District</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moulton Niguel Water District</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Los Angeles</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho California Water District</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Municipal Utility District</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Fire Department</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silicon Valley Power</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So. Orange Co. Wastewater Authority</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tahoe Public Utility District</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turlock Irrigation District</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to our California local government experience identified above, NexLevel also has significant planning and project management experience working with the State of California for agencies such as California Highway Patrol, Department of Justice, Department of Motor Vehicles, Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Department of Child Support Services, and more.

NexLevel has extensive, hands-on knowledge of the technologies and applications typically used by California public agencies. The table below identifies NexLevel’s technology expertise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Agency Technologies and Applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Payroll, and Human Resources (ERP) Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitting/Inspections/Code Enforcement Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Billing/Customer Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Management Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility and Class Management, Scheduling, and Registration Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD)/Record Management System (RMS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management/Computerized Maintenance Management System (CMMS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Information System (GIS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business License Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Document Management/Records Retention Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intranet / Collaboration/Workflow Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet and eGovernment Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Solutions/Field Access/Field Reporting Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated Metering Infrastructure (AMI) &amp; Automated Meter Reading (AMR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Management Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Management Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Agency Technologies and Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Management Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Procurement and Vendor Management Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Relationship Management (CRM) Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Recruitment Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation Management Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Management Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated Vehicle Locator (AVL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Order Management Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Management/Ticketing Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of current IT structure and systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience with City technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent Relevant ITSP Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of proposal process, schedule and deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of proposal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Understanding of current IT structure and systems**
- Clearly understood existing City software and hardware in use: Score 2
- Did not ask probing questions to understand City environment: Score 1
- Did not show knowledge of City systems: Score 0

**Experience with City technologies**
- Have worked recently with most City utilized technologies: Score 2
- Have worked with some City utilized technologies: Score 1
- Have not worked with most City technologies: Score 0

**Recent Relevant ITSP Experience (Last three years)**
- Completed multiple ITSP's: Score 2
- Completed one or two ITSP's: Score 1
- Completed no ITSP's: Score 0

**Clarity of proposal process, schedule and deliverables**
- Proposal was clear, concise and had a distinct schedule and deliverables: Score 2
- Proposal was vague, or did not provide a schedule or deliverables: Score 1
- Proposal was vague and did not provide a schedule and deliverables: Score 0

**Cost of proposal (Expectation of $55,000)**
- Cost was within expected range of values: Score 2
- Cost was considerably outside expected range: Score 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Item</th>
<th>Avasant</th>
<th>NexLevel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of Organization</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of recent clients</td>
<td>Larger</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Location</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Participation</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>