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.

MEETING OF THE EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
TUESDAY, JUNE 19, 2018 – 4:00 PM

4:00 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:

1. Consideration and possible action to (1) receive and file a report from Public Works on the City's Solid Waste Program and Waste Collection Services, and (2) provide staff direction on negotiations of a contract extension with Republic Services and future solid waste collection services.
   (Fiscal Impact: TBD)
   Recommendation – 1) Receive and file a report from Public Works related to the City's Solid Waste Program and Waste Collection Services; 2) Provide staff direction on negotiations of a contract extension with Republic and future solid waste collection services; 3) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

2. Consideration and possible action to interview candidates of the Economic Development Advisory Council (EDAC) and the Library Board of Trustees.
   (Fiscal Impact: None)
   Recommendation – 1) Interview candidates; 2) Announce appointment(s) at the 7:00 p.m., July 17, 2018 City Council meeting, if any; 3) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

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)(1): -0- matters

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION

Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to Government Code §54956.9(d)(2): -2- matters.

DISCUSSION OF PERSONNEL MATTERS (Gov’t Code §54957): -1- matters

1. Public Employee Review
   Position: City Manager

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): -0- matters

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

1. Represented Group: El Segundo Police Officer’s Association
   City’s Negotiators: Irma Moisa Rodriguez
   City Manager
   Human Resources Director
EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA ITEM STATEMENT

MEETING DATE: June 19, 2018
AGENDA HEADING: Special Order of Business

AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action to (1) receive and file a report from Public Works on the City’s Solid Waste Program and Waste Collection Services, and (2) provide staff direction on negotiations of a contract extension with Republic Services and future solid waste collection services. (Fiscal Impact: TBD)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
1. Receive and file a report from Public Works related to the City’s Solid Waste Program and Waste Collection Services; and,
2. Provide staff direction on negotiations of a contract extension with Republic and future solid waste collection services; or,
3. Alternatively, take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
Solid Waste Management Program - PowerPoint

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

STRATEGIC PLAN:
Goal: 1A El Segundo provides unparalleled service to internal and external customers.
Objective: 2 City services are convenient, efficient and user-friendly for all residents, businesses, and visitors.

PREPARED BY: Ken Berkman, Director of Public Works
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:
The El Segundo Municipal Code (ESMC), Title 5, Chapter 2 states that, “The City shall collect and dispose of residential and miscellaneous refuse from every residential unit within the City at least once per week.” Additionally, the State of California has several laws and regulations pertaining to solid waste disposition that are enforced by the Department of Resources, Recycling, and Recovery (CalRecycle), with which the City must comply.

The following is provided to assist the City Council with its consideration of the residential solid waste collections contract with Republic Services that will be expiring on October 31, 2018, and to provide direction to staff on how to proceed with negotiations with Republic Services and the future of the City’s Solid Waste Program as a whole.
Residential Solid Waste Collection

The following is a chronological history of the City’s residential solid waste collection contracts to date:

- 1993 - Zakaroff Recycling Services (Zakaroff) was awarded a contract, which was extended in 1997 for an additional five years.
- 1998 - Zakaroff merged with Republic Industries, and the agreement was assigned to Consolidated Disposal Services (CDS), a subsidiary of Republic Services, Inc. (Republic).
- 2001 – CDS/Republic’s contract was extended for five years, and in 2006 it was extended another five years.
- 2010 - Prior to the expiration of the contract in 2011, the City, with assistance from the then-active Trash Subcommittee, determined it was in the City’s best interest to bid out the residential trash collection contract. The City also considered whether to include or exclude residential properties with three or four units in the new contract. The City concurrently commenced a Proposition 218 process to implement a residential trash collection fee schedule.

In February 2011, the City released the RFP with various bid options, including contracting for the same services for three or seven years, or contracting for enhanced services for a three- or seven-year term. The scope of work included multi-family properties of up to four units. The City received four proposals in response to the RFP, and the Trash Subcommittee recommended award of the contract to CDS/Republic for a seven-year period, given that all respondents were well-qualified and CDS/Republic had the lowest cost proposal.

The existing contract with CDS (Republic is providing the services), which expires on October 31, 2018, provides waste collection services to 3,981 residential units, including all single-family residences and multi-family properties up to four units. The ESMC requires the City provide services to properties of up to two units (§5-2-2-B). The City pays CDS/Republic $9.88 per unit per month, which, with the additional services provided, amounts to approximately $520,000 per year.

The City is one of only three cities in California that pays for its residents’ solid waste collection. Residents of San Diego and Commerce do not directly pay for their waste collection services.

The City is the only city in LA County that uses curbside, manual collection for its solid waste.

The existing contract includes the following services:

- Weekly unlimited waste - residents provide containers
- Weekly Unlimited recyclables - CDS provides 2-16 or 1-32 gallon containers
- Weekly unlimited bulky items
- Green waste drop-off at the City Yard
- Two annual cleanup weeks for bulky items
- Two annual document shredding events
- Holiday tree collection
- Abandoned item collection in public right-of-way
- Five City-sponsored events/year
- Outreach and education
Residential Trash Collection Survey

In November 2017, in consultation with the Environmental Committee, the City prepared and conducted a survey of the residents to gather opinions on the existing waste collection services and desires for future services. Out of 3,077 surveys of property owners, 1,300 responses were received (overall response rate of 42%). In summary, 87% of the respondents gave the existing service a top rating, and 62% indicated they preferred the City continue providing the current manual (hand-tossed) method of collection versus switching to an automated side-loading method. Furthermore, 78% of respondents indicated they did not want to pay $35 per month for their trash collection services. Of those who were willing to pay $35 per month, there was still a slight preference for the manual method over automated collection.

In late 2017, the City requested a proposal from CDS/Republic to continue the existing manual services for a one- or two-year period. They offered the following rates for continuing our curbside, manual service:

- 2 year extension: 1st year: $16.95/unit; 2nd year: $19.55/unit
- 1 year extension: $19.55/unit

State Regulations and CalRecycle

There are several key State regulations with which the City must maintain compliance. In addition to AB 939, the State’s mandated landfill diversion legislation from 1990, new legislation adopted over the past five years has increased the requirements for landfill diversion, recycling, and managing organics.

- AB 341, adopted in 2012, requires recycling at businesses and multi-family properties with more than five units that generate four cubic yards (CY) of solid waste, and requires reporting and monitoring by the City and its haulers.
- AB 1826, enacted in 2016, requires organics recycling at businesses and multi-family properties with more than five units that generate four CY per week of organics. In 2019, this requirement will be expanded to include all businesses and M-F properties with more than five units that generate four CY of trash per week. Under this law, the City and haulers also must report and monitor compliance.

CalRecycle’s Local Assistance and Market Development (LAMD) Branch conducts a compliance review every four years. In March 2017, under the recommendation of the LAMD, the CalRecycle Board referred the City to CalRecycle’s Jurisdiction Compliance Unit (JCU) due to the City’s program “gaps”, including mandatory commercial recycling monitoring and implementation, residential green waste program effectiveness and oversight, and Construction and Demolition (C&D) debris recycling program. Staff has been working cooperatively with JCU staff to assist with their review of the City’s program. JCU staff findings are expected to be delivered to staff after a year of their review, in Summer 2018.

SB 1383, the organic waste reduction legislation, affects Residential and Commercial Generators, and establishes a 50% disposal reduction of organics by 2020 and a 75% disposal reduction of organics by 2025. Under this new legislation, the City must provide residential and commercial organic waste collection services, conduct minimum levels of education, outreach and contamination monitoring, oversee compliance of generators and haulers, and report annually to CalRecycle. Implementation and
enforcement of SB 1383 begins in 2022. The legislation allows CalRecycle to issue penalties up to $10,000 per day if the City is not in compliance, and Corrective Action Plans to consider compliance efforts, timelines, and milestones. The regulations to implement SB 1383 are presently being written, and will be finalized in Fall 2018.

The requirements of SB 1383 and ongoing compliance with AB 939 and other mandates has changed the landscape of municipal solid waste collection systems. Given the referral to the JCU and the pending expiration of CDS/Republic’s residential collections contract, in this fiscal year’s budget Council authorized the hiring of a Solid Waste Program consultant firm to ensure the City has the expertise and experience required to address these issues. The Public Works Department prepared and conducted an RFP process and selected SCS Engineers (SCS) as the most qualified and competent firm. SCS will help prepare for implementation of new policies, programs, and infrastructure to meet existing and new legislative and regulatory requirements, as well as ensure the City’s short- and long-term needs of the residential (and commercial) collection services are included in any and all contracts or franchise agreements.

The City will need to consider future options for its residential service, including automated collection using a three-cart system for Trash, Recyclables, and Organics; a two-cart system for Trash and Recyclables with organics drop-off; or mixed waste processing of residential waste. Presently, rates for automated three-cart collection programs in Los Angeles County are approximately $25-30 per month. With the additional future collection of organics, and challenges associated with markets for recyclables, the City can anticipate similar monthly costs per unit, depending on the hauler and type of services.

The City currently has 24 commercial haulers operating under business licenses with no reporting requirements, which is a significant reason staff has had difficulty obtaining their disposal data and reporting it to CalRecycle. Staff is seeking Council’s concurrence to issue the required Notice of Intent to Franchise Commercial (and thus multi-family) Collection Services with the goal of establishing Franchise Agreements with selected haulers at the end of the 5-year Notice period.

To ensure the necessary solid waste collection services are provided to the residents and business in the City, the options include:

- Extend the CDS/Republic contract with existing services for 1 or 2 years;
- Negotiate a new long-term contract with CDS/Republic, for an automated 2- or 3-cart system;
- Prepare an RFP and seek bids for a new residential collections contract, including options for automated collection and manual collection that can provide regulatory compliance;
- Issue a 5-year Notice of Intent to Franchise commercial collection services.
Solid Waste Management Program

June 19, 2018
Topics

- History of solid waste in the City
- Residential waste collection survey
- Republic Services agreement
- Future Options for the City
History

- Residential Collection
- Commercial Collection
- Legislation and Compliance
Residential Services Contract

- 1993: City contracted with Zakaroff for residential and municipal trash services
- 1997: Contract Extended
- 1998: Zakaroff merged with Republic Industries, agreement assigned to Consolidated Disposal Services (CDS), a subsidiary of Republic Services, Inc.
- 2001: Contract extended 5 years
- 2006: Contract extended 5 years
- 2011: RFP distributed for new contract
  - CDS/Republic lowest bid; awarded contract
  - City no longer pays for service for M-F greater than 4 units
- Existing contract expires October 31, 2018
Residential Services

- 3,981 Residential Units
  - Single Family
  - Multi-Family up to 4 units
- $9.88/month/unit = $472,000
- City pays $520,000/year (including other services noted in next slide)
- City is one of three cities in CA where residents are not charged for waste collection (San Diego and Commerce are the other two).
- Only curbside manual collection provided by Republic in LA/Orange Counties
Residential Services

- Services include:
  - Weekly unlimited waste - residents provide containers
  - Weekly Unlimited recyclables: Republic provides 2-16 or 1-32 gal containers
  - Weekly unlimited bulky items
  - Green waste drop-off at City yard
  - 2 annual cleanup weeks for bulky items
  - 2 annual shredding events
  - Holiday tree collection
  - Abandoned item collection in public right-of-way
  - City-sponsored events (Five minimum)
  - Outreach
Commercial Services

- 24 licensed haulers
- Serve businesses and multi-family 5+ units
- Construction and demolition debris boxes
- No reporting requirements
Legislation and Compliance

• AB 939 – (1990) Mandated 50% diversion

• AB 341- (2012) Mandatory commercial recycling
  • Businesses and M-F > 5 units with 4 cy/week trash
  • Reporting and monitoring requirements for City and haulers

• AB 1826 – (2016) Mandatory commercial organics
  • 2017: Businesses and M-F >5 units with 4 cy/week organics
  • 2019: Businesses and M-F >5 units with 4 cy/week trash
  • Reporting and monitoring requirements for City and haulers
CalRecycle Compliance

- Local Assistance and Market Development Branch conducts compliance review every four years
- March 2017: referred to Jurisdiction Compliance Unit (JCU)
  - Mandatory Commercial Recycling monitoring and implementation
  - Residential green waste program effectiveness and oversight
  - C&D debris recycling program
  - City required to implement additional outreach and monitoring
  - City to provide plan to address program "gaps"
- January 2018: CalRecycle sent letters to commercial haulers requesting compliance data
- Summer 2018: CalRecycle will assess status of compliance and present findings in report
SB 1383
Organic Waste Disposal Reduction

REQUIREMENTS
- Affects Residential and Commercial Generators
- 50% disposal reduction by 2020
- 75% disposal reduction by 2025
- Recover 20% of edible food by 2025
- Must provide residential and commercial organic waste collection services
- Must conduct minimum levels of education, outreach and contamination monitoring
- Must oversee compliance of generators and haulers
- Must report annually
SB 1383
Organic Waste Disposal Reduction

IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT

• Begins in 2022
• Can require jurisdictions to impose requirements
• Can impose penalties up to $10,000/day
• Corrective Action Plans to consider compliance efforts, timelines, and milestones
# Residential Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Online</th>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Surveys Sent on 11/27/2017:</td>
<td>3161</td>
<td>1003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Close date:</td>
<td>12/15/2017</td>
<td>12/24/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Surveys Delivered:</td>
<td>3077 *</td>
<td>978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Reminders:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate:</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Return/Respondents = 1300</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1: On a scale of 1-10, how would you rate your trash collection services?

Current Trash Collection Services
Average Rating

Respondents gave the collection services a very high rating: 8.75 out of 10
Q1: On a scale of 1-10 (10 being exceptional), how would you rate your trash collection services?

Current Trash Collection Services Rating

87% of the Respondents gave their current trash collection service a top rating, and 2% gave them a poor rating.
Q2: Would you like the City to continue providing the current manual (hand-tossed) method of collection or switch to the automated side-loading method?

### Preferred Collection Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62% prefer manual method compared to 11% who prefer Automated.
Q4: El Segundo currently provides unlimited bulky (large) item pickups for residents. How many bulky item pick-ups do you feel residents actually need per year?

Number of Bulky Item Pick-Ups Needed

77% of the respondents need "3-4" or fewer bulky item pick-ups per year.
Q4: Would you be willing to pay for this service?

Willingness to Pay $35/Month

- **TOTAL**: 78% (Yes) 23% (No)
- **Online**: 69% (Yes) 31% (No)
- **Paper**: 86% (Yes) 14% (No)

78% of respondents do not want to pay $35/month for their Trash collection services.
Q2: Would you like the City to continue providing the current manual (hand-tossed) method of collection or switch to the automated side-loading method?

Preferred Collection Method if Willing to Pay $35/month compared to Not Willing to pay $35/month

If respondents were willing to pay $35/month, there was a slight preference for manual service if there was a preference indicated.
Republic Residential Agreement

- Expires October 31, 2018
- Offering the following for manual service:
  2-year extension of existing manual service
    - 1st year: $16.95/unit = $810,000
    - 2nd year: $19.55/unit = $934,000
  1-year extension of existing manual service
    - 1st year: $19.55/unit
Future Residential Options

Automated Collection
- 3-cart system: Trash, Recyclables, Organics
- 2-cart system: Trash and Recyclables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>Monthly Rate (96 gal)</th>
<th>Hauler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culver City</td>
<td>$31.38</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardena</td>
<td>$20.24</td>
<td>Waste Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne</td>
<td>$25.09</td>
<td>Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermosa</td>
<td>$20.71</td>
<td>Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redondo Beach</td>
<td>$17.06</td>
<td>Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan Beach</td>
<td>$21.19</td>
<td>WM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>$49.47</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrance</td>
<td>$27.64</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>$24.11</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Palos Verdes</td>
<td>$33.35</td>
<td>EDCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thousand Oaks</td>
<td>$33.83</td>
<td>WM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td>$34.70</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Hills Estates</td>
<td>$41.17</td>
<td>WM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>$41.32</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burbank</td>
<td>$51.88</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawndale</td>
<td>$19.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inglewood</td>
<td>$16.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton</td>
<td>$21.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lennox</td>
<td>$21.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>$17.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino, Del Aire, Wiseburn</td>
<td>$19.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average all cities</strong></td>
<td><strong>$28.06</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average So Bay Cities</strong></td>
<td><strong>$23.13</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Options

- Extend contract for existing services for 1 or 2 years
- Negotiate for new long-term contract with Republic
  - Automated, 2 or 3 cart system
- Prepare RFP and seek bids for a new residential contract
  - Automated collection
  - Manual – if regulatory compliance can be achieved
- Issue 5-year notice of intent to franchise commercial haulers
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action to interview candidates of the Economic Development Advisory Council and Library Board of Trustees. (Fiscal Impact: SNone)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
1. Interview candidates;
2. Announce appointment (s) at the 7:00 p.m., July 17, 2018 City Council meeting, if any;
3. Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

FISCAL IMPACT: None
Amount Budgeted: SNone
Additional Appropriation: N/A
Account Number(s):

STRATEGIC PLAN:
Goal: 1 Enhance Customer Service Engagement
Objective: 1(b) The City engages in regular, intentional information gathering

ORIGINATED BY: Mishia Jennings, Executive Assistant
REVIEWED BY: 
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Applying to: CCBs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rick Yuse (5:00 pm)</td>
<td>Economic Development Advisory Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lance Giroux (5:12 pm)</td>
<td>Economic Development Advisory Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tim Harris (5:24 pm)</td>
<td>Economic Development Advisory Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Alex Perez (5:36 pm)</td>
<td>Economic Development Advisory Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. James McCaulley (5:48 pm)</td>
<td>Economic Development Advisory Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. David Jonta (6:00 pm)</td>
<td>Library Board of Trustees – Incumbent – (Phone Interview 310-590-5031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Carol Ericson (6:12 pm)</td>
<td>Library Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Corinne Murat</td>
<td>Economic Development Advisory Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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, JUNE 19, 2018 - 7:00 P.M.

7:00 P.M. SESSION

CALL TO ORDER

INVOCATION – Father Alexei Smith, St. Andrew Russian Greek Catholic Church

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – Council Member Pimentel
PRESENTATIONS

a) Presentation – Public Works quarterly update of the Capital Improvement Program.

b) Presentation – Receive and file a presentation from FilmLA.

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 conduct a Public Hearing to consider adopting new fees or amending current fees and service charges and other amendments to the City of El Segundo Fee Schedule; not including water rate fees, sewer rate fees, and development impact fees.
   (Fiscal Impact: potential additional revenue for FY 2017-18 of approximately $50,000 & $602,700 in FY 2018-19)

   Recommendation – 1) Conduct the public hearing on the proposed fee adjustments; 2) Adopt a resolution establishing a schedule of fees and charges for City services; 3) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.
2. Consideration and possible action regarding Environmental Assessment No. EA-1218, General Plan Amendment No. GPA 18-01 and Zone Text Amendment No. ZTA 18-01 to: 1) Approve a Negative Declaration in accordance with CEQA; 2) Amend text in the Corporate Office section of the General Plan Land Use Element; and, 3) Amend certain sections in Title 15 of the El Segundo Municipal Code pertaining to the permitted uses, permitted accessory uses and conditionally permitted uses allowed in the Corporate Office (CO) Zone of the City.

(Fiscal Impact: None with this action)

Recommendation – 1) Conduct a public hearing; 2) Take testimony and other evidence as presented; 3) Introduce an Ordinance (Zone Text Amendment No. ZTA 18-01) amending the Corporate Office section of the El Segundo Municipal Code; 4) Schedule second reading and adoption of the Ordinance for July 17, 2018; 5) Adopt Resolution No. ____, approving a Negative Declaration, and approving Environmental Assessment No. EA-1218, General Plan Amendment No. GPA 18-01 and Zone Text Amendment No. ZTA 18-01; 3) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

3. Consideration and possible action (1) conduct a General Plan update for all properties located east of Pacific Coast Highway ("PCH"), including but not limited to updating the various non-residential zones and studying and possible rezoning some areas east of PCH for housing purposes; and, if the Council directs staff to conduct study housing east of PCH to provide some parameters/details of the issues to be studied; (2) determine whether the Council as a part of updating the general plan or for transit purposes wants to accept a grant from Metropolitan Transit Authority ("MTA") to study increasing densities on non-residential properties, developing affordable (low income) housing, reconfiguring properties and their buildings and parking lots, and providing more pedestrian and bicycle friendly routes; all for purposes of attempting to increase transit ridership; (3) (if the Council wants to accept the MTA grant), to provide potential clarifications and amendments to the City's MTA application; and, consider other related actions.

(Fiscal Impact: To Be Determined but range is likely between $0 and $2.5 million)

Recommendation - 1) Consider whether Council want to update the City's General Plan east of PCH to update and/or modify current zones to be more compatible with current and future land use trends and potentially increasing the intensity of development in some areas; 2) Consider whether as part of a General Plan update process or on a stand-alone basis the Council wants to study rezoning some areas east of PCH to allow for residential housing; 3) Consider whether the Council wants to utilize an MTA grant to conduct a partial General Plan update for purposes increasing Greenline ridership, including: increasing development intensity near the transit stations, providing affordable
(low income) and market rate residential units, reconfiguring existing development and parking to encourage transit use, and providing pedestrian and bicycle friendly routes to the transit stations; 4) Consider whether the Council wants to request that MTA allow the City to change some of the proposed areas for study if the City for purposes of the City utilizing the MTA grant; 5) Consider adopting Resolution No. _____ regarding the pending MTA grant; 6) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

4. Consideration and possible action regarding the second reading and adoption of Ordinance No. 1568 to prohibit loud and unruly gatherings and provide a means for the City to hold responsible persons liable by imposing civil penalties, and adoption of Resolution No. _____ amending the schedule of fines for administrative citations pertaining to violations of Ordinance No. 1568.
(Fiscal Impact: To Be Determined)
Recommendation – 1) Waive second reading and adopt Ordinance No. 1568; 2) Adopt Resolution No. _____; 3) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

D. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS AND BOARDS

5. Consideration and possible action to announce the appointments to the Recreation and Parks Commission, Planning Commission, Technology Committee, Investment Advisory Committee, Capital Improvement Program Advisory Committee, Senior Citizen Housing Corporation Board, Arts and Culture Advisory Committee and Environmental Committee.
(Fiscal Impact: None)
Recommendation – 1) Announce the appointees; 2) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

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.

6. Warrant Numbers 3021434 through 3021644 and 9000452 through 9000452 on Register No. 17 in the total amount of $969,206.19 and Wire Transfers from 5/28/18 through 6/10/18 in the total amount of $1,314,115.78.
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.
Recommendation – 1) Approval

8. Consideration and possible action regarding authorizing the City Manager to pre-pay the City's annual unfunded liability contribution (UAL) to California Public Employees Retirement System (CalPERS) for the CalPERS Fiscal Year 2018-19.
(Fiscal Impact: savings of $297,671: $74,418 for fiscal year (FY) 2017-18 and $223,253 in FY 2018-19)
Recommendation – 1) Authorize City Manager to execute the annual unfunded liability (UAL) prepayment option to CalPERS in the total amount of $8,218,670 resulting in a total savings of $297,671 to the City; 2) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

9. Consideration and possible action to award a standard Public Works Contract to Ramona, Inc. for the Storm Drain Pipe Abandonment on Eucalyptus Drive Project, Project No. PW 18-11.
(Fiscal Impact: $116,150)
Recommendation – 1) Authorize the City Manager to execute a standard Public Works Contract in a form as approved by the City Attorney with Ramona, Inc. in the amount of $101,000 and approve an additional 15% contingency of $15,150 for unforeseen conditions; 2) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

10. Consideration and possible action authorizing the City Manager to execute a Professional Services Agreement in a form approved by the City Attorney with EMG to complete a Citywide Facilities Condition Assessment.
(Fiscal Impact: $96,403.50 to the General Fund)
Recommendation – 1) Authorize the City Manager to execute a Professional Services Agreement with EMG in a form approved by the City Attorney in the amount of $96,403.50; 2) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.
11. Consideration and possible action to 1) award a standard Public Works Contract to All American Asphalt for FY 17/18 Pavement Rehabilitation, Project No. PW 18-18, and 2) award a standard Professional Services Agreement to KOA Corporation for construction inspection services. (Fiscal Impact: $1,236,730)

Recommendation – 1) Authorize the City Manager to execute a standard Public Works Contract, in a form approved by the City Attorney, with All American Asphalt in the amount of $1,050,770 for FY 17/18 Pavement Rehabilitation, Project No. PW 18-18, and authorize an additional $105,000 for construction related contingencies; 2) Authorize the City Manager to execute a standard Professional Services Agreement, in a form as approved by the City Attorney, with KOA Corporation in the amount of $73,660 for construction inspection and testing services, and authorize an additional $7,300 for construction related contingencies; 3) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

12. Consideration and possible to authorize an additional budget appropriation of $7,115 for an existing Professional Services Agreement with MIG, Inc. for planning and environmental services related to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Update Project. (Fiscal Impact: $0)

Recommendation – 1) Approve a budget appropriation of $7,115 and transfer from the General Plan Maintenance Fund (GPMF) to provide planning and environmental services; 2) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

13. Consideration and possible action to adopt a Resolution identifying which projects will be funded with SB-1, “Road Repair and Accountability Act” funds. (Fiscal Impact: Approximately $700,000 in FY 18-19 in SB1, Gas Tax and Prop C funds)

Recommendation – 1) Adopt the attached Resolution identifying which projects will be funded with SB-1, “Road Repair and Accountability Act” funds; 2) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

14. Consideration and possible action regarding approval of an amendment to the Prosun Technology Services Agreement Number 5346 for temporary staffing in the Information Systems Department. (Fiscal Impact: $200,000.00)

Recommendation – 1) Authorize the City manager to execute an agreement amendment, in a form approved by the City Attorney, with Prosun Technology Services to provide additional temporary staffing for the Information Systems Department; 2) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.
15. Consideration and possible action regarding the acceptance of a donation from American Youth Soccer Organization (AYSO) Region 92 in the amount of $50,000 to help fund the capital improvement project to install shade structures at Campus El Segundo Athletic Fields, and authorize the City Manager to execute an agreement in a form approved by the City Attorney designating the use of funds.
(Fiscal Impact: $50,000.00 Revenue)
Recommendation – 1) Accept the donation from AYSO; 2) Authorize the City Manager to execute an agreement in a form approved by the City Attorney designating the use of funds; 3) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

16. Consideration and possible action to adopt a resolution approving two new part-time classifications of Lifeguard and Senior Lifeguard and establishing an hourly pay rate for such positions.
(Fiscal Impact: $N/A)
Recommendation – 1) Adopt the resolution approving new part-time classifications Lifeguard and Senior Lifeguard and establishing an hourly pay rate for such positions; 2) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

17. Consideration and possible action to Increasing the previously approved Professional Services Agreement in the amount of $75,916.40 with Wiland Associates LLC for Incident Management Training and Consulting Services by $36,083.60 for a total of $112,000.00.
(Fiscal Impact: $112,000.00)
Recommendation – 1) Approve the vendor and procurement of training services of RFP # 18-03 so that a contract can be established with Wiland Associates LLC.; 2) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

18. Consideration and possible action to appoint Lily Craig to the South Bay Workforce Investment Board (SBWIB).
(Fiscal Impact: None)
Recommendation – 1) Ratify the El Segundo Chamber of Commerce nomination to appoint Lily Craig to seat #18 of the SBWIB; 2) Request the City Clerk to forward a certified copy of Council’s action to the SBWIB; 3) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

F. NEW BUSINESS
19. Consideration and possible action to adopt a resolution approving the Statement of Investment Policy, as amended, to allow investment in Joint Powers Authority Pools for the California Asset Management Program and receive and file the Quarterly Investment Report for the period ending March 31, 2018.
(Fiscal Impact: None)
Recommendation – 1) Adopt a resolution approving the Statement of Investment Policy, as amended; 2) Receive and file the Quarterly Investment Report for the period ending March 31, 2018; 3) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible 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 Pimentel –

Council Member Nicol –

20. Consideration and possible action to form a City Council Subcommittee to work with staff to develop a Social Media Communications Policy for Council Members.
(Fiscal Impact: None)
Recommendation – 1) Discuss development of a Social Media Policy for Council Members to use in seeking public input and providing information to the public on matters of city business through social media; 2) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

Council Member Brann –

Mayor Pro Tem Pirsztuk –
Mayor Boyles –

21. Consideration and possible action to form an Ad Hoc Committee to advise City Council regarding issues related to the City of El Segundo’s Aquatics Programs.
(Fiscal Impact: None)

Recommendation – 1) Discuss the information of an ad hoc committee to advise the City Council on matters related to the City’s Aquatics Programs; 2) Alternative, 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: 4/15/18

TIME: 9:00AM

NAME: [Signature]
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action to receive the quarterly update of the Capital Improvement Program. (Fiscal Impact: None.)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1. Receive and file the FY17/18 2nd and 3rd Quarters Update on the Capital Improvement Program.
2. Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

FY17/18 2nd and 3rd Quarters Update on the Capital Improvement Program.

FISCAL IMPACT: N/A

STRATEGIC PLAN:

Goal: 4 Develop Quality Infrastructure and Technology
Objective: (a) El Segundo’s physical infrastructure supports an appealing, safe, and effective City

Goal: 3 Develop as a Choice Employer & Workforce
Objective: 4 The City has an inspired, engaged workforce

PREPARED BY: Ken Berkman, Public Works Director
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

One of the most critical services Public Works provides to the City within the Strategic Plan is the development and execution of the projects that comprise the CIP. This is the 2nd and 3rd quarterly updates for the current Fiscal Year.
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
FY 2017/18 Q2 & Q3 Review
June 19, 2018

STRATEGIC PLAN

GOAL #4: DEVELOP QUALITY INFRASTRUCTURE & TECHNOLOGY
OBJECTIVE: THE CITY'S INFRASTRUCTURE IS WELL MAINTAINED AND SUPPORTS AN APPEALING, SAFE, AND EFFECTIVE CITY.
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
FY 2017/18 Q2 & Q3 Review
June 18, 2018

$17M OF PROJECTS

$4.3M GENERAL FUND
$10.6 WATER/SEWER
$2.2M OTHER

$3.1M OF WORK COMPLETED
ADA Ramps. ($65,000)

Before

After
Downtown String Lights ($6,000)
Lifeguard Forcemain ($814,000)
Pump Station #1 & #7 ($2,000,000 to date)
Pump Station #1 & #7 ($2,000,000 to date)
Pump Station #1 & #7 ($2,000,000 to date)
Pump Station #1 & #7 ($2,000,000 to date)
Fire Station #1 Seismic Retrofit ($200,000)
Fire Station #1 Seismic Retrofit ($200,000)
COMING NEXT QUARTER...

- Annual Paving Rehabilitation!
- Water Main Replacements!
- Main Street Retractable Bollards!
- More Downtown Beautification!
- and MORE...
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action to receive a presentation from FilmLA.

1. Receive and file presentation
2. Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

N/A

FISCAL IMPACT: N/A

STRATEGIC PLAN:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal:</th>
<th>1. Enhance Customer Service and Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective:</td>
<td>City communication is comprehensive and integrated,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal:</td>
<td>2. Support Community Safety and Preparedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective:</td>
<td>The City participates in proactive communication and community engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal:</td>
<td>5. Champion Economic Development and Fiscal Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective:</td>
<td>The City will implement a comprehensive economic development strategy to ensure the City encourages a vibrant business climate that is accessible, user-friendly and welcoming to all residents and visitors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORIGINATED BY: Juliana G. Demers, Revenue Manager

REVIEWED BY: Joseph Lillio, Director of Finance

APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND:

There will be a representative from FilmLA providing a brief presentation about the services and opportunities FilmLA offers to municipalities regarding promoting filming and economic development in communities.

Film LA, is a 501(c)4 not-for-profit public benefit organization which coordinates the filming processing for the City and County of Los Angeles, among a larger roster of local municipalities. They provide a streamlined film permit process and production planning services along with a comprehensive community relations and an extensive knowledge of the industry.
The City last updated its Motion Picture, Radio and Television Regulations (ESMC 4-11) in 2008, El Segundo has been showcased in several movies, commercials and photo shoots since the early 1920’s. Recently, the City has become even more popular for filming activities because it falls within the Los Angeles “studio zone” as defined by the California Film Commission. (The studio zone is a 30 mile radius used by union film projects to determine per diem rates and driving distances for crew members).

Issuing a Film Permit is a challenging process which encompasses several steps and requires extended coordination between City departments, residents, the business community, and multi agencies. Furthermore, filming activities are often scheduled simultaneously in the City and in other jurisdictions around Los Angeles, in order to maximize crew schedules and meet filming deadlines in a fast paced, ever-changing Southern California Filming Industry. Through their successful business model and industry experience, FilmLA could possibly complement the City of El Segundo’s filming activities.
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action to conduct a Public Hearing to consider adopting new fees or amending current fees and service charges and other amendments to the City of El Segundo Fee Schedule; not including water rate fees, sewer rate fees, and development impact fees. (Fiscal impact: potential additional revenue for FY 2017-18 of approximately $50,000 & $602,700 in FY 2018-19)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1. Conduct the public hearing on the proposed fee adjustments.
2. Adopt a resolution establishing a schedule of fees and charges for City services
3. Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

1. Exhibit A – Fee Study Report
2. Exhibit B – Service Costing Detail Guide to Compliment the Fee Study
3. Exhibit C – City-wide Fees and Charges Comparison Report (not including Building & Safety)
4. Exhibit D – Building & Safety Fees and Charges Comparison Report
5. Exhibit E – Fee Resolution

STRATEGIC PLAN:

Goal: 5(b) Champion Economic Development and Fiscal Sustainability:

El Segundo approaches its work in a financially disciplined and responsible way

Objective: 2 The City will maintain a stable, efficient, and transparent financial environment

FISCAL IMPACT: $ (0)

Amount Budgeted: $0
Additional Appropriation: N/A

PREPARED BY: Juliana Demers, Revenue Manager
REVIEWED BY: Joseph Lillio, Director of Finance
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

DISCUSSION:

It has been almost ten years since the last comprehensive fee study was completed. Due to changes in state law and the amount of time that has passed since the last comprehensive fee study was performed, staff undertook, with City Council direction, a comprehensive updated fee study.

On April 27, 2017, the Finance Department issued a request for proposals (RFP) for the development of a Cost Allocation Plan and Master (User) Fee Study. There were a total of three qualified vendors
that responded to the RFP, which was awarded to Revenue Cost Specialists (RCS) upon City Council approval during the June 20, 2017 Council meeting.

A city-wide Cost Allocation Plan and User Fee Analysis was initiated in September 2017. This project proceeded in two phases. The first phase was to prepare an updated Cost Allocation Plan, which spreads the cost of general government and support services across the direct services provided to the public. This phase was completed in January 2018. The second phase, User Fees and Charges study, included a thorough analysis of the total cost of providing services, including all applicable direct, indirect and overhead costs associated with specific services. This was a coordinated effort among all City departments and included many meetings between RCS and City staff to review updates and provide feedback.

During the February 6, 2018 City Council meeting, the Fee Study Report was presented to City Council by the Finance Director and a representative from RCS.

A Special City Council Meeting was conducted on March 22, 2018 to review the fee Study and its supporting documents. During this study session City Council also discussed options on Cost Recovery Policy Option and analyzed the fiscal impacts resulting on the recommended city-wide fee study.

This Public Hearing was initially scheduled to take place during the April 17, 2018 City Council Meeting. Although no public comments were received or presented, City Staff recommended the hearing to be postponed to a Special Council Meeting scheduled for April 30, 2018. The public hearing and adoption of the proposed fees was removed from the April 30, 2018 Special Agenda, re-noticed, and scheduled for June 19, 2018.

**Background**
User fees and charges are collected to recover some or all costs incurred in providing a specific service from which one or more individuals obtain a benefit. It is a best practice for cities to perform a comprehensive update of their cost allocation plans every 5 years and review user fees and charges schedules annually. One of the Council’s priority focus areas is to enhance the City’s long-term financial stability. Adopting a fee methodology and resulting fee adjustments realigns user fees to more efficiently utilize general revenues (taxes) for services and programs such as public safety, infrastructure maintenance, and economic development.

Furthermore, the California Constitution (Propositions 13, 218 and 26) and various state laws have placed both substantive and procedural limits on cities’ ability to impose fees and charges. Proposition 26 contains a more general articulation of the cost of service principle and includes a requirement that the local government bear the burden of proof that [1] “a levy, charge, or other exaction is not a tax; [2] that the amount is no more than necessary to recover the reasonable costs of the government activity; and [3] that the manner in which those costs are allocated to a payor bear a fair or reasonable relationship to the payor’s burden on, or benefits received from, the governmental activity.” (Cal. Const. art. XIII C, § (e).) It is important to note that rental charges for rooms or facilities, fines, penalties and late charges are not technically user fees and are not required to be based on actual costs. Instead, these types of charges are more typically governed by market rates, reasonableness and other policy driven factors and can legally exceed the cost.

**Principle Involved**
A basic principle involved in this Report is the recognition of those full business costs as they are as defined by the authors of the Constitutional amendment, NOT just those costs which 1) the City might
recognize and decide to budget; or 2) which it might decide to use in some other cost analysis methodology; or 3) that other jurisdictions not so complying might use; or 4) that some accounting or other consulting firm might decide it should use, based on some external, non-California legal requirements.

These cost elements have been determined in a businesslike manner per basic business principles, and applied to each and every fee-financed or fee-financeable service provided by the City, modified only slightly to accommodate the published intent and definitions of the authors of Article XIIIIB. Thus a logical, legal, and Constitutionally-mandated cost-consciousness can now be applied to City operations.

**TYPES OF COSTS**
The following costs, identified above as part of "costs reasonably borne" by the Authors of Proposition 4, make up the cost detail found on the right-hand page in Appendix B of Attachment A for each service center.

- Salaries and Wages
- Employee Fringe Benefits
  - PERS Retirement
  - Group Health Insurance
  - Medicare Insurance
  - Social Security
  - Other Post-Employment Benefits
  - Workers Compensation Insurance
- Maintenance and Operation Costs
- General City Overhead.
- Departmental Administration

**Fees to Encourage Behavior or Compliance**
One of the notes in the following Summary Schedule 1 has a note called “Fee to Encourage Behavior.” This is associated with certain public safety fees, such as false alarms and loud party responses. The point of these fees is not necessarily to recover revenue, but instead to encourage a certain behavior, such as fixing your alarm or quieting your party. These fees are structured in a way that allows for a certain number of free responses before the fee is charged. Thus, if the fee is working correctly there will be no revenue at all. Therefore, we don’t project any new revenues for these services.

**Conclusion**

The City Council should review each service and the suggested recovery rate to determine how much of each service should be recovered through fees, and how much should be subsidized through the City’s tax dollars. This review is very important because it gives City staff direction as to what the Council wants to subsidize and what it does not.

It is recommended that the City Council review suggested cost recovery rates and adjust the fee schedule for the enumerated City services presented in Appendix A of Attachment A (Fee Study Update Report). A formal review of the suggested cost recovery rates and recommended fees can be facilitated in an open meeting to the public through a City Council study session with the consultant from RCS and City staff. Continued use of the "full business costing" concept will create consistency in the establishment of fees, and allow for timely adjustment to reflect changes in the cost of providing services.
If all the recommendations and suggestions made in this Report are adopted, the City's financial picture would be improved. Also, far more equity between taxpayers and fee-payers, as well as fairness between property-related and non-property-related services could be secured, assisting in the City's continued financial stability into the future. The comprehensive City-wide fee schedule will be adjusted on an annual basis at the beginning of each fiscal year based on the most recent reported June consumer price index (CPI) annual percentage of change as listed in the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics’ Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County CPI-U for the calendar year. The fees will also be reviewed each year for any substantial operational or process changes.
Fee Study Update
for the
City of El Segundo

FEBRUARY 2018

Prepared by:

Revenue & Cost Specialists, LLC

1519 East Chapman Ave, Suite C
Fullerton, CA 92831

www.revenuecost.com
(714) 992-9020
EXHIBIT B

FEE SERVICE COSTING DETAIL GUIDE

SERVICE TIME DETAIL

As records of time spent by service by position do not exist, we met with departmental staff to determine the amount of time spent by position for each service. There were a number of meetings in which the prior information was reviewed and updated. We also identified the number of units for each service to be able to identify the total amount of time allocated to each position. This allowed us to do a reality check on the time data to make sure that what is being allocated made sense at an aggregate level based on the experience of staff. In some cases, more detail was developed, which is in tab 9 of the Workpapers.

We also identified the other services provided by each position, such as overhead or tax-supported services, to allocate 100% of the time for each position. The Time Detail by Position report is in an electronic file attached to the Workpapers.

The available hours for each position is based on 1,668 hours. Holiday, vacation, and 50% of available sick leave are deducted from the starting 2,080 hours. In addition, break time and start up/wind down time is deducted. The detail of the calculations are attached.

FULLY ALLOCATED HOURLY RATE

The service time by position from above is then matched up with the fully allocated hourly rate that is calculated for each position. This rate is made up of multiple components, which are detailed below.

Salaries

The salary component for each position is calculated from the actual budgeted salary for each position divided by the available work hours. The salary detail is located in tab 3 of the Workpapers.

Benefits

A benefit rate was developed for each workers compensation group. The City provided a report which identified the actual budgeted benefit cost by benefit component for each employee. These costs were then resorted by workers compensation group. The cost for each benefit component was subtotaled for each group and was then calculated as a percentage of the salaries within that group. That resulting percentage is then applied against the salary rate from above to calculate the benefit rate cost. These details are in tab 4 of the Workpapers.

Maintenance and Operations

The Maintenance and Operations component is for the general operating expenses within each division. This is calculated from the budgeted operating expenditures within each budget. But first, some expenditures were applied against specific services and deducted from the amount applied against the hourly rate. This would be for accounts such as contract services as they provide support for a service and not an employee. The detail of the budgeted accounts is located in the City budget detail in tab 8 of the Workpapers. The accounts that are applied against services are highlighted in the account detail. The resulting amount is then seen in the Costs Applied to Positions – Summary Report in tab 8 also. This
Operations & Maintenance amount is divided by the salaries in that division in the first column of this Report. That percentage is then applied against the salary rate from above to calculate the M&O rate cost.

Overhead

The overhead costs are for the support costs provided to each position. Therefore, we calculated separate City, departmental, and sometimes, divisional overhead rates, which are detailed below.

City Overhead Rate – The City Overhead is calculated from the Cost Allocation Plan (CAP), whose allocations are detailed in a separate Report. The City overhead calculations by division are located in tab 1 of the Cost Allocation Plan. Like the M&O allocations above, there are certain CAP allocations that are allocated specifically to services. The detail of those allocations is located in tab 6 of the Workpapers. The resulting amount is then seen in the Costs Applied to Positions – Summary Report in tab 8 in the CAP column. That amount is then applied against the Non-CAP salaries as seen in an attached document. This is so that overhead is not applied against overhead costs, as this would increase the costs of the overhead service, which then increases the overhead percentage. This results in an infinite loop of allocations. Therefore, we only apply overhead costs to non-overhead salaries. The calculation of a sample overhead rate is also seen in an attached document.

Departmental and Divisional Overhead Rates – The cost for each of these overhead services is applied against the non-overhead salaries for the divisions that they should applied against. The costs of these services and the resulting calculation is detailed in tab 5 of the Workpapers.

For each division a combined City, departmental, and divisional overhead rate is calculated based on the above calculations. Attached here is an example of one division with actual numbers to see how an overhead rate is calculated.

Final Fully Allocated Hourly Rate

All of the above components are added up to determine the final Fully Allocated Hourly Rate for each position, which are detailed in an electronic file attached to the Workpapers.
# EXHIBIT C

## CITY OF EL SEGUNDO

### FEE COMPARISON REPORT

**FY 2017-2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: AD-001</th>
<th>TITLE: SHORT TERM RENTAL REGISTRATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| None | New - $200 per application  
Renewal - $155 per renewal |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: AD-002</th>
<th>TITLE: FILM PERMIT PROCESSING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Permit Application Fee - $640  
Daily Film Permit Fee - $101.45 per day  
Revision/Rider - $175  
Public Right-of-Way Usage - $750 per day per location  
City Location Usage - various fees per day per location  
Police Personnel - Actual Costs  
Fire Personnel - Actual Costs  
Public Works Personnel - Actual Costs | Permit Application Fee - $1,225  
Daily Film Permit Fee - $104.40 per day  
Revision/Rider - $190  
Public Right-of-Way Usage - $750 per day per location  
City Location Usage - various fees per day per location  
Police Personnel - Actual Costs  
Fire Personnel - Actual Costs  
Public Works Personnel - Actual Costs |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: AD-003</th>
<th>TITLE: NSF CHECK PROCESSING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| $25 per NSF Check | First NSF Check - $45  
Each subsequent NSF Check - $90 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: AD-004</th>
<th>TITLE: CREDIT CARD PROCESSING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.75% of amount charged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: AD-005</th>
<th>TITLE: COPY SERVICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| First 5 copies - No Charge  
Each additional copy - $0.20 per copy  
FPPC Copies - $0.10 per copy | First 5 copies - No Charge  
Each additional copy - $0.20 per copy  
FPPC Copies - $0.10 per copy |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: AD-006</th>
<th>TITLE: DOCUMENT CERTIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3 per document</td>
<td>$3 per document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### FEE COMPARISON REPORT
#### FY 2017-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: AD-007</th>
<th>TITLE: VIDEO/AUDIO COPYING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$10 per tape/disk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$10 per tape/disk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: AD-008</th>
<th>TITLE: INITIATIVE PROCESSING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$200 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$200 per application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Fee is to be refunded to the filer if, within one year of the date of filing the notice of intent, the elections official certifies the sufficiency of the petition.

This is the maximum allowed under State law.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: BL-001</th>
<th>TITLE: BUILDING PLAN CHECK SERVICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>See Appendix C of this Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>See Appendix C of this Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: BL-002</th>
<th>TITLE: BUILDING INSPECTION SERVICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>See Appendix C of this Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>See Appendix C of this Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: BL-003</th>
<th>TITLE: MAP/PLAN/FILE SCANNING SERVICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$1.20 per sheet - 8 1/2&quot; x 11&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1.80 per sheet - larger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$1.20 per sheet - 8 1/2&quot; x 11&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1.80 per sheet - larger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: BL-004</th>
<th>TITLE: DRAINAGE STUDY REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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REF #: BL-005 TITLE: STOCKPILE/BORROW SITE PLAN CHECK
CURRENT FEE $340 per plan
RECOMMENDED FEE This service is no longer provided as a separate fee.

REF #: EN-001 TITLE: ENCROACHMENT PERMIT
CURRENT FEE
Permit Issuance: $30
Inspection:
SW/Curb/Cutter - $2.85 per linear foot with a minimum of $140 per location
Utility Street Cut - $2.85 per linear foot with a minimum of $140 per location
House Sewer Lateral Connection to Existing City Sewer Main - $225
House Sewer Connection to Existing Sewer Lateral - $145
Plan Check - $300
USA - $0.50 per linear foot of excavation/trench with a minimum of $50
plus performance bond at a level determined by City staff

RECOMMENDED FEE
Permit Issuance - $135
Inspection $2 per linear foot with a minimum of $110 per location
Plan Review - $3.25 per linear foot with a minimum of $165 per location
USA - $0.50 per linear foot of excavation/trench with a minimum of $50
plus performance bond at a level determined by City staff

REF #: EN-002 TITLE: EXCAVATION PERMIT
CURRENT FEE
Now included in Encroachment Permit (S-063)

RECOMMENDED FEE
Now included in Encroachment Permit (EN-001)

REF #: EN-003 TITLE: UTILITY STREET CUT PERMIT
CURRENT FEE
Now included in Encroachment Permit (S-063)

RECOMMENDED FEE
Now included in Encroachment Permit (EN-001)

REF #: EN-004 TITLE: LONG TERM ENCROACHMENT AGREEMENT
CURRENT FEE
Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.

RECOMMENDED FEE
Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: EN-005</th>
<th>TITLE: TRAFFIC CONTROL PLAN REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Closure Review - $215 per application</td>
<td>Minor - $160 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial Lane Closure - $905 per application</td>
<td>Arterial Lane Closure - $2,155 per application or deposit with charges at actual costs as determined by staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: EN-006</th>
<th>TITLE: TRAFFIC CONTROL INSPECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Permit Issuance - $55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection:</td>
<td>First Day - $165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Additional Day - $40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: EN-007</th>
<th>TITLE: NEWSRACK PERMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New - $105 per newsrack</td>
<td>New - $115 per newsrack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Renewal - $50 per newsrack</td>
<td>Annual Renewal - $50 per newsrack</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: EN-008</th>
<th>TITLE: NEWSRACK IMPOUNDMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90 per newsrack + $5 per day for storage</td>
<td>$90 per newsrack + $5 per day for storage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: EN-009</th>
<th>TITLE: FINAL MAP CHECK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Map - $665 per map</td>
<td>1-9 lots - $1,300 per map plus actual costs for contract surveyor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Map - $1,565 per map (actual costs if 10 or greater lots)</td>
<td>10+ lots - Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Any County processing fees are paid directly to the County by the applicant)</td>
<td>(Any County processing fees are paid directly to the County by the applicant)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: EN-010</th>
<th>TITLE: FINAL MAP AMENDMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$155 per application</td>
<td>$520 per application plus actual costs for contract surveyor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Any County processing fees are paid directly to the County by the applicant)</em></td>
<td><em>(Any County processing fees are paid directly to the County by the applicant)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: EN-011</th>
<th>TITLE: PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT PLAN CHECK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Construction Valuation:</td>
<td>Percent of Construction Valuation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0-$100,000 - 3%</td>
<td>$0-$100,000 - 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,001-$500,000 - 2% of the construction value over $100,000</td>
<td>$100,001-$500,000 - 2% of the construction value over $100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,001+ - 1% of the construction value over $500,000</td>
<td>$500,001+ - 1% of the construction value over $500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: EN-012</th>
<th>TITLE: PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT INSPECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Construction Valuation:</td>
<td>Now included in Encroachment Permit (EN-001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0-$100,000 - 1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,001-$500,000 - 1% of the construction value over $100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,001+ - 0.5% of the construction value over $500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: EN-013</th>
<th>TITLE: CERTIFICATE OF CORRECTION ISSUANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,505 per application</td>
<td>This service is no longer provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: EN-014</th>
<th>TITLE: RECORD OF SURVEY PLAN CHECK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$382.50 per plan</td>
<td>$175 per plan plus actual costs for contract surveyor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: EN-015</th>
<th>TITLE: EASEMENT PROCESSING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: EN-016</th>
<th>TITLE: SURETY &amp; SUBORDINATION REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$382 per plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>This service is included in other service costs, and therefore is no longer included as a separate fee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: EN-017</th>
<th>TITLE: LIEN REMOVAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$156 per lien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>This service is no longer provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: EN-018</th>
<th>TITLE: MINOR PLAN CHECK REVISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$305 per sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$350 per sheet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: EN-019</th>
<th>TITLE: STREET NAME CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: EN-020</th>
<th>TITLE: ALLEY/STREET VACATION REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
### FEE COMPARISON REPORT
#### FY 2017-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: EN-021</th>
<th>TITLE: ASSESS, DISTRICT FORMATION RESEARCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: EN-022</th>
<th>TITLE: CITY PROPERTY ACQUISITION PROC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: EN-023</th>
<th>TITLE: WIDE &amp; OVERLOAD PERMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **CURRENT FEE** | Daily - $16 per permit  
Annual - $90 per permit  
Fees are set by State Law. |
| **RECOMMENDED FEE** | Daily - $16 per permit  
Annual - $90 per permit  
Fees are set by State Law. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: EN-024</th>
<th>TITLE: BLUEPRINT COPY SERVICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **CURRENT FEE** | In House - $2.50  
Outside - Actual Costs |
| **RECOMMENDED FEE** | Blueprints are no longer provided as hard copies. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: EN-025</th>
<th>TITLE: NEW INDUSTRIAL WASTE PERMIT/INSPECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **CURRENT FEE** | New Permit Application: Sewer - $480  
Off-Site - $480  
On-Site - $935  
New Sewer Plan: 1/2 - $570  3/4 - $800  5/6 - $1,255  
New Off-Site Plan: 1/2 - $725  3/4 - $1,010  5/6 - $1,580  
New Off-Site Plan: 1/2 - $625  3/4 - $875  5/6 - $1,370  
Closure Inspection - $1,185  
Wastewater Sampling - $685 plus actual lab costs  
Site Remediation - Actual Costs  
Special Inspection and Off-Hours Inspection - Actual Costs  
Additional Plan Review - Actual Costs |
| **RECOMMENDED FEE** | New Permit Application: Sewer - $340  
Off-Site - $340  
On-Site - $640  
New Sewer Plan: 1/2 - $415  3/4 - $565  5/6 - $865  
New Off-Site Plan: 1/2 - $515  3/4 - $700  5/6 - $1,075  
New Off-Site Plan: 1/2 - $450  3/4 - $610  5/6 - $940  
Closure Inspection - $790  
Wastewater Sampling - $490 plus actual lab costs  
Site Remediation - Actual Costs  
Special Inspection and Off-Hours Inspection - Actual Costs  
Additional Plan Review - Actual Costs |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: EN-026</th>
<th>TITLE: REVISED INDUSTRIAL WASTE PERMIT/INS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise Permit Application - $230</td>
<td>Revise Permit Application - $190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise Sewer Plan: 1/2 - $440 3/4 - $610 5/6 - $950</td>
<td>Revise Sewer Plan: 1/2 - $325 3/4 - $440 5/6 - $665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise On-Site Plan: 1/2 - $550 3/4 - $760 5/6 - $1,180</td>
<td>Revise On-Site Plan: 1/2 - $400 3/4 - $540 5/6 - $815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise Off-Site Plan: 1/2 - $440 3/4 - $610 5/6 - $950</td>
<td>Revise Off-Site Plan: 1/2 - $325 3/4 - $440 5/6 - $665</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: EN-027</th>
<th>TITLE: INDUSTRIAL WASTE ANNUAL INSPECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 1 - $455</td>
<td>Class 1 - $340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2 - $390</td>
<td>Class 2 - $640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 3 - $1,370</td>
<td>Class 3 - $940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 4 - $1,825</td>
<td>Class 4 - $1,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 5 - $2,735</td>
<td>Class 5 - $1,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 12 - $5,475</td>
<td>Class 12 - $3,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class X - $685</td>
<td>Class X - $490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: EN-028</th>
<th>TITLE: STORMWATER INSPECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant - $165</td>
<td>Restaurant - $230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive - $165</td>
<td>Automotive - $230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Acre - $200</td>
<td>1 Acre - $315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 Acres - $235</td>
<td>2-5 Acres - $395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 Acres - $330</td>
<td>More than 5 Acres - $600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Violation Fines: 1st Violation - $100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Violation - $500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Violation - $1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsequent Violations - Fines determined by City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: FR-001</th>
<th>TITLE: FIRE SPRINKLER PLAN CHECK/INSPECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation based on Tables in Appendix C of this Report</td>
<td>Valuation based on 10% of Tables in Appendix C of this Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedited Plan Check - additional 50% of standard plan check fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These revenues should be in separate revenue accounts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: FR-002</th>
<th>TITLE: FIRE ALARM PLAN CHECK/INSPECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td>Valuation based on Tables in Appendix C of this Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td>Valuation based on 25% of Tables in Appendix C of this Report Expedited Plan Check - additional 50% of standard plan check fee These revenues should be in separate revenue accounts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: FR-003</th>
<th>TITLE: FIRE EXTINGUISHING SYSTEM PC/INSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td>Valuation based on Tables in Appendix C of this Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td>Valuation based on 25% of Tables in Appendix C of this Report Expedited Plan Check - additional 50% of standard plan check fee These revenues should be in separate revenue accounts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: FR-004</th>
<th>TITLE: FIRE PROTECTION TESTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td>$465 per system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td>$250 per system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: FR-005</th>
<th>TITLE: ANNUAL BUSINESS FIRE INSPECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td>0-1,499 square feet - $65 1,500-9,999 square feet - $85 10,000-24,999 square feet - $150 25,000-99,999 square feet - $275 100,000+ square feet - $1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td>0-1,499 square feet - $80 1,500-9,999 square feet - $110 10,000-24,999 square feet - $195 25,000-99,999 square feet - $375 100,000-499,999 square feet - $1,585 500,000+ square feet - $3,355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: FR-006</th>
<th>TITLE: ANNUAL BUSINESS FIRE REINSPECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td>0-1,499 square feet - $45 1,500-9,999 square feet - $45 10,000-24,999 square feet - $65 25,000-99,999 square feet - $105 100,000-499,999 square feet - $200 500,000+ square feet - $400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td>0-1,499 square feet - $50 1,500-9,999 square feet - $50 10,000-24,999 square feet - $80 25,000-99,999 square feet - $135 100,000-499,999 square feet - $665 500,000+ square feet - $665</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

January 29, 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: FR-007</th>
<th>TITLE:  ANNUAL FIRE PERMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$95 per permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$75 per permit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: FR-008</th>
<th>TITLE:  TEMPORARY FIRE PERMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$505 per permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$425 per permit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: FR-009</th>
<th>TITLE:  FIRE HIGH RISE INSPECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$1.02 per 100 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$1.10 per 100 square feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: FR-010</th>
<th>TITLE:  STATE MANDATED FIRE INSPECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$125 per inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$115 per inspection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: FR-011</th>
<th>TITLE:  SPECIAL FIRE EQUIP INSPECT/APPROVAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$775 per request plus any outside costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$645 per request plus any outside costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: FR-012</th>
<th>TITLE:  NEW CONSTR. FIRE RE-INSPECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$175 per inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>Charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## City of El Segundo
### Fee Comparison Report
#### FY 2017-2018

**REF #: FR-013**  **Title: After-hours Fire Inspection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Fee</th>
<th>Recommended Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$130 per hour (2 hour minimum)</td>
<td>Charges at the overtime rate (120% of fully allocated hourly rates) for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs, with a 2 hour minimum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REF #: FR-014**  **Title: Hazardous Materials Insp. Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Fee</th>
<th>Recommended Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Range I - $382  
Range II - $428  
Range III - $564  
Range IV - $1,640  
Range V - $1,755 | Range I - $420  
Range II - $455  
Range III - $590  
Range IV - $635  
Range V - $720 |

**REF #: FR-015**  **Title: Chemical Accident Release Prev Prog**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Fee</th>
<th>Recommended Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 100-1,000 Pounds:  
1 chemical - $1,370  
2 chemicals - $1,825  
3+ chemicals - $2,280  
1,000-10,000 Pounds:  
1 chemical - $1,480  
2 chemicals - $2,055  
3+ chemicals - $2,735  
10,000+ Pounds:  
1 chemical - $2,055  
2 chemicals - $3,195  
3+ chemicals - $5,020 | Program 1 - $5,915  
Program 2 - $9,315  
Program 3 - $17,000  
Program 4 - $142,640 |

State CalARP Program Surcharge - $35 per chemical

**REF #: FR-016**  **Title: Hazardous Waste Generator Permit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Fee</th>
<th>Recommended Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Silver/Universal Waste Only Generator - $230  
1-5 employees - $515  
Small (6-19 employees) - $800  
Intermediate (20-100 employees) - $1,100  
Advanced (101-500 employees) - $1,600  
Complex (501+ employees) - $2,625  
Large Quantity Generator - $125 | Very Small Quantity Generator - $455  
Small Quantity Generator - $565  
Large Quantity Generator - $635  
RCRA Large Quantity Generator - $845 |
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# CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
## FEE COMPARISON REPORT
### FY 2017-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: FR-017</th>
<th>TITLE: TIERED HAZ WASTE PERMIT PROCESSING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit By Rule - $1,300</td>
<td>Permit By Rule - $1,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Authorization - $1,000</td>
<td>Conditional Authorization - $1,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditionally Exempt - $125</td>
<td>Conditionally Exempt - $2,490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: FR-018</th>
<th>TITLE: UNDERGROUND TANK PERMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Permit Maintenance - $770 plus $140 per add'l tank</td>
<td>Annual Permit Maintenance - $985 plus $140 per add'l tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Permit Transfer - $725</td>
<td>Operating Permit Transfer - $420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction Plan Clearance - $1,140 + $275 per add'l tank</td>
<td>New Construction Plan Clearance - $705 + $175 per add'l tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure Application - $2,095 plus $230 per add'l tank or deposit</td>
<td>Closure Application - $1,265 plus $140 per add'l tank or deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex Site Investigation - Deposit with actual costs</td>
<td>Complex Site Investigation - Deposit with actual costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Addendum - $460</td>
<td>Permit Addendum - $280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Cleanup Oversight - Deposit with actual costs</td>
<td>Voluntary Cleanup Oversight - Deposit with actual costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Containment Testing Oversight - $500 plus $570 per tank plus $570 for each re-inspection per tank after the first 2 inspections</td>
<td>Secondary Containment Testing Oversight - $280 plus $350 per tank plus $350 for each re-inspection per tank after the first 2 inspections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: FR-019</th>
<th>TITLE: ABOVE GROUND LIQUID TANK INSPECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10,000 gallons - $62.50 per facility</td>
<td>0-10,000 gallons - $810 per facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-100,000 gallons - $125 per facility</td>
<td>10,001-1,000,000 gallons - $2,025 per facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,001-1,000,000 gallons - $250 per facility</td>
<td>1,000,001 or more gallons - $2,365 per facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,001-10,000,000 gallons - $1,000 per facility</td>
<td>10,000,001 or more gallons - $18,750 per facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000,001-100,000,000 gallons - $5,000 per facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000,001 or more gallons - $18,750 per facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: FR-020</th>
<th>TITLE: HAZARDOUS MATERIALS RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charge the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
<td>Charge the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: FR-021</th>
<th>TITLE: ENVIRON SAFETY ENFORCE INSPECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Charge the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: FR-022</th>
<th>TITLE: REVIEW OF RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
<td>This service is now included as part of Hazardous Waste Permit (FR-016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: LB-001</th>
<th>TITLE: NEW LIBRARY CARD PROCESSING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents, Volunteers, &amp; SCLC - No Charge Non-Resident - $40 per year Business/Corporate - $103 per year</td>
<td>Residents, Volunteers, &amp; SCLC - No Charge Out-of-State Non-Resident - $40 per year Business/Corporate - $103 per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: LB-002</th>
<th>TITLE: LIBRARY REPLACEMENT CARD PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2 per card</td>
<td>$3 per card</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: LB-003</th>
<th>TITLE: INTER-LIBRARY LOAN PROCESSING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCLC Request - $1 per item Non-SCLC Request - $2 per item plus postage</td>
<td>SCLC Request - $1 per item Non-SCLC Request - $2 per item plus postage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: LB-004</th>
<th>TITLE: LIBRARY ITEM RESERVATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 per item</td>
<td>$1 per item</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: LB-005</th>
<th>TITLE: OVERDUE LIBRARY ITEM PROCESSING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books/Periodicals/Audio Visual - $0.20 per day up to the item cost Reference Materials - $3 per day up to the item cost Video Tapes/DVDs - $2.50 per day up to the cost</td>
<td>Books/Periodicals/Audio Visual - $0.25 per day up to the item cost Reference Materials - $3 per day up to the item cost Video Tapes/DVDs - $1 per day up to the cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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REF #: LB-006  TITLE: LOST LIBRARY ITEM REPLACEMENT

CURRENT FEE
$5.15 per item plus the replacement cost
ILL Lost Item - $6.50 per item plus the replacement cost

Damaged Materials Fees:
Book/Bindery Repairs - $14 maximum
Periodicals - $2 plus replacement cost
Pamphlets/Paperbacks - $1 plus replacement cost
Audiocassette/Compact Disc cases - $1.30
Videocassette/Book on Tape/DVD cases - $3.55

RECOMMENDED FEE
Lost or Damaged Item - $10 per item plus the replacement cost

Damaged Materials Fees:
Book/Bindery Repairs - $10 maximum
Periodicals - $2 plus replacement cost
Pamphlets/Paperbacks - $1 plus replacement cost
Audiocassette/Compact Disc cases - $1.50
Videocassette/Book on Tape/DVD cases - $5

REF #: LB-007  TITLE: LIBRARY INTERNET PRINTING

CURRENT FEE
Black and White - $0.15 per page
Color - $0.75 per page

RECOMMENDED FEE
Black and White - $0.20 per page
Color - $1 per page

REF #: LB-008  TITLE: LIBRARY FACILITY RENTAL

CURRENT FEE
Non-Profit Organization - $10 per rental
For Profit Organization - $30 per hour
Kitchen - $30 refundable deposit

RECOMMENDED FEE
Resident Non-Profit Organization - $10 per hour
Resident For Profit Organization - $30 per hour
Non-Resident Non-Profit Organization - $35 per hour
Non-Resident For Profit Organization - $45 per hour
Kitchen - $30 refundable deposit
Study Room:
Students/Non-Profit - No Charge
All Others - $5 per hour

REF #: PL-001  TITLE: ADMINISTRATIVE USE PERMIT

CURRENT FEE
Commercial/Industrial/Institutional/PRO Zone - $3,935 per application
Downtown Specific Plan/DSP Zone - $1,970 per application

RECOMMENDED FEE
$3,570 per application
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## FEE COMPARISON REPORT
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-003</th>
<th>TITLE: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Industrial/Institutional/PRD Zone - $8,220 per application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Specific Plan/DSP Zone - $4,110 per application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3 Multi-Family Residential Zone - $8,220 per application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$10,952 per application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-004</th>
<th>TITLE: DOWNTOWN DESIGN REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Industrial/Institutional/PRD Zone - $55 per application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Specific Plan/DSP Zone - $275 per application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>Staff Review - $535 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director Review - $3,575 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Commission Review - $6,490 per application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-005</th>
<th>TITLE: VARIANCE REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$8,220 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$6,490 per application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-006</th>
<th>TITLE: ADJUSTMENT REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>Fence Height:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial/Industrial/Institutional/PRD Zone - $2,945 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other - $1,475 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Categories - $2,945 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$3,030 per application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-007</th>
<th>TITLE: ZONE TEXT AMENDMENT/ZONE CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-008</th>
<th>TITLE: PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$3,510 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>No fee is recommended for this service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-009</th>
<th>TITLE: TRAFFIC STUDY REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-010</th>
<th>TITLE: OFF-SITE PARKING COVENANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$335 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$340 per application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-011</th>
<th>TITLE: PARKING DEMAND/SHARED PARKING STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$3,590 per study plus actual costs for Traffic Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$995 per study plus actual costs for Traffic Engineer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-012</th>
<th>TITLE: GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-013</th>
<th>TITLE: SPECIFIC PLAN REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-014</th>
<th>TITLE: SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REF #: PL-015</td>
<td>TITLE: SPHERE OF INFLUENCE AMENDMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>This service is no longer provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-016</th>
<th>TITLE: ANNEXATION REQUEST REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>This service is no longer provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-018</th>
<th>TITLE: DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-019</th>
<th>TITLE: COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$940 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$870 per application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-020</th>
<th>TITLE: PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT REV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO  
FEE COMPARISON REPORT  
FY 2017-2018

REF #: PL-021  TITLE: FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

CURRENT FEE
In House:
New:
Single-Use Residential - $750  Single-Use Commercial - $1,500
Single-Use Industrial - $1,500
Two-Use Mixed - $2,000  Three Use Mixed - $2,500
Amendment:
Single-Use Project - $250  Two-Use Project - $500
Three-Use Project - $750
Actual costs if performed by an outside consultant

RECOMMENDED FEE
This service is no longer provided.

---

REF #: PL-022  TITLE: SMOKY HOLLOW FLOATING ZONE PROC.

CURRENT FEE
Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.

RECOMMENDED FEE
This service is no longer provided.

---

REF #: PL-023  TITLE: SMOKY HOLLOW SITE PLAN

CURRENT FEE
Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.

RECOMMENDED FEE
This service is no longer provided.

---

REF #: PL-024  TITLE: DENSITY BONUS AGREEMENT REVIEW

CURRENT FEE
Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.

RECOMMENDED FEE
Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.

---

REF #: PL-025  TITLE: ENVIRON. CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION

CURRENT FEE
$155 per application

RECOMMENDED FEE
$170 per application

January 29, 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-026</th>
<th>TITLE: ENVIRON INITIAL STUDY/NEG DEC/RECIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,185 per application</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-027</th>
<th>TITLE: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-028</th>
<th>TITLE: MITIGATION MONITORING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor - $520 per project</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major - Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-029</th>
<th>TITLE: PRECISE PLAN MODIFICATION REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
<td>$5,720 per application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-030</th>
<th>TITLE: TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,360 per map</td>
<td>$4,865 per map plus actual cost for contract surveyor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Any County processing fees are paid directly to the County by the applicant)</td>
<td>(Any County processing fees are paid directly to the County by the applicant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REF #: PL-031</td>
<td>TITLE: TENTATIVE TRACT MAP REVIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$5,360 per map plus $420 per lot for every lot over 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Any County processing fees are paid directly to the County by the applicant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$5,010 per map plus $385 per lot for every lot over 4, plus actual cost for contract surveyor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Any County processing fees are paid directly to the County by the applicant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-033</th>
<th>TITLE: RESUBMITTED MAP REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$1,240 per map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$995 per map</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-034</th>
<th>TITLE: LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$1,610 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$1,210 per application plus actual cost for contract surveyor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-035</th>
<th>TITLE: LOT MERGER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$1,610 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$1,210 per application plus actual cost for contract surveyor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-036</th>
<th>TITLE: REVERSION TO ACREAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$6,230 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>This service is no longer provided,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-037</th>
<th>TITLE: CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$1,725 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$1,540 per application plus actual cost for contract surveyor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REF #: PL-038</td>
<td>TITLE: RECIPROCAL ACCESS EASEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,660 per application plus actual costs for City Attorney</td>
<td>$535 per application plus actual costs for City Attorney</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-039</th>
<th>TITLE: CC&amp;R REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,660 per application plus actual costs for City Attorney</td>
<td>$535 per application plus actual costs for City Attorney</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-040</th>
<th>TITLE: HISTORIC RESOURCE NOMINATION REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,910 per application</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-041</th>
<th>TITLE: ADMIN DETERMINATION - DIR DECISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,245 per application</td>
<td>$1,700 per application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-042</th>
<th>TITLE: ADMIN DETERMINATION - PC DECISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,825 per application</td>
<td>$2,090 per application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-043</th>
<th>TITLE: SIGN PROGRAM SIGN PLAN REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$135 per application</td>
<td>$100 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REF #: PL-044</td>
<td>TITLE: MASTER SIGN PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor - $895 per application</td>
<td>$610 per application or deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major - Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-045</th>
<th>TITLE: LARGE FAMILY DAY CARE PERMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$275 per application plus $100 if a public hearing is requested</td>
<td>$390 per application plus $125 if a public hearing is requested.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-046</th>
<th>TITLE: MOVED BUILDING SITE PLAN REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,230 per application</td>
<td>This service is no longer provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-047</th>
<th>TITLE: ZONING CONFORMANCE LETTER/REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$905 per letter</td>
<td>$730 per letter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-048</th>
<th>TITLE: MODIF. TO DISCRETIONARY APPROVAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,920 per application</td>
<td>$5,720 per application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-049</th>
<th>TITLE: TIME EXTENSION REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>$870 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REF #: PL-050</td>
<td>TITLE: APPEAL TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,280 per appeal</td>
<td>$1,360 per appeal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-051</th>
<th>TITLE: APPEAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident - $1,855 per appeal for 50% cost recovery Non-Resident - $3,710 per appeal for 100% cost recovery Inside the Coastal Appeal Zone - No Charge per State law</td>
<td>$2,760 per appeal for 100% cost recovery Inside the Coastal Appeal Zone - No Charge per State law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-052</th>
<th>TITLE: STREET ADDRESS CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$670 per application</td>
<td>$610 per application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-053</th>
<th>TITLE: GENERAL PLAN MAINTENANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% of all Building &amp; Safety permit fees</td>
<td>10% of all Building &amp; Safety permit fees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-054</th>
<th>TITLE: TEMPORARY USE PERMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$870 per application</td>
<td>$1,155 per application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-055</th>
<th>TITLE: ENTERTAINMENT PERMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$800 per application</td>
<td>$885 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REF #: PL-056</td>
<td>TITLE: ADULT USE PLANNING PERMIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-057</th>
<th>TITLE: AMPLIFIED SOUND PERMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td>$135 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td>$255 per application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-058</th>
<th>TITLE: ANIMAL PERMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td>$405 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td>$535 per application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-059</th>
<th>TITLE: ANIMAL PERMIT RENEWAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td>$205 per renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td>$265 per renewal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-060</th>
<th>TITLE: ANIMAL PERMIT APPEAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **CURRENT FEE** | Resident - $920 per appeal  
Non-Resident - $1,840 per appeal |
| **RECOMMENDED FEE** | Resident - $1,155 per appeal for 50% cost recovery  
Non-Resident - $2,305 per appeal for 100% cost recovery |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-061</th>
<th>TITLE: BUSINESS ZONING CLEARANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **CURRENT FEE** | Home Occupation - $135 per application  
Other Businesses - $70 per application |
| **RECOMMENDED FEE** | Home Occupation - $185 per application  
Other Businesses - $100 per application |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PL-062</th>
<th>TITLE: PUBLIC NOTICING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$216 per notice or deposit with actual costs, at the discretion of City staff.</td>
<td>Actual costs charged by publication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-001</th>
<th>TITLE: FIREARMS DEALER PERMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$645 per application</td>
<td>$1,010 per application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-002</th>
<th>TITLE: FORTUNETELLER PERMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$465 per application</td>
<td>$690 per application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-003</th>
<th>TITLE: SECONDHAND DEALER PERMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$115 per application</td>
<td>$290 per application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-003A</th>
<th>TITLE: PAWNSHOP PERMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$645 per application</td>
<td>$1,010 per application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-004</th>
<th>TITLE: BINGO PERMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| $350 per application | Annual Application - $50 per application plus Department of Justice Fee  
Fee is set by Penal Code Section 326.5(f)(1). 
Remote Caller Game - $515 |

January 29, 2018
### CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
### FEE COMPARISON REPORT
### FY 2017-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-006</th>
<th>TITLE: POLICE MASSAGE ESTABLISHMENT PMT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td>$465 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td>$680 per application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-007</th>
<th>TITLE: MASSAGE THERAPIST PERMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td>$90 per application plus County testing fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td>$140 per application plus County testing fee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-008</th>
<th>TITLE: AUCTION HOUSE PERMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td>$465 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td>$690 per application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-009</th>
<th>TITLE: POOL ROOM PERMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td>$465 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td>$680 per application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-010</th>
<th>TITLE: TOBACCO PERMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td>$200 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td>$245 per application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-013</th>
<th>TITLE: MISC. POLICE BUSINESS PERMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td>$465 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td>$730 per application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

January 29, 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-014</th>
<th>TITLE: CONCEALED WEAPONS PERMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee is set by State Law.</td>
<td>Fee is set by State Law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New application - $100</td>
<td>New application - $100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25 - renewal application</td>
<td>$25 - renewal application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amended application - $10</td>
<td>Amended application - $10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological testing costs are to be added to the above fee up to $150</td>
<td>Psychological testing costs are to be added to the above fee up to $150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% of the fee is collected upon filing of the initial application and is non-refundable. The balance of the fee is collected on issuance of the license.</td>
<td>20% of the fee is collected upon filing of the initial application and is non-refundable. The balance of the fee is collected on issuance of the license.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-015</th>
<th>TITLE: CLEARANCE FORM/LETTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25 per letter</td>
<td>$25 per letter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-016</th>
<th>TITLE: RECORDS CHECK - LOCAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20 per name</td>
<td>$20 per name</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-017</th>
<th>TITLE: CITATION SIGN-OFF SERVICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10 per citation</td>
<td>$15 per citation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-018</th>
<th>TITLE: VEHICLE IMPOUND RELEASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Impound - $55 per vehicle</td>
<td>Standard Impound - $205 per vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Day/DUI Impound - $115 per vehicle</td>
<td>30 Day/DUI Impound - $285 per vehicle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-019</th>
<th>TITLE: POLICE FALSE ALARM RESPONSE/BILLING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td>First 3 alarms in a calendar year - No Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th false alarm - $200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5th false alarm - $300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6th and subsequent false alarm - $400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td>First 3 alarms in a calendar year - No Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th false alarm - $200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5th false alarm - $300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6th and subsequent false alarm - $400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-020</th>
<th>TITLE: POLICE ALARM PERMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td>Alarm Permit - No Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violation for non-alarm permit - $160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td>Alarm Permit - No Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violation for non-alarm permit - $160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-022</th>
<th>TITLE: DUI COLLISION RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td>Charge the fully allocated hourly rates for all responding emergency personnel, not to exceed $12,000 per incident by State law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td>Charge the fully allocated hourly rates for all responding emergency personnel, not to exceed $12,000 per incident by State law.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-023</th>
<th>TITLE: SECOND RESPONSE CALL-BACK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td>Charge the fully allocated hourly rates for all responding emergency personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td>Charge the fully allocated hourly rates for all responding emergency personnel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-024</th>
<th>TITLE: MISDEMEANOR BOOKING SERVICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td>$215 per booking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td>$245 per booking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-024A</th>
<th>TITLE: DUI ARREST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td>$640 per arrest to be collected upon conviction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td>$735 per arrest to be collected upon conviction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-025</th>
<th>TITLE: SPECIAL EVENT POLICE SERVICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>Charge the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>Charge the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-026</th>
<th>TITLE: FINGERPRINTING ON REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$30 per application plus any DOJ fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$35 per application plus any DOJ fees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-027</th>
<th>TITLE: POLICE REPORT/DOCUMENT REPRODUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$0.20 per page</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| RECOMMENDED FEE | First 5 copies - No Charge  
Each additional copy - $0.20 per copy |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-028</th>
<th>TITLE: POLICE PHOTO REPRODUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$30 per request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$35 per request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-029</th>
<th>TITLE: POLICE DISPATCH TAPE COPY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$100 per request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$10 per disk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-030</th>
<th>TITLE: POLICE AUDIO/VIDEO TAPE COPY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$155 per tape/DVD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$10 per disk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
### FEE COMPARISON REPORT
#### FY 2017-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-040</th>
<th>TITLE: ANIMAL AT-LARGE PICKUP</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st offense - $10</td>
<td>1st offense - $10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd offense - $25</td>
<td>2nd offense - $25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd and subsequent offense - $40</td>
<td>3rd and subsequent offense - $40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-041</th>
<th>TITLE: VICIOUS ANIMAL HEARING</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>No fee is recommended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PO-047</th>
<th>TITLE: ANIMAL CONTROL SERVICES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog License:</td>
<td>Dog License:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spayed/Neutered - $20</td>
<td>Spayed/Neutered - $20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Spayed/Neutered - $40</td>
<td>Non-Spayed/Neutered - $80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors - $10</td>
<td>Seniors - $10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Fee - $10</td>
<td>Late Fee - $10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PW-001</th>
<th>TITLE: WATER SERVICE LATERAL INSPECTION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1/2&quot; - 2&quot; - $300 plus $1,000 refundable deposit</td>
<td>1 1/2&quot; - 2&quot; - $1,115 plus $1,000 refundable deposit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&quot; - 10&quot; - $400 plus $1,500 refundable deposit</td>
<td>3&quot; - 10&quot; - $1,535 plus $1,500 refundable deposit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PW-001A</th>
<th>TITLE: WATER SERVICE PRE-PLAN REVIEW</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>$180 per application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PW-002</th>
<th>TITLE: WATER METER UPGRADE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FEE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED FEE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| None | Upgrade up to 1" - $4,255 per meter plus actual cost of meter and materials  
Upgrade to over 1" - Charge the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel used plus any materials or outside costs. |  |
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CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
FEE COMPARISON REPORT
FY 2017-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PW-003</th>
<th>TITLE: WATER METER ABANDONMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>$210 per meter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PW-004</th>
<th>TITLE: TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION METER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$350 deposit</td>
<td>Installation - $110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Move - $60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>plus refundable deposit to cover the cost of the meter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PW-005</th>
<th>TITLE: FIRE FLOW TEST WITNESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>$140 per test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PW-006</th>
<th>TITLE: DAMAGED METER/SERVICE LINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Charge the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel used plus any materials or outside costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PW-007</th>
<th>TITLE: ANNUAL BACKFLOW DEVICE PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>$60 per device per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PW-010</th>
<th>TITLE: NEW SEWER LATERAL INSPECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>$210 per lateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REF #: PW-011</td>
<td>TITLE: SEWER CAP INSPECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$210 per cap</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PW-012</th>
<th>TITLE: SEWAGE SPILL RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>Actual Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>Charge the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel used plus any materials or outside costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PW-015</th>
<th>TITLE: NEW UTILITY ACCOUNT PROCESSING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>No processing fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deposit:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential - $36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial - $100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$85 per new account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deposit:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential - $65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial - $250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PW-016</th>
<th>TITLE: DELINQUENTUTILITY BILLING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>Delinquent Bill - $10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>Delinquent Bill - $13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red Tag - $28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PW-017</th>
<th>TITLE: DELINQUENT UTILITY TURN-OFF/ON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>$30 per delinquent turn-off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$100 per delinquent turn-off</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #: PW-020</th>
<th>TITLE: WATER METER TEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED FEE</td>
<td>$275 per meter test (refunded if the meter is found to be running fast)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO  
FEE COMPARISON REPORT  
FY 2017-2018

REF #: PW-021  
TITLE: REFER TO COLLECTION AGENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT FEE</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED FEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5% of the amount owed to the City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td>CURRENT FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit Issuance</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL BUILDING PERMITS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit Under $500 Valuation</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit $501-$2,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$18 + $2.40 for each $100 over $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit $2,001-$25,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$54 + $10.80 for each $1,000 over $2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit $25,001-$50,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$302.40 + $7.80 for each $1,000 over $25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit $50,001-$100,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$481.80 + $5.40 for each $1,000 over $50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit $100,001-$500,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$751.80 + $4.20 for each $1,000 over $100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit $500,001-$1,000,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$2,431.80 + $3.60 for each $1,000 over $500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit Over $1,000,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$4,231.80 + $3 for each $1,000 over $1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL BUILDING PLAN CHECK</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Plan Check Under $500 Valuation</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Plan Check $501-$2,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$9 + $1.20 for each $100 over $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Plan Check $2,001-$25,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$27 + $5.40 for each $1,000 over $2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Plan Check $25,001-$50,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$151.20 + $3.90 for each $1,000 over $25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Plan Check $50,001-$100,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$248.70 + $2.70 for each $1,000 over $50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Plan Check $100,001-$500,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$383.70 + $2.10 for each $1,000 over $100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Plan Check $500,001-$1,000,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$1,223.70 + $1.80 for each $1,000 over $500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Plan Check Over $1,000,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$2,123.70 + $1.50 for each $1,000 over $1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL COMBO PERMITS:**
- Electrical Permit: 8% of the Building Permit Fee
- Plumbing Permit: 8% of the Building Permit Fee
- Mechanical Permit: 8% of the Building Permit Fee
- 10% of the Building Permit Fee

1/31/2016
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
BUILDING & SAFETY FEE SCHEDULE
BUILDING PERMIT FEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>CURRENT FEE</th>
<th>NEW PROPOSED FEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NON-SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL BUILDING PERMITS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit Under $500 Valuation</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>$24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit $501-$2,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$24 + $3.60 for each $100 over $500</td>
<td>$24 + $5.73 for each $100 over $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit $2,001-$25,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$78 + $14.40 for each $1,000 over $2,000</td>
<td>$110 + $12.52 for each $1,000 over $2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit $25,001-$50,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$409.20 + $10.80 for each $1,000 over $25,000</td>
<td>$398 + $10.64 for each $1,000 over $25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit $50,001-$100,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$679.20 + $7.20 for each $1,000 over $50,000</td>
<td>$564 + $11.52 for each $1,000 over $50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit $100,001-$500,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$1,039.20 + $9.60 for each $1,000 over $100,000</td>
<td>$1,240 + $4.42 for each $1,000 over $100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit $500,001-$1,000,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$3,439.20 + $4.80 for each $1,000 over $500,000</td>
<td>$3,010 + $5.13 for each $1,000 over $500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit Over $1,000,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$5,839.20 + $3.60 for each $1,000 over $1,000,000</td>
<td>$5,577 + $2.57 for each $1,000 over $1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **NON-SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL BUILDING PLAN CHECK** | | |
| Building Plan Check Under $500 Valuation | $36.96 | $24 + $4.20 for each $100 over $500 |
| Building Plan Check $501-$2,000 Valuation | $36.96 + $5.54 for each $100 over $500 | $36.96 + $5.54 for each $100 over $500 |
| Building Plan Check $2,001-$25,000 Valuation | $120.06 + $22.18 for each $1,000 over $2,000 | $87 + $11.35 for each $1,000 over $2,000 |
| Building Plan Check $25,001-$50,000 Valuation | $630.20 + $16.63 for each $1,000 over $25,000 | $348 + $10.44 for each $1,000 over $25,000 |
| Building Plan Check $50,001-$100,000 Valuation | $1,045.95 + $11.09 for each $1,000 over $50,000 | $809 + $8.72 for each $1,000 over $50,000 |
| Building Plan Check $100,001-$500,000 Valuation | $1,600.45 + $9.24 for each $1,000 over $100,000 | $1,045 + $4.35 for each $1,000 over $100,000 |
| Building Plan Check $500,001-$1,000,000 Valuation | $5,296.45 + $7.39 for each $1,000 over $500,000 | $2,787 + $5.01 for each $1,000 over $500,000 |
| Building Plan Check Over $1,000,000 Valuation | $8,991.45 + $5.54 for each $1,000 over $1,000,000 | $4,791 + $2.50 for each $1,000 over $1,000,000 |

**NON-SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL COMBO PERMITS:**
- Electrical Permit
- Plumbing Permit
- Mechanical Permit

- 40% of the Building Permit Fee
- 10% of the Building Permit Fee
- 20% of the Building Permit Fee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>CURRENT FEE</th>
<th>NEW PROPOSED FEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OTHER DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW</td>
<td>15% of the Building Permit Fee</td>
<td>15% of the Building Permit Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition Permit</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicate Inspection Card</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>$77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicate Certificate of Occupancy</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Certificate of Occupancy</td>
<td>$408 + $10,000 deposit refunded at time of Final C of O</td>
<td>$556 + $10,000 deposit refunded at time of Final C of O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Inspections not specified</td>
<td>$68</td>
<td>$148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime Inspection (4 hour minimum)</td>
<td>OT Hourly Rate</td>
<td>OT Hourly Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Plan Review</td>
<td>Hourly Rate</td>
<td>Hourly Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Plan Review in addition to regular Plan Review Fee</td>
<td>OT Hourly Rate</td>
<td>OT Hourly Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Inspection Site Visit</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime Hourly Rate is 120% of the Regular Hourly Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADING PERMITS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Permit under $2,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Permit $2,001-$10,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$50 + $18.75 for each $1,000 over $2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Permit $10,001-$50,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$200 + $8 for each $1,000 over $10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Permit $50,001-$100,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$520 + $4.48 for each $1,000 over $50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Permit $100,001-$500,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$744 + $0.84 for each $1,000 over $100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Permit Over $500,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$1,079 + $0.84 for each $1,000 over $500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADING PLAN CHECK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Plan Check under $2,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Plan Check $2,001-$10,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$100 + $42.50 for each $1,000 over $2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Plan Check $10,001-$50,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$440 + $11 for each $1,000 over $10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Plan Check $50,001-$100,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$880 + $8.60 for each $1,000 over $50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Plan Check $100,001-$500,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$1,320 + $1.83 for each $1,000 over $100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Plan Check Over $500,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$2,050 + $1.83 for each $1,000 over $500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPEDITED PLAN CHECK SURCHARGE</td>
<td>50% of Plan Check Fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERMIT CENTER SURCHARGE</td>
<td>4% of Permit and Plan Check Fees</td>
<td>4% of Permit and Plan Check Fees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/21/2019
### Electrical Permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permit Issuance</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Appliances, up to 5 hp</td>
<td>$17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential Appliances, up to 5 hp</td>
<td>$34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Sign</td>
<td>$68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motors/Transformers (Ratings in HP, KW, KVA, or KVAR) up to 100</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100+</td>
<td>$136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Power Pole</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services, Switchboards, Control Centers, &amp; Panels up to 600 volts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 400 amps SFR</td>
<td>$34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-SFR</td>
<td>$68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 400 amps</td>
<td>$102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greater than 600 volts</td>
<td>$136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switchboards First Section Standing Panel</td>
<td>$42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Sections</td>
<td>$36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Warning Communication Control Panel</td>
<td>$14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Warning Communication Control Panel - over 600 volts</td>
<td>$73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Warning Communication Control Panel - add’l sections</td>
<td>$67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recept, Switch, Lighting Outlet, and Lighting Fixture, per fixture SFR: First 10 items</td>
<td>$4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each item over 10</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-SFR: First 10 items</td>
<td>$7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each item over 10</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pole or Platform Mounted Fixtures, per fixture SFR</td>
<td>$19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-SFR</td>
<td>$23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pool</td>
<td>$136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meter Reset</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Duct Bank (per 100 lin ft)</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch Circuits (Temporary or Future)</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Conduits and Conductors (per 100 linear feet)</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspections not specified</td>
<td>$68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinspections Hourly Rate</td>
<td>Hourly Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Hours Inspection (4 hour minimum) OT Hourly Rate</td>
<td>OT Hourly Rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan Check - 100% of Permit Fee
Overtime Hourly Rate is 120% of the Regular Hourly Rate
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
BUILDING & SAFETY FEE SCHEDULE
MECHANICAL, ELECTRICAL, AND PLUMBING PERMIT FEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLUMBING PERMITS</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permit Issuance</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing Fixtures and Vents</td>
<td>$14</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair or Alteration of Drainage or Vent Piping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>$17</td>
<td>$43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-SFR</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grease Interceptor</td>
<td>$102</td>
<td>$129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piping (per dwelling unit)</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repipe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential (per dwelling unit)</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family Residential (per dwelling unit)</td>
<td>$68</td>
<td>$83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn Sprinklers, Vacuum Breakers, and Backflow Protection Dev.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Lawn Sprinkler System per Valve</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>$31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Vacuum Breaker or Backflow Protection Device</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>$31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backflow Protection Device greater than 6&quot;</td>
<td>$204</td>
<td>$240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas System, per system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2&quot;</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&quot; or more</td>
<td>$133</td>
<td>$92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Each Outlet over 5</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-SFR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2&quot;</td>
<td>$98</td>
<td>$92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&quot; or more</td>
<td>$177</td>
<td>$92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Each Outlet over 5</td>
<td>$14</td>
<td>$18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Heater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>$17</td>
<td>$68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-SFR</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar Water Heating system (Combo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-SFR</td>
<td>$68</td>
<td>$201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piping to a Condensate Pump, piping repair, sump pump</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake Valve</td>
<td>$68</td>
<td>$82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-25 linear feet</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>each additional ’100 linear feet</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pool</td>
<td>$102</td>
<td>$184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Ground Spa</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool/Spa Heater</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$68</td>
<td>$92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspections not specified</td>
<td>$68</td>
<td>$170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinspections</td>
<td>Hourly Rate</td>
<td>Hourly Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Hours Inspection (4 hour minimum)</td>
<td>OT Hourly Rate</td>
<td>OT Hourly Rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan Check - 100% of Permit Fee
Overtime Hourly Rate is 120% of the Regular Hourly Rate
### MECHANICAL PERMITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Issuance</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permit Issuance</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced-Air or Gravity-Type Furnace or Burner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>$28.50</td>
<td>$93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-SFR</td>
<td>$57</td>
<td>$93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Furnace - Installation or Relocation</td>
<td>$22.50</td>
<td>$92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended/Recessed Wall/Floor Mounted Heater - Install/Reloc</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-SFR</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appliance Vents per each Inlet/Outlet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-SFR</td>
<td>$16</td>
<td>$31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Handling Units</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Inlet/Air Outlet - First 10 vents</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$92.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Inlet/Air Outlet - Each additional vent</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Air Volume Box</td>
<td>$16</td>
<td>$37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Register Ventilation Fan</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>$37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Venting System</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood served by Mechanical Exhaust</td>
<td>$68</td>
<td>$92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boilers, Compressors, and Absorption Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-15 HP or 0-500,000 Btu/h</td>
<td>$68</td>
<td>$92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-30 HP or 500,001-1,000,000 Btu/h</td>
<td>$102</td>
<td>$154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50 HP or 1,000,001-1,750,000 Btu/h</td>
<td>$136</td>
<td>$191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+ HP or 1,750,001+ Btu/h</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>$240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoke/Fire Damper</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoke Control Damper</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermostat</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incinerator/Klin</td>
<td>$68</td>
<td>$92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alteration to Duct Work not otherwise noted</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>$9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$68</td>
<td>$92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspections not specified</td>
<td>$68</td>
<td>$170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reinspections**

- Hourly Rate: $68
- OT Hourly Rate: $170

**After Hours Inspection (4 hour minimum)**

- Hourly Rate
- OT Hourly Rate

---

Plan Check - 100% of Permit Fee

Overtime Hourly Rate is 120% of the Regular Hourly Rate
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
BUILDING & SAFETY FEE SCHEDULE
MECHANICAL, ELECTRICAL, AND PLUMBING PERMIT FEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMBO PERMITS</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electric Vehicle Charging System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>$242</td>
<td>$255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$655</td>
<td>$680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar Charging System:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>$535</td>
<td>$570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$840</td>
<td>$880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>$998</td>
<td>$1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$1,257</td>
<td>$1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generator</td>
<td>$591</td>
<td>$650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>$259</td>
<td>$280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT E

RESOLUTION NO.____________________

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO ESTABLISHING A SCHEDULE OF FEES AND CHARGES FOR RECOVERING COSTS INCURRED FROM PROVIDING VARIOUS CITY SERVICES.

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of El Segundo as follows:

SECTION 1. The City Council finds as follows:

The City Council may establish fees for services under various provisions of California law including, without limitation, Business & Professions Code§ 16000; Government Code §§36936.1, 43000, 54344, 65104, 65456, 65874, 65909.5, 65943, 66013, 66014, 66451.2; and Health & Safety Code §§ 510, 17951, 17980.1, 19852.

Pursuant to Government Code§ 66016, the City made data available regarding the cost, or estimated cost, of providing services for various fees ten (10) days before the public hearing held on June 19, 2018.

On June 19, 2018, City Council heard public testimony and considered evidence in a public hearing held and noticed in accordance with Government Code§ 66016.

At the recommendation of the City's Departments and the City Manager, the City Council believes that it is in the public interest to establish the recommended fees to recover the costs of public services.

SECTION 2. The Fee Schedule Adoption: The following schedule of fees and charges attached as Exhibits "C" and "D" and incorporated into this Resolution as if fully set forth, are approved and adopted.

SECTION 3. Separate Fee for Each Process: All fees set by this Resolution are for each identified process; additional fees shall be required for each additional process or service that is requested or required. Where fees are indicated on a per-unit of measurement basis, the fee is for each identified unit or portion thereof within the indicated ranges of such units.

A. Added Fees and Refunds: Where additional fees need to be charged and collected for completed work, or where a refund of excess deposited monies is due, and where such charge or refund is $15.00 or less, a charge or refund need not be made, pursuant to California Government Code Sections 50055 and amendments thereto.
SECTION 4. New Fees: Any fees for new services established throughout the year shall be incorporated into the City’s fee structure and collected with recovery percent consistent with similar services.

SECTION 5. Interpretations: This Resolution may be interpreted by the several City Department Heads in consultation with the City Manager, and should there be a conflict between two fees, then the lower in dollar amount of the two shall be applied.

A. Intent: It is the intention of the City Council to review the fees and charges as determined and set out herein, based on the City’s next Annual Budget and all of the City’s costs reasonably borne as established at that time and, if warranted, to revise such fees and charges based thereon.

SECTION 6. Unless otherwise revised, the fees established by this Resolution will be automatically adjusted on an annual basis at the beginning of each fiscal year based on the most recent reported June annual percentage of change in the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics’ Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County CPI-U for the calendar year.

A. The first fee adjustment cannot be made before a minimum of twelve (12) months after the effective date of this Resolution.

SECTION 7. This Resolution is exempt from review under the California Environmental Quality Act (Cal. Pub. Res. Code §§ 211000. et seq.; "CEQA") and CEQA regulations (Cal. Code Regs. tit. 14, §§ 15000, et seq.) because it establishes, modifies, structures, restructures, and approves rates and charges for meeting operating expenses; purchasing supplies, equipment, and materials; meeting financial requirements; and obtaining funds for capital projects needed to maintain service within existing service areas. This Resolution, therefore, is categorically exempt from further CEQA review under Cal. Code Regs. tit. 14. § 15273.

SECTION 8. Effective Date: This resolution shall go into full force and effect immediately but shall be subject to the terms and conditions pursuant to Government Code § 66017. Development related fees will go into effect September 1, 2018, Recreation fees will go into effect August 1, 2018, Aquatic fees and Special event fees shall go into effect August 1, 2018, while all other fees will become effective on August 1, 2018 and will remain effective unless repealed or superseded.

SECTION 9. Repealer: All resolutions and other actions of the City Council in conflict with the contents of this Resolution are hereby repealed.
SECTION 10. Constitutionality: If any portion of this Resolution is declared invalid or unconstitutional, then it is the intention of the City Council to have passed the entire Resolution and all its component parts, and all other sections of this Resolution shall remain in full force and effect.

SECTION 11: The City Clerk will certify to the passage and adoption of this Resolution; will enter the same in the book of original Resolutions of said City; and will make a minute of the passage and adoption thereof in the record of proceedings of the City Council of said City, in the minutes of the meeting at which the same is passed and adopted.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this ____ day of ____________, 2018.

AYE:
NOE:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties hereto have executed this contract the day and year first hereinabove written.

CITY OF EL SEGUNDO

__________________________
Greg Carpenter,
City Manager

ATTEST:

__________________________
Tracy Weaver,
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

By: _______________
Mark D. Hensley, City Attorney
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Zone Text Amendment to the Corporate Office Zone
Consideration and possible action regarding Environmental Assessment No. EA-1218, General Plan Amendment No. GPA 18-01 and Zone Text Amendment No. ZTA 18-01 to: 1) Approve a Negative Declaration in accordance with CEQA; 2) Amend text in the Corporate Office section of the General Plan Land Use Element; and, 3) Amend certain sections in Title 15 of the El Segundo Municipal Code pertaining to the permitted uses, permitted accessory uses and conditionally permitted uses allowed in the Corporate Office (CO) Zone of the City.

Address: Corporate Office (CO) Zone of El Segundo

(Fiscal Impact: None with this action.)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1. Conduct a public hearing;
2. Take testimony and other evidence as presented; and,
3. Introduce an Ordinance (Zone Text Amendment No. ZTA 18-01) amending the Corporate Office section of the El Segundo Municipal Code;
4. Schedule second reading and adoption of the Ordinance for July 17, 2018;
5. Adopt Resolution No. ____, approving a Negative Declaration, and approving Environmental Assessment No. EA-1218, General Plan Amendment No. GPA 18-01 and Zone Text Amendment No. ZTA 18-01; and/or
6. Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

1. Resolution No. ____, approving a Negative Declaration and approving EA-1218, GPA 18-01 and ZTA 18-01
2. Proposed Ordinance No. _____
3. Planning Commission Resolution No. 2836
4. Planning Commission Staff Report, dated May 24, 2018 (without attachments)
5. Initial Study/Negative Declaration
6. Email from Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

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

STRATEGIC PLAN:

Goal: Champion economic development and fiscal sustainability.
Objective: Encourage a vibrant business climate that is accessible, user-friendly and welcoming to all residents and visitors.
INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

The proposed project includes amending the text in the Corporate Office section of the General Plan Land Use Element, and amending three sections of the El Segundo Municipal Code ("ESMC") regarding the Corporate Office Zone. On May 24, 2018, the Planning Commission conducted a public hearing to consider amendments to the General Plan and Zoning Code related to the uses in the Corporate Office Zone, specifically with regards to the permitted uses, the permitted accessory uses and the conditionally permitted uses allowed in the CO Zone. After discussing the proposed amendments, the Planning Commission on a 4-0 vote\(^1\) adopted Resolution No. 2836 (attached) recommending that the City Council approve a Negative Declaration and approve general plan and zone text amendments. Since the project includes amending the city’s General Plan and Zoning Code, the City Council is the decision-making body. Therefore, it is now before the City Council for consideration.

DISCUSSION

ZONE TEXT AMENDMENT

There are three sections in the CO Zone regulations that will be amended by this application. The first is to the Permitted Uses section (15-5D-2) in the CO Zone. Although the CO zone is intended primarily for office uses, the Code does not allow for many service uses that are oriented towards offices and office workers. Staff believes that creating the classification of Office Worker-Oriented Services as a permitted use allows uses that are supportive to the office environment. Office Worker-Oriented Services would include uses such as dry cleaning; parcel shipping, printing and business service centers such as FedEx Kinko’s or the UPS Store; and self-service parcel delivery services such as Amazon Locker. Thus, it would provide amenities to the offices and their workers in the CO Zone that are currently not allowed. As such, the following language is recommended to be added to the permitted uses in the CO Zone:

Office worker-oriented services, not located along Pacific Coast Highway or El Segundo Boulevard, such as:

\(a\). Dry cleaners which have cleaning operations on site and limited to not more than 3,000 gross square feet (not including Laundromats);

\(b\). Shipping, postal, printing and business service centers limited to not more than 3,000 gross square feet;

\(^1\) The Planning Commission is currently comprised of four members due to the election of Planning Commissioner Scot Nicol, to the City Council,
c. Self-service parcel delivery service; and,
d. Other service uses determined by the Director to be oriented towards, and clearly related to, office workers in the surrounding area.

The next section recommended to be amended is the Permitted Accessory Uses (15-5D-3). The recommendation includes deleting cafes and adding a provision that any permitted primary use is also a permitted accessory use. This will allow more flexibility to staff and the business community to provide these uses as part of a larger primary use. Staff also recommends deleting Limited Support Service Retail Uses since there is no definition, description or example of what that entails. Lastly, staff recommends adding bike-share docking stations as a permitted accessory use.

The last section recommended to be amended is the Uses Subject to Conditional Use Permit (15-5D-5). The recommendation includes deleting Freight Forwarding uses since such a use is not consistent with an office environment and are not compatible with the purpose of the CO Zone. Further, these operations include the use of large semi-trailer trucks that impact the City’s roadways, pavement and other infrastructure, but generate little in tax revenue and business licensing.

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT

The project also includes amendments to the Corporate Office sections contained in the General Plan Land Use Element. Staff believes that the necessary findings can be made to recommend City Council approval of the proposed amendment and the inclusion of uses that are oriented towards serving the needs of office workers and the office environment. The findings are discussed in the proposed resolution.

In accordance with Senate Bill 18 requirements for General Plan Amendments, the City contacted the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians to determine if consultation will be requested. Staff received an email (attached) from the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians specifying that consultation is not necessary since the project does not include any ground disturbing activity.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

In accordance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a Negative Declaration has been prepared for this project. The Negative Declaration/Initial Study was circulated for public review and comment from May 1 through May 24, 2018. Further, the accompanying Notice of Intent (NOI) was published in the El Segundo Herald on May 3, 2018. No comments were received during the comment period, nor have any comments been received since the comment period ended.

CONCLUSION:

Planning Staff recommends that the Council introduce an Ordinance amending the three sections of the El Segundo Municipal Code; schedule second reading and adoption of the Ordinance for July 17, 2018; and adopt Resolution No. _____, approving a Negative
Declaration, and approving Environmental Assessment No. EA-1218, General Plan Amendment No. GPA 18-01 and Zone Text Amendment No. ZTA 18-01.
RESOLUTION NO. ___

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO APPROVING A NEGATIVE DECLARATION UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. EA-1218, GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. GPA 18-01 AND ZONE TEXT AMENDMENT NO. ZTA 18-01; AND ADOPTING GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 18-01 TO AMEND THE LAND USE ELEMENT OF THE GENERAL PLAN PERTAINING TO CORPORATE OFFICE.

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

SECTION 1: The City Council does hereby finds and declares that:

A. On February 14, 2018, Marcos A. Neri initiated the process to amend Title 15 of the Municipal Code in order to allow dry cleaners in the Corporate Office (CO) Zone;

B. The project applications were reviewed by the City’s Planning and Building Safety Department for, in part, consistency with the General Plan and conformity with the El Segundo Municipal Code (ESMC);

C. The City reviewed the project’s environmental impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code §§ 21000, et seq., “CEQA”) and the regulations promulgated thereunder (14 California Code of Regulations §§ 15000, et seq., the “CEQA Guidelines”);

D. On May 24, 2018, the Planning Commission held a public hearing to receive public testimony and other evidence regarding the application including information provided by city staff, and adopted PC Resolution No. 2836 recommending that the City Council approve the proposed amendments;

E. On June 19, 2018, the City Council held a public hearing and considered the information provided by City staff and public testimony regarding this Ordinance; and,

F. This Resolution and its findings are made based upon the entire administrative record including testimony and evidence presented to the City Council at its June 19, 2018 public hearing and 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:

A. Zone Text Amendment No. 18-01, considered concurrently with this Resolution, amends Section 15-5D-2 (Permitted Uses) by allowing office worker-oriented services in the CO Zone, provided they are not located on properties fronting Pacific Coast Highway or El Segundo Boulevard.
B. The CO Zone is intended to provide for the development of offices, and principal uses are restricted to a mixture of office and food serving uses with limited retail. Zone Text Amendment No. 18-01 expands the allowable uses in the CO Zone by including service uses that are supportive to office workers, complimentary to the allowable uses in the CO Zone, and are consistent with the character of the CO Zone.

C. General Plan Amendment No. 18-01 amends the Corporate Office sections of the Land Use Element to include language that broadens the types of uses allowed to include uses that offer services to office workers and the office environment.

D. Zone Text Amendment No. 18-01 amends Section 15-5D-3 (Permitted Accessory Uses) by allowing bike-share docking stations as a permitted accessory use in the CO Zone, and thereby facilitating their installation. Bike-share docking stations can be accommodated on properties within the CO Zone, provides an additional amenity to workers and visitors in the zone, and provides and promotes bicycles as an alternative to automobiles as a mode of mobility.

E. Zone Text Amendment No. 18-01 amends Section 15-5D-5 (Uses Subject to Conditional Use Permit) by deleting freight forwarding use from this section, thereby becoming a prohibited use in the CO Zone. Freight forwarding is not consistent with the purpose and intent of the CO Zone.

SECTION 3: Environmental Assessment. The proposed project was analyzed for its environmental impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code §§ 21000, et seq., “CEQA”), and the regulations promulgated thereunder (14 Cal. Code of Regulations §§15000, et seq., the “CEQA Guidelines”). The City prepared an Initial Study of Environmental Impacts pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15063. A Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts is proposed for this project pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15070.

The IS/ND concluded that the project will not result in or create any significant impacts, or have less than significant impacts to aesthetics; agriculture and forestry resources; air quality; geology/soils; greenhouse gas emissions; hazards/hazardous materials; hydrology/water quality; land use; mineral resources; noise; population and housing; public services; recreation; biological resources; cultural resources; transportation/traffic; and, utilities.

The IS/ND prepared for this Project reflects the City’s independent judgment and analysis, and the City Council finds that there is no substantial evidence that the Project would have a significant impact on the environment to warrant mitigation measures, nor is there any need to prepare an environmental impact report for the proposed project.

SECTION 4: Adoption. The City Council adopts General Plan Amendment No. 18-01, as outlined in the attached Exhibits A and B, which are incorporated herein by this reference.

SECTION 5: Reliance On Record. Each and every one of the findings and determination
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 City Council in all respects and are fully and completely supported by substantial evidence in the record as a whole.

SECTION 6: 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'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 7: 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 8: Severability. If any part of this Resolution or its application is deemed invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the City Council intends that such invalidity will not affect the effectiveness of the remaining provisions or applications and, to this end, the provisions of this Ordinance are severable.

SECTION 9: The City Clerk is directed to certify the adoption of this Resolution, record this Resolution in the book of the City's original resolutions, and make a minute of this adoption of the Resolution in the City Council's records and the minutes of this meeting.

SECTION 10: This Resolution will become effective immediately and will remain effective unless repealed or superseded.

SECTION 11: A copy of this Resolution must be mailed to applicant Marcos A. Neri, and to any other person requesting a copy.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 19th day of June, 2018.

Drew Boyles, 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 and adopted by said City Council, approved and signed by the Mayor, and attested to by the City Clerk, all at a regular meeting of said Council held on the 19th day of June, 2018, and the same was so passed and adopted by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

____________________
Tracy Weaver, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

____________________
Mark D. Hensley, City Attorney
El Segundo General Plan Land Use Element

Land Use Designations

Revise the following paragraph on page 3-7, as illustrated below

“Commercial Designations

* * *

Corporate Office

Permits a mixture of office and food-serving uses in single-tenant or multi-tenant buildings with limited retail uses permitted in the lobby area. Research and development uses are permitted east of Pacific Coast Highway-Sepulveda Boulevard. The maximum allowed floor area ratio (FAR) is 0.8. Office worker-oriented service uses are permitted, provided they are not located along Pacific Coast Highway or El Segundo Boulevard. A maximum FAR of 1.086 is permitted for the property commonly referred to as 888 North Pacific Coast Highway-Sepulveda Boulevard (Assessor's Parcel Number 4138-005-055), pursuant to Development Agreement No. 00-2. (Ord. 1331, GPA 00-2, 3/20/01)”

* * *
El Segundo General Plan Land Use Element

Proposed Land Use Plan

Revise the following paragraph(s) on pages 3-10 and 3-11 as illustrated below

"Northeast Quadrant

* * * *

On the 1992 Land Use Plan, the majority of the northeast quadrant is designated either Corporate Office (193.4 ac) or Urban Mixed-Use (232.5 ac). The Corporate Campus Specific Plan (46.5 ac) also allows a mixture of office and commercial uses. Corporate Office allows a mixture of office uses with retail in the lobby. Corporate Office also allows Office-worker oriented service uses, provided they are not located along Pacific Coast Highway or El Segundo Boulevard. This designation covers the "Superblock Area" and will allow uses similar to those currently in that area.

* * * *
ORDINANCE NO. ____

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING EL SEGUNDO MUNICIPAL CODE
SECTIONS 15-5D-2, 15-5D-3 AND 15-5D-5, MODIFYING PERMITTED
USES, PERMITTED ACCESSORY USES AND CONDITIONALLY
PERMITTED USES IN THE CORPORATE OFFICE (CO) ZONE.

(Environmental Assessment No. 1218 and
Zone Text Amendment No. 18-01)

The City Council of the city of El Segundo does ordain as follows:

SECTION 1: The Council finds and declares as follows:

A. On February 14, 2018, Marcos A. Neri initiated the process to amend Title 15 of
the Municipal Code in order to allow dry cleaners in the Corporate Office (CO)
Zone;

B. The project applications were reviewed by the City's Planning and Building Safety
Department for, in part, consistency with the General Plan and conformity with the
El Segundo Municipal Code (ESMC);

C. The City reviewed the project's environmental impacts under the California
Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code §§ 21000, et seq.,
"CEQA") and the regulations promulgated thereunder (14 California Code of
Regulations §§ 15000, et seq., the "CEQA Guidelines");

D. On May 24, 2018, the Planning Commission held a public hearing to receive public
testimony and other evidence regarding the application including information
provided by city staff, and adopted PC Resolution No. 2836 recommending that
the City Council approve the proposed amendments;

E. On June 19, 2018, the City Council held a public hearing and considered the
information provided by City staff and public testimony regarding this Ordinance;
and,

F. This Ordinance and its findings are made based upon the entire administrative
record including testimony and evidence presented to the City Council at its June
19, 2018 public hearing and the staff report submitted by the Planning and Building
Safety Department.

SECTION 2: General Plan Amendment. As required under Government Code § 65860,
the ESMC amendments proposed by the Ordinance, and the proposed development
project are consistent with the El Segundo General Plan, because concurrently with this
Ordinance, the City Council is also considering a General Plan Amendment No. 18-01.
That Resolution amends the General Plan as follows:
A. An amendment to the text in the “Land Use Designations – Commercial Designations, Corporate Office” subsection of the Land Use Element to include Office-worker oriented service uses.

B. An amendment to the text in the “Proposed Land Use – Northeast Quadrant” subsection of the Land Use Element, to include Office-worker oriented service uses.

SECTION 3: Zone Text Amendment Findings. In accordance with ESMC § 15-26-6 and based on the findings set forth herein, the proposed Zone Text Amendment is consistent with the goals, policies, and objectives of the General Plan as follows:

A. The amendments are consistent with the purpose of the ESMC, which is to serve the public health, safety, and general welfare and to provide the economic and social advantages resulting from an orderly planned use of land resources.

B. The amendments are consistent with the purpose of the Corporate Office (CO) Zone in that it expands the allowable uses by including service uses that are supportive to office workers and complimentary to other allowable uses in the CO Zone.

C. The amendments are necessary to facilitate new uses that are office worker-oriented and compatible with surrounding properties and uses in the CO Zone.

SECTION 4: General Plan Findings. As required under Government Code § 65454 the proposed amendments are consistent with the City’s General Plan goals and policies in that the amendments are in the public interest, and there will be a community benefit resulting from the amendments.

A. Goal LU-1: Maintain El Segundo’s "small town" atmosphere, and provide an attractive place to live and work.

The proposed amendments will provide greater opportunities in the CO zone by including service uses that are supportive to office workers; complimentary to the allowable uses in the CO Zone; provides and promotes bicycles as an alternative to automobiles as a mode of mobility; and eliminates freight forwarding as the use is not consistent with the purpose and intent of the CO Zone.

B. Objective LU4-4: Provide areas where development has the flexibility to mix uses, in an effort to provide synergistic relationships which have the potential to maximize economic benefit, reduce traffic impacts, and encourage pedestrian environments.
The provision of Office worker-oriented services expands the mix of uses by including service uses that are supportive to other businesses, thereby maximizing economic benefit in the CO Zone. Further, allowing bike stations encourages mobility alternatives to create a more pedestrian-friendly environment. Lastly, eliminating freight forwarding uses reduces the traffic impacts caused by large vehicles that are used to transport goods that are associated with freight forwarding operations.

SECTION 5: Environmental Assessment. The City Council makes the following environmental findings:

A. Due to the facts contained in Section 2, the proposed project was analyzed for its environmental impacts under CEQA. The City prepared an Initial Study of Environmental Impacts (IS) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and a Negative Declaration (ND) of Environmental Impacts is proposed for this project.

B. The draft IS/ND concluded the project will either not create or result in, or will have less than significant impacts to: aesthetics; agriculture and forestry resources; air quality; geology/soils; greenhouse gas emissions; hazards/hazardous materials; hydrology/water quality; land use; mineral resources; noise; population and housing; public services; recreation; biological resources; cultural resources; transportation/traffic; and, utilities.

C. Accordingly, based upon the evidence presented to the Planning Commission, the City need not prepare an environmental impact report for the proposed project.

SECTION 6: ESMC §15-5D-2 (Permitted Uses) is amended to read as follows (strikethrough is language deleted, and underlined is language added):

15-5D-2: PERMITTED USES:

The following uses are permitted in the CO Zone:

A. Daycare centers.
B. Fitness centers.
C. General offices.
D. Medical-dental offices.
E. Public uses, including, but not limited to, fire and police stations, post offices and libraries.
F. Recreational facilities (public and private).
G. Research and development uses, located east of Pacific Coast Highway Sepulveda Boulevard only.
H. Restaurants and cafes.
I. Office worker-oriented services, provided they are not located along Pacific Coast Highway or El Segundo Boulevard, such as:
   a. Dry cleaners that have cleaning operations on site and are not more than 3,000 gross square feet (not including Laundromats);
   b. Shipping, postal, printing and business service centers that are not more than 3,000 gross square feet;
   c. Self-service parcel delivery service; and,
   d. Other service uses determined by the Director to be oriented towards, and clearly related to, office workers in the surrounding area.

J. Such uses as the Director deems to be similar and not more intensive. Other similar uses approved by the Director, as provided by chapter 22 of this title.

SECTION 7: ESMC Section 15-5D-3 (Permitted Accessory Uses) is amended to read as follows:

15-5D-3: PERMITTED ACCESSORY USES:

A. Any use customarily incidental to a permitted use.
B. Cafes. Bike-share docking station.
C. Drive-through or walk-up services, including financial operations, but excluding drive-through restaurants.
D. Limited-support service retail uses. Open storage of commodities sold or utilized on the premises.
E. Any of the permitted uses allowed in Section 15-5D-2 is a permitted accessory use.

G. Such uses as the Director deems to be similar and not more intensive. Other similar uses approved by the Director of Community, Economic and Development Services as provided by chapter 22 of this title.

SECTION 8: ESMC Section 15-5D-4 (Uses Subject to Administrative Use Permit) is amended to read as follows:

15-5D-4: USES SUBJECT TO ADMINISTRATIVE USE PERMIT:

A. The off-site sale of alcohol at limited support service retail establishments as an accessory use.
B. The on-site sale and consumption of alcohol at restaurants, drive-through restaurants, and delicatessens.
C. Such uses as the Director deems to be similar and not more intensive. Other similar uses approved by the Director, as provided by chapter 22 of this title.
SECTION 9: ESMC Section 15-5D-5 (Uses Subject to Conditional Use Permit) is amended to read as follows:

15-5D-5: USES SUBJECT TO CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT:

A. Drive-through restaurants, except properties located west of Pacific Coast Highway Sepulveda Boulevard where drive-through restaurants are prohibited.

B. Freight-forwarding.

BC. Helicopter landing facilities subject to the provisions of section 15-2-13 of this title.

CD. Hotels and motels, except properties located west of Pacific Coast Highway Sepulveda and east of Aviation Boulevards where hotels and motels are prohibited.

DE. Museums.

EF. On site sale and consumption of alcohol at bars.

FG. Outdoor dining areas for restaurants, except cafes, that are larger than two hundred-(200) square feet.

GH. Service stations, if a five hundred-foot-(500-foot) minimum distance from any residential zoned property is provided. This distance criteria does not apply to properties east of Pacific Coast Highway Sepulveda Boulevard.

HI. Other similar uses approved by the Director, as provided by chapter 22 of this title.

SECTION 10: CONSTRUCTION. This ordinance must be broadly construed in order to achieve the purposes stated in this ordinance. It is the City Council's intent that the provisions of this ordinance be interpreted or implemented by the City and others in a manner that facilitates the purposes set forth in this ordinance.

SECTION 11: VALIDITY OF PREVIOUS CODE SECTIONS. If this entire ordinance or its application is deemed invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, any repeal or amendment of the ESMC or other city ordinance by this ordinance will be rendered void and cause such previous ESMC provision or other ordinance to remain in full force and effect for all purposes.

SECTION 12: SEVERABILITY. If any part of this Ordinance or its application is deemed invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the city council intends that such invalidity will not affect the effectiveness of the remaining provisions or applications and, to this end, the provisions of this Ordinance are severable.
SECTION 13: The City Clerk is directed to certify the passage and adoption of this Ordinance; cause it to be entered into the City of El Segundo's book of original ordinances; make a note of the passage and adoption in the records of this meeting; and, within 15 days after the passage and adoption of this Ordinance, cause it to be published or posted in accordance with California law.

SECTION 14: This Ordinance will become effective on the 31st day following its passage and adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this ___ day of ____________, 2018.

________________________________________
Drew Boyles, Mayor

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

________________________________________
Mark D. Hensley, City Attorney

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 Ordinance No. __________ was duly introduced by said City Council at a regular meeting held on the ___ day of ____________ 2018, and was duly passed and adopted by said City Council, approved and signed by the Mayor, and attested to by the City Clerk, all at a regular meeting of said Council held on the ___ day of ____________, 2018, and the same was so passed and adopted by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

________________________________________
Tracy Weaver, City Clerk
P.C. RESOLUTION NO. 2836

A RESOLUTION OF THE EL SEGUNDO PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. EA-1218 FOR A NEGATIVE DECLARATION; APPROVE A GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT TO AMEND THE LAND USE ELEMENT OF THE GENERAL PLAN PERTAINING TO CORPORATE OFFICE; AND, ADOPT AN ORDINANCE AMENDING EL SEGUNDO MUNICIPAL CODE SECTIONS 15-5D-2, 15-5D-3 AND 15-5D-5 REGARDING PERMITTED USES, PERMITTED ACCESSORY USES AND CONDITIONALLY PERMITTED USES IN THE CORPORATE OFFICE (CO) ZONE.

(Environmental Assessment No. 1218, General Plan Amendment and Zone Text Amendment No. 18-01)

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

SECTION 1: The Planning Commission finds and declares that:

A. On February 14, 2018, Marcos A. Neri initiated the process to amend the El Segundo General Plan and Title 15 of the Municipal Code in order to allow dry cleaners in the Corporate Office (CO) Zone;

B. The project applications were reviewed by the City's Planning and Building Safety Department for, in part, consistency with the General Plan and conformity with the El Segundo Municipal Code (ESMC);

C. The City reviewed the project's environmental impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code §§ 21000, et seq., "CEQA") and the regulations promulgated thereunder (14 California Code of Regulations §§ 15000, et seq., the "CEQA Guidelines");

D. An Initial Study was prepared and a Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts is proposed for this project pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines. The Draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration were circulated for public review and comment from May 1 through May 24, 2018. The accompanying Notice of Intent (NOI) included a notice of public hearing scheduled for May 24, 2018. A notice was also published in the El Segundo Herald on May 3, 2018. Lastly, both the ND document and the notice were made available on the City's website and at the El Segundo Library;

E. The Planning Commission of the City of El Segundo held a noticed public hearing on May 24, 2018, to review and consider the staff report prepared for the Project, receive public testimony, and review all correspondence received on the Project; and,
F. This Resolution, and its findings, are made, in part, based upon the evidence presented to the Commission at its May 24, 2018, public hearing including, 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:

A. Zone Text Amendment No. 18-01 amends Section 15-5D-2 (Permitted Uses) by allowing office worker-oriented services in the CO Zone, provided they are not located on properties fronting Sepulveda or El Segundo Boulevards.

B. The CO Zone is intended to provide for the development of offices, and principal uses are restricted to a mixture of office and food serving uses with limited retail. Zone Text Amendment No. 18-01 expands the allowable uses in the CO Zone by including service uses that are supportive to office workers, complimentary to the allowable uses in the CO Zone, and are consistent with the character of the CO Zone.

C. General Plan Amendment No. 18-01 amends the Corporate Office sections of the Land Use Element to include language that broadens the types of uses allowed to include uses that offer services to office workers and the office environment.

D. Zone Text Amendment No. 18-01 amends Section 15-5D-3 (Permitted Accessory Uses) by allowing bike-share docking stations as a permitted accessory use in the CO Zone, and thereby facilitating their installation. Bike-share docking stations can be accommodated on properties within the CO Zone, provides an additional amenity to workers and visitors in the zone, and provides and promotes bicycles as an alternative to automobiles as a mode of mobility.

E. Zone Text Amendment No. 18-01 amends Section 15-5D-5 (Uses Subject to Conditional Use Permit) by deleting freight forwarding use from this section, thereby becoming a prohibited use in the CO Zone. Freight forwarding is not consistent with the purpose and intent of the CO Zone.

SECTION 3: General Plan Findings. As required under Government Code § 65454 the proposed amendments are consistent with the City’s General Plan goals and policies in that the amendments are in the public interest, and there will be a community benefit resulting from the amendments.

A. Goal LU-1: Maintain El Segundo's "small town" atmosphere, and provide an attractive place to live and work.

The proposed amendments will provide greater opportunities in the CO zone by including service uses that are supportive to office workers; complimentary to the allowable uses in the CO Zone; provides and promotes bicycles as an
alternative to automobiles as a mode of mobility; and eliminates freight forwarding as the use is not consistent with the purpose and intent of the CO Zone.

B. Objective LU4-4: Provide areas where development has the flexibility to mix uses, in an effort to provide synergistic relationships which have the potential to maximize economic benefit, reduce traffic impacts, and encourage pedestrian environments.

The provision of Office worker-oriented services expands the mix of uses by including service uses that are supportive to other businesses, thereby maximizing economic benefit in the CO Zone. Further, allowing bike stations encourages mobility alternatives to create a more pedestrian-friendly environment. Lastly, eliminating freight forwarding uses reduces the traffic impacts caused by large vehicles that are used to transport goods that are associated with freight forwarding operations.

SECTION 4: General Plan Amendment. The Planning Commission hereby recommends that the City Council make the following amendments to the El Segundo General Plan:

A. An amendment to the text in the “Land Use Designations – Commercial Designations, Corporate Office” subsection of the Land Use Element to include Office-worker oriented service uses. The corresponding changes are set forth in attached Exhibit “A”

B. An amendment to the text in the “Proposed Land Use – Northeast Quadrant” subsection of the Land Use Element, to include Office-worker oriented service uses. The corresponding changes are set forth in attached Exhibit “B”.

SECTION 5: Zone Text Amendment Findings. In accordance with ESMC § 15-26-4 and based on the findings set forth in Section 3, the proposed amendments are consistent with the goals, policies, and objectives of the ESMC as follows:

A. The amendments are consistent with the purpose of the ESMC, which is to serve the public health, safety, and general welfare and to provide the economic and social advantages resulting from an orderly planned use of land resources.

B. The amendments are consistent with the purpose of the Corporate Office (CO) Zone in that it expands the allowable uses by including service uses that are supportive to office workers and complimentary to other allowable uses in the CO Zone.
B. The amendments are necessary to facilitate new uses that are office worker-oriented and compatible with surrounding properties and uses in the CO Zone.

SECTION 6: Environmental Assessment. The Planning Commission makes the following environmental findings:

A. Due to the facts contained in Section 2, the proposed project was analyzed for its environmental impacts under CEQA. The City prepared an Initial Study of Environmental Impacts (IS) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and a Negative Declaration (ND) of Environmental Impacts is proposed for this project.

B. The draft IS/ND concluded the project will either not create or result in, or will have less than significant impacts to: aesthetics; agriculture and forestry resources; air quality; geology/soils; greenhouse gas emissions; hazards/hazardous materials; hydrology/water quality; land use; mineral resources; noise; population and housing; public services; recreation; biological resources; cultural resources; transportation/traffic; and, utilities.

C. Accordingly, based upon the evidence presented to the Planning Commission, the City need not prepare an environmental impact report for the proposed project.

SECTION 7: Recommendation. For the foregoing reasons and based on the information and findings included in the Staff Report, Resolutions, Minutes and the whole of the administrative record, the Planning Commission of the City of El Segundo hereby recommends that the City Council adopt the ordinance set forth in the attached Exhibit “C” (Draft Ordinance) of this Resolution, and incorporated into this resolution by reference.

SECTION 8: Reliance on Record. Each and every one of the findings and determination 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

SECTION 9: Limitations. The Planning Commission’s analysis and evaluation of the project is based on information available at the time of the decision. It is inevitable that in evaluating a project that absolute and perfect knowledge of all possible aspects of the project will not exist. In all instances, best efforts have been made to form accurate assumptions.

SECTION 10: This Resolution will remain effective until superseded by a subsequent resolution.

SECTION 11: The Commission secretary is directed to mail a copy of this Resolution to any person requesting a copy.
SECTION 12: This Resolution may be appealed within ten calendar days after its adoption. All appeals must be in writing and filed with the City Clerk within this time period. Failure to file a timely written appeal will constitute a waiver of any right of appeal.

SECTION 13: Except as provided in Section 12, this Resolution is the Planning Commission's final decision and will become effective on the tenth day after its adoption.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 24th day of May 2018.

/s/ Ryan Baldino
Ryan Baldino, Chairperson
City of El Segundo Planning Commission

ATTEST:

/s/ Sam Lee
Sam Lee, Secretary

Baldino - Aye
Newman - Aye
Wingate - Aye
Hoeschler - Aye

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

By: /s/ David King
David King, Assistant City Attorney
El Segundo General Plan Land Use Element

Land Use Designations

Revise the following paragraph on page 3-7, as illustrated below

"Commercial Designations

* * *

Corporate Office

Permits a mixture of office and food-serving uses in single-tenant or multi-tenant buildings with limited retail uses permitted in the lobby area. Research and development uses are permitted east of Sepulveda Boulevard. The maximum allowed floor area ratio (FAR) is 0.8. Office worker-oriented service uses are permitted, provided they are not located along Sepulveda Boulevard or El Segundo Boulevard. A maximum FAR of 1.086 is permitted for the property commonly referred to as 888 North Sepulveda Boulevard (Assessor's Parcel Number 4138-005-055), pursuant to Development Agreement No. 00-2. (Ord. 1331, GPA 00-2, 3/20/01)"

* * *
El Segundo General Plan Land Use Element

Proposed Land Use Plan

Revise the following paragraph(s) on pages 3-10 and 3-11 as illustrated below

"Northeast Quadrant

* * * *

On the 1992 Land Use Plan, the majority of the northeast quadrant is designated either Corporate Office (193.4 ac) or Urban Mixed-Use (232.5 ac). The Corporate Campus Specific Plan (46.5 ac) also allows a mixture of office and commercial uses. Corporate Office allows a mixture of office uses with retail in the lobby. Corporate Office also allows Office-worker oriented service uses, provided they are not located along Sepulveda Boulevard or El Segundo Boulevard. This designation covers the "Superblock Area" and will allow uses similar to those currently in that area.

* * * *
P.C. Resolution No. 2836
Exhibit C

DRAFT ORDINANCE NO. ____

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING EL SEGUNDO MUNICIPAL CODE
SECTIONS 15-5D-2, 15-5D-3 AND 15-5D-5, MODIFYING PERMITTED
USES, PERMITTED ACCESSORY USES AND CONDITIONALLY
PERMITTED USES IN THE CORPORATE OFFICE (CO) ZONE.

(Environmental Assessment No. 1218 and
Zone Text Amendment No. 18-01)

The City Council of the city of El Segundo does ordain as follows;

SECTION 1: The Council finds and declares as follows:

A. On February 14, 2018, Marcos A. Neri initiated the process to amend Title 15 of
the Municipal Code in order to allow dry cleaners in the Corporate Office (CO)
Zone;

B. The project applications were reviewed by the City’s Planning and Building Safety
Department for, in part, consistency with the General Plan and conformity with the
El Segundo Municipal Code (ESMC);

C. The City reviewed the project’s environmental impacts under the California
Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code §§ 21000, et seq.,
“CEQA”) and the regulations promulgated thereunder (14 California Code of
Regulations §§ 15000, et seq., the “CEQA Guidelines”);

D. On May 24, 2018, the Planning Commission held a public hearing to receive public
testimony and other evidence regarding the application including information
provided by city staff, and adopted PC Resolution No. 2836 recommending that
the City Council approve the proposed amendments;

E. On __________, 2018, the City Council held a public hearing and considered the
information provided by City staff and public testimony regarding this Ordinance;
and,

F. This Ordinance and its findings are made based upon the entire administrative
record including testimony and evidence presented to the City Council at its
__________, 2018 public hearing and the staff report submitted by the Planning and
Building Safety Department.

SECTION 2: Findings. The City Council incorporates by reference all of the findings and
conclusions set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. 2836 as if fully set forth
including the environmental determination set forth in Section 6 of Planning Commission Resolution No. 2836.

SECTION 3: ESMC §15-5D-2 (Permitted Uses) is amended to read as follows (strikethrough is language deleted, and underlined is language added):

15-5D-2: PERMITTED USES:

The following uses are permitted in the CO Zone:

A. Daycare centers.
B. Fitness centers.
C. General offices.
D. Medical-dental offices.
E. Public uses, including, but not limited to, fire and police stations, post offices and libraries.
F. Recreational facilities (public and private).
G. Research and development uses, located east of Sepulveda Boulevard only.
H. Restaurants and cafes.
I. Office worker-oriented services, provided they are not located along Sepulveda Boulevard or El Segundo Boulevard, such as:
   a. Dry cleaners that have cleaning operations on site and are not more than 3,000 gross square feet (not including Laundromats);
   b. Shipping, postal, printing and business service centers that are not more than 3,000 gross square feet;
   c. Self-service parcel delivery service; and,
   d. Other service uses determined by the Director to be oriented towards, and clearly related to, office workers in the surrounding area.
J. Such uses as the Director deems to be similar and not more intensive. Other similar uses approved by the Director, as provided by chapter 22 of this title.

SECTION 4: ESMC Section 15-5D-3 (Permitted Accessory Uses) is amended to read as follows (strikethrough is language deleted, and underlined is language added):

15-5D-3: PERMITTED ACCESSORY USES:

A. Any use customarily incidental to a permitted use.
B. Cafes Bike-share docking station.
C. Drive-through or walk-up services, including financial operations, but excluding drive-through restaurants.
D. Limited support service retail uses. Open storage of commodities sold or utilized on the premises.
E. Any of the permitted uses allowed in Section 15-5D-2 is a permitted accessory use.
G. Such uses as the Director deems to be similar and not more intensive. Other similar uses approved by the Director of Community, Economic and Development Services as provided by chapter 22 of this title.

SECTION 5: ESMC Section 15-5D-4 (Uses Subject to Administrative Use Permit) is amended to read as follows:

15-5D-4: USES SUBJECT TO ADMINISTRATIVE USE PERMIT:

A. The off-site sale of alcohol at limited support service retail establishments as an accessory use.
B. The on-site sale and consumption of alcohol at restaurants, drive-through restaurants, and delicatessens.
C. Such uses as the Director deems to be similar and not more intensive. Other similar uses approved by the Director, as provided by chapter 22 of this title.

SECTION 6: ESMC Section 15-5D-5 (Uses Subject to Conditional Use Permit) is amended to read as follows:

15-5D-5: USES SUBJECT TO CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT:

A. Drive-through restaurants, except properties located west of Sepulveda Boulevard where drive-through restaurants are prohibited.
B. Freight forwarding.
C. Helicopter landing facilities subject to the provisions of section 15-2-13 of this title.
D. Hotels and motels, except properties located west of Sepulveda and east of Aviation Boulevards where hotels and motels are prohibited.
E. Museums.
F. On site sale and consumption of alcohol at bars.
G. Outdoor dining areas for restaurants, except cafes, that are larger than two hundred (200) square feet.
H. Service stations, if a five hundred foot (500-foot) minimum distance from any residential zoned property is provided. This distance criteria does not apply to properties east of Sepulveda Boulevard.
I. Other similar uses approved by the Director, as provided by chapter 22 of this title.
SECTION 7: If any part of this Ordinance or its application is deemed invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the city council intends that such invalidity will not affect the effectiveness of the remaining provisions or applications and, to this end, the provisions of this Ordinance are severable.

SECTION 8: The City Clerk is directed to certify the passage and adoption of this Ordinance; cause it to be entered into the City of El Segundo’s book of original ordinances; make a note of the passage and adoption in the records of this meeting; and, within 15 days after the passage and adoption of this Ordinance, cause it to be published or posted in accordance with California law.

SECTION 9: This Ordinance will become effective on the 31st day following its passage and adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this ___ day of ____________, 2018.

Drew Boyles, Mayor

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Mark D. Hensley, City Attorney

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 Ordinance No. _________ was duly introduced by said City Council at a regular meeting held on the ___ day of ____________ 2018, and was duly passed and adopted by said City Council, approved and signed by the Mayor, and attested to by the City Clerk, all at a regular meeting of said Council held on the ___ day of ____________, 2018, and the same was so passed and adopted by the following vote:
AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

Tracy Weaver, City Clerk
EL SEGUNDO PLANNING COMMISSION

AGENDA STATEMENT

MEETING DATE: May 24, 2018

AGENDA HEADING: Public Hearing

AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action regarding Environmental Assessment No. EA-1218, General Plan Amendment No. GPA 18-01, and Zone Text Amendment No. ZTA 18-01:

- Approve a Negative Declaration in accordance with CEQA;
- Amend the Corporate Office section of the General Plan Land Use Element; and,
- Amend certain sections in Title 15 of the El Segundo Municipal Code pertaining to the permitted uses, permitted accessory uses and conditionally permitted uses allowed in the Corporate Office (CO) Zone of the City.

Address: Corporate Office (CO) Zone of El Segundo
Applicant: Marcos Neri

RECOMMENDED PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION: It is recommended that the Planning Commission open the public hearing and take public testimony on the proposed amendments; close the public hearing and consider the evidence; and, adopt Resolution No. 2836, recommending that the City Council approve Environmental Assessment No. 1218, General Plan Amendment No. GPA 18-01, and Zone Text Amendment No. ZTA 18-01.

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

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

1. Planning Commission Resolution No. 2836
   Exhibits A and B – General Plan Land Use Element changes
   Exhibit C – Draft Ordinance
2. Initial Study/Negative Declaration

ORIGINATED BY: Eduardo Schonborn, AICP, Principal Planner
REVIEWED BY: Gregg McClain, Planning Manager
APPROVED BY: Sam Lee, Director of Planning and Building Safety

I. BACKGROUND

The applicant, Marcos Neri, currently operates a dry cleaner business in El Segundo and seeks to relocate to a currently-vacant facility at 2003 Mariposa Avenue. The applicant prepared plans to remodel the facility and submitted the plans to the Building Division for plan check. However, it was determined that the property is located in the Corporate Office (CO) Zone where services such as dry cleaners are not an authorized use. As a result, on February 14, 2018, Mr. Neri submitted a Zone Text Amendment application, initiating the process to amend the Title 15 of the Municipal Code in order to all dry cleaners in the CO Zone.
II. DISCUSSION

Staff sees this as an opportunity to reevaluate the uses (permitted, accessory and conditional uses) allowed in the CO zone, and believes that a minor improvement to the CO Zone can be accomplished with this request. There are three sections in the CO Zone regulations that are proposed to be amended by this application.

In accordance with Mr. Neri’s request, the first is to the Permitted Uses section (15-5D-2) in the CO Zone. The applicant desires to amend the Code to allow dry cleaners. Staff believes the use would provide an amenity to the workers in the area, but is currently not allowed. The CO zone is intended primarily for offices and does not allow for many service uses that are oriented towards offices and office workers, such as parcel shipping, postal, printing and business service centers such as FedEx Kinko’s or the UPS Store. Staff believes that creating the classification of Office Worker-Oriented Services as a permitted use allows uses that are supportive to the office environment. As such, Staff believes that the following language should be added to the permitted uses in the CO Zone:

Office worker-oriented services, not located along Sepulveda Boulevard or El Segundo Boulevard, such as:

a. Dry cleaners which have cleaning operations on site and limited to not more than 3,000 gross square feet (not including Laundromats);

b. Shipping, postal, printing and business service centers limited to not more than 3,000 gross square feet;

c. Self-service parcel delivery service; and,

d. Other service uses determined by the Director to be oriented towards, and clearly related to, office workers in the surrounding area.

The next section that staff proposes be amended is the Permitted Accessory Uses (15-5D-3). Staff recommends deleting cafes and adding a provision that any permitted primary use is also a permitted accessory use. This will allow more flexibility to staff and the business community to provide these uses as part of a larger primary use. Staff also recommends deleting Limited Support Service Retail Uses since there is no definition, description or example of what that entails. Lastly, staff recommends adding bike-share docking stations as a permitted accessory use.

The last section that staff proposes be amended is to Uses Subject to Conditional Use Permit (15-5D-5). Staff recommends deleting Freight Forwarding uses since staff believes that such a use is not consistent with an office environment and are not compatible with the purpose of the CO Zone. Further, these operations include the use of large semi-trailer trucks that impact the City’s roadways, pavement and other infrastructure, but generate little in tax revenue and business licensing.

III. GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING CONSISTENCY

Consistency with the El Segundo General Plan

ESMC § 15-1-1 (Purpose, Title) states that Title 15 is the primary tool for implementation of the goals, objectives, and policies of the El Segundo General Plan. Accordingly, the Planning Commission must find that the proposed Amendment is consistent with those
goals, objectives, and policies. Staff believes that the necessary findings can be made to recommend City Council approval of the proposed amendment and the inclusion of uses that are oriented towards serving the needs of office workers and the office environment. The findings are discussed in the proposed resolution.

In accordance with Senate Bill 18 requirements for General Plan Amendments, the City contacted the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation to determine if consultation will be requested. Should consultation be requested, it would be conducted prior to City Council action and does not affect the Planning Commission’s recommendation.

*Consistency with the El Segundo Municipal Code*

Pursuant to ESMC Title 15, Chapter 26 (Amendments), in order to recommend City Council approval of the proposed amendments, the Planning Commission must find that the amendments are necessary to carry out the general purpose of ESMC Title 15. The purpose of this Title (ESMC § 15-1-1) is to serve the public health, safety, and general welfare and to provide economic and social advantages resulting from an orderly planned use of land resources. Staff believes that the necessary findings can be made to recommend City Council approval of the proposed Amendment. The findings are discussed in the proposed resolution.

**IV. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:**

In accordance with the provisions of the CEQA, an Initial Study was prepared of the project’s environmental impacts (see attached Draft IS/ND). Although CEQA identifies a number of categorical exemptions that would exempt a proposed project from the preparation of environmental documents, the IS/ND were prepared since the proposed project did not qualify for a CEQA exemption. The environmental document was prepared by city staff. As shown in the attached IS/ND, the project amends the zoning code to allow Office-worker oriented service uses, and the amendment will not create or result in significant impacts to: aesthetics; air quality; agriculture and forestry resources; geology/soils; greenhouse gas emissions; hazards/hazardous materials; land use; mineral resources; noise; population and housing; public services; recreation; biological resources; cultural resources; transportation/traffic; and, utilities.
DRAFT
INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE DECLARATION

GENERAL PLAN AND ZONE TEXT AMENDMENT,
USES IN THE CORPORATE OFFICE ZONE
(EA 1218, GPA 18-01, AND ZTA 18-01)

LEAD AGENCY:

CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
Planning and Building Safety Department
350 Main Street
El Segundo, California 90245
Contact: Eduardo Schonborn, AICP
310.524.2312

May 1, 2018
INITIAL STUDY

1. Project Title:

Zone Text Amendment, Uses in the Corporate Office Zone

2. Lead Agency Name/Address:

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

3. Contact Person and Phone Number:

Eduardo Schonborn, AICP, Principal Planner
(310) 524-2312

4. Project Location:

The project site is the City’s Corporate Office (CO) Zone. The CO Zone is located within the northeast quadrant of the City and consists of approximately 194 acres. The CO Zone is generally bounded by El Segundo Boulevard on the south, by Imperial Highway on the north, Sepulveda Boulevard to the west, and the city boundary on the east.

Figures: Figure 1 illustrates the CO Zone within the context of the Zoning Map.
5. Project Sponsor’s Name and Address:

Marco Neri
2003 Mariposa Avenue
El Segundo, CA 90245

6. General Plan Designation:

Corporate Office

7. Zoning:

Corporate Office (CO)

8. Proposed Project Description:

The applicant is requesting approval of Environmental Assessment No. EA-1218, General Plan Amendment No. GPA 18-01, and Zone Text Amendment No. ZTA 18-01. The proposed project consists of amending the text in the Corporate Office section of the General Plan Land Use Element, and amend certain sections in the Municipal Code regarding the permitted uses, permitted accessory uses and conditionally permitted uses in the CO Zone. Most notably to allow Office worker-oriented services and uses in the CO Zone.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The areas surrounding the City’s CO Zone are built out, and include the following land uses:

North: Interstate 105 Freeway and Los Angeles International Airport.
East: Manufacturing and office uses in El Segundo, and single-family residential in County of Los Angeles.
South: Office uses in El Segundo, and residential in the City of Hawthorne.
West: Commercial and office uses in El Segundo.

10. Required Approvals:

The City as Lead Agency for the Project has discretionary authority over the Project proposal. To implement this Project, the following entitlements are required for the proposed development:

- General Plan Amendment
- Zone Text Amendment

11. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or particular agreement):

No discretionary public agency approvals are required for the project, other than those required by the City of El Segundo.
12. References

The documents listed below are incorporated into this document by reference and are available for review in the Planning and Building Safety Department of the City of El Segundo, which is located in City Hall at 350 Main Street, El Segundo, CA 90245, or as shown in the reference.

http://myplan.calema.ca.gov/.


http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/.


El Segundo, City of El Segundo SEMS Emergency Operations Plan Executive Summary. 


Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan. 2004. 

State of California, Department of Conservation, Los Angeles County Tsunami Inundation Maps. 
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- [ ] Land Use and Planning
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources
- [ ] Population and Housing
- [ ] Mineral Resources
- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Geology and Soils
- [ ] Hazards/Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Hydrology and Water Quality
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Recreation
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Utilities and Service Systems
- [ ] Mandatory Findings of Significance

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 17, Earlier Analysis, may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration, Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section 19, at the end of the checklist, if utilized.
DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☒ I find that the project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that, although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required but must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effect (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed on the proposed project.

Signature: [Signature] Date: [April 30, 2018]

Printed Name: Sam Lee For: City of El Segundo

Title: Director of Planning and Building Safety

May 1, 2018 Initial Study – Negative Declaration
1. LAND USE AND PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Checklist Judgments

1.a) The CO Zone is bounded by various commercial, retail, office and institutional uses, within a developed area of the City, including residential uses outside the City limits. The project involves amending the text in the Corporate Office section of the General Plan Land Use Element, and amending certain sections in the Municipal Code regarding the permitted uses, permitted accessory uses and conditionally permitted uses in the CO Zone to allow service uses that are supportive to office workers, complimentary to the allowable uses in the CO Zone, and are consistent with the character of the CO Zone. Due to the built-out nature of the project area, the amendments will not disrupt the physical arrangement or physically divide an established community. Thus, **no impact** would occur.

1.b) The proposed amendments would not conflict with the environmental plans or policies of the City or other agencies. The amendment to the General Plan Land Use Element would ensure consistency with the El Segundo Municipal Code such that the land use designation of the Project area would allow service uses that are supportive to office workers, complimentary to the allowable uses in the CO Zone, and are consistent with the character of the CO Zone. The proposed amendments are not found to be inconsistent with the goals and policies of the City’s General Plan, the underlying zoning and land use designations. As such, there would be a **less than significant impact**.

1.c) There is presently no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan in the City. Implementation of the proposed project would not interfere with any current local, regional, or State HCPs or NCCPs. Further, the project area is currently developed with a variety of office, manufacturing and other re-purposed buildings, and no agricultural operations or community gardens are conducted in the project area. Therefore, Project implementation would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances relating to habitat or natural community conservation. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.
2. POPULATION AND HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Checklist Judgments

2.a-c) The project involves amending the text in the Corporate Office section of the General Plan Land Use Element, and amending certain sections in the Municipal Code regarding the permitted uses, permitted accessory uses and conditionally permitted uses in the CO Zone to allow service uses that are supportive to office workers, complimentary to the allowable uses in the CO Zone, and are consistent with the character of the CO Zone. The proposed amendments would not induce direct population growth in the City through new housing development, nor indirectly since the project site and surrounding areas are developed with urban uses and infrastructure is already in place. Any increase in employees resulting from allowing additional uses would be negligible and would not serve to induce significant population growth either locally or regionally. Further, there is no existing housing within the CO Zone project area, and implementation would not displace any housing or persons. Thus, the project would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. As such, there would be no impact to population and housing.
### 3. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquification?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code (2004), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation of Checklist Judgments**

3.a.i-iv) The project involves amending the text in the Corporate Office section of the General Plan Land Use Element, and amending certain sections in the Municipal Code regarding the permitted uses, permitted accessory uses and conditionally permitted uses in the CO Zone to allow service uses that are supportive to office workers, complimentary to the allowable uses in the CO Zone, and are consistent with the character of the CO Zone. The amendments would not affect the geology of the area or expose people to any geologic hazards. Further, according to the seismic hazard zone maps for the city (California Geological Survey 1999), the project site is not located within a landslide hazard area. Lastly, according to the Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology
Seismic Hazard Zones Map, the project site is not within a liquefaction hazard zone. As such, there would be no impact.

3.b-e) The project involves amending the text in the Corporate Office section of the General Plan Land Use Element, and amending certain sections in the Municipal Code regarding the permitted uses, permitted accessory uses and conditionally permitted uses in the CO Zone to allow service uses that are supportive to office workers, complimentary to the allowable uses in the CO Zone, and are consistent with the character of the CO Zone. The amendments would not result in ground-disrupting activities such as excavation and trenching; the project area is level and there are no hillsides onsite or in the abutting areas; the project area is currently developed and has already been subject to extensive disruption; and the area is connected to the public sewer system and drainage system. Thus, no impact would occur with regards to soils, soil erosion, sewers or alternative wastewater disposal systems.
## 4. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing (and uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siliation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Explanation of Checklist Judgments

4.a-f) The project involves amending the text in the Corporate Office section of the General Plan Land Use Element, and amending certain sections in the Municipal Code regarding the permitted uses, permitted accessory uses and conditionally permitted uses in the CO Zone to allow service uses that are supportive to office workers, complimentary to the allowable uses in the CO Zone, and are consistent with the character of the CO Zone. The amendments would not alter any drainage infrastructure or systems that are currently in place; would not contribute to runoff; or degrade water quality. Any development resulting from the proposed amendments would require appropriate permits to ensure proper drainage. Thus, there would be no impact.

4.g-j) According to the General Plan, the CO Zone is not located within the 100-year floodplain boundaries, as identified by the Flood Insurance Rate Maps. Since the project would not be located within a 100-year flood hazard area, development of the proposed project would not expose people or structures to significant flood hazards and would not impede or redirect flood flows. In addition, no levees or dams present flooding risks to the site or surrounding area, and the project site is not located within the City’s coastal areas that are subject to coastal storm surges. Lastly, the CO Zone is not located near any major bodies of surface water; therefore, impacts from seiche is not expected. Thus, there would be no impact to hydrology and water quality.
## 5. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Explanation of Checklist Judgments

5.a-e) The City of El Segundo is located within a five-county region in southern California that is designated as the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). Air quality management for the SCAB is administered by the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) to address federal and state air quality standards. The 2012 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) was prepared to accommodate growth, to reduce the high levels of pollutants in the areas under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), and to attain clean air in the region.

The proposed project involves amending the text in the Corporate Office section of the General Plan Land Use Element, and amending certain sections in the Municipal Code regarding the permitted uses, permitted accessory uses and conditionally permitted uses in the CO Zone to allow service uses that are supportive to office workers, complimentary to the allowable uses in the CO Zone, and are consistent with the character of the CO Zone. The proposed project does not include any physical modifications or alterations of the existing land or structures and thus is not considered a regionally significant project that would warrant Intergovernmental Review by SCAG under CEQA Guidelines section 15206; would not result in construction emissions or and long-term operational emissions that would affect air quality; and does not represent or result in significant growth.

Further, land uses considered sensitive receptors typically include residences, schools, playgrounds, child care centers, hospitals, convalescent homes, and retirement homes. However, the types of service uses proposed as part of the amendments would not impact these sensitive populations (i.e., children, senior citizens, and acutely or chronically ill people). Lastly, according to the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, land uses
associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The proposed amendments would allow service uses, and would not include any uses identified by SCAQMD as being associated with odors. Therefore, there would be no impact to air quality.
### 6. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Without Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation of Checklist Judgments**

6.a-f) The proposed project involves amending the text in the Corporate Office section of the General Plan Land Use Element, and amending certain sections in the Municipal Code regarding the permitted uses, permitted accessory uses and conditionally permitted uses in the CO Zone to allow service uses that are supportive to office workers, complimentary to the allowable uses in the CO Zone, and are consistent with the character of the CO Zone. The proposed project does not include any physical modifications or alterations of the existing land or structures and thus no traffic generation will result from the proposed amendment. As such, the proposed project would have **no impacts** related to traffic and transportation.
7. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Checklist Judgments

7.a-f) The project area is a developed, urbanized portion of the city and is not located in an area containing high ecological sensitivity; there are no natural vegetation, habitat or plant communities present in the project area; is not an area designated as critical habitat for any sensitive wildlife species, nor is the area subject to any conservation plans, recovery plans, or similar policies and ordinances. Further, the project area is not located in an area with riparian habitat, wetlands, or any other identified sensitive natural communities; and movement of wildlife species will not be impeded. Lastly, there are no local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance; and the Project area is not within the jurisdiction of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local,
regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, Project implementation would not conflict with these or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans. Thus, no impact to biological resources would occur.
8. MINERAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Checklist Judgments

8.a) According to the Final EIR for the City's General Plan, the City is underlain by the El Segundo Oil Field. Seventy-six (76) oil wells have been drilled within the El Segundo Oil Field. However, the project area is fully developed, and there are no operating oil wells on or adjacent to the CO Zone. Therefore, project implementation would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. Thus, no impact would occur.

8.b) According to the City's General Plan, there are no designated Mineral Resources Zones in El Segundo. Further, the General Plan does not identify the project area as an important mineral resource recovery site. Thus, no impact to mineral resources would occur.
9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Checklist Judgments

9.a-d) The proposed project involves amending the text in the Corporate Office section of the General Plan Land Use Element, and amending certain sections in the Municipal Code regarding the permitted uses, permitted accessory uses and conditionally permitted uses in the CO Zone to allow service uses that are supportive to office workers, complimentary to the allowable uses in the CO Zone, and are consistent with the character of the CO Zone.
Zone. The proposed project does not include any physical modifications or alterations of the existing land or structures. However, all applicable site-specific environmental analysis would be reviewed prior to any construction or use to identify potential adverse impacts or conditions. If hazardous material is found, appropriate remediation and mitigation methods would be incorporated to prevent creating any hazardous condition for the public and the environment. Further, if permitting is required by any County, State or Federal agency prior to operation, then the use would be subject to complying with such permitting requirements. Therefore, there is **no impact** caused by the proposed amendment.

9.e-h) According to the Los Angeles International Airport - Airport Influence Area Map, the Project area is situated outside of the LAX Planning Area Boundary/Airport Influence Area. The Project area is also located approximately 2 miles west of Hawthorne Municipal Airport (HMA). Further, the amendments will not impact the City’s Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) or evacuation plan. Lastly, the project area is not designated as a “Very High Fire Hazard” area by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. As such, **no impact** would occur.
10. NOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation of Checklist Judgments**

10.a-d) The proposed project involves amending the text in the Corporate Office section of the General Plan Land Use Element, and amending certain sections in the Municipal Code regarding the permitted uses, permitted accessory uses and conditionally permitted uses in the CO Zone to allow service uses that are supportive to office workers, complimentary to the allowable uses in the CO Zone, and are consistent with the character of the CO Zone. The proposed project does not include any physical modifications or alterations of the existing land or structures and thus no noise production will result from the proposed code amendment. Notwithstanding, any physical modifications or alterations to existing land and/or structures as a result of implementing the Code Amendment will be addressed through separate environmental analysis consistent with CEQA. As such, there will be no impacts associated with the proposed Code Amendment.

10.e-f) Although the project area is south of LAX, the area is not located in the LAX airport land use plan. The Project area is located approximately 2.5 miles west of Hawthorne Municipal Airport (HMA); however, according to the Hawthorne Municipal Airport - Airport Influence Area Map, the project site is not located within the HMA planning boundaries. Lastly, the
project area is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip, nor is there a private airstrip within the project area. Thus, there would be no impact.
11. PUBLIC SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Fire protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Police protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Parks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Other public facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Checklist Judgments

11.a) The proposed project involves amending the text in the Corporate Office section of the General Plan Land Use Element, and amending certain sections in the Municipal Code regarding the permitted uses, permitted accessory uses and conditionally permitted uses in the CO Zone to allow service uses that are supportive to office workers, complimentary to the allowable uses in the CO Zone, and are consistent with the character of the CO Zone. The proposed project does not include any physical modifications or alterations of the existing land or structures, and will not result in an increased demand for fire, police, schools, parks or other public services. As such, there will not no impact to public services resulting from the code amendment.
12. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Checklist Judgments

12.a) The proposed project involves amending the text in the Corporate Office section of the General Plan Land Use Element, and amending certain sections in the Municipal Code regarding the permitted uses, permitted accessory uses and conditionally permitted uses in the CO Zone to allow service uses that are supportive to office workers, complimentary to the allowable uses in the CO Zone, and are consistent with the character of the CO Zone. The proposed project does not include any physical modifications or alterations of the existing land or structures and thus there will be no increase in demand for utilities or service systems as a result of the proposed amendment. As such, there would be no impact in this regard.
13. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

| **In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? |  |  | X |
| b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? |  |  | X |
| c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? |  |  | X |
| d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? |  |  | X |
| e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? |  |  | X |

**Explanation of Checklist Judgments**

13.a) The project area is currently built-out and developed with various buildings and structures, and the area is not located adjacent to or near any land used for agricultural purposes. Since the site is fully developed with a restaurant and parking lot, the site is not used for agricultural purposes. Further, the project area is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. As such, there would be no impact to farmland.

13.b-d) The Project area is zoned and designated Corporate Office (CO), and is not part of a Williamson Act Contract. Surrounding lands to the north, east and west within the City of
El Segundo are zoned Commercial, Light Manufacturing and Urban Mixed Use North; while the lands to the north, south, and east within the County of Los Angeles and the City of Hawthorne are developed with residential uses. The project area and the surrounding areas are developed and there are no forest land onsite or in the area. Consequently, project implementation would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract, nor would it cause rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. As such, there would be no impact to agricultural zoning, forest land, or timberland uses.

13.e) The Project area is developed and built-out, and there are no agricultural or forest uses in the vicinity. Therefore, project implementation would not involve changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. As such, there would be no impact.
14. AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Checklist Judgments

14.a-b) The proposed project involves amending the text in the Corporate Office section of the General Plan Land Use Element, and amending certain sections in the Municipal Code regarding the permitted uses, permitted accessory uses and conditionally permitted uses in the CO Zone to allow service uses that are supportive to office workers, complimentary to the allowable uses in the CO Zone, and are consistent with the character of the CO Zone. There are no General Plan-identified scenic vistas/views located in the Project area; the amendments do not affect property along a designated State scenic highway; and, there is no vegetation in the Project area, aside from ornamental trees that are not protected tree species. Further, no historic buildings or rock outcroppings are located in the project area. Therefore, project implementation would have no impact to scenic resources within a state scenic highway.

14.c-d) A project is generally considered to have a significant visual/aesthetic impact if it substantially changes the character of a project site such that it becomes visually incompatible or visually unexpected when viewed in the context of its surroundings. The proposed project does not include any physical modifications or alterations of the existing land or structures. Instead, the proposed project involves amending the text in the Corporate Office section of the General Plan Land Use Element, and amending certain sections in the Municipal Code regarding the permitted uses, permitted accessory uses and conditionally permitted uses in the CO Zone to allow service uses that are supportive to office workers. Further, the proposed code amendment deals with uses, and does not include any new lighting issues or standards. Therefore, the code amendment will have no impact on the visual character of the area.
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15. CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Checklist Judgments

15.a-d) The proposed project involves amending the text in the Corporate Office section of the General Plan Land Use Element, and amending certain sections in the Municipal Code regarding the permitted uses, permitted accessory uses and conditionally permitted uses in the CO Zone to allow service uses that are supportive to office workers, complimentary to the allowable uses in the CO Zone, and are consistent with the character of the CO Zone. The proposed project does not include any physical modifications or alterations of the existing land or structures that could impact cultural resources. Any physical modification or alteration to existing land and/or structures as a result of the amendments will be addressed through separate environmental analysis consistent with CEQA. Further, given the developed condition of the area, the potential for the project to impact an as yet unidentified paleontological resource is considered remote. Lastly, impacts on any human remains appears to be remote, given the degree of past disturbance of the area, as it is currently developed. Therefore, the code amendment will have no impact to cultural resources.
## 16. RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Explanation of Checklist Judgments

**16.a)** Refer to Response 11.a.iv. As such, there would be **no impact**.

**16.b)** Refer to Response 11.a.iv. As such, there would be **no impact**.
17. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Checklist Judgments

17.a-b) The proposed project involves amending the text in the Corporate Office section of the General Plan Land Use Element, and amending certain sections in the Municipal Code regarding the permitted uses, permitted accessory uses and conditionally permitted uses in the CO Zone to allow service uses that are supportive to office workers, complimentary to the allowable uses in the CO Zone, and are consistent with the character of the CO Zone. The proposed project does not include any physical modifications or alterations of the existing land or structures that could generate emissions of greenhouse gases. Further, uses are required to operate in accordance with certain air quality and greenhouse gas emissions standards. Any new use resulting from the proposed amendment will be subject to the applicable agency requirements. As such, there will be no impact from greenhouse gas emissions as a result of the Code Amendment.
# 18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Explanation of Checklist Judgments

18.a) The proposed project is not anticipated to substantially affect fish or wildlife populations or to reduce the number or range of rare or endangered species. In addition, no locally, state, or federally designated examples of major periods in California history or prehistory have been identified on the site or in the vicinity of the site.

18.b) The proposed project involves amending the text in the Corporate Office section of the General Plan Land Use Element, and amending certain sections in the Municipal Code regarding the permitted uses, permitted accessory uses and conditionally permitted uses in the CO Zone to allow service uses that are supportive to office workers, complimentary to the allowable uses in the CO Zone, and are consistent with the character of the CO Zone. The proposed project does not include any physical modifications or alterations of the existing land or structures, and the approval of the proposed project will not directly grant any entitlement to develop. Any physical modifications or alterations to existing land and/or structures as a result of the project objectives will be addressed through separate environmental analysis consistent with CEQA. As such, the project does not have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable.

18.c) Previous sections of this Initial Study/Negative Declaration reviewed the project’s potential impacts upon certain environmental issue areas that could affect human beings. As concluded in these previous discussions, the code amendment would result in no impacts. Therefore, the project would not cause substantial adverse effects on humans.
Schonborn, Eduardo

From: Schonborn, Eduardo
Sent: Monday, June 11, 2018 5:15 PM
To: Schonborn, Eduardo
Subject: FW: El Segundo Notice, General Plan Text Amendment

From: Administration Gabrieleno Indians [mailto:admin@gabrielenoindians.org]
Sent: Tuesday, May 29, 2018 12:27 PM
To: Schonborn, Eduardo
Subject: Re: El Segundo Notice, General Plan Text Amendment

Thank you for notifying us. We will not need to consult due to no ground disturbance taking place.

Thank you

Sincerely,

Brandy Salas

Sincerely,
Admin Specialist
Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation
PO Box 393
Covina, CA 91723
Office: 844-390-0787
website: www.gabrielenoindians.org

On Tue, May 29, 2018 at 12:11 PM, Schonborn, Eduardo <eschonborn@elsegundo.org> wrote:

Hello Ms. Salas,

Thank you for your response. And to confirm, there is no ground disturbance taking place as a result of this code amendment.

-eduardo

Eduardo Schonborn, ASCE
Principal Planner
City of El Segundo
510-524-2312
Thank you for notifying us. If there will be no ground disturbance taking place there is no need for a consultation. Thank you

Sincerely,

Brandy Salas

On Thu, May 17, 2018 at 5:26 PM Schonborn, Eduardo <eschonborn@elsegundo.org> wrote:

Hello Mr. Salas,

I wanted to follow up on a NOI (attached) that was sent to your office at the beginning of the month. I wanted to clarify that the proposed General Plan Amendment and zone text results in adding an office-service use to the allowable uses in the Corporate Office Zone. There would be no changes to the development standards, and no development is contemplated with this amendment. I have attached the General Plan sections with the proposed language underlined. No other changes will result from this amendment.

Please let me know if you wish to have consultation regarding the proposed language of the General Plan.

Thank you,

-eduardo

Eduardo Schonborn, AICP
Principal Planner
City of El Segundo
310-524-2512
Sincerely,
Admin Specialist
Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation
PO Box 393
Covina, CA 91723

Office: 844-390-0787

website: www.gabrielenoindians.org
C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

3. Consideration and possible action to (1) conduct a General Plan update for all properties located east of Pacific Coast Highway ("PCH"), including but not limited to updating the various non-residential zones and studying and possible rezoning some areas east of PCH for housing purposes; and, if the Council directs staff to conduct study housing east of PCH to provide some parameters/details of the issues to be studied; (2) determine whether the Council as a part of updating the general plan or for transit purposes wants to accept a grant from Metropolitan Transit Authority ("MTA") to study increasing densities on non-residential properties, developing affordable (low income) housing, reconfiguring properties and their buildings and parking lots, and providing more pedestrian and bicycle friendly routes; all for purposes of attempting to increase transit ridership; (3) (if the Council wants to accept the MTA grant), to provide potential clarifications and amendments to the City's MTA application; and, consider other related actions.

(Fiscal Impact: To Be Determined but range is likely between $0 and $2.5 million).

Recommendation - 1) Consider whether Council wants to update the City’s General Plan east of PCH to update and/or modify current zones to be more compatible with current and future land use trends and potentially increasing the intensity of development in some areas. 2) Consider whether as part of a General Plan update process or on a stand-alone basis the Council wants to study rezoning some areas east of PCH to allow for residential housing; 3) Consider whether the Council wants to utilize an MTA grant to conduct a partial General Plan update for purposes increasing Greenline ridership, including: increasing development intensity near the transit stations, providing affordable (low income) and market rate residential units, reconfiguring existing development and parking to encourage transit use, and providing pedestrian and bicycle friendly routes to the transit stations; 4) Consider whether the Council wants to request that MTA allow the City to change some of the proposed areas for study if the City for purposes of the City utilizing the MTA grant; 5) Consider adopting Resolution No. ______ regarding the pending MTA grant; 6) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

Links below are related to the Agenda Item above regarding the MTA Grant.
Council Meeting Agenda from March 6, 2018 – Item #2 (MTA Grant)
Go to Bookmarks on upper right hand corner of the attachment and Click on Item #2 of the Agenda
Additional Information: https://www.metro.net/projects/tod/
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action to (1) conduct a General Plan update for all properties located east of Pacific Coast Highway ("PCH"), including but not limited to updating the various non-residential zones and studying and possibly rezoning some areas east of PCH for housing purposes; and, if the Council directs staff to study housing east of PCH to provide some parameters/details of the issues to be studied; (2) determine whether the Council as a part of updating the general plan or for transit purposes wants to accept a grant from Metropolitan Transit Authority ("MTA") to study increasing densities on non-residential properties, developing affordable (low income) housing, reconfiguring properties and their buildings and parking lots, and providing more pedestrian and bicycle friendly routes; all for purposes of attempting to increase transit ridership; (3) (if the Council wants to accept the MTA grant), to provide potential clarifications and amendments to the City’s MTA application; and, consider other related actions. (Fiscal Impact: To Be Determined but range is likely between $0 and $2.5 million).

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1. Consider whether Council wants to update the City’s General Plan east of PCH to update and/or modify current zones to be more compatible with current and future land use trends and potentially increasing the intensity of development in some areas;
2. Consider whether as part of a General Plan update process or on a stand-alone basis, the Council wants to study rezoning some areas east of PCH to allow for residential housing;
3. Consider whether the Council wants to utilize an MTA grant to conduct a partial General Plan update for purposes increasing Greenline ridership, including: increasing development intensity near the transit stations, providing affordable (low income) and market rate residential units, reconfiguring existing development and parking to encourage transit use, and providing pedestrian and bicycle friendly routes to the transit stations;
4. Consider whether the Council wants to request that MTA allow the City to change some of the proposed areas for study if the City for purposes of the City utilizing the MTA grant;
5. Consider adopting Resolution No. _______ regarding the pending MTA grant; and/or
6. Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

1. Grant Agreement;
2. Attachment A—Project Schedule and Budget;
3. Attachment B—Scope of Work
4. MTA Document defining 10 goals/work areas of grant
5. MTA Grant Application
6. Resolution

FISCAL IMPACT: ($0 to $2.5 million depending on direction.)
STRATEGIC PLAN:

Goal: 4a. Physical infrastructure supports appealing, safe, effective city.


Goal: 5b. Approach work in a financially strategic and responsible way.

PREPARED BY: Gregg McClain, Planning Manager

REVIEWED BY: Sam Lee, Planning and Building Safety Director

Mark Hensley, City Attorney

APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

Background

A General Plan consists of 8 elements: land use, housing, circulation, conservation, noise, safety, open space, and environmental justice. The City has not specifically conducted a General Plan update since 1992, but has through the years made numerous changes to its General Plan relating to land use, housing, and circulation issues. The General Plan governs over all properties within the City and in most instances, the changes that have been made have been only in specific areas or zoning districts.

The issues of potentially updating the City’s General Plan and whether to allow housing development east of PCH have been raised at the City’s Economic Development Advisory Committee (EDAC) meetings (including some that were joint meetings of EDAC and the City Council) for several or more years. The focus has been on the properties east of PCH. The Council’s position that came out of the 2017 Strategic Planning process was that the majority of the Council was not interested in having staff pursue these issues at that time and there was one Council Member interested in updating the General Plan and one that wanted to further discuss the issue of providing housing east of PCH. The 2018 Strategic Planning, while not completed, appears to have yielded a similar result.

There has been no discussion to date regarding what the City’s goals might be regarding a General Plan update. Gathering information from the Council would be a positive start to this process.

Prior to completion of the 2017 Strategic Planning process, staff had already submitted an application for a MTA grant that was not identified as being for purposes of a General Plan update but has some overlap with some issues that would be studied as part of updating the City’s General Plan – land use, housing and circulation. The MTA grant is for purposes of increasing MTA ridership.

General Plan Update (Complete for Area East of PCH)

Business Land Uses

Staff has concerns that the current General Plan is outdated at it relates to business uses east of PCH. Of particular concern is the Corporate Office zone. One example of a problem in this zone is that it had previously been industrial and was developed accordingly. Parking was put in place
at the low industrial level. The zone is now commercial and the permitted uses are offices and retail, both of which have much higher parking requirements imposed by the ESMC. Many of the industrial buildings in the city are being converted to creative office, but in the CO zone that type of conversion requires coming up with another 50 to 100 percent additional parking. As a result, development in the zone is stagnant compared to other zones. Studying this area may result in solutions that increase development potential that does not cause traffic or parking issues in the area.

Another problem with the east side is the pattern of disconnected and non-integrated development. Many of the newest projects east of PCH were developed or are proposed to be developed under specific plans. A specific plan is a tool that cities and developers use to build a project when the zoning would otherwise not permit or to provide more certainty with respect to the type of development that will occur. This overreliance on specific plans could be an indication that the zoning is not working. The M-1 zone also has similar new development patterns and issues for transitioning from manufacturing to creative office, but the M-1 zone is more robust and adaptable to the changes.

Overall, non-residential land uses are changing relatively swiftly in some areas. The demand for retail land uses is dropping dramatically due to online shopping and office space demand is changing to some degree also. Part of the purpose of updating the General Plan would be to study the changing trends of development and attempt to meet the future needs of the City and developers, and provide some degree of flexibility to maximize land use utility and maintain the City’s significant revenue stream from the businesses east of PCH.

Residential land Uses

Providing for residential development in areas east of PCH has been the subject of some discussion for several years or more. The prior Council did not identify this as an area/issue for staff to study. The issue is whether the current Council wants to do so.

There is no doubt a demand for housing east of PCH. If units are built, they will be sold. The timing of the building of the units will dictate the initial pricing of the units but overtime it is expected that they would increase in value given their location. There is a demand for housing in the South Bay, Los Angeles County, and Southern California generally. Housing prices in the beach cities in the South Bay are significantly above median house prices in Los Angeles County on average.

If the Council wants to pursue this area of study, the studies would likely be focused on the impacts of replacing properties that generate significant income to the City with residential units, including the cost of providing service versus property taxes received. Also, the studies would focus on traffic, parking, demand on public safety services as well as water and wastewater services, etc. It is possible that some or all of this lost revenue could be recouped through special taxes on the residents that would be located east of PCH or through increased revenues from businesses—this issue would also need to be studied. Council may wish to identify other issues to be studied.

Studying the above issues could be complicated by the current trend of the state legislature to attempt to take away local government control over residually zoned properties. That is, the
City could rezone properties for residential uses with certain expectations regarding the units being sold at market rates and being required to not exceed certain height and density requirements and provide sufficient parking and other improvements to serve the residential units, only to have the state legislature unilaterally alter these expectations and requirements.

Staff is also aware of a sentiment held by some members of the community that providing for housing east of PCH would create two separate and different communities which some find to be undesirable. This is clearly a policy issue for the Council to decide as staff does not believe there is an objective manner to study this issue.

The development and business community have expressed concerns that there is inadequate housing in the region which is having an adverse impact on business retention and attraction. Also, the business community believes that more revenue generating businesses could be created by increasing the City’s housing stock.

If the Council is interested in studying the housing issue, it would be helpful to have some understanding of some parameters (if any) the Council would like staff to work within. For example, is there a maximum number of units that should be studied, are there certain areas east of PCH that should be or should not be studied for this use, or are there types of housing that are preferred over others, such as mid-rise and mixed use versus high rise or purely residential?

It is difficult to estimate with certainty how much a complete General Plan update would cost for the area east of PCH. This is even more difficult to estimate without some direction regarding the housing issue and then getting specific estimates for the studies to be performed. Also, the CEQA study cost is highly dependent on the specific land uses changes that might be made to the existing developments on the properties located east of PCH. That is, the cost of the review will correlate with the significance of the types and intensity of development changes that are sought to be implemented.

General estimates could be gathered with respect to the process, but they will be just estimates until there is more definition regarding the City’s goals. With that said, this process could approach or exceed $2.5 million.

**MTA Grant**

Last summer Staff submitted an application for grant funding to Metro for purposes of studying how to re-envision the portion of the city east of Pacific Coast Highway from a transit oriented perspective. The application laid out a plan that would result in a specific plan for the project area and several preliminary studies that would inform the decision making as the specific plan was developed. Each of these studies is described in more detail below. The proposal was accepted by Metro and the City was awarded $659,500 toward the project subject to the City accepting the terms and conditions of the grant. Although the grant application did not require a funding match from the City, City staff proposed in the application an offer $343,000 from the General Plan Maintenance Fund to make a total budget of just over $1 million. The General Plan Maintenance Fund is an existing account that uses surcharges on building permits to set aside funding to update the General Plan. The use of this fund is appropriate for this project if the specific plan is also used to completely update the General Plan. There will need be more funds utilized to complete this process as the Specific Plan proposal to MTA did not include all of the
required elements of a general plan update. Staff will be providing an estimate of the additional funds necessary to complete the process. The project is proposed to take approximately 34 months from start to finish and is proposed to proceed as shown in Attachment A to the Grant Agreement (attached).

Staff’s purposes for applying for this grant were several. Primary among them is to update and fix systemic problems with the commercial zones east of PCH. The zoning on the east side is based on land use policies of the late 1980s and 1990s when the City was attempting to make adjustments after the Cold War ended and the aerospace sector was declining. The transition from industrial uses to office and commercial uses has a lingering legacy of dysfunctional zoning regulations that have yet to be resolved. As the building stock in the area ages, these problems are increasingly coming to the forefront.

Staff also hopes to address through this grant application is the missed opportunity of the Green Line. As it is currently, the tracks seem to float over the city and barely engage with activity at the ground level. The Green Line could arguably relieve the area of a significant degree of traffic and serve as an economic development tool if it was used more. Part of the reason is that the line is not connected directly to useful destinations, but that is changing with the completion of the Crenshaw Line and the future extension of the Green Line to Torrance. Both of these projects will improve the potential for riders to use the Green Line stations in El Segundo, but the development pattern around the stations is not in a condition to accommodate increased ridership.

The grant will fund studies and the development of design guidelines that will help the City to create a district that is conducive to Green Line riders getting from the stations to places of employment nearby. There will be plans for improved pedestrian amenities as well as bicycle facilities. The funds will be used for plans to upgrade sidewalks, crosswalks and bike lanes, there needs to be more shade and better lighting, and infrastructure that may accommodate local use electric vehicles, ride sharing and bike share facilities. The grant will help us to achieve all of these goals.

The grant might resolve a long-standing issue that is causing dissent and unease in the community—should there be affordable housing east of PCH. To the extent that the City is interested in studying affordable housing, the grant funds can be used to study affordable and to some extent market rate housing as such relates to transit issues.

Studying housing, affordable housing is a requirement of the grant because Metro sees an obvious link between housing near stations and transit ridership. Affordable housing, however, is one specific element of 10 elements Metro requires its grantees to look into. Some of the elements overlap regarding the housing issue so it may make up more that 10 percent of the study focus areas but its exact percentage cannot be determined. These elements are described in more detail in the next section.

Staff wrote into our grant application a plan to prepare a housing study, but this does not obligate the City to enact a change in the General Plan or zoning to permit, let alone require, housing in the plan area. However, if the Council has no interest in studying affordable housing then it should not accept the grant or it should seek to amend the scope of work to delete this requirement. The City must act in good faith in accepting and using the grant funds.
Objectives of the Grant

Metro’s purpose in providing TOD grants is to advance several policy objectives which are laid out on page 3 of the Grant Program Guidelines. These are:

- Support municipalities in implementing complimentary transit-supportive infrastructure projects and affordable housing.
- Increase transit ridership.
- Increase the number of comprehensive, community-driven transit supportive planning efforts around Metro light rail, Metrolink stations, and Metro Transitway/Bus Rapid Transit stations and adjacent transit corridors in Los Angeles County.
- Improve local and regional efforts that enhance an equitable integration of transportation and community planning.
- Improve the transit network and increase utilization of public transit by reducing the number of modes of transportation necessary to access regional and local transit lines;
- Further the reduction in greenhouse gases through encouraging in-fill development along transit corridors and transit use;
- Support and implement sustainable development principles.
- Increase opportunities to meaningfully engage diverse stakeholders, especially underserved and vulnerable communities, in advancing transit supportive planning efforts across the region.

Staff’s application for this grant was successful because we touched on each of objectives and wrote into our grant proposal a thorough and rigorous program to study each of the 10 Transit Supportive Planning Elements in the Guidelines (pages 15 and 16). These elements were the basis of Metro’s scoring of our proposal and covered the following elements (See attachment that provides MTA’s description of these 10 areas of study):

- Compact design
- Complete neighborhoods
- Street and network connectivity
- Site layout, parking layout and building design
- Affordable housing
- Commercial stabilization, business retention and expansion
- Transit prioritization, accessibility and area design
- Parking management
- Transportation demand management
- Pedestrian and bicycle circulation

Based on conversations with Metro’s grant program manager, local circumstances may preclude every element being workable, but Metro’s expectation is that each will be studied and considered as part of advancing the objectives of the grant. This commitment to study each of the ten elements is demonstrated in the grant proposal and again in the scope of work that will be attached to the grant agreement.

There are some statements in the grant applications that were made in the grant application that were prematurely made that will need to be corrected with the MTA. First, the application contains a statement that the Council supports studying housing east of PCH. There has been no
such statement made by the “Council” to date regarding studying affordable or market rate housing. Additionally, the application states that EDAC will be involved in providing studies regarding the housing issue and involved in the grant study process. Again, this was a premature statement as no decision has been made by the Council regarding EDAC’s involvement in the grant process. This statement was not included in the Scope of Work.

Community Participation and Outreach

About $90,000 of the total budget for the project is dedicated toward community outreach and stakeholder engagement. This is a very robust budget that reflects a commitment to developing a plan that works for the whole community, not just for the impacted property owners. This is a ground up approach that will ultimately be brought to the Council but will be primarily focused on stakeholders initially. By the whole community, it is staff’s intention to solicit opinions and ideas from representatives of everyone who will be impacted by changes on the east side of PCH. The list is large, but staff wants to hear from locals (who, even while living west of PCH, will be impacted); employees in the project area who are or may become transit users, but certainly are consumers of goods and services; affordable housing groups; cyclists; families that use the soccer fields or ice rink; commercial and industrial property owners, both big and small; commercial realtors who understand the market; children who attend school in the project area as well as representative from the school boards who will be expected to adjust to possible changes; and, of course, subject matter experts who will provide the data and analysis that elected and appointed officials rely on to make decisions.

Work Product

Several studies will be produced that will inform the development of the final documents. Each, document that is to be produced for this project is described below. Staff believes it is premature to consider limits on what should be studied or to consider development standards before the analysis is completed. Any changes that are considered during the plan development will include in depth analysis of appropriate limits and thresholds designed to meet the objectives of the plan, which cannot be determined until the existing conditions are studied and a consensus on policy direction is made. Thus, the Council will be presented with recommendations.

Policy decisions as they relate to the plan development will be made by the City Council after consideration of the Planning Commission recommendations and public input. The process outlined in the schedule has the important policy decisions being made around the 18th month of the project when all the studies except the economic study will be complete and before drafting of the specific plan begins. Most of the public outreach and stakeholder engagement will be done in the six months or so prior so the City Council will have the benefit of a thorough community vetting of the emerging plan before setting the policy direction that will be in the final document.

1. Existing Conditions Report ($135,000 from grant, $5,000 local match)

The Specific Plan Consultant team and Staff will identify opportunity sites within the project area for transit-supportive developments, first-last mile improvements, or urban greening strategies. Analysis will include a determination of whether the current zoning development standards can support transit-supportive development, and whether the current street classifications and design standards are consistent with complete streets that create a district that
is safe for walking and cycling, and to consider green infrastructure. If zoning development standards, General Plan land uses, or street classifications are identified as obstacles or barriers to transit-oriented developments, the consultant will prepare in the Existing Conditions Report a summary of the obstacles and how they impede TOD.

Staff and the consultant team will meet with Metro to review Metro’s Transit Supportive Planning “Toolkit” and other applicable policies and tools which may include the Countywide Sustainability Policy, First-Last Mile Strategic Plan, and the Green Places Toolkit. Metro will work in collaboration with Staff and the Consultant team to review these documents and identify strategies and practices that could be incorporated into the Specific Plan.

2. Walk and Bike Audits ($15,000 from grant, $400 local match)

The consultant team will facilitate a series of walk and bike audits to engage stakeholders and City staff in the evaluation of the existing walking and cycling conditions on city streets and access to private properties and buildings, including a walk and bike audit training on evaluation techniques and toolbox of solutions.

Walk and Bike Audit results will be presented to the CAC by the Project Manager. Any guidance related to how to use the information in developing the specific plan or the urban design and street standards documents will be transmitted back to the consultant.

3. Parking Study ($15,000 from grant, $400 local match)

Building off the existing conditions report, the consultant will conduct a parking study that analyzes existing and future parking supply and demand for private vehicles, car share, ride-hailing services, bicycles, electric scooters, local electric vehicles (LEVs) and other relevant forms of mobility that require dedicated parking or loading. The study will include a complete inventory of the location, type (public, private, disabled) and hours of use of the parking available in the study area. The study will include a determination of both existing utilization and future demand; will identify locations with surplus or deficient supply of vehicular parking; and identify strategies, such as parking districts, shared use parking, park once strategies, and parking maximums.

An analysis of current supply and projected need for bicycle parking will also be provided. Based on the results of the study, adjustments to current parking standards, a parking management plan, or identification of potential locations for structured or subterranean parking, if applicable, will guide the implementation and policies of the plan.

Parking Study results will be presented to the CAC by the Project Manager. Any guidance related to how to use the information in developing the specific plan or the urban design and street standards documents will be transmitted back to the consultant.

4. Housing Study ($5,000 from grant, $27,000 local match)

The consultant will conduct a housing feasibility and demand study that analyzes existing and future demand for housing. The study will acknowledge that there are no housing units in the project area and any decision to change or maintain the General Plan policies and zoning related to housing must be made with a good understanding of the potential impacts to the City, the
school districts, and utility providers. The intent of the Housing Study is not to promote or
discourage a change in housing policy for the project area, but instead to provide thorough and
objective analysis of potential benefits and detriments for the elected officials to base their
decisions on. The Housing Study must consider, at a minimum, the implications of housing
policy on City and school districts’ finances and tax base, police and fire services, water, sewer
and other utilities, and social impacts to the existing residents. The Housing Study must also
address affordability, and State regulations such as related to the Regional Housing Needs
Assessment.

Any study of housing will address the possibility of including affordable housing requirements in
the specific plan. Affordable housing is defined as housing affordable to households at various
levels of lower income, such that not more than 30 percent of total household income is spent on
housing. Lower income households are classified into several levels which include moderate,
low, very low and extremely low income classifications. The cutoff between affordable housing
and what is termed market-rate housing is at the top of the moderate income limit, which is
defined as 120 percent of the area median income. In Los Angeles County, median income in
2018 for a family of 4 is $69,300 and the upper limit of the moderate income bracket is $83,150.
Family size determines the threshold of the income limits, but a family of 4 is often used as the
benchmark for describing median income and the limits for each type of lower income
household. Below are the 2018 income limits published by the Department of Housing and
Community Development (HCD).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>Number of Persons in Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>Extremely Low</td>
<td>20350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>33950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Person Area Median Income:</td>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>54250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$69,300</td>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>48500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate Income</td>
<td>58200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affordable rents and affordable purchase prices are derived from the income limits. The
calculations represent a figure that represents roughly 30 percent of household income, but also
takes into consideration unit size. In 2018, rent for a two bedroom affordable apartment unit in
Los Angeles County would be limited to $1,397 per month, but would also be limited by the
household’s income, so it could be lower. Typically, however, managers of affordable units
strive to find households near the top of the income limit.

The chart below shows the 2018 rent limits for HUD’s HOME program as published by HCD.
Any affordable housing that may be considered in the specific plan area would not be subject to
HOME program guidelines, but the line which lists the “High HOME Rent Limit” represents the
rent limit on moderate income households and would be applicable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Rent Category</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Low HOME Rent Limit</td>
<td>$848</td>
<td>$903</td>
<td>$1,091</td>
<td>$1,260</td>
<td>$1,406</td>
<td>$1,551</td>
<td>$1,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High HOME Rent Limit</td>
<td>$1,007</td>
<td>$1,105</td>
<td>$1,207</td>
<td>$1,305</td>
<td>$1,471</td>
<td>$1,636</td>
<td>$2,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For Information Only</td>
<td>$1,007</td>
<td>$1,105</td>
<td>$1,207</td>
<td>$1,305</td>
<td>$1,471</td>
<td>$1,636</td>
<td>$2,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair Market Rent</td>
<td>$1,007</td>
<td>$1,105</td>
<td>$1,207</td>
<td>$1,305</td>
<td>$1,471</td>
<td>$1,636</td>
<td>$2,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% Rent Limit</td>
<td>$948</td>
<td>$999</td>
<td>$1,091</td>
<td>$1,260</td>
<td>$1,406</td>
<td>$1,551</td>
<td>$1,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65% Rent Limit</td>
<td>$1,094</td>
<td>$1,163</td>
<td>$1,307</td>
<td>$1,605</td>
<td>$1,771</td>
<td>$1,936</td>
<td>$2,101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a considerable gap between the income limits and the median income of El Segundo, which is now over $91,000 for all families. There is a similar gap between affordable rents and the market rate in El Segundo, which is now more than double the affordable rents.

Housing Study results will be presented to the CAC by the Project Manager. Any guidance related to how to use the information in developing the specific plan will be transmitted back to the consultant.

5. Mobility Study ($70,000 from grant, $1,200 local match)

The consultant team will prepare a mobility study that evaluates existing conditions for pedestrians, cyclists, transit riders and drivers; identifies deficiencies and barriers to mobility and access; and recommends improvements to mitigate those impacts. The study will be completed in consultation with the CAC and community stakeholders through community engagement process.

Mobility Study results will be presented to the CAC by the Project Manager. Any guidance related to how to use the information in developing the specific plan and Urban Design and Street Standards will be transmitted back to the consultant.

6. Economic Study ($5,000 from grant, $27,000 local match)

The consultant team will prepare an Economic Study to identify the current and forecasted demand for various types of real estate development within the study area. The economic study shall determine the potential and implications for multi-family residential at various densities, retail, mixed use, office, institutional, and denser development of existing land uses that support transit ridership and benefit from transit proximity. The economic study will also analyze the impacts and benefits of various land uses on the economic wellbeing of the City, its local economy and its taxpayers. This includes, among other things, the economic impacts to the City of all the changes considered based on the previous studies. In particular, if housing is proposed, how that would affect City revenues, costs of services, and administrative costs (such as to administer an affordable housing program). All will be completed in consultation with City staff, the CAC and community stakeholders through community engagement process.

Economic Study results will be presented to the CAC by the Project Manager. Any guidance related to how to use the information in developing the specific plan will be transmitted back to the consultant.
7. Urban Design and Street Standards ($100,000 from grant, $2,000 local match)

The consultant will prepare an Urban Design and Street Standards report that will offer strategies that focus on design elements of the built environment in TOD districts. These strategies should encourage design used in development projects and streetscape improvements that improve the built environment to be more conducive to walking, public life, transit use, and neighborhood identity.

8. Environmental Impact Report and accompanying documents ($150,000 from grant, $4,000 local match)

The consultant team will prepare an Initial Study and Notice of Preparation, circulate the NOP as part of the early scoping effort, and submit the NOP to the State Clearinghouse and all trustee and responsible agencies. The consultant will also conduct one public scoping meeting on issues addressed in the Initial Study. The consultant will prepare a complete screecheck Draft EIR for review by staff prior to publication. The screecheck Draft EIR will include all text, tables, and figures. The consultant will then prepare a Draft EIR that incorporates the comments received from staff. The Draft EIR will be distributed to the CAC, the Planning Commission, the City Council and the public for review and comment. Following the completion of the public review comment period on the Draft EIR, the consultant will prepare responses to the comments and the Final EIR.

The consultant will prepare a Statement of Overriding Considerations (if required) and a draft Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) that will identify required mitigation measures, responsible implementing parties, and timeframe for implementation. After staff review, the consultant will prepare a Final MMRP that incorporates staff’s comments.

9. Vision, Goals, Objectives and Strategy Report and Specific Plan Framework (Part of Specific Plan, see below)

Using existing conditions analysis, the Housing Study, Mobility Study, Walk and Bike Audits, Parking Study, the and Economic Study, as well as the accumulated inputs from stakeholders, the consultant team will prepare a Vision, Goals, Objectives and Strategies report and a framework and outline for the Specific Plan that meets with the State Specific Plan requirements. The framework will be organized in chapters that are easy to understand to the public and efficient to administer by City staff upon adoption.

10. Specific Plan ($187,000, 100% local funds)

The consultant team will develop a Draft TOD Specific Plan. The issue of whether the land use change will be made as part of a Specific Plan or through land use map changes and zone text changes is still under discussion amongst staff and the City Attorney’s Office. It is believed that MTA will not care about which method is utilized but this will be confirmed. For purposes of this report regarding the MTA grant, the term “Specific Plan” has been used for discussion purposes.

The Specific Plan will include all required components of a specific plan including land use maps, zoning and development standards, parking requirements, street standards and cross sections, urban design standards, and sustainable design requirements. City staff will announce
the release of the Draft TOD Specific Plan and related Draft General Plan Land Use Map to the public and provide the opportunity to comment. Based on comments and feedback from staff, Metro, the community, and various stakeholders, the consultant will prepare a Final Draft Land Use Policy Map and TOD Specific Plan.

Consultant Team will also coordinate with outside agencies and adjacent jurisdictions. Team will develop alternative land use and transportation scenarios that can be reviewed and evaluated for their strengths and weaknesses by the team and stakeholders during the community outreach and engagement process.

The consultant and City staff will present the Draft Specific Plan to the Planning Commission and the City Council as informational items (not public hearings) to solicit final comments and suggestions that will be incorporated into the Specific Plan and EIR as appropriate. The consultants will prepare a Final Draft Land Use Policy Map and TOD Specific Plan.

It is important to note that the specific plan is subject to adoption by a vote of the City Council. It is staff’s intention that the process whereby the plan is to be developed will be guided by the policy direction given by the City Council at about 19 months into the process. Those 19 months will be time used to develop the various studies and to solicit broad public input. Nothing in the grant agreement compels the City Council to adopt the specific plan, but it is Staff’s desire to not produce a plan that would not have full support of the Council.

D. Project Oversight

Starting in the fifth month, a Community Advisory Committee (CAC) will be established. The CAC will be composed of representative stakeholders and number approximately 25 volunteer members. The recommended composition of this group is as follows:

- Green Line users (1 member)
- Bicycle advocacy groups (1 member)
- Pedestrian advocacy groups (1 member)
- Property owners within the project area (3 members)
- Major employers within the project area (2 members)
- Wiseburn and El Segundo school districts (2 members)
- United States Air Force (1 member)
- Environmental advocacy groups (1 member)
- City representatives from Finance, Public Works, Police, Fire, Recreation & Parks, as well as from the Environmental and Arts & Culture Committees (7 members)
- Public Utilities (1 member)
- Transportation providers other than Metro serving the project area (1 member)
- Commercial real estate expert (1 member member)
- Sports and recreation advocacy groups (1 member)
- Residents associations from adjacent area (1 member)
- Homeless or affordable housing advocacy groups (1 member)

The above list is reproduced in the Scope of Work that will be part of the Grant Agreement. The list is not meant to be prescriptive, but rather to achieve a balance of stakeholder perspectives. Other impacted groups are not excluded from participation.
The CAC will meet every other month for at least 12 meetings. The role of the CAC is to review the work in progress of the various documents, vet any policy recommendations, steer the project in directions that are suitable for the City and the community, and to ensure progress within the timelines described in the Project Schedule. The CAC schedule is presented in the Scope of Work as follows:

- Meeting 1—Review Existing Conditions Analysis and Draft Community Outreach Plan
- Meeting 2—Consultation and recommendations on Housing and Mobility Studies
- Meeting 3—Review of Walk and Bike Audit and Parking Study
- Meeting 4—Review of Housing Study, consultation on Economic Study
- Meeting 5—Review of Mobility Study and Vision, Goals, Objectives and Strategies of the specific plan, and the draft specific plan framework
- Meeting 6—Consultation on Urban Design and Street Standards document
- Meeting 7—Review Economic Study
- Meeting 8—Review draft Environmental Impact Report
- Meeting 9—First review of Draft Specific Plan
- Meeting 10—Second review of Draft Specific Plan
- Meeting 11—Review of Urban Design and Street Standards
- Meeting 12—Final Specific Plan review

While the CAC will be a constant and regular checkpoint throughout the process, the Planning Commission and City Council will be kept in the loop by receiving summary reports after each CAC meeting. The Council could hold a public meeting during this process to alter or cease the process, but there could be financial ramifications (paying back grant funds) for cancelling the process. In addition, two public informational updates are scheduled before each body prior to any public hearings. In accordance with the Schedule, the Planning Commission will be updated at about the 16 month mark after the CAC has reviewed and commented on the Walk and Bike Audit, the Parking Study, the Housing Study, the Mobility Study, and has provided initial direction in the Economic Study.

The City Council will be updated right after the Planning Commission. And at this point the City Council will be asked to provide the policy direction of the specific plan. Most of the studies will be complete and the public input portion of the outreach program will be wrapping up. The second public updates to the Planning Commission and the City Council will be just before the drafts of the specific plan, the Urban Design and Street Standards and the EIR are ready for public circulation and comments.

E. Project Administration

Grant administration is critical to maintain the success of the project. There are two main components of administering a grant like this, one is the financial and reporting responsibility to the grantor, and the other is managing the information and schedule. The Metro grant process allows applicants to use a portion of the grant award to bring on board an administrative consultant to assist in one or both of these functions. Our proposal to Metro included this request.

The administrative consultant will primarily be responsible to ensure that all invoicing and billing, as well as quarterly reporting is delivered to Metro accurately and on time. The administrative consultant will also assist with agenda, minutes and scheduling the CAC meetings.
and preparing the summary reports that come from them. The administrative consultant will be responsible to ensure that the specific plan consultant is keeping to the schedule and budget and will work with the Project Manager to resolve issues as they come up.

Just as with the specific plan consultant, the administrative consultant will be selected through a competitive RFP process. Although the administrative consultant will be selected and under contract first, she or he will not participate in the selection of the specific plan consultant.

E. Project Budget

As described in Attachment A, the overall budget for the project is $1,002,500, of which $659,500 is to be provided by Metro and the remainder comes from the General Plan Maintenance Fund. A question was raised at the March 6 City Council meeting concerning the adequacy of this budget considering the enormity of the study. Below is a sample of recent specific plans and the total cost, including the associated EIRs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>SP+EIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>Town Center Specific Plan</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>$335,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cerrito</td>
<td>San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>$457,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne</td>
<td>Downtown Hawthorne Specific Plan</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>$597,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azusa</td>
<td>TOD Specific Plan</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Patrick Henry Drive Specific Plan</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>$765,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>Heart of Fairfield Specific Plan</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>$807,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Freedom Circle Specific Plan</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>$810,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>Downtown Sacramento SP</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1,902</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| El Segundo     | Green Line Corridor Specific Plan | 2021 | 1,280 | $1,002,500 |
| Riverside County | Northside Specific Plan | ongoing | 1,400 | $1,593,000 |

The budget can be broken into four main parts: the costs of community engagement and outreach ($104,000); the costs of developing the specific plan and other reports ($595,000); the cost of preparing the CEQA analysis ($154,000); and the cost of administration and oversight ($149,500). A large portion of the specific plan development work will also be used in the preparation of the EIR. This includes work on existing conditions, walk and bike audit, parking study, housing study, mobility study and the economic study. Assuming that at least half of the work on these studies will be usable by the EIR team, the total cost of the EIR comes in at about $300,000, which is roughly the cost of the Topgolf EIR.

Cost of Recent EIRs in El Segundo And Proposed Green Line Corridor EIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EIR for South Campus Specific Plan (Raytheon)</td>
<td>$663,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR for The Lakes Specific Plan (Topgolf)</td>
<td>$307,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EIR for Green Line Corridor Specific Plan</strong></td>
<td>approx. $300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City Attorney’s Office has expressed some concern regarding the estimate for this CEQA review as significant projects in the City have incurred CEQA review costs in excess of $300,000 to $400,000 in most cases.
Staff consulted with several EIR consultants and received reassurance that $300,000 was an acceptable budget for this EIR, especially when a single consulting team is used for both the specific plan and the EIR and much of the initial work is covered by the various studies.
ATTACHMENT 1 – GRANT AGREEMENT
TOD Planning Grant Program Round 5

GRANT AGREEMENT

This Grant Agreement ("Agreement") is dated [INSERT PROCESSING START DATE] for reference purposes only, and is by and between the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority ("LACMTA") and [INSERT GRANTEE NAME] ("Grantee") for [INSERT PROJECT TITLE] - LACMTA Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Planning Grant Program ID# 920000000TOD2018[XX] as described in this Agreement and the attachments hereto ("Project").

WHEREAS, as part of Round 5 of the TOD Planning Grant Program, the LACMTA Board of Directors, at its meeting on [INSERT APPROVAL DATE], authorized a grant to Grantee, subject to the terms and conditions contained in this Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereby agree as follows:

The terms and conditions of this Agreement consist of the following, and each is incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein:

1. Part I - Specific Terms of the Agreement
2. Part II - General Terms of the Agreement
3. Attachment A - Project Schedule and Budget
4. Attachment B - Scope of Work
5. Attachment C - Reporting and Expenditure Guidelines
6. Attachment D - Quarterly Progress/Expense Report
7. Attachment E - TOD Planning Grant Program and Lapsing Guidelines

In the event of a conflict, the Specific Terms of this Agreement and Attachments A, B, C, D, and E shall have precedence in that order and shall prevail over the General Terms.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have caused this Agreement to be executed by their duly authorized representatives as of the dates indicated below:

LACMTA:

LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

By: __________________________ Date: __________________________
Phillip A. Washington
Chief Executive Officer

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

MARY C. WICKHAM
County Counsel

By: __________________________ Date: __________________________
Deputy

GRANTEE:

[INSERT GRANTEE NAME]

By: __________________________ Date: __________________________
[INSERT NAME]
[INSERT TITLE]

APPROVED AS TO FORM (OPTIONAL):

[INSERT GRANTEE'S LEGAL COUNSEL'S SIGNATURE BLOCK IF APPROPRIATE]

By: __________________________ Date: __________________________
[INSERT NAME]
[INSERT TITLE]
PART I
SPECIFIC TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT

1. The Title of the Project is [INSERT PROJECT TITLE] - LACMTA TOD Planning Grant Program ID# 920000000TOD2018[XX].

2. To the extent the Funds are available, LACMTA shall make to Grantee a one-time grant of Measure R 2% System Improvement and/or Measure R 3% Metrolink, based on Project eligibility and funds available, in the amount of $[INSERT GRANT AMOUNT] (the “Funds”) for the Project in accordance with the terms of this Agreement. LACMTA Board of Directors’ action of [INSERT APPROVAL DATE] granted the Funds to Grantee for the Project.

3. This one time grant shall be on a reimbursement basis. Grantee must provide the appropriate supporting documents with the Quarterly Progress/Expense Report, Attachment D.

4. Grantee shall contribute the Grantee Funding Commitment (local match), if any, to the Project in the amounts and toward the Scope of Work, all as specified in Attachment A. In each Quarterly Progress/Expense Report (Attachment D), Grantee shall report on the use of the local match which should be consistent with Attachment A. If Grantee does not meet its local match commitment, it shall be considered a default under this Agreement and LACMTA will have the remedies available to it under Part II, Section 9 and 10. Any changes in the Grantee Funding Commitment must be made by mutual agreement of the parties and documented in an amendment to this Agreement.

5. Grantee shall complete the Project as described in the “Scope of Work,” attached to this Agreement as Attachment B. The Scope of Work includes a description of the Project and a detailed description of the work and tasks to be completed, including project deliverables, by Grantee. Project work shall adhere to the Project Schedule and Budget attached to this Agreement as Attachment A, consistent with the most recently adopted LACMTA TOD Planning Grant Guidelines that includes lapping policies is referenced collectively, the “Guidelines” attached to this Agreement as Attachment E. If Grantee is consistently behind schedule in meeting milestones or in delivering the Project, in accordance with Attachments A and E, then LACMTA shall have the option to terminate this Agreement for default as described in Part II, Sections 9 and 10 and deobligate funds as described in Part II Section 8.

6. Eligible Project expenses are defined in the Reporting and Expenditure Guidelines attached to this Agreement as Attachment C. The form of the Quarterly Progress/Expense Report is attached as Attachment D. LACMTA shall withhold five percent (5%) of eligible expenditures per invoice as retention pending an audit of expenditures and completion of the Scope of Work (Attachment B).

7. The duration of the grant, as evidenced in Attachment A, shall be thirty-six (36) months and all eligible costs shall be incurred during this period. Pursuant to Section IX in the Guidelines, the funds may be deobligated if the Project is not completed within thirty-six...
(36) months from the fully executed agreement date. To the extent this Agreement is inconsistent with any term of the Guidelines, the Guidelines shall govern.

8. Grantee shall ensure that the grant funded work is focused on creating new opportunities for regulatory change that support TOD. If upon review of the Quarterly Progress/Expense Report (Attachment D), LACMTA finds that the Project is not creating a regulatory framework that supports TOD principles, LACMTA may find Grantee to be in default and shall have the remedies as described in Part II, Section 9 and 10. LACMTA may also deobligate funds as described in PART II, Section 8.

9. Amendments to this Agreement shall be in writing executed by the parties. No changes to the (i) grant amount, (ii) Project Funding, (iii) Scope of Work (Attachment B), or (iv) lapse date of the Funds shall be allowed without a written amendment to this Agreement, approved and signed by the LACMTA Chief Executive Officer or his/her designee and Grantee. Notwithstanding the forgoing, Grantee may transfer funds between line items within the Scope of Work and Budget or make non-material schedule changes, subject to LACMTA written approval without a formal amendment to this Agreement. In order to transfer funds or make non-material schedule changes, Grantee shall submit a memo to LACMTA describing (i) the amount of proposed transfer of funds, and between which line items; (ii) how the proposed transfer will affect the Scope of Work; and (iii) how the Scope of Work and deliverables are still achievable if the proposed transfer is effectuated. LACMTA will have fifteen (15) working days to approve or disapprove the proposed change, and such approval or disapproval may be provided either by written memo or by email.

10. Notice shall be given to the parties at the address specified below unless otherwise notified in writing of change of address. Any notice required or permitted to be delivered hereunder shall be deemed to be delivered upon receipt at the correct address by United States mail, postage prepaid, certified or registered mail, return receipt requested, or by Federal Express or other reputable overnight delivery service addressed to the parties hereto as follows:

LACMTA’s Address:
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Attention: Desiree P. Rabinov, 23rd Floor, Mail Stop 99-23-4
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Grantee’s Address:
[INSERT GRANTEE NAME]
Attention: [RESPONSIBLE STAFF PERSON’S NAME, EMAIL ADDRESS]
[ADDRESS 1]
[CITY, STATE, ZIP]
PART II
GENERAL TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT

1. TERM:

1.1 The term of this Agreement shall commence on the date this Agreement is fully executed and shall expire upon the occurrence of all of the following, unless terminated earlier as provided herein: (i) the agreed upon Scope of Work (Attachment B) has been completed; (ii) all LACMTA audit and reporting requirements have been satisfied; and (iii) the final disbursement of the Funds has been made to Grantee. The parties understand and agree there are certain covenants and agreements which specifically remain in effect after expiration or termination of this Agreement.

1.2 Should LACMTA determine there are insufficient Funds available for the Project, LACMTA may terminate this Agreement by giving written notice to Grantee at least thirty (30) days in advance of the effective date of such termination. If this Agreement is terminated pursuant to this section, LACMTA will not reimburse Grantee any costs incurred after the termination date.

2. INVOICE BY GRANTEE:

2.1 Unless otherwise stated in this Agreement, the Quarterly Progress/Expense Report (Attachment D), with supporting documentation of expenses and project progress as described in Part II, Section 4.1 of this Agreement, and other documents as required pursuant to this Agreement, shall satisfy LACMTA invoicing requirements. Expenses that are not invoiced within sixty (60) days after the lapsing date as defined in the Lapsing Policy, Part II, Section 8.1 below are not eligible for reimbursement.

Send invoices with supporting documentation to:
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Accounts Payable
P. O. Box 512296
Los Angeles, CA 90051-0296
Re: LACMTA Agreement# 920000000TOD2018[XX]
Attention: Desiree P. Rabinov, 23rd Floor, Mail Stop 99-23-4

3. USE OF FUNDS:

3.1 Grantee shall utilize the Funds to complete the Project as described in the Scope of Work (Attachment B) and in accordance with the Reporting and Expenditure Guidelines (Attachment C) and the most recently adopted Guidelines (Attachment E). Grantee shall be eligible for the Funds up to the grant amount specified in Part I, Section 2 of this Agreement subject to the terms and conditions contained herein and in the Guidelines.

3.2 Grantee shall not use the Funds to substitute for any other funds or projects not specified in this Agreement. Further, Grantee shall not use the Funds for any expenses or activities above and beyond the approved Scope of Work (Attachment B).
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3.3 Grantee must use the Funds in the most cost-effective manner. If Grantee intends to use a consultant or contractor to implement all or part of the Project, LACMTA requires that such activities be procured in accordance with Grantee's contracting procedures and consistent with State law. Grantee will also use the Funds in the most cost-effective manner when the Funds are used to pay "in-house" staff time. Grantee staff or consultant with project oversight roles cannot award work to companies in which they have a financial or personal interest. This effective use of funds provision will be verified by LACMTA through on-going Project monitoring and through any LACMTA interim and final audits.

3.4 Grantee may change budgetary amount per task within the Scope of Work (Attachment B), subject to LACMTA approval as set forth in Part I, Section 9 hereof.

3.5 Grantee's employees, officers, councilmembers, board members, agents, or consultants (a "Grantee Party") are prohibited from participating in the selection, award, or administration of a third-party contract or sub-agreement supported by the Funds if a real or apparent conflict of interest would be involved. A conflict of interest would include, without limitation, an organizational conflict of interest or when any of the following parties has a financial or other interest in any entity selected for award: (a) a Grantee Party (b) any member of a Grantee Party's immediate family, (c) a partner of a Grantee Party; (d) any organization that employs or intends to employ any of the above. This conflict of interest provision will be verified by LACMTA through on-going Project monitoring and through any LACMTA interim and final audits.

4. **DISBURSEMENT OF FUNDS:**

4.1 Grantee shall submit the Quarterly Progress/Expense Report (Attachment D) within forty-five (45) days after the close of each quarter. Should Grantee fail to submit such reports within ten (10) days of the due date or if Grantee submits incomplete reports, LACMTA will not reimburse Grantee until the completed required reports are received, reviewed, and approved. The Quarterly Progress/Expense Report (Attachment D) shall include all appropriate supporting documentation (such as contractor invoices, timesheets, receipts, etc.) as set forth in the Guidelines. All supporting documents must include a clear justification and explanation of their relevance to the Project. If no activity has occurred during a particular quarter, Grantee will still be required to submit the Quarterly Progress/Expense Report (Attachment D), indicating that no dollars were expended that quarter. If a request for reimbursement exceeds $500,000 in a month, then Grantee can submit such an invoice once per month with supporting documentation.

4.2 Disbursements shall be made on a reimbursement basis in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement.

4.3 LACMTA will make all disbursements electronically unless an exception is requested in writing. Disbursements via Automated Clearing House (ACH) will be made at no cost to Grantee. Grantee must complete the ACH form and submit such form to LACMTA.
before grant payments can be made. ACH Request Forms can be found at http://www.metro.net/projects/tod/.

4.4 Expenses that are not invoiced within sixty (60) days after the lapsing date specified in Part II, Section 8.1 below are not eligible for reimbursement.

4.5 Any Funds expended by Grantee prior to the execution of this Agreement by LACMTA shall not be reimbursed.

5. REPORTING AND AUDIT REQUIREMENTS/PAYMENT ADJUSTMENTS:

5.1*1 LACMTA and/or its designee shall have the right to conduct audits of the Project, as it deem appropriate, such as financial and compliance audits; interim audits; pre-award audits; performance audits; and final audits. LACMTA will commence a final audit within six months of receipt of an acceptable final invoice, provided the Project is ready for final audit (meaning all costs and charges have been paid by Grantee and invoiced to LACMTA and such costs, charges, and invoices are properly documented and summarized in the accounting records to enable an audit without further explanation or summarization, including actual indirect rates for the period covered by the Agreement period under review). Grantee agrees to establish and maintain proper accounting procedures and cash management records and documents in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP). Grantee shall reimburse LACMTA for any expenditure not in compliance with this Agreement and the Guidelines. Grantee’s eligible expenditures submitted to LACMTA for this Project shall be in compliance with the Reporting and Expense Guidelines (Attachment C) and Office of Management and Budget (“OMB”) Circular A-87. The allowability of costs for Grantee’s contractors, consultants and suppliers submitted to LACMTA through Recipient’s Quarterly Progress Reports/Expense Report (Attachment D) shall be in compliance with OMB Circular A-87 or Federal Acquisition Regulations, Subpart 31 (FAR), whichever is applicable. Any use of the Funds which is expressly prohibited under this Agreement shall be an ineligible use of the Funds and may be disallowed by LACMTA audit. Findings of the LACMTA audit are final. When LACMTA audit findings require Grantee to return monies to LACMTA, Grantee shall return such monies within thirty (30) days after the final audit is sent to Grantee.

5.2* Grantee’s records shall include, without limitation, accounting records, written policies and procedures, contract files, original estimates, correspondence, change order files (including documentation covering negotiated settlements), invoices, and any other supporting evidence deemed necessary by LACMTA to substantiate charges related to the Project (all collectively referred to as “records”). Grantee’s records shall be open to inspection and subject to audit and reproduction by LACMTA auditors or authorized representatives to the extent deemed necessary by LACMTA to adequately permit evaluation of expended costs. Such records subject to audit shall also include, without limitation, those records deemed necessary by LACMTA to evaluate and verify direct and indirect costs (including overhead allocations) as they may apply to costs associated with the Project. These records must be retained by Grantee for 3 years following final payment under this

---

1 See Part II Section 12.6 for asterisk
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Agreement. Payment of retention amounts shall not occur until after the LACMTA’s final audit is completed.

5.3* Grantee shall cause all contractors to comply with the requirements of this Part II, Sections 5.1 and 5.2 above. Grantee shall cause all contractors to cooperate fully in furnishing or in making available to LACMTA all records deemed necessary by LACMTA auditors or authorized representatives related to the Project.

5.4* LACMTA or any of its duly authorized representatives, upon reasonable written notice, shall be afforded access to all of the records of Grantee and its contractors related to the Project and shall be allowed to interview any employee of Grantee and its contractors through final payment to the extent reasonably practicable.

5.5* LACMTA or any of its duly authorized representatives, upon reasonable written notice, shall have access to the offices of Grantee and its contractors, shall have access to all necessary records, including reproduction at no charge to LACMTA, and shall be provided adequate and appropriate work space in order to conduct audits in compliance with the terms and conditions of this Agreement.

5.6* In addition to LACMTA’s other remedies as provided in this Agreement, LACMTA shall withhold the Funds and/or recommend not to award a future TOD Planning Grant to Grantee if the LACMTA audit has determined that Grantee failed to comply with the Scope of Work (such as misusing Funds or failure to return Funds owed to LACMTA in accordance with LACMTA audit findings) and/or is materially out of compliance with other terms and conditions as defined by this Agreement and the Guidelines, including the access to records provisions of this Part II, Section 5.

5.7* Grantee shall certify monthly invoices by reviewing all contractor and subcontractor costs and maintaining internal control to ensure that all expenditures are allocable, allowable and reasonable and in accordance with OMB Circular A-87 or FAR Subpart 31 (whichever is applicable) and the terms and conditions of this Agreement.

5.8 Grantee shall also certify final costs of the Project to ensure all costs are in compliance with OMB Circular A-87 or FAR Subpart 31 (whichever is applicable) and the terms and conditions of this Agreement.

5.9 Whenever possible, in exercising its audit rights under this Agreement, LACMTA shall rely on Grantee’s own records and audit work to minimize direct audit of contractors, consultants, and suppliers.

6. **ONE TIME GRANT:**

6.1 This is a one time only grant subject to the terms and conditions agreed to herein and in the Guidelines. This grant does not imply nor obligate any future funding commitment on the part of LACMTA.
7. SOURCES AND DISPOSITION OF FUNDS:

7.1 The obligation for LACMTA to grant the Funds for the Project is subject to sufficient Funds being made available for the Project by the LACMTA Board of Directors. If such Funds are not made available for the Project, LACMTA shall have no obligation to provide the Funds for the Project, unless otherwise agreed to in writing by LACMTA.

7.2 Grantee shall be responsible for any and all cost overruns for the Project.

7.3 If the Funds are insufficient to complete the Project, Grantee may modify the Scope of Work (Attachment B) to allow project completion with other funds available to Grantee. LACMTA shall have the right to review and approve or reject any proposed changes to the Scope of Work (Attachment B).

7.4 If at any time, Grantee receives outside funding for the Project in addition to the Funds identified in the Scope of Work (Attachment B) at the time this grant was awarded, this Agreement shall be amended to reflect such additional funding. If, at the time of final invoice, funding for the Project (including the Funds and any additional funding) exceeds the actual Project costs, then the cost savings shall be applied in the same proportion as the sources of funds as specified in the Scope of Work (Attachment B), and the Funds required for the Project shall be reduced accordingly.

8. TIMELY USE / RECERTIFICATION / DEOBLIGATION OF FUNDS:

8.1 Grantee must demonstrate timely use of the Funds and effective implementation of project scope of work by:

   (i) Executing this Agreement within sixty (60) days of receiving formal transmittal of the Agreement from LACMTA.
   (ii) Meeting the Project milestone and deliverable due dates as stated in the Project Schedule and Budget (Attachment A) and Scope of Work (Attachment B).
   (iii) Timely submitting of the Quarterly Progress/Expense Reports (Attachment D) as defined in Part II, Section 2 of this Agreement and the Reporting and Expenditure Guidelines (Attachment C); and
   (iv) Expending funds granted within thirty-six (36) months from the date the Grant Agreement is fully executed.
   (v) Procuring contract/consultant to complete grant Scope of Work (Attachment B) within six (6) months of agreement execution with LACMTA.
   (vi) Notifying LACMTA as soon as grantee is aware of any changes and circumstances which alter the eligibility of the Board approved project.
If Grantee fails to meet any of the above conditions, the project shall be considered lapsed and will be submitted to the LACMTA Board of Directors for deobligation.

8.2 In the event that the timely use of the Funds and effective implementation of the project scope of work is not demonstrated as described in Part II, Section 8.1 of this Agreement, the Project will be reevaluated by LACMTA as part of its annual budget recertification of funds and TOD Planning Grant Program deobligation process. The Funds may be deobligated and reprogrammed to another project by the LACMTA Board of Directors. If Grantee does not complete one element of the Project, as described in the Scope of Work (Attachment B) due to all or a portion of the Funds lapsing, the entire Project may be subject to deobligation at LACMTA’s sole discretion. In the event that all the Funds are reprogrammed, this Agreement shall automatically terminate.

9. **DEFAULT:**

9.1 A Default under this Agreement is defined as any one or more of the following: (i) Grantee fails to comply with the terms and conditions contained herein or in the Guidelines; or (ii) Grantee is consistently behind schedule in meeting milestones or in delivering the Project; or (iii) Grantee fails to perform satisfactorily or makes a material change, as determined by LACMTA at its sole discretion, to the Scope of Work (Attachment B) or the Project Funding without LACMTA’s prior written consent or approval as provided herein.

10. **REMEDIES:**

10.1 In the event of a Default by Grantee, LACMTA shall provide written notice of such Default to Grantee with a 30-day period to cure the Default. In the event Grantee fails to cure the Default or to commit to cure the Default and commence the cure within such 30-day period, and thereafter diligently continue such cure to completion to the satisfaction of LACMTA, LACMTA shall have the following remedies: (i) LACMTA may terminate this Agreement; (ii) LACMTA may make no further disbursements of Funds to Grantee; and/or (iii) LACMTA may recover from Grantee any Funds disbursed to Grantee as allowed by law or in equity.

10.2 Effective upon receipt of written notice of termination from LACMTA, pursuant to Section 10.1, Grantee shall not undertake any new work or obligation with respect to this Agreement unless so directed by LACMTA in writing. Any Funds expended after termination shall be the sole responsibility of Grantee.

10.3 The remedies described herein are non-exclusive. LACMTA shall have the right to enforce any and all rights and remedies herein or which may be now or hereafter available at law or in equity.

11. **COMMUNICATIONS:**

11.1 Grantee shall ensure that all Communication Materials contain recognition of LACMTA’s contribution to the Project as more particularly set forth in
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“Funding Agreement Communications Materials Guidelines” available online or from the LACMTA Project Manager. Please check with the LACMTA Project Manager for the web address. The Funding Agreement Communications Materials Guidelines may be changed from time to time during the course of this Agreement. Grantee shall be responsible for complying with the latest Funding Agreement Communications Materials Guidelines during the term of this Agreement, unless otherwise specifically authorized in writing by the LACMTA Chief Communications Officer.

11.2 For purposes of this Agreement, “Communications Materials” include, but are not limited to community outreach materials, press events, public and external newsletters, printed materials, advertising, websites radio and public service announcements, electronic media, and construction site signage, as well as the plan or other primary deliverables funded by the Grant. A more detailed definition of “Communications Materials” is found in the Funding Agreement Communications Materials Guidelines.

11.3 The Metro logo is a trademarked item that shall be reproduced and displayed in accordance with specific graphic guidelines. These guidelines and logo files including scalable vector files will be available through the LACMTA Project Manager.

11.4 Grantee shall ensure that any subcontractor, including, but not limited to, public relations, public affairs, and/or marketing firms hired to produce Project Communications Materials for public and external purposes will comply with the requirements contained in this Section.

11.5 The LACMTA Project Manager shall be responsible for monitoring Grantee compliance with the terms and conditions of this Section. Grantee failure to comply with the terms of this Section shall be deemed a default hereunder and LACMTA shall have all rights and remedies set forth herein.

12. OTHER TERMS AND PROGRAM CONDITIONS:

12.1 This Agreement, along with its Attachments and the Guidelines, constitutes the entire understanding between the parties with respect to the subject matter herein. The Agreement shall not be amended, nor any provisions or breach thereof waived, except in writing signed by the parties who agreed to the original Agreement or the same level of authority. Adoption of revisions or supplements to the Guidelines shall cause such revisions or supplements to become incorporated automatically into this Agreement as though fully set forth herein.

12.2* In the event that there is any court proceeding between the parties to enforce or interpret this Agreement to protect or establish any rights or remedies hereunder, the prevailing party shall be entitled to its costs and expenses, including reasonable attorney’s fees.

12.3* Neither LACMTA nor any officer or employee thereof shall be responsible for any damage or liability occurring by reason of anything done or committed to
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be done by Grantee under or in connection with any work performed by and or service
provided by Grantee, its officers, agents, employees, contractors, and subcontractors under this
Agreement. Grantee shall fully indemnify, defend with counsel approved by LACMTA, and
hold LACMTA and its subsidiaries, and their respective directors, officers, agents, and
employees harmless from and against any suits and causes of actions, claims, losses, liability,
damages, costs and expenses, including without limitation, any costs or liability on account of
bodily injury, death or personal injury of any person, or damage to or loss of property, any
environmental obligation, and any legal fees, in any way arising out of the acts or omissions to
act related to Project or this Agreement, without requirement that LACMTA first pay such
claims.

12.4 Neither party hereto shall be considered in default in the performance of
its obligation hereunder to the extent that the performance of any such obligation is prevented
or delayed by unforeseen causes including acts of God, acts of a public enemy, and
government acts beyond the control and without fault or negligence of the affected party. Each
party hereto shall give notice promptly to the other of the nature and extent of any such
circumstances claimed to delay, hinder, or prevent performance of any obligations under this
Agreement.

12.5* Grantee shall comply with and ensure that work performed under this
Agreement is done in compliance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP), all
applicable provisions of federal, state, and local laws, statutes, ordinances, rules, regulations,
and procedural requirements, and the applicable requirements and regulations of LACMTA.
Grantee acknowledges responsibility for obtaining copies of and complying with the terms of
the most recent federal, state, or local laws and regulations, and LACMTA requirements
including any amendments thereto.

12.6 Grantee agrees that those sections of this Agreement marked with an
asterisk and the Guidelines shall be included in every contract entered into by Grantee or its
contractors relating to work performed under this Agreement and LACMTA shall have the
right to review and audit such contracts.

12.7 To ensure that future development is designed and constructed to allow
for continuous safe operations of the transit network, the Grantee shall consult with Metro
throughout the approval and permitting process for proposed development or construction
within 100 feet of Metro’s right-of-way and shall obtain Metro’s written concurrence that such
development or construction is compatible with Metro’s transit planning and operations.

Furthermore, the Grantee shall include the following language in all Transit Supportive
Regulatory Documents funded by the Grant Agreement:

"The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) shall be
notified of any planned development or construction activities on properties that are
within 100 feet of Metro right-of-way (ROW) property line. Metro must be provided
the opportunity early in the entitlement process to review plans and comment, if
necessary, to ensure that the project does not impact the safe operation of Metro
transit service and/or compromise Metro infrastructure. As the project design
advances, Metro may review construction drawings and work plans for potential impacts to the Metro system and to ensure safe operation of cranes, overhead loads, excavation, drainage, worker safety, and other construction activities.

Projects adjacent to Metro ROW should include a setback from the Metro property line to accommodate construction and maintenance activities on the private property. Developers should not assume that Metro will grant a right-of-entry permit for construction or maintenance activities on Metro property. For this reason, Metro recommends a minimum five (5) foot setback from the adjacent Metro property line.”

12.8 Grantee shall not assign this Agreement, or any part thereof, without prior approval of the LACMTA Chief Executive Officer or his/her designee, and any assignment without said consent shall be void and unenforceable at the option of LACMTA.

12.9* This Agreement shall be governed by California law. If any provision of this Agreement is held by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, void, or unenforceable, the remaining provisions shall nevertheless continue in full force without being impaired or invalidated in any way.

12.10 The covenants and agreements of this Agreement shall inure to the benefit of, and shall be binding upon, each of the parties and their respective successors and assignees.

12.11 Grantee will advise LACMTA prior to any key Project staffing changes.

12.12 Grantee in the performance of the work described in this Agreement is not a contractor nor an agent or employee of LACMTA. Grantee attests to no organizational or personal conflicts of interest and agrees to notify LACMTA immediately in the event that a conflict, or the appearance thereof, arises. Grantee shall not represent itself as an agent or employee of LACMTA and shall have no powers to bind LACMTA in contract or otherwise.

12.13 Grantee is required to share their proposed draft RFP, draft consultant contract and draft regulatory documents to LACMTA project staff prior to City approval.

12.14 Quarterly briefings will be conducted with Metro staff throughout the project schedule at significant milestones, i.e., kick off meetings, draft documents, outreach events and committee approvals, etc.

12.15 Grantee shall demonstrate that it can meet project milestones and stay within the budget identified in this Agreement. If at the time Grantee has expended seventy-five percent (75%) of the Grant Funds and Grantee has not demonstrated that the work is sufficiently complete consistent with this Agreement, LACMTA’s Project Manager will notify Grantee’s Project Manager through written notice that payments will cease until a mutually agreed-to cost control plan is in place. In the case of insufficient funds to complete
the Project, no further payments will be made and Grantee will identify and secure additional funds to complete the project identified in Attachment A.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Number</th>
<th>Task Title</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Local Match</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2018-19</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2019-20</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2020-21</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Walks and Bikes Audit</td>
<td>$19,400</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$4,400</td>
<td>J A S O N D F M A M J A J S O N D F M A M J A</td>
<td>Draft and Final Walk and Bike Audit Checklist, Route Maps and Summaries of Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Facilitate a series of Walks and Bike Audits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Parking Study</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft and Final Parking Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Prepare Parking Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Housing Study</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft and Final Housing Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Prepare Housing Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mobility Study</td>
<td>$71,330</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>$27,100</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft and Final Mobility Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Prepare a Mobility Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Economic Study</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft and Final Economic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Prepare Economic Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Report</td>
<td>$154,000</td>
<td>$154,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Initial Study and Notice of Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Prepare Initial Study &amp; Notice of Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stop and Revising Meeting and Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Public hearing meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Review Scenarios and draft EIR and circulate for comments</td>
<td>$102,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft EIR and Notice of Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Respond to Comments and prepare final EIR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Respond to Comments and Final EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Prepare Draft and MVRP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statement of Overriding Considerations, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Prepare Notice of Determination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Notification of Determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Develop Specific Plan</td>
<td>$187,000</td>
<td>$187,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visions, Goals, Objectives and Strategies Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>Prepare Vision, Goals, Objectives and Strategies (VGOS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>Develop framework for plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft and Final Plan Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>Prepare Draft Specific Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Specific Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>Prepare Final Specific Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final Specific Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Urban Design/Bridge Standards</td>
<td>$102,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft and Final Urban Design and Bridge Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>Prepare Urban Design and Bridge Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Final Presentations to Decision Makers</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft and Final Urban Design and Bridge Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>Public hearings for Specific Plan and EIR</td>
<td>$1,032,500</td>
<td>$655,500</td>
<td>$343,000</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentations, reports, resolutions, and ordinances. Adopted SP, Certified EIR? Calculated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,032,500</td>
<td>$655,500</td>
<td>$343,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,032,500</td>
<td>$655,500</td>
<td>$343,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ATTACHMENT A - PROJECT SCHEDULE AND BUDGET

### Project Title: GREEN LINE CORRIDOR SPECIFIC PLAN

#### TOD Planning Grant Program: CITY OF EL SEGUNDO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Number</th>
<th>Task Title</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Local Match</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Consultant Procurement</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultant lists, Selection criteria and interview questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Create lists of consultants and selection criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative consultant RFP &amp; plan consultant RFP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Develop and issue RFPs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Review proposals and conduct interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional service contracts for administrative and plan consultants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Negotiate and execute contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kick-Off Meeting</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting agenda and notes, Confirmed schedule or adjustments (if any)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Kick-Off Meeting with consulting teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>$123,900</td>
<td>$68,900</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quarterly invoicing and progress reports, schedule and budget updates (if any)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>City's project management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly and monthly project management meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Invoicing and reporting to Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly and monthly project management meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Weekly and monthly project management meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly and monthly project management meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Presentation and outreach materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary of meetings may be incorporated into quarterly reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Analysis and Mapping of Existing Conditions</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Digital presentation and workshop slides, handouts, photos, videos, displays, etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Document existing conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary report of data collected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Map relevant existing conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing conditions maps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Prepare analysis of existing conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing conditions report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community Advisory Committee</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roster of CAC members and affiliations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Establish a CAC of approximately 25 stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roster of CAC members and affiliations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Conduct bi-monthly CAC meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC meeting agendas, notes and presentation materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Community Outreach and Stakeholder Engagement</td>
<td>$104,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outreach plan and marketing strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Develop Outreach Plan &amp; Marketing Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant lists, agendas and summaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Develop online platform and update content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Online platform and content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Conduct small group stakeholder meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting agenda, presentation materials, conceptual renderings, and summary notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Conduct workshops, forums and charrettes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation materials and handouts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Engage at community events such as farmer's market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Documentation of actions and narrative summary of results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Conduct pop-up and tactical urbanism events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT B

SCOPE OF WORK

Project Title: Green Line Corridor Specific Plan

Project Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LACMTA Grant Funds</td>
<td>$659,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match – Cash</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match – In Kind</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match – Other: [Insert Source]</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,029,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Location: The El Segundo Transit Corridor Plan is bounded on the north by Imperial Highway, on the east by the city boundary (mostly Aviation Boulevard), on the South by Rosecrans Avenue, on the west by Pacific Coast Highway (until recently named Sepulveda Boulevard), and is bisected by El Segundo Boulevard into northern and southern halves.

Project Objective: The City of El Segundo will prepare to adopt regulatory changes that advance transit-supportive development patterns by:

- Creating a new Specific Plan;
- Amending the General Plan and as appropriate, the Zoning Code; and
- Advancing the relevant Environmental Clearance.

The following map(s) illustrate the Project Area’s boundaries and existing land use and zoning categories. Parcels within a 1/2-mile radius and/or adjacent transit corridors are highlighted (as this would be a focus area for most stations), as are potential boundaries that extend to parcels beyond the highlighted areas that will be evaluated as the planning process proceeds.

The tasks set forth in the following pages may be modified by the parties without the need to amend this Agreement. Any changes to the tasks which are approved in writing by LACMTA shall be automatically incorporated into this Agreement.
**TASK 1—CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT**

**Duration: 3 months**

**TASK 1.1—Create List of Consultants and Selection Criteria**

The City Project Manager (PM) will develop lists of potential consultants for the RFPs. One RFP is to select an Administrative Consultant (AC), the other is for the Specific Plan Consultant (SPC) team.

Deliverables: Consultant lists; selection criteria; interview questions

**TASK 1.2—Develop and Issue RFPs**

The PM will develop RFPs for the AC and the SPC team, which will involve preparing a detailed statement of work and conducting a public bid process in order to secure a consultant that is qualified in transit-supportive development, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction measures, urban design, pedestrian and bicycle safety, and land use integration with transit operations. The consultant will be responsible for coordinating with Metro staff, administering the planning and environmental work, public outreach, and providing support for City staff in the plan adoption process.

Deliverables: Administrative Consultant RFP; Specific Plan Consultant RFP.

**TASK 1.3—Review Proposals and Conduct Interviews**

The PM will forward specific plan consultant and administrative consultant RFP responses to Metro. In consultation with Metro, the PM and City staff will review and select the best qualified responses and arrange interviews with those consulting teams. The PM and City staff will select the best qualified consultant in each category and inform Metro of the decisions.

Deliverables: Responses to RFPs; Notice of consultant selections.

**TASK 1.4—Negotiate and Execute Contracts**

The PM and City Attorney will negotiate professional service contracts with selected consultants. Contracts will be executed through the normal City procedures and recorded with the City Clerk. The PM will issue an order to commence work as soon as the necessary contracts are all in order.

Deliverables: Executed professional service contracts for both consultants.

**TASK 2—KICK-OFF MEETING**

**Duration: 1 month**

**TASK 2.1—Kick-Off Meeting with Consultant Team**

The PM and AC to lead kick-off meeting with full SPC team, Metro staff, and appropriate City personnel. The meeting will cover the following:
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• A full review of the work program objectives, tasks, products, and preliminary schedule;
• Discuss recent or current planning efforts by the City that may influence or support the work program and relevant Metro plans and toolkits related to transit-supportive development;
• Discuss the roles and responsibilities that relevant City agencies and departments will play in achieving the objectives of the work program, including type and frequency of required coordination;
• Establish a calendar for briefings of City departments;
• Confirm appropriate contacts within each organization

Deliverables: Meeting agenda and notes; Table summarizing relevant planning documents, current planning efforts, and specific opportunities for coordination with other agencies and departments; Confirmed schedule and budget and adjustments (if any).

**TASK 3—PROJECT MANAGEMENT**

**Duration: 28 months**

**TASK 3.1—Project Management**

The PM, with the assistance of the AC, will ensure that all work by SPC is performed to high standards and on schedule and on budget. The PM is responsible for ensuring that a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) is established and holds meetings bi-monthly. The PM will coordinate with the SPC to report to the CAC on progress, to transmit guidance and requests for further information back to the SPC, and to ensure that relevant guidance is incorporated into the specific plan documents. The PM will ensure that the SPC is reaching out to and communicating with community stakeholders and making appropriate efforts to consult with traditionally underrepresented communities. The PM will report progress to the Planning Commission and City Council regularly. The PM will be responsible for scheduling community workshops as well as public hearings at the end of the process.

Deliverable: None except as required by Task 3.2.

**TASK 3.2—Invoicing and Reporting to Metro**

The PM, with help from the AC, will prepare a detailed statement of work and conduct a public bid process in order to secure a consultant that is qualified in transit-supportive development, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction measures, urban design, pedestrian and bicycle safety, and land use integration with transit operations. The consultant will be responsible for coordinating with Metro staff, administering the planning and environmental work, public outreach, and providing support for City staff in the plan adoption process.

Deliverables: Quarterly Progress reports describing progress to date and highlighting expected completion date and anticipated delays; Quarterly Invoices for payment.
TASK 3.3—Weekly and Monthly Project Management Meetings

The PM, AC and Project Manager for the SPC will meet by conference call weekly to go over the schedule and to address project management-related issues. In addition, the PM and AC will meet monthly to review progress and to prepare for quarterly reports to Metro and invoicing.

Deliverables: Summary of meetings (may be incorporated into the Quarterly Progress Reports).

TASK 3.4—Presentations and Outreach Materials

Throughout the project, various materials will be developed for presentations and for public consumption through digital or print media. These items will be archived and incorporated into the Quarterly Progress Reports to Metro.

Deliverables: Print and digital media content, as well as slide shows, photographs and videos.

TASK 4—ANALYSIS AND MAPPING OF EXISTING CONDITIONS  

Duration: 5 months

TASK 4.1: Document Existing Conditions

Using Metro’s Transit Supportive Planning Toolkit’s 10 Characteristics of Transit Supportive Places as the foundation, the SPC will evaluate the existing conditions of the project area. As part of the existing conditions analysis, the SPC will inventory existing land uses, circulation patterns, environmental features, and mobility amenities, and identify opportunities and constraints related to transit-oriented development. The consultant will review applicable policy documents such as the General Plan and Climate Action Plan, current zoning regulations, relevant specific plans, and other related studies of the area. The presence of each of the 10 Characteristics of Transit-Supportive Development shall be addressed in the analysis and report.

Toolkit: Metro’s Transit Supportive Planning Toolkit

Deliverable: Summary report of data collected.

TASK 4.2: Map Relevant Existing Conditions

Based on Task 4.1, the SPC will map the existing conditions of the project area, including existing land uses, circulation patterns, environmental features, and mobility amenities, and identify opportunities and constraints related to transit-oriented development.

Deliverables: Existing conditions maps.

TASK 4.3: Prepare Analysis of Existing Conditions

The Specific Plan Consultant team and Staff will identify opportunity sites within the project area for transit-supportive developments, first/last mile improvements, or urban greening
strategies. Analysis will include a determination of whether the current zoning development standards can support transit-supportive development, and whether the current street classifications and design standards are consistent with complete streets that create a district that is safe for walking and cycling, and to consider green infrastructure (Green places toolkit). If zoning development standards, General Plan land uses, or street classifications are identified as obstacles or barriers to transit-oriented developments, the SPC shall prepare in the Existing Conditions Report a summary of the obstacles and how they impede TOD.

Staff and the consultant team will meet with Metro to review Metro’s Transit Supportive Planning “Toolkit” and other applicable policies and tools which may include the Countywide Sustainability Policy, First-Last Mile Strategic Plan, and the Green Places Toolkit, Metro will work in collaboration with Staff and the Consultant team to review these documents and identify strategies and practices that could be incorporated into the Specific Plan.

Toolkit: Building standards and design guidelines, Street standards and design guidelines, Community design overlay district

Deliverable: Existing conditions report.

**TASK 5—COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)  
Duration: 25 months**

**TASK 5.1: Establish a CAC of approximately 25 members**

A Community Advisory Committee, composed of a variety of stakeholders and community members will be created to guide policy decisions related to the specific plan development. The members will be volunteers representing various interests in the project area, including, representatives of the following groups:

- Green Line users (1)
- Bicycle advocacy groups (1)
- Pedestrian advocacy groups (1)
- Property owners within the project area (3)
- Major employers within the project area (2)
- Wiseburn and El Segundo school districts (2)
- United States Air Force (1)
- Environmental advocacy groups (1)
- City department representatives from Finance, Public Works, Police, Fire, Recreation & Parks, as well as representatives from the Environmental and Arts & Culture Committees (7)
- Public Utilities (1)
- Transportation providers other than Metro serving the project area (1)
- Commercial real estate expert (1)
- Sports and recreation advocacy groups (1)
- Residents associations from adjacent areas (1)
- Homeless advocacy groups (1)
The members of the CAC will be recruited by the SPC and the PM and will serve for the duration of the project.

Deliverable: Roster of CAC members and affiliations.

**TASK 5.2: Conduct Bi-Monthly CAC Meetings**

The CAC will meet every other month over a 24 month period beginning about 3-4 months after the kick-off meeting. Meetings will be organized by the PM and AC. The CAC will review work in progress and provide suggestions and feedback to the SPC. On more sensitive components of the work plan, namely housing, mobility, and economics, the CAC will provide initial guidance as well as review studies when nearing completion. The CAC will receive updates and make recommendations throughout the development of the specific plan and the urban design and street standards.

CAC meetings, although not subject to the Brown Act, will be open to the public and public input opportunities will be provided at each meeting.

The CAC meetings will be presided over by the PM or a member selected by the membership as the chairperson. Recommendations and guidance provided by the CAC will be summarized by the PM in written form and delivered to the SPC, and included in periodic reports made to the Planning Commission and City Council. Recommendations shall be by consensus wherever possible, and when not possible, a poll of CAC members shall be taken to gauge the relative support and dissent for recommendations. In such case, dissenting recommendations will also be presented to the SPC, PC and City Council.

The CAC schedule will be roughly as follows:

- Meeting 1—Existing Conditions Analysis; Draft Community Outreach Plan
- Meeting 2—Consultation and recommendations on Housing and Mobility Studies
- Meeting 3—Walk and Bike Audit; Parking Study
- Meeting 4—Housing Study; Consultation on Economic Study
- Meeting 5—Mobility Study; Vision, Goals, Objectives and Strategies; SP Framework
- Meeting 6—Consultation on Urban Design and Street Standards
- Meeting 7—Economic Study
- Meeting 8—Draft Environmental Impact Report
- Meeting 9—First review of Draft Specific Plan
- Meeting 10—Second review of Draft Specific Plan
- Meeting 11—Urban Design and Street Standards
- Meeting 12—Final Specific Plan

Deliverables: CAC meeting agendas, notes and presentation materials.
TASK 6—COMMUNITY OUTREACH AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT  
Duration: 26 months

TASK 6.1: Develop Outreach Plan and Marketing Strategy

The SPC, in collaboration with City staff, will develop a robust and innovative Outreach Plan that will establish a comprehensive and meaningful strategy for engaging community stakeholders in developing a shared vision for the plan area. The Outreach Plan will identify stakeholders (community groups, business owners, transit users, and active transportation (biking and walking) proponents, and other stakeholders as appropriate). The Outreach Plan will outline the methods by which stakeholders will be informed about and engaged in the project through multiple formats, as needed, including community charrettes, public workshops, stakeholder interviews, project website, and social media. The Outreach Plan will identify the key project milestones that will require stakeholder input and develop innovative and complementary engagement activities with the goal of building a broad spectrum of support for the plan. Particular attention will be given to reaching those most directly impacted by any proposed changes within the project area and those most difficult to reach through conventional means. The Plan will be evaluated by the CAC.

Toolkit: Transit Supportive Planning Toolkit: Outreach Tools

Deliverables: Outreach plan and Marketing Strategy.

TASK 6.2: Develop Online Platform and Update Content

SPC team will develop online resources that support outreach efforts and may include some or all of the following, as well as other approaches:
- Project specific website and content
- Project specific social media account and content
- Content for City’s use in newsletter and cable broadcasting
- Automatic email or text notification system

Deliverables: Online platform and content updates.

TASK 6.3: Conduct Small Group Stakeholder Meetings

SCP and City staff will conduct up to three focus group meetings with stakeholders that may include a) transit, bicycling, and walking organizations, b) members of the development community to obtain local input on the market for transit-oriented retail, office, and mixed-use development, and c) environmental organizations focused on greenhouse gas mitigation and climate resilience. The focus groups may be conducted prior to or concurrent with the workshops and charrettes described in Task 6.4.

The SPC will assist Staff in preparing for meetings with City elected officials and Planning Commissioners. These meetings will be conducted on an as-needed basis to keep the policy makers informed of the project progress and to solicit feedback as necessary throughout the project phases. SPC shall also assist City staff in preparing materials for a Planning Commission
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study session (possibly joint session with City Council), ideally during the process of preparing the draft plan.

**Toolkit:** Use multiple forms of communication; Making the Case to Elected Officials

**Deliverables:** Participant lists, agendas, staff reports and summaries.

**TASK 6.4: Conduct workshops, forums and charrettes**

SPC team will conduct at least three communitywide workshops, forums and participatory charrettes to directly engage the public in developing the vision, goals and objectives for the specific plan; develop key planning strategies and land use and transportation alternatives; discuss the preliminary findings of the background analysis and studies; identify opportunities and challenges for transit-supportive and community beneficial development; develop a vision for the project area; and, discuss possible strategies that can be used to reach that vision.

**Toolkit:** Best practice: Use visualizations, Visionering, Make it fun

**Deliverables:** Meeting agendas, presentation materials, conceptual renderings of future development options, and summary notes.

**TASK 6.5: Engage at Community Events Such as Farmer’s Market**

City staff will engage with community members at community events such as farmer’s markets, festivals, sporting events, school meetings, employee gatherings, business association meetings, etc. SPC will provide handout templates and other tools as needed and will participate at strategic points in the process.

**Deliverables:** Presentation materials and handouts.

**TASK 6.6: Conduct Pop-Up and Tactical Urbanism Events**

SPC team will conduct pop-up and tactical urbanism events that support the efforts to build public support for the plan or some aspect of it.

**Deliverables:** Documentation of actions and narrative summary of results.

**TASK 7—WALK AND BIKE AUDIT**

**Duration:** 5 months

**TASK 7.1: Facilitate a series of Walk and Bike Audits**

SPC team will facilitate a series of walk and bike audits to engage stakeholders and City staff in the evaluation of the existing walking and cycling conditions on city streets and access to private properties and buildings, including a walk and bike audit training on evaluation techniques and toolbox of solutions.
Walk and Bike Audit results will be presented to the CAC by the PM. Any guidance related to how to use the information in developing the specific plan or the urban design and street standards documents will be transmitted back to the SPC.

Toolkit: Bicycle Sharing Programs; Bike Stations.

Deliverables: Walk and Bike Audit Checklists; Route Maps and Summaries of Findings.

**TASK 8—PARKING STUDY**

**Duration: 5 months**

**TASK 8.1: Prepare Parking Study**

Building off of the existing conditions report, the SPC will conduct a parking study that analyzes existing and future parking supply and demand for private vehicles, car share, ride-hailing services, bicycles, electric scooters, LEVs and other relevant forms of mobility that require dedicated parking or loading. The study will include a complete inventory of the location, type (public, private, disabled) and hours of use of the parking available in the study area. The study will include a determination of both existing utilization and future demand; will identify locations with surplus or deficient supply of vehicular parking; and identify strategies, such as parking districts, shared use parking, park once strategies, and parking maximums.

An analysis of current supply and projected need for bicycle parking will also be provided. Based on the results of the study, adjustments to current parking standards, a parking management plan, or identification of potential locations for structured or subterranean parking, if applicable, will guide the implementation and policies of the plan.

Parking Study results will be presented to the CAC by the PM. Any guidance related to how to use the information in developing the specific plan or the urban design and street standards documents will be transmitted back to the SPC.

Toolkit: Traffic Calming; Car-Share Programs; Shared Parking; Innovative Parking Design; Parking Benefit Districts; Parking Management Districts; Parking Minimums and Maximums

Deliverables: Draft and Final Parking Studies.

**TASK 9—HOUSING STUDY**

**Duration: 9 months**

**TASK 9.1: Prepare Housing Study**

The SPC will conduct a housing feasibility and demand study that analyzes existing and future demand for housing. The study will acknowledge that there are virtually no housing units in the project area and any decision to change or maintain the General Plan policies and zoning related to housing must be made with a good understanding of the potential impacts to the City, the school districts, and utility providers. The intent of the Housing Study is not to promote
or discourage a change in housing policy for the project area, but instead to provide thorough and objective analysis of potential benefits and detriments for the elected officials to base their decisions on. The Housing Study must consider, at a minimum, the implications of housing policy on City and school districts’ finances and tax base, police and fire services, water, sewer and other utilities, and social impacts to the existing residents. The Housing Study must also address homelessness, affordability, and State regulations such as related to the Regional Housing Needs Assessment.

Housing Study results will be presented to the CAC by the PM. Any guidance related to how to use the information in developing the specific plan will be transmitted back to the SPC.

Toolkit: Inclusionary Zoning; Linkage Fees; Community Land Trusts; Joint Public/Private Development.

Deliverables: Draft and Final Housing Studies.

**TASK 10—MOBILITY STUDY**

**Duration: 9 months**

**TASK 10.1: Prepare Mobility Study**

The SPC team will prepare a mobility study that evaluates existing conditions for pedestrians, cyclists, transit riders and drivers; identifies deficiencies and barriers to mobility and access; and recommends improvements to mitigate those impacts. The study will be completed in consultation with the CAC and community stakeholders through community engagement process.

Mobility Study results will be presented to the CAC by the PM. Any guidance related to how to use the information in developing the specific plan and Urban Design and Street Standards will be transmitted back to the SPC.


Deliverables: Draft and Final Mobility Studies.

**TASK 11—ECONOMIC STUDY**

**Duration: 9 months**

**TASK 11.1: Prepare Economic Study**

The SPC team will prepare an Economic Study to identify the current and forecasted demand for various types of real estate development within the study area. The economic study shall determine the potential and implications for multi-family residential at various densities, retail, mixed use, office, institutional, and denser development of existing land uses that support transit ridership and benefit from transit proximity. The economic study will also analyze the impacts and benefits of various land uses on the economic wellbeing of the City, its local
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economy and its taxpayers. This includes, among other things, the economic impacts to the City of all the changes considered based on the previous studies. In particular, if housing is proposed, how that would affect City revenues, the cost of services, and administrative costs (such as to administer an affordable housing program). All will be completed in consultation with City staff, the CAC and community stakeholders through community engagement process.

Economic Study results will be presented to the CAC by the PM. Any guidance related to how to use the information in developing the specific plan will be transmitted back to the SPC.

Toolkit: New Markets Tax Credit; Special Districts; Fast Track Permitting, Fee Waivers, and Other Financial/Process Incentives; EIFD and CRIA

Deliverables: Draft and Final Economic Studies.

**TASK 12—ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

**Duration: 23 months**

**TASK 12.1: Prepare Initial Study and Notice of Preparation (NOP)**

The SPC will prepare an Initial Study and NOP, circulate the NOP as part of the early scoping effort, and submit the NOP to the State Clearinghouse and all trustee and responsible agencies.


**TASK 12.2: Public Scoping Meeting**

The consultant will conduct one public scoping meeting on issues addressed in the Initial Study.

Deliverables: Meeting agenda, presentation, notices and summary notes.

**TASK 12.3: Prepare Screencheck Draft EIR and Circulate for Comments**

The SPC will prepare a complete screencheck Draft EIR for review by staff prior to publication. The screencheck Draft EIR will include all text, tables, and figures. The consultant will then prepare a Draft EIR that incorporates the comments received from staff. The Draft EIR will be distributed to the public for review and comment. The Draft EIR will be presented to the CAC.

Deliverable: Draft EIR.

**TASK 12.4: Prepare Responses to Comments and Final EIR**

Following the completion of the public review comment period on the Draft EIR, the SPC will prepare responses to the comments and the Final EIR.

Deliverable: Final EIR, including responses to comments.
TASK 12.5: Prepare Statement of Overriding Considerations and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)

The SPC will prepare a Statement of Overriding Considerations (if required) and a draft Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) that will identify required mitigation measures, responsible implementing parties, and timeframe for implementation. After staff review, the consultant will prepare a Final MMRP that incorporates staff’s comments.

Deliverable: Final Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

TASK 12.6: Notice of Determination

Upon adoption of the Final EIR, the SPC will prepare the Notice of Determination and file with the appropriate agencies.

Deliverables: Notice of Determination, Proof of filing.

TASK 13—DEVELOP SPECIFIC PLAN

Duration: 23 months

TASK 13.1: Prepare Vision, Goals, Objectives and Strategies (VGOS) Report

Using existing conditions analysis, the Housing Study, Mobility Study, Walk and Bike Audits, Parking Study, the and Economic Study, as well as the accumulated inputs from stakeholders, the SPC team will prepare a Vision, Goals, Objectives and Strategies report.

Deliverable: Visions, Goals, Objectives and Strategies Report

TASK 13.2: Develop Framework for Plan

The SPC team will develop a framework and outline for the Specific Plan that meets with the State Specific Plan requirements with an organization and chapters that are easy to understand to the public and efficient to administer by city staff upon adoption.

Deliverables: Draft and Final Plan Framework.

TASK 13.3: Prepare Draft Specific Plan

The SPC team will develop a Draft TOD Specific Plan. The Specific Plan will include all required components of a specific plan including land use maps, zoning and development standards, parking requirements, street standards and cross sections, urban design standards, and sustainable design requirements. City staff will announce the release of the Draft TOD Specific Plan and related Draft General Plan Land Use Map to the public and provide the opportunity to comment. Based on comments and feedback from staff, Metro, the community, and various stakeholders, the SPC will prepare a Final Draft Land Use Policy Map and TOD Specific Plan.
Consultant Team will also coordinate with outside agencies and adjacent jurisdictions. Team will develop alternative land use and transportation scenarios that can be reviewed and evaluated for their strengths and weaknesses by the team and stakeholders during the community outreach and engagement process.

The SPC and City staff will present the Draft Specific Plan to the Planning Commission and the City Council as informational items (not public hearings) to solicit comments and suggestions. Comments from the Planning Commission and City Council will be incorporated into the Specific Plan and EIR.

Toolkit: TOD specific plan

Deliverables: Draft Specific Plan; Correspondence, agendas, and summaries of meetings.

**TASK 13.4: Prepare Final Specific Plan**

Based on comments and feedback from staff, Metro, the community, and various stakeholders, the consultants will prepare a Final Draft Land Use Policy Map and TOD Specific Plan.

Deliverable: Final Specific Plan.

**TASK 14—URBAN DESIGN AND STREET STANDARDS**

**Duration: 14 months**

**TASK 14.1: Prepare Urban Design and Street Standards**

The SPC will prepare an Urban Design and Street Standards report that will offer strategies that focus on design elements of the built environment in TOD districts. These strategies should encourage design used in development projects and streetscape improvements that improve the built environment to be more conducive to walking, public life, transit use, and neighborhood identity.

Toolkit: Building Standards and Design Guidelines; Streetscape Standards and Design Guidelines; Community Design Overlays

Deliverables: Draft and Final Urban Design and Street Standards.

**TASK 15—FINAL PRESENTATIONS TO DECISION MAKERS**

**Duration: 5 months**

**TASK 15.1: Public Hearings for Specific Plan and EIR**

The SPC and City staff will prepare the necessary materials to facilitate the public hearing process before the Planning Commission, including, but not limited to, a public hearing notice staff report, presentation, and draft resolutions. Following approval by the Planning Commission, the SPC and City staff will prepare the necessary materials to facilitate the public
hearing process before City Council, including staff reports, presentations, draft resolutions and ordinances, and all required CEQA documents.

Deliverables: Public hearing package. If approved, also the signed resolutions, ordinances, adopted Specific Plan and Certified EIR.
## ATTACHMENT A

### Transit Supportive Planning Toolkit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 Transit Supportive Planning Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compact Design</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complete Neighborhoods</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street &amp; Network Connectivity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Layout, Parking Layout &amp; Building Design</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordable Housing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial Stabilization, Business Retention &amp; Expansion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Prioritization, Accessibility &amp; Area Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritizing transit and active transportation as the first and highest priority of a circulation network may result in increased transit service, through better travel times and speeds, which can result in significant transit ridership improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Demand Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM strategies influence a variety of factors to encourage greater transportation system efficiency, including trip mode, trip timing, travel safety, and trip cost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPLICATION

Project Information

El Segundo Transit Corridor Plan

**Title**: Green Line Aviation, Mariposa, El Segundo and Douglas Stations

**Transit Line(s)/Station(s)/Corridor(s)**: Imperial Highway on the north, Aviation Blvd and the City of El Segundo boundary on the east, Rosecrans Blvd on the south boundary and Sepulveda Blvd on the west.

**Boundaries (Continued)**

**4th District Janice Hahn**

**Supervisory District(s)**

Applicant Information

**City of El Segundo**

**Sponsor(s)**

**Greg Carpenter, City Manager**

**Executive Director & Title**

**Gregg McClain, Planning Manager**

**Contact Person & Title**

350 Main Street

**Mailing Address**

El Segundo, CA 90245

**City & Zip Code**

gmcclain@elsegundo.org

**E-mail Address(s)**

310.524.2393

**Telephone Number**

Funding Information

**Grant Funds Requested**: $659,500.00

**Local Match - Cash (if any)**: $300,000.00

**Local Match - In-Kind (if any)**: $70,000.00

**Other Sources (if any)**: $

**Total Project Cost**: $1,029,500.00

**Source**: LACMTA

**City of El Segundo General Fund**

**Type**: City of El Segundo Staff Time

---

*Project title not to exceed 60 characters. This title will be used on all Metro summary listings. The purpose of this title is to avoid confusion by attaching an easily identifiable project title that will remain consistent throughout the selection process and, should funds be awarded, through the life of the project.

**The e-mail address you provide will be used for notification of application status, so it must be accurate. Any change to the e-mail address must be reported to Desiree Portillo Robins at portillo@metro.net.*
The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) has released Round 5 of the TOD Planning Grant Program (Grant Program) to support municipalities across LA County to advance comprehensive transit-supportive planning efforts. Metro has a vested interest in planning efforts around transit stations that promote, encourage and support transit riders and the interface between public transportation and surrounding communities.

Metro’s Transit Supportive Planning Toolkit (Toolkit) will be the basis for how Metro will evaluate grant applications for Metro’s Grant Program and how grant-funded planning efforts are advanced. Interested parties must demonstrate how their proposed project will advance Metro’s goals of encouraging transit supportive planning efforts and increasing transit ridership. Information on the Toolkit can be found online at metro.net/projects/tod-toolkit.

Transit supportive places are areas where the presence of effective and predictable transit can be enhanced through appropriate patterns and types of development. This can be achieved through practices such as community-scaled density, diverse land use mix, reduced reliance upon private automobiles, and enhanced infrastructure for pedestrians, bicyclists and people of all ages and abilities.

The following chart gives a brief description of the Toolkit’s 10 characteristics of transit supportive places:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher density, especially within a quarter or half mile of a transit facility, can impact travel behavior by providing more opportunities to live in close proximity to transit.</td>
<td>Compact neighborhoods include a variety of housing options, retail and commercial services, and community services. Complete neighborhoods bring land uses and amenities closer together, reduce travel distances, and allow for more non-automobile trips.</td>
<td>Well connected streets and non-automobile networks bring destinations closer together, reduce travel distances, and improve pedestrian and bicycle access to adjacent areas and uses.</td>
<td>Placing buildings towards the edges of streets and public spaces help create walkable urban environments.</td>
<td>Low-income residents often have some of the highest rates of transit ridership. Adding new affordable housing near transit can improve access to employment, health care and education opportunities, and reduce commuting cost for low-income families.</td>
<td>Complete neighborhoods include a variety of housing options, retail and commercial services, and community services. Complete neighborhoods bring land uses and amenities closer together, reduce travel distances, and allow for more non-automobile trips.</td>
<td>Commercial stabilization measures can help protect and encourage existing small, local businesses that serve the needs of neighborhood residents.</td>
<td>Prioritizing transit and active transportation as the first and highest priority of a circulation network may result in increased transit service, through better travel times and speeds, which can result in significant transit ridership improvements.</td>
<td>Efficient parking management can reduce the parking supply needed, allowing an increase in land use intensity, mix of uses, wider sidewalks and bike networks.</td>
<td>TDM strategies influence a variety of factors to encourage greater transportation system efficiency, including trip mode, trip timing, travel safety and trip cost.</td>
<td>Adding pedestrian and bicycle amenities to station areas and connecting those facilities to the surrounding area can create a more accessible transit environment, encouraging new riders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metro will evaluate grant applications based on:

1) The proposed project area’s existing conditions and challenges as it pertains to the 10 characteristics of transit supportive places.

2) How the proposed project will address and mitigate these challenges, with respect to each Toolkit characteristic and the various Toolkit Tools and Best Practices.

Metro recommends that applicants familiarize themselves with the TOD Grant Program Guidelines and the Toolkit and use them as the framework for responding to the application questions.
Section 1: Project Scope/Description (UP TO 10 POINTS)

1. Provide a concise description of the proposed project area, targeted communities, and specific transit stations and/or corridors the project will impact. Additionally:
   
   a. Identify specific transit line(s), station(s) the proposed project may impact and briefly discuss their significance to the local community and larger region’s transit connectivity, access and ridership.
   
   b. Describe the most pressing barriers to public transportation usage and non-private vehicle multi-modalism (walking, rolling, biking, etc.).
   
   c. Describe prominent community equity concerns (lack of affordable housing, economic development, environmental justice, safety, active transportation needs, public health disparities, etc.).

2. Attach a proposed project area map(s) that illustrates the half-mile radius or adjacent transit corridors around the qualifying station(s) to demonstrate project area eligibility and opportunity sites.

El Segundo is divided into distinct quadrants separated by major thoroughfares. All the housing and civic functions in the city are contained within the northwestern quadrant, while the southwestern quadrant is the site of the Chevron refinery. The eastern quadrants together are the focus of the El Segundo Transit Corridor Plan. The Corridor is a thriving employment center -- home to major aerospace, technology and telecommunications companies. Land uses, street patterns and streetscape in the corridor were shaped by a suburban, single-use, car-oriented development concept. The context, since the area was designed, has entirely changed, resulting in pressing demands for new land use and transportation planning. The city faces an opportunity to build on and continue the Corridor's success towards a new phase of its development. See Project Area maps 2A - 2K attached.

The proposed El Segundo Transit Corridor Plan is bounded on the north by Imperial Highway, on the east by Aviation Boulevard, on the south by Rosecrans Avenue, on the west by Sepulveda Boulevard, and is bisected by El Segundo Boulevard into northern and southern halves, respectively zoned commercial and industrial. White and blue collar employees, current and future residents of the city, employers, property owners, adjoining cities and the sub-region would benefit from the project. The Corridor Specific Plan would increase ridership for Metro buses and at four Metro Green Line Stations – Aviation, Mariposa, El Segundo and Douglas - that extend north-south through the Corridor.

a) The four Green Line stations, two along Nash (Mariposa and El Segundo), one on Douglas and another just outside the city (Aviation/LAX) together have a daily ridership of around 25,000. The bus lines in the Corridor are operated by Metro, Torrance Transit, Culver City Bus and Big Blue Bus (see Attachment 2E Transit Routes & Stops Map). Currently, around 90% of workers in the corridor drive to work alone. If the built environment in the Corridor provided better conditions for walking and biking, less parking and a better range of amenities fostered by a greater variety of land uses, more employees would be able to take transit to their jobs. Residents in El Segundo and adjoining communities, would take better advantage of the valuable asset of Metro light rail and bus lines to access jobs outside of the city.

b) The most pressing barriers to transit use and viability of non-car modes in the Corridor are extremely large properties with perimeter security fencing, lack of housing, and large parking lots separating properties. Facilities including the LA Air Force Base, Northrup Grumman, Raytheon, Boeing and nearby LAX will inevitably continue to be of high-demand by car. The high concentration of office, industrial and institutional workers face a lack of accessible pedestrian routes to supportive uses like retail and food. All major thoroughfares are heavily used truck routes with fast moving traffic, discouraging bikes or other rolling modes. The only cycling infrastructure, an unprotected Class II facility, is on Imperial Highway. Active heavy-rail corridors crisscross the southern portion of the Corridor. Streets are devoid of trees and lighting. The nearest residents to any Green Line station are over 1/2 mile away, and access to the elevated stations is encumbered by grade separation. Outdated circulation policies in the General Plan encourage grade-separated pedestrian facilities, ignoring street-level connectivity. The Walk Score from the Metro ATSP (out of 100) in station areas is 32 (El Segundo), 36 (Mariposa), 52 (Douglas) and 35 (Aviation/LAX) (See Attachments 2J.1 - 2K.4).

c) The key equity issues are pollution, affordable housing, and active transportation. Proximity to several industrial and light uses, such as the refinery, as well as LAX, contribute to air and noise pollution in the city. El Segundo is a business-friendly city led by employment. It has a worker population of roughly 65k (LEHD, 2014) and about 16.5k residents (ACS, 2016). Only about 1,700 people live and work in the city. Most workers commute from nearby South Bay cities, however 40% travel over 25 miles. Low-income workers may be not be able to afford housing near work, as the median home sales price, roughly $1 million, is over $500k higher than the County overall (Nielsen Co., 2016). The city’s 7,427 housing units (ACS, 2016) are all located in the northwestern quadrant. This area is over 1/2 mile from the Green Line stations, and there are no viable local transportation options to access rail and bus lines without a car. The specific plan area also lacks cohesive active transportation infrastructure.
Section 2: Existing Conditions and Regulatory Constraints (Up to 10 Points)

1. Using the 10 characteristics below, provide clear and specific description of the proposed project area's existing conditions and regulatory constraints to creating an equitable transit supportive place.

Compact Design

The Specific Plan area is overwhelmingly made up of sprawling one or two story office buildings, along with some four or five story structures, set back from roads and separated by parking lots. Major streets such as Sepulveda Boulevard feature buildings around 20 stories tall. Structures stand as separate objects, and don't form a unified streetscape. Large private campuses, such as Raytheon, Northrop Grumman and the Air Force, are major physical barriers.

Complete Neighborhoods

The specific plan area has only commercial and industrial land uses, with no housing. Beyond offices and manufacturing facilities, there are hotels, private recreation facilities including a golf course and ice-skating center, a movie theatre, gas stations, strip malls and shopping and dining in large, vibrant retail centers including a "lifestyle center". All of these uses, including dining options, are designed for access by car.

Street & Network Connectivity

Distances as long as a mile separate destinations within the Corridor. While there are sidewalks on most streets, they are narrow and lack street trees, buffers and parkways, pedestrian lighting & shade at bus stops. There are no public pathways for those on foot or bike through the islands of private land. Low intersection density (Metro ATSP score of 6-16 out of 100) results in travel by car even for short distances and contributes to traffic congestion. The Green Line is an aerial alignment that creates a barrier along Nash and Douglas streets. The heavy freight rail lines create another barrier in the southern half of the Corridor.

Site Layout, Parking Layout & Building Design

With few exceptions, building design in the Corridor is corporate and indistinguishable. Some recently built and planned new buildings hold greater promise for the standard of design, but current site planning overwhelmingly features a sea of parking. Fenced properties and buildings set far back from the curb without "eyes on the street" create an unfriendly walking environment -- with difficult access by foot or bike and no direct connections to public transportation.

Affordable Housing

While El Segundo has been able to meet, and plans to exceed, its "fair share" of affordable housing (according to the RHNA), the sub-region and region overall are suffering from an acute shortage of housing. This means long and expensive commutes, and lack of convenient access to jobs, particularly for low-income workers. In the long run, it also limits reliable access to quality workers for employers in El Segundo.

Commercial Stabilization, Business Retention & Expansion

Commercial stabilization measures help protect and encourage existing small, local businesses that serve the needs of neighborhood residents. Retail needs in the Corridor are mostly served by chain stores, and current retail business stabilization measures are only directed to Main Street, in the northwest, residential quadrant of the city. The city has a strong well established commercial office expansion program to promote new creative, biomed, high tech, data and other businesses in the project area and the rest of the city.
Transit Prioritization, Accessibility & Area Design

The Green Line is elevated, creating design challenges for pedestrian access to the area at grade below the stations and long walks up stairs or use of elevators. Pedestrian and bike connectivity to the stations is seriously lacking. The Corridor’s private walkways are not geared to transit access, and distances between destinations are far. There are no dedicated bus lanes and no transit signal prioritization. The schedule for buses serves commuters, with only sparse night and weekend service. The local shuttle follows a circuitous fixed route, only operates on weekdays at lunch, and doesn’t serve the Metro light rail stations.

Parking Management

Expanses of surface parking lots, both for corporate campuses and shopping centers, are underutilized for portions of the day and week. Most parcels in the Corridor have their own parking lots, and there is no on street parking. Much of the land in the Corridor is taken up by parking, reinforcing the dependence on the car with a land use that neither directly generates revenue for the city nor serves more beneficial purposes.

Transportation Demand Management

The city’s current TDM strategies only address parking for carpool vehicles. They do not incentivize transit passes or otherwise offer substantive transit encouragement. The city does not yet engage in a number of regional best practices to increase transit use.

Pedestrian & Bicycle Circulation

The city has many planned on-street bike facilities - see Attachment 21 but only one has been implemented on Imperial Hwy and there are no off-street bike paths. Facilities for bicycles & pedestrians are inadequate, and do not constitute a viable network to access destinations in the Corridor. There are few accommodations in the station walk shed, such as wayfinding, shade, street trees or lighting. Sidewalks and bike riders are next to fast moving traffic, and pedestrains and cyclists have to cross very wide, busy thoroughfares. Signalization at intersections prioritizes automobile movements over active transportation modes.

2. What existing regulatory constraints preclude the jurisdiction from addressing the equity issues identified in Section 1, Question 1c (above)?

The City's Land Use Element has not been updated since 1992, the Housing Element since 2009 and the Circulation Element since 2004. Because many of these plans were adopted before widespread recognition of the importance of strong relationships between land use and transportation, and jobs and housing, the plans do not adequately support, encourage and promote the use of public transportation or active transportation modes. A challenge for the city in terms of equity, is the fact that existing Green Line riders are mainly transit-dependent, low-wage workers who live far from their jobs in El Segundo and must commute long distances to get to work. Their needs are not addressed in the current polices, programs and improvements in the city. Once Green Line riders leave the station platform they must take long stairways and ramps (1/4 mile long) to access narrow sidewalks (3-4 feet) without street trees where they have to walk next to high speed traffic (45 MPH and higher) along streets devoid of activity and life with limited safe access to buildings and work sites. This inequity has been created by the focus on moving and parking cars at the expense of moving people and creating places. Although there are four Green Line light rail stations located in this part of El Segundo, with over 25,000 riders/day, the City’s planning documents and policies do not acknowledge the incredible transportation resource that the Green Line provides to the city. The Green Line provides the city’s residents and workers with unparalleled access to the region’s transit system, directly connecting the South Bay with the Gateway Cities; with a transfer to the Blue Line to DTLA and Long Beach; via the Silver Line to USC/Expo Park and DTLA; and via the Red, Purple, Gold, Expo and Orange Lines to many other regions of the county. When the Crenshaw/LAX Line opens in 2019, area residents and workers will be the envy of the South Bay. Nearby cities will have the potential to grow and develop a stronger sense of place with additional housing and job opportunities along with greater amenities that will come to support more residents and workers. Along with new transit access comes the opportunity for cities to focus less on moving cars and more on making places for people. Streets that currently only serve as conduits for vehicular movement can become lively energized corridors of activity with protected bike lanes, pedestrians promenades with cafes, shops, and entertainment. The Specific Plan can help to create a more equitable El Segundo with more housing and job opportunities with strong transit and active transportation connections.
3. Using the Toolkit Tools and Best Practices, describe the specific regulatory documents that will require revision and/or new regulatory documents that will be developed as part of the proposed project.

A new Specific Plan for the project area (see Project Area Maps in Attachment 2) will be developed through a strong and dynamic community-based engagement process that will consider all of Metro’s 10 transit supportive planning elements, as detailed below in Section 3.4, to encourage and support transit riders, reduce vehicles miles traveled and develop a synergistic interface between public transportation and the surrounding communities within the eastern portion of El Segundo. The Plan will build on the interrelationship between the 10 transit supportive planning elements to comprehensively address the project area’s strengths and challenges to: increasing transit ridership and improved access to transit; reducing GHG emissions and improving air quality; creating more livable places and active environments with safe and easily accessible multi-modal connections; balancing land uses to support sustainable development; promoting and preserving local businesses; increasing economic benefits to the City, residents and businesses; and creating a more equitable environment for residents, workers and visitors.

To assure a comprehensive review of the existing conditions, issues and challenges, the development of the plan will include: a Housing Study to evaluate the feasibility of adding housing in this currently non-residential section of the city; an Economic Study to investigate the opportunities for business stabilization, retention and expansion and build on the work of the Economic Development Advisory Council; a Mobility Study and a Parking Study to analyze the safety and mobility needs of all road users, especially pedestrians, cyclists and transit riders; as well as study on and off street parking utilization and future needs assessment. A Program EIR will be completed to fulfill the plan’s CEQA obligation and to streamline the processing of subsequent discretionary projects by obviating the need for additional environmental documentation.

The new regulatory document will allow the City to: provide a detailed vision, policies and principles to guide the growth and development of the transit corridor; directly regulate the distribution, location and extent of uses of land in the Plan area; detail the major components of public and private transportation and public utilities; create design and development standards to ensure quality development that enhances the character of the transit corridor and the larger community; establish design standards for pedestrian, cyclist and other non-auto modes circulation and accessibility; create incentives to reduce vehicle miles traveled through TDM strategies; and outline a series of implementation measures including regulations, programs and public works projects and financing measures necessary to carry out the Plan.

The Plan will include an explanation of the relationship of the Plan to the General Plan and other planning documents. It should be noted that portions of the Project Area currently have other regulatory documents, including Specific Plans, that control development within those geographic areas, however the proposed El Segundo Transit Corridor Plan will supersede those plans and will potentially replace some of those existing plans. (See Attachment 2G Specific Plan/Overlay Zone Map).

The Specific Plan is proposed to include at least the following chapters:
- Executive Summary; Introduction and Purpose; Current Context; Vision and Guiding Principles; Urban Form, Open Space and Street Network; Land Use; Circulation and Mobility; Art and Culture; Economic Stability; Utility Infrastructure; Transportation Demand Management Rules and Regulations; Development Standards and Land Use Regulations; Design Standards & Guidelines for Blocks, Streets, Street Wall & Ground Floor, Access & Parking, Architecture, On-site Open Space, Landscape & Storm Water Treatment, Streetscape Improvements, Signage and Cultural Amenities; and Implementation. The plan will be supported with detailed exhibits including: maps, images, diagrams, tables, 3D sketches and street sections.

The Specific Plan will be adopted by the City Council as an ordinance that will control all private development and public infrastructure construction in the Project Area. The City’s Zoning Maps and Ordinance will also be updated. The City will establish procedures for how the Specific Plan will be implemented and administered to assure effective oversight of the adopted regulations.
4. Describe how the proposed project will address, mitigate and/or improve the challenges described in Section 2 for each of the 10 characteristics. How will the project accomplish the goals set forth in the Toolkit for creating transit supportive places? If not applicable, please state why.

**Compact Design**

| The Specific Plan has the potential to designate land within the walk shed of Metro light rail for more compact and denser development, of either commercial and/or residential buildings. Based on stakeholder input, concentrating development, instead of letting it spread out, might be a key outcome of the planning process. With new tools for shaping development, the city could potentially increase the number of people within walking distance to transit. Alternatives considered may include taller buildings, and/or a more tight-knit pattern of development. |

**Complete Neighborhoods**

| The public and stakeholders will consider a broad range of alternatives including new mixed and residential uses, diversifying the amenities available to employees, and influencing the massing and form of new buildings, sites and streetscapes. According to the result of discussions with the community, introducing housing to the area may emerge as an option since it has the potential to offer current and future workers at all income levels a shorter commute. Stakeholders could consider the scenario of increasing the number of housing units locally, and addressing the regional housing crisis in Los Angeles. |

**Street & Network Connectivity**

| With community input, the Plan will lay groundwork for higher intersection density, and together with revised zoning and land use, bring origins and destinations closer together. Pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, and the continuity of the network, and how it connects to bus and light rail transit, could become a focus. Already planned bicycle routes can be adapted to make the most of updated streets and crossings. Outreach about streetscapes could result in greater safety for active modes. Networks that take into account bicycles and pedestrians could connect to the residential side of the city and adjoining cities. |

**Site Layout, Parking Layout & Building Design**

| The Specific Plan could result in better use of land currently given over to outdated facilities and parking, by including new offices and/or housing. Stakeholders could guide developers to build entrances with direct, close and convenient access to sidewalks and make their buildings part of an ensemble, instead of solitary objects. Design guidelines could help developers leverage site design to meet the needs, for safety and access, of pedestrians and cyclists. Excellent transitions and connections extending from spaces, and uses, inside buildings, outside and into the public realm may shape the area's future identity. |

**Affordable Housing**

| The city can benefit from a new planning toolkit to envision, discuss & analyze the option of housing in the Corridor, along with related uses like schools and healthcare facilities. Housing is in short supply in the sub-region and region, making the Corridor an invaluable opportunity to consider a new land use and building type in an area currently without housing. Housing could decrease dependence on the car, and activate the Corridor on weekends and evenings, providing new customers for local retail and entertainment. The nearby Metro Green Line and buses could meet residents' transportation needs. |

**Commercial Stabilization, Business Retention & Expansion**

| Commercial stabilization has the potential to ensure that workers and any new residents in the Corridor have ongoing access to retail destinations such as convenience stores, grocery stores and dining options within walking distance of existing development and the transit stations and bus stops. With stakeholder input, the crafting of successful policy will also increase the number and diversity of small, local businesses and contribute to cohesion of the area as a lively retail corridor with a distinct identity and can help to create a sense of place that will lead to the development of a true neighborhood. |
Transit Prioritization, Accessibility & Area Design

El Segundo could introduce a flexible, on-demand shuttle to serve the Corridor and connect it to the northwestern quadrant of the City. New bus lanes, signal prioritization, shade/seating at bus stops could help the bus system. Design guidelines can consider the relationship of buildings to the pedestrian network and area around stations along with wayfinding, shade, street trees, landscaping and storm water management. These support access on foot and bike - importantly, to transit. Conditions at grade across the elevated light rail corridor may be revised to ensure pedestrian and bike comfort and safety.

Parking Management

Study and outreach for the Corridor Specific Plan can potentially result in the reduction of surface parking and infill with commercial or other uses. Discussions with stakeholders in the planning process could result in lower parking requirements for new construction in order to shift the reliance for commuting from driving alone to transit and active modes. New parking regulations could potentially encourage transit use and carpooling, and reduce traffic in the region. On street parking will be an alternative to parking in private structures and lots, and parking meters on streets will be considered to generate revenue.

Transportation Demand Management

New guidelines and regulations can potentially introduce, according to scenario analysis of projected outcomes, a transportation impact fee for both new construction and substantial renovations. They could also encourage employee transit passes. The City may take the Transit Corridor Plan as an opportunity to study and make actionable regional best practices for Transportation Demand Management. These may include participation in a Transportation Management Organization (TMO). The potential is for an enforceable set of TDM policies.

Pedestrian & Bicycle Circulation

The Corridor Plan will bring stakeholders to consider how to increase bike and pedestrian mobility, safety and comfort. It can study how to reinforce non-car circulation, center it on transit facilities, direct efforts toward the key objective of increased transit use and review/revise access in the area around the elevated Metro Green Line. The City and stakeholders have the potential to build on existing plans, including Metro’s ATSP, which incorporates the SB Bike Master Plan. The City can also build on Metro’s Slow Speed Network (see Attachment 5), and support the range of on street and sidewalk non-car modes.

How will the project accomplish the goals set forth in the Toolkit for creating transit supportive places?
If not applicable, please state why.

The project will develop a community-generated Specific Plan that incorporates all the above stated transit supportive planning principles. To help inform the community-based process, the project will be initiated with focused studies on Housing, Economic, and Mobility/Parking Studies to provide the city and stakeholders with up-to-date information, data and mapping related to key issues facing the project area. The formation of a Community Advisory Committee (CAC), as outlined in Section 4, and the early workshops and other community engagement events will involve the public from the beginning of the project.
Section 4: Public Participation (UP TO 20 POINTS)

Inclusive public engagement is imperative to successful planning. Over the course of this program, we have learned that the most successful projects are established by meaningfully engaging stakeholders early on and throughout the process. Equity is a prominent concern across the county. To accurately address equity, grantees must ensure community stakeholders, including disadvantaged/underserved stakeholders, are at the table to support decision-makers in identifying equity concerns and policy recommendations. This will largely be influenced by when and how community stakeholders are engaged.

1. Describe the proposed project’s targeted communities and existing population. Identify key stakeholders and community organizations (advocacy groups, business groups, religious/social organizations, etc.) that will be impacted by the proposed project and describe the applicant’s experience working with these groups OR how these groups will be engaged in this process.

To assure that the Specific Plan has the support of the diverse business and residential communities of El Segundo, the project will consistently engage all stakeholders in a meaningful community-based process that goes to where people are and that relates to the lives of the people who live, work and play in the city.

Stakeholders include, but are not limited to the following:
Large employers (Raytheon, US Air Force, Boeing, Northrop Grumman, Chevron, Mattel, etc) representatives from their corporate, government affairs, facilities planning, safety/security and transportation coordination departments; employees from various industries including: office, light industry, manufacturing, aerospace, data, software, high tech, creative, biomed, airport, hotels (including unionized), long-term hotels, entertainment, sports, retail and restaurant; governmental agencies including LAX, South Bay Cities Council of Governments, Caltrans, Metro, City of LA Bureau of Sanitation, LA County Public Health Department, utilities including Edison, West Basin Municipal Water District, and Southern Pacific and ATSF Railroads; representatives from adjacent cities – Hawthorne, Manhattan Beach, Los Angeles, Inglewood; downtown business owners, small and mid-size retailers, Chamber of Commerce; Nonprofits and community serving organizations representing affordable housing, pedestrians and cyclists (South Bay Bicycle Coalition), safe routes to schools, urban forestry, housing, renters, homeless advocates; religious and educational institutions; recreational and social service facilities; and the Economic Development Advisory Council (EDAC) that includes representatives from the aerospace, real estate, hospitality and marketing industries as well as business owners and developers.

The stakeholders will be engaged in all stages of the community-based engagement process. A key group of approximately 25 stakeholders will be identified to represent the broader group on a Community Advisory Committee (CAC) that will work closely with the City and the Specific Plan Consultant Team to develop the vision and goals for the plan, the public outreach plan and the specific plan itself. The CAC will meet regularly (approximately bi-monthly) to assure consistent input from the public in all phases of the Specific Plan development process.

The City currently engages residents, employees, and business and property owners in various policies, programs and projects through outreach tools including Survey Monkey, the City’s Website, their Facebook page and Nixel as well as at the weekly Farmer’s Market in Downtown area. Many past programs and projects have utilized advisory committees, such as the one proposed for the Specific Plan, made up of community leaders and representatives. As mentioned above, the EDAC involves community representatives on a monthly basis with city staff and elected officials to help chart the course for business opportunities across the city.

The City has the unique opportunity to engage sports fans in the future development of the city with the two sports franchises - the Lakers and the Kings - training facilities located in the Project Area. Many of the Lakers and Kings team members live in South Bay communities and have a vested interest in the future growth and development of El Segundo and the transit connections that can be made in the future from their training facilities in El Segundo to their arena at the Staples Center in DTLA via Green Line to Crenshaw/LAX Line to the Expo Line.

Another opportunity to collaborate comes from the art community in El Segundo. The El Segundo Museum of Art (ESMoA) has spearheaded an effort they call ELSEUNDOISSIMO which is capturing the artistic spirit of residents and others eager to explore what the future of El Segundo can be like. They can be an ideal partner for community outreach and engagement. The city already supports their engagement with the creative side of El Segundo (see Attachment 6 for article about ESMoA).
2. Outline a comprehensive, meaningful public participation and outreach plan that will bring the proposed regulatory changes forward. Describe how disadvantaged and/or underserved communities will be engaged in the process, specifying creative and proactive activities that will be undertaken to ensure their participation, and the identification and recommendations around community-specific equity issues. How will the project team make the case for this planning work? Use the Toolkit’s ‘Making the Case’ information as a resource.

Building on sound principles of community engagement, the project will engage participants early and consistently through to the adoption of the plan by City Council. In later phases, community engagement will continue into implementation.

As outlined in Metro’s Transit Supportive Places Best Practices Outreach Tools, the Team will make the most of the following community engagement tools: a clear outreach plan, defensible data, multiple modes of communication, new technologies for outreach, visualization tools, and activities to make engagement fun. The process will re-frame the discussion to consider multiple alternatives, build coalitions and identify project champions. Outreach will be personally relevant to participants, and equity and inclusion will be important considerations.

The CAC will integrate public input from the beginning of the project to assure that the process is not top down. Regular meetings will assure that the input of the public is integrated with the work of the City and Consultant Team.

In addition to the CAC, the outreach program will do just that — reach out. The Team will go to where people are: where they work; where they eat lunch; where they go to school and recreate; where they shop and go for entertainment and sports events; where they park their car or ride the train or bus; where they meet, etc. Team members will go to shopping malls, farmers markets, Metro Green Line stations and bus stops, cafes and restaurants, golf courses and skating rinks, parks and playgrounds, PTA meetings, walking and cycling clubs, church socials, carnivals and festivals. Anywhere people are, the Team will follow.

Forms of engagement will reach people on a human and personal level with enjoyable interactive and participatory workshops, lively forums, community visioning charrettes, walk and bike audits, pop-up events, temporary “tactical urbanism” installations, youth and other focus group activities. Outreach events can be held in concert with sports and entertainment activities such as a Lakers or Kings training days, kids soccer games, outdoor movie night, office-related league baseball games, and other activities.

Organized larger events will bring the diverse stakeholders together to hear ideas and challenges from each other and to develop a common vision for the project area that supports the ambition of the city to enhance the connectivity through strengthening the sense of place and reaping the benefits of a multi-modal transportation network.

To assure that disadvantaged and/or under-served communities will be engaged in the process, proactive activities will be undertaken to engage these populations. The project team will include translators, materials will be prepared in multiple languages, meetings will be held when people are available in the evenings and/or weekends, and events will be held at schools, parks, places where people eat lunch and where they work. The project team will partner with organizations who have the trust of the local individuals and groups, including: hotel unions, business associations, active transportation and transit advocates, affordable housing advocates, equity and environmental justice organizations, renters’ rights groups, homeowner associations, neighborhood groups, and others.

During the development of the Specific Plan, a series of land use and transportation alternatives will be considered by the Team and the stakeholders that create different scenarios for the mix of land uses and transportation improvements in the project area. The stakeholders will be provided with research and data to help inform them on making sound decisions and recommendations. The Team will utilize strong graphic and communications techniques to clearly communicate the different land use and transportation alternatives.
3. Provide evidence of community stakeholder and policy maker support for the types of regulatory changes being proposed; this may include a description of prior actions or plans implementing similar changes elsewhere in the community, letters of support, etc. Supporting documentation may be attached.

The City of El Segundo has a long standing relationship with many of the stakeholders in the city and surrounding communities on the need for regulatory changes to promote the sustained vitality of the city as a place to live, work and play. The City established an Economic Development Advisory Council (EDAC) in 1994 to collaborate on the identification of responsible development strategies in four key areas - Strategic & Forward Planning, Business Retention and Expansion, New Business Attraction and Hospitality & Tourism. One of the current key recommendations of the EDAC is to conduct a Housing Study to identify housing needs and potential financial impacts. The City Council strongly supports the development of the Housing Study, which will be an essential part of the proposed Specific Plan, as well as the establishment of development and infrastructure standards that will support new private and public investment.

Other key economic development strategies developed by the EDAC and City staff include: growing hotel occupancy by promoting the city as a tourist destination and encouraging local businesses to have their guests stay locally; to leverage the Lakers and the Kings, who both have training facilities in the project area, to attract out-of-town fans to stay overnight during the game season and to attract youth sports tournaments to their facilities; to identify targeted industries to attract as new businesses in the city; and to strengthen relationships with existing major employers to assure their long term commitment to staying in El Segundo and growing their businesses there. See Attachment 4 for Economic Development Brochure.

Key past actions of the City and regional government that show support for the ten key transit supportive principles and the types of regulatory changes proposed include:

The El Segundo City Council adopted a Complete Streets Policy in January 2016 to express their support of a comprehensive and integrated transportation network that allows safe and convenient travel along and across streets for all users (See Attachment 3).

The South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG) is preparing a regional Land Use and Transportation Climate Action Plan (LUTCP) for the all of the South Bay Cities. The plan is concentrating on strategies that support Neighborhood Centers and/or Neighborhood Oriented Development to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, reduce energy costs, protect air quality and public health, and improve the economy and environment to reduce the impacts of climate change.

The SBCCOG, in cooperation with constituent cities, including El Segundo, is also preparing a Slow Speed Network Strategic Plan for South Bay, which includes downtown El Segundo as a case study area (See Attachment 5). The proposed slow speed network would provide viable routes for slow speed modes (under 25MPH) to connect downtown El Segundo with the Green Line station corridor.

The SBCCOG is exploring many land use and transportation initiatives including neighborhood electric vehicles (NEVs) for short local trips; and has issued a Sustainable South Bay - An Integrated Land Use and Transportation Strategy; established an Infrastructure Working Group to review transportation and infrastructure needs and issues in the sub-region; and coordinated the development of the South Bay Sub-regional Mobility Matrix that prioritizes transportation projects in the South Bay for Measure M.

The South Bay Bicycle Coalition has completed a South Bay Bicycle Master Plan for all the cities, including El Segundo, in the South Bay. The plan designates a network of bicycle facilities along with outlining a series of program and policies to promote safe and accessible cycling in the South Bay. See Attachment 2! Active Transportation Facilities Map for the proposed network of streets in El Segundo.

Letters of Support from the following organizations are included in Attachment 7 of this application:
Kurt Weideman, Chair, South Bay Cities Council of Governments
Joseph B. McCormack, CFO & Senior Vice President, Los Angeles Lakers, Inc.
Richard C. Lundquist, President, Continental Development Corporation
Stuart MacDonald, Director of Development, Western Region, Federal Realty Investment Trust
Andrea N. Giancoli, Executive Director, South Bay Bicycle Coalition
Section 5: Future Project Implementation (up to 10 points)

1. Describe existing opportunity sites: parcels of land within the proposed project area that could be developed or redeveloped using principles of the Toolkit. Ensure that these sites are identified on the proposed project area map (see Section 1). Please note whether the properties are publicly or privately held.

Existing opportunity sites that can be developed or redeveloped using the principles of the transit supportive planning toolkit are delineated in Attachment 2H Major Developments Map and are described below:

Raytheon Campus - located in the southern portion of the Project Area and currently covered by the El Segundo South Campus Specific Plan, the Raytheon Campus incorporates over 142 acres and over 1.8 million square feet of commercial and industrial development located immediately adjacent to the El Segundo Green Line station. However the Campus does not have direct access to the station and and almost half of the site is only developed with surface parking lots for the exclusive use of the Campus. As stated in the Specific Plan "The Campus' proximity to freeways, major arterials and the Metro Rail makes the Campus an ideal location for expansion of uses and is consistent with the City's desire to facilitate economic development in El Segundo". The existing plan calls for a direct pedestrian access easement to the station and the plan governs the amount of new automobile traffic trips that can be generated by the new development. These factors create an opportunity for the proposed Specific Plan to make sure that new development on the Campus be aligned with Metro transit supportive planning principles and that development could be more intensive if designed with transit riders in mind and with smart transportation demand management policies.

Northrop Grumman Campus - located in the northeastern portion of the project area, there is a 22 acre portion of the site north of Maple Avenue near the Aviation/LAX Green Line Station that is currently underutilized and has the potential to become a transit supportive development site within very close walking distance to the station.

Metro Green Line Parking Lots - Metro owned surface parking lots at the El Segundo and Douglas Green Line provide immediately adjacent properties to the light line station that can be developed with transit supportive land uses, improved pedestrian connections to the stations and provide secure bike parking and other transit amenities.

Cement Mixing Plant Site- A 5-acre site located on Aviation Blvd. between the railroad tracks south of El Segundo Blvd. and within a 15 minute walk of both the El Segundo and Douglas stations is at an important location adjacent to three existing redevelopment projects and one new development that are bringing almost 800,000 square feet of creative office space to El Segundo.

Existing surface parking lots and large landscape setbacks throughout project area - many of the existing commercial and industrial properties are developed with buildings located far from the public rights-of-way surrounded by extensive surface parking lots and landscaping. As the demand for transit supportive land uses, compact design and pedestrian and cyclist access increase and the demand for parking decreases, these parking lots can be transformed into mixed-use development sites. In addition, surface parking lots can be replaced with structures to make more efficient use of land and free up space for other activities and uses.

Reuse and additions to existing low-rise light industrial properties - as can be seen with the redevelopment of older former aerospace and data office buildings along Aviation Blvd, new creative office space is in high demand in El Segundo. Other older underutilized or vacant office and industrial buildings in the area also provide opportunity for redevelopment, expansion or replacement with new facilities.

Wide high speed underutilized streets with lack of pedestrian and bicycle facilities - many of the public streets in the project area are designed for more road capacity than is currently utilized. This extra capacity can be re-purposed for safe and accessible pedestrian, cyclist and transit facilities. Wider sidewalks with landscaped buffers, street trees and lighting, enhanced transit stops and buffered or protected bikeways can replace excess roadway for a safer more transit supportive environment in the project area.
2. Describe the long-term implementation plan for building a successful transit supportive community after grant-funded regulatory changes are adopted.

The Specific Plan will start a citywide conversation about transit supportive land use planning that can lead to the update of the city's General Plan, which has not been comprehensively updated since 1992. The general public, residents, property and business owners and the arts & cultural community in El Segundo have all been very interested in comprehensively and thoughtfully developing the planning tools necessary to assure that the future of El Segundo supports their vision and ambitions. El Segundo's reputation as part of the Silicon Beach of the Westside and as one of the most business-friendly cities in Southern California, with more Fortune 500 companies than any other city in California other than San Francisco, shows the City's ambitions to grow and develop to support the existing world-class talent and entrepreneurial spirit of the people who live and work in the city. This base of dedicated residents, workers and business interests in El Segundo can be tapped to create stakeholders that are vested in the development and implementation of the Specific Plan. The City's Economic Development Advisory Council (EDAC), comprised of respected industry leaders, is a model of effective public and private collaboration that develops and implements innovative economic development strategies in the city and will be directly involved in the planning and implementation processes of the plan (See Attachment 4 Economic Development Brochure). The EDAC and the City have turned around the devastating loss of the aerospace industry in the 1990's and 2000's to reinvent the city as a center for innovation and creativity.

The Specific Plan development and implementation process provides an important opportunity for the City to engage these innovative and creative stakeholders in a dialog about how best to build on the opportunity provided by the four Green Line Stations located in or adjacent to the project area. As well as the unique location that the city provides with it's adjacency to the Pacific Ocean and great beaches, LAX and two freeways - the 405 and the 105, no other city in the region can boast four metro stations and the beach within two miles of 70,000 workers and 16,000 residents. The City and the EDAC have done an excellent job of promoting the city's ideal geographic location for businesses who want to be near LAX and other Silicon Beach communities, but now they have an expanded mandate of capitalizing on the mobility options provided by the four Green Line stations. With the opening of the Crenshaw/LAX Line, El Segundo will be within a train ride of the entire Los Angeles county region, making the City ripe for expanded development opportunities to support the existing investments that the City and the business community have made over the past 20 years. It is in the best interest of both the private and public sectors to see that the Specific Plan is implemented so that they can fulfill their ambitions for truly innovative community.

The Specific Plan will outline direct strategies for implementation including a funding plan for identifying funding for capital improvement projects from city funds, grant funding at the county, state and federal levels and public-private partnerships. Many of the larger scaled pedestrian, cyclist and transit improvements will likely be initiated by the City since projects that span more than one property are more efficiently implemented for one block or more instead of incrementally. Implementation of some public improvements will also occur as part of the Specific Plan conditions of approval for private development projects. For example, streetscape design standards will require pedestrian, cyclist and transit stop improvements adjacent to new or redeveloped properties which will be the responsibility of the developer of that property.

The Specific Plan will also designate which City departments, other agencies or private property owners are responsible to implementation actions in the plan. The EDAC would likely be assigned to implement marketing and economic development strategies and ideas, whereas the Public Works Department would follow up on street redesign projects and the Parks and Recreation Department will work on locating funding for expanding sites for parks and open space features identified in the plan.

As stated in the City's 2016-2019 Strategic Plan Vision Statement - "The City has transformed. We are leading the way with innovation and environmental responsibility. With fewer people driving cars, we have adapted our street, parking and land use plans. We have high-speed fiber optics as a utility to support more work from home and fewer brick and mortar businesses. The downtown is vibrant with successful businesses and day and evening pedestrian activity. The east side of town has become denser (especially near the rail lines) including a high level of service with retail and a school to support it. While our revenue base has shifted to changing businesses, we are financially sustainable and growing because we have capitalized on the changes."
Section 6: Staffing and Administrative Plan (up to 15 points)

PROJECT TASKS, SCHEDULE AND BUDGET

1. Use Attachments A and B provided to demonstrate the overall approach for project completion within the 36-month grant period. Identify and describe the principle tasks that will be undertaken to complete the proposed project, the budget (both local and grant sources), the timeline for completion, approach and deliverables for each task.

The following is a sample list of typical tasks:

> Consultant Procurement
> Kick-off Meeting
> Project Management
> Existing Conditions and Opportunity Sites Evaluation
> Parking Study and Management Plan
> Market Study
> Public Participation/Outreach
> Preparation of Regulatory Documents
> Environmental Analysis
> Adoption Process

The above list is only a sample. Applicants may make project-specific modification by adding or deleting tasks, as well as making adjustments to the proposed project timeline. Attachments submitted in any format other than the one provided will not be accepted.

If applicable, please describe any activities and/or planning efforts which may potentially delay the proposed project.

It is not anticipated that any activities and/or planning efforts would potentially delay the proposed project.
2. Describe the team composition, including the roles and responsibilities of city/county staff and/or consultants, and the applicant’s capacity for implementing the proposed project.

The Specific Plan Team will be composed of the following city staff and consultant team members, at a minimum:

City of El Segundo City Manager
City of El Segundo Director of Planning and Building & Safety
City of El Segundo Planning Manager - lead city staff for project
City of El Segundo Principal Planner
City of El Segundo Assistant Planner
City of El Segundo GIS Specialist
City of El Segundo Public Works Director
City of El Segundo City Engineer
City of El Segundo Building Safety Manager/Building Official
City of El Segundo Director of Recreation & Parks
Consultant Project Manager - hired by City exclusively to manage the El Segundo Transit Corridor Plan Project

Specific Plan Consultant Team composed of the following (some of the roles can be combined and provided by the same consultant/individual) to complete tasks and deliverables outlined in Attachment B: Lead Consultant/Project Manager, Urban/Land Use Planner, Urban Designer, Landscape Architect, Architect, Pedestrian Planner/Designer, Bicycle Planner/Designer, Transportation Planner, Transportation Engineer, Civil Engineer, Parking Specialist, Economist, Housing Specialist, GIS/Mapping Specialist, EIR Consultant and Sub-consultants, Public Outreach/Engagement Consultant, Marketing/Public Relations Specialist and others as necessary to complete the scope and work, tasks and deliverables outlined in Attachment B.

A Consultant Project Manager will be hired by the City since the Planning Department does not currently have enough staff to provide this function. The Project Manager will manage the project including the Consultant Team and the city staff. The tasks outlined in Attachments A & B will be completed by the Consultant Team with overview by the Project Manager and with regular input and review by the city staff listed above. The City has extensive experience working with and managing consultant teams on planning projects such as the proposed Specific Plan. Current examples include the Downtown Specific Plan and the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan.

The City has highly qualified and experienced staff to implement the project. Gregg McClain, Planning Manager for the The City of El Segundo, will function as the lead planner for the project and has extensive experience from his eight years at the neighboring City of Hawthorne before his move to the City of El Segundo one year ago.

The City also has planning staff that implement other specific plans including the Downtown Specific Plan and the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan. Staff currently review and process design standards for those and other projects on a daily basis. Smoky Hollow is a particularly active part of town that generates several site plan and design review applications each year. The City has a staff of 6 staff planners: 1 technician; 2 assistants; 2 principals and 1 manager—which is above average for a city of population 17,000. The staff reviews commercial and industrial plans daily and have considerable competence in this. The City also has extensive experience hiring contract planners as needed and currently has 1 contract planning technician working full time and 3 other contract planners dedicated to specific projects. Most large projects are funded through reimbursement agreements with developers, which are used to fund contract planners as needed so that staff are available for daily project review. The Planning Manager assigns two planners to every major project to be co-project managers. One is one of the principal planners and the other a junior planner. This ensures 2 dedicated staff on each project and someone always ready to answer for the project’s progress. There are no disruptions during vacations or sick leave, because two people are sharing the work. The Planning staff are also knowledgeable and experienced in refining and amending Specific Plans and developing additional ordinances that further implement the intentions and goals of the Specific Plan.

The Public Works Department has extensive experience implementing capital improvement projects that are likely to be included as a part of Specific Plan to achieve the goals of creating a transit supportive corridor. They have experience pursuing grants to fund capital improvement projects as well as successfully managing the grants and supervising contractors to construct the improvements.
PRIOR GRANT PERFORMANCE (IF APPLICABLE)

3. Describe past performance of grants with respect to timeliness of invoicing, and adherence to project schedules and goals.

The City of El Segundo Public Works Department is the main city agency that receives grants from LA Metro and other funding agencies. They have solid experience administering grants from Metro and are able to deliver projects on time and within budget. Examples include the Imperial Highway Resurfacing Project and Maple Street Improvements which have achieved projects goals and schedules. The City has dedicated grant administration and accounting department staff that assures timely invoicing and reporting to funding agencies to meet grant obligations.
Application Signature Page

A person duly authorized to sign for the organization (city manager, general manager, executive director, planning director or high-ranking officer) must sign and certify the application.

If this application is selected for funding, the information contained in this application will become the foundation of a contract with Metro. Applicants should be aware that the scope approved by the Metro Board may differ from that contained in the original application and that Metro may place stipulations on the project as a condition of approval. These will be noted at the time of the funding recommendation.

To the best of my knowledge, all information contained in this application is true and correct. If awarded a grant from Metro, I agree that I will adhere to the program guidelines, as well as provide a local resolution evidencing authorization to execute a grant agreement and receive funds.

[Signature]
Greg Carpenter
City Manager

DATE
JULY 31, 2017

REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION

☑ APPLICATION FORM AND SIGNATURE PAGE
☑ ATTACHMENT A – TASKS, SCHEDULE AND BUDGET
☑ ATTACHMENT B – TASK DESCRIPTION, APPROACH AND DELIVERABLES
☑ MAP(S) OF PROPOSED PROJECT AREA AND MAPS THAT CORRESPOND TO GRANT APPLICATION QUESTIONS

NUMBER OF COPIES AND FORMAT:

☑ TWO (2) HARD COPIES OF THE COMPLETE APPLICATION PACKAGE WITH ORIGINAL WET SIGNATURES
☑ ONE (1) CD OR FLASH DRIVE CONTAINING:
  ☑ APPLICATION FORM IN ORIGINAL PDF
  ☑ ATTACHMENTS A AND B IN EXCEL
  ☑ COMPLETE APPLICATION PACKAGE IN PDF

FAILURE TO INCLUDE ANY OF THE REQUIRED DOCUMENTS WILL RESULT IN A REDUCED APPLICATION SCORE AND POTENTIAL INELIGIBILITY.
# LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

## TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT PLANNING GRANT PROGRAM

### ROUND 5

## ATTACHMENT A - TASKS, SCHEDULE, AND BUDGET

**Project Title:** El Segundo Transit Corridor Plan  
**Sponsor:** City of El Segundo

List each principle task and provide both the budget and timeline for each task. Add or delete rows as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task #</th>
<th>Task Title</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Local Match</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>In-Kind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Consultant Procurement</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kick-Off Meeting</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mapping</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Existing Conditions Analysis</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Community Advisory Committee</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Community Outreach/Engagement</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$104,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Housing Study</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mobility Study</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>$71,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Walk and Bike Audit</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Parking Study</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Economic Studies</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>EIR</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$154,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Urban Design/Street Standards</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$102,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Plan Development</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$111,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Plan Framework</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Draft Specific Plan</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Final Specific Plan</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Presentations to Decision Makers</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Printing and Expenses</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$659,500</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$1,029,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fiscal Years:

- Q3
- Q4
- Q1
- Q2
- Q3
- Q4
- Q1
- Q2
- Q3
- Q4
- Q1
- Q2

Revised: 4.28.17  
7/30/17
Project Title: El Segundo Transit Corridor Plan  
Sponsor: City of El Segundo

Describe each principle task identified in Attachment A, provide approach, and list deliverable(s). Add or delete rows as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task #</th>
<th>Task Title</th>
<th>Description and Approach</th>
<th>Deliverable(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1      | Consultant Procurement       | Staff & Consultant Project Manager to develop RFP inc. Scope of Work for SP Consultant Team and Timeline, List of potential Consultants, Selection Criteria; Review Proposals and Conduct Interviews and Select consultant; Negotiate and execute contract | Consultant RFP  
Consultant List  
Selection Criteria and Interview Questions Contract |
| 2      | Kick-Off Meeting            | Staff and Consultant Project Manager to lead Kick-Off Meeting with selected SP Consultant Team                                                                                                                        | Meeting Agenda and Notes; Confirmed Schedule                                 |
| 3      | Project Management          | Consultant Project Manager will lead all tasks to develop the Specific Plan from Consultant Procurement to Plan Adoption including Metro TOD Grant Administration; Facilitate Monthly Meetings with Project Team | Meeting Agendas and Notes; Project Schedule Updates; Metro Invoicing and Progress Reports |
| 4      | Data Collection             | Consultant Team will obtain, assemble and document existing conditions including population and demographics; land use and zoning; pedestrian/cyclist/vehicle/transit infrastructure characteristics and conditions, networks, collision rates, usage/trips; condition and useful life of utilities; relevant planning, building and infrastructure ordinances and policy documents; economic conditions; financing and funding mechanisms available; age and useful life of existing structures. | Summary Report of Data collected                                                   |
| 5      | Mapping                     | Consultant Team will create GIS Base Map; Map relevant existing conditions from data collection                                                                                                                  | Base Map  
Series of Existing Conditions Maps  
Summary Report                                                                      |
| 6      | Existing Conditions Analysis| Consultant Team will analyze existing conditions data collected and prepare Summary Report                                                                                                                             | Summary Report                                                                 |
| 7      | Community Advisory Committee| Form Community Advisory Committee (CAC) of approximately 25 community stakeholders and city staff; Conduct bi-monthly meetings for the duration of the project                                                                 | CAC Roster, CAC Meeting Agendas and Notes, Presentation Materials           |
Project Title: El Segundo Transit Corridor Plan
Sponsor: City of El Segundo

Describe each principle task identified in Attachment A, provide approach, and list deliverable(s). Add or delete rows as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task #</th>
<th>Task Title</th>
<th>Description and Approach</th>
<th>Deliverable(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8      | Community Outreach & Stakeholder Engagement | Consultant Team will develop Outreach Plan and Marketing Strategy; develop Online Platform; conduct small group stakeholder meetings; engage with community members at community events such as farmer's markets, festivals, sporting events, school meetings, employee gatherings, business association meetings, etc; conduct pop-up and tactical urbanism events; conduct community-wide workshops, forums and participatory charrettes to directly engage the public in developing the vision, goals and objectives for the Specific Plan along with developing key planning strategies and land use and transportation alternatives | Outreach Plan  
Marketing Strategy  
Online Platform and content  
Participant Invitee List  
Meeting Agendas & Summaries  
Presentation Materials  
Presentations  
Handouts  
Outreach Summary                                                                 |
| 9      | Housing Study                       | Consultant Team will prepare Housing Study to evaluate existing conditions, future demand and develop alternative scenarios in consultation with the CAC and community stakeholders through community engagement process | Draft Housing Study  
Final Housing Study                                                                                    |
| 10     | Mobility Study                      | Consultant Team will prepare a Mobility Study that evaluates existing conditions for pedestrians, cyclists, transit riders and drivers; identifies deficiencies and barriers to mobility and access; and recommends improvements to mitigate those impacts. All completed in consultation with the CAC and community stakeholders through community engagement process | Draft Mobility Study  
Final Mobility Study                                                                                   |
| 11     | Walk and Bike Audit                 | Consultant Team will facilitate a series of Walk and Bike Audits to engage stakeholders and city staff in the evaluation of the existing walking and cycling conditions on city streets and access to private properties and buildings, including a Walk and Bike Audit Training on evaluation techniques and toolbox of solutions | Walk Audit Checklists and Route Maps  
Bike Audit Checklists and Route Maps  
Walk and Bike Audit & Toolbox Training  
Walk & Bike Audit Summary of Findings                                                                      |
| 12     | Parking Study                       | Consultant Team will prepare Parking Study that considers existing conditions, utilization rates and future demand, in consultation with the CAC and community stakeholders through community engagement process | Draft Parking Study  
Final Parking Study                                                                                   |
LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT PLANNING GRANT PROGRAM
ROUND 5
ATTACHMENT B - TASK DESCRIPTION, APPROACH AND DELIVERABLES

Project Title: El Segundo Transit Corridor Plan
Sponsor: City of El Segundo

Describe each principle task identified in Attachment A, provide approach, and list deliverable(s). Add or delete rows as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task #</th>
<th>Task Title</th>
<th>Description and Approach</th>
<th>Deliverable(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 13    | Economic Studies         | Consultant Team will prepare an Economic Study based on past studies developed by the EDAC, existing conditions, the Housing & Mobility Studies conducted for the SP, future market demand and projections. All completed in consultation with city staff, the CAC and community stakeholders through community engagement process | Draft Economic Study
Final Economic Study |
| 14    | Environmental Impact Report | Consultant Team will complete the CEQA required environmental clearance for the project in compliance with State and Local regulations, including Notice of Preparation, Scoping Meeting(s); Initial Study, Draft EIR, Response to Comments, and Final EIR with Statement of Overriding Considerations | Notice of Preparation
Scoping Meeting Agenda and Presentation
Initial Study, Other CEQA required Documents, Draft EIR, Response to Comments, Final EIR |
| 15    | Urban Design/Street Standards | Consultant Team will prepare Urban Design and Street Standards in consultation with city staff, the CAC and community stakeholders through community engagement process. Standards will include strong graphics to easily communicate intention of the standards including: illustrations, street sections, photographs, charts, tables, maps, etc. | Draft Urban Design/Street Standards
Final Urban Design/Street Standards |
| 16    | Plan Development         | Consultant Team will prepare vision, goals, objectives and strategies for the plan in consultation with city staff, elected officials, the CAC and community stakeholders. Team will consolidate existing conditions analysis and housing, mobility, walk and bike audits, parking and economic strategies as well as urban design/Street standards developed in earlier tasks into the plan. Consultant Team will also coordinate with outside agencies and adjacent jurisdictions. Team will develop alternative land use and transportation scenarios that can be reviewed and evaluated for their strengths and weaknesses by the team and stakeholders during the community outreach and engagement process. | Vision, Goals, Objectives & Strategies
Land Use and Transportation Alternatives |
| 17    | Plan Framework           | Consultant Team will develop a framework and outline for the Specific Plan that meets with the State Specific Plan requirements with an organization and chapters that are easy to understand to the public and efficient to administer by city staff upon adoption. | Draft Plan Framework
Final Plan Framework |
LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT PLANNING GRANT PROGRAM
ROUND 5

ATTACHMENT B - TASK DESCRIPTION, APPROACH AND DELIVERABLES

Project Title: El Segundo Transit Corridor Plan
Sponsor: City of El Segundo

Describe each principle task identified in Attachment A, provide approach, and list deliverable(s). Add or delete rows as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task #</th>
<th>Task Title</th>
<th>Description and Approach</th>
<th>Deliverable(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Draft Specific Plan</td>
<td>Consultant Team will complete a Draft Plan including all components of the plan in</td>
<td>Draft Specific Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>coordination with the city staff, CAC and stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Final Specific Plan</td>
<td>Consultant Team will update the Draft Plan into the Final based on recommended</td>
<td>Final Specific Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>changes from the community outreach process and review by the Planning Commission and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Presentations to Decision Makers</td>
<td>Consultant Team and city staff will present the Vision, Goals, Objectives and</td>
<td>Presentation Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategies; and the Draft and Final Specific Plans to the Planning Commission and City</td>
<td>Staff Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council for their review, comment and adoption</td>
<td>Draft Resolutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Ordinances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Printing and Expenses</td>
<td>Consultant Team will coordinate the printing of presentation and handout materials;</td>
<td>Printing of Presentation Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>equipment, supplies, food and beverages and room rentals for community outreach events;</td>
<td>Printing of Handouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment Rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Room Rentals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop and Meeting Supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Food and Beverages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION NO. XXXX

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO AUTHORIZING THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY AND LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY AND DIRECTING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE THE AGREEMENT

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

SECTION 1: The City of El Segundo applied for a Transit Oriented Development Planning Grant that was made available from the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority. A total of $3.1 million in funding is available to the County of Los Angeles and all local governments with land use regulatory jurisdiction within a one-half mile of existing, planned, or proposed Metrolink, Metro Rail, or Metro Transitway/Bus Rapid Transit stations and adjacent transit corridors.

SECTION 2: On March 1, 2018, the City of El Segundo was congratulated by Metro as a recipient of a TOD Planning Grant Round 5 award that will be used toward the administrative and consulting costs of establishing a transit supportive regulatory document for the City of El Segundo. The next step to receive the funds is to execute a grant agreement with Metro.

SECTION 3: The City Clerk shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.
PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 19th day of June 2018.

Drew Boyles, 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. XXXX was duly passed, approved and adopted by said City Council at a regular meeting held on the 19th day of June, 2018, 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

David King, Assistant City Attorney
EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA STATEMENT

MEETING DATE: June 19, 2018
AGENDA HEADING: Unfinished Business

AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action regarding the second reading and adoption of Ordinance No. 1568 to prohibit loud and unruly gatherings and provide a means for the City to hold responsible persons liable by imposing civil penalties, and adoption of Resolution No. ___ amending the schedule of fines for administrative citations pertaining to violations of Ordinance No. 1568.

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
1. Waive second reading and adopt Ordinance No. 1568;
2. Adopt Resolution No. ___;
3. Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
1. Ordinance No. 1568; and
2. Resolution No. ___.

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

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

STRATEGIC PLAN:
Goal: El Segundo is a safe and prepared city.
Objective: The City has a proactive approach to risk and crime.

PREPARED BY: Bill Whalen, Chief of Police
Natalie C. Karpeles, Deputy City Attorney

REVIEWED BY: Sam Lee, Planning and Building Safety Director

APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:
On June 5, 2018, the City Council introduced the first reading of Ordinance No. 1568 to prohibit loud or unruly gatherings. Additionally, Ordinance No. 1568 provides a means for the City to hold responsible persons liable by imposing civil penalties. Following due consideration of the Ordinance, the City Council provided staff with direction regarding the appropriate administrative citations for a violation of this Ordinance. These fine amounts are to be established by Resolution, which is now presented to the City Council for adoption.

On June 13, 2018, the City Council considered the ordinance at a continued regular meeting. The City Council directed staff to remove the new cost recovery components in both Ordinance No. 1568 and another ordinance relating to hosting, permitting or allowing social gatherings of minors consuming alcohol or marijuana (Ordinance No. 1567). The City Council directed staff to engage
community members with Ordinance No. 1567, make certain changes and bring the ordinance back for further consideration at the City Council’s regular meeting on July 17, 2018.

I. Loud and Unruly Gathering Ordinance (“Chapter 7-12”).

Ordinance No. 1568, if adopted, would establish a new Chapter 7-12 in the El Segundo Municipal Code. The new chapter would hold residential property owners and persons responsible for loud or unruly gatherings through the issuance of administrative citations and other penalties. Penalties for a violation of Chapter 7-12 would subject the violator to an administrative citation, which would obligate the citee to pay civil penalties; these penalties would be established by City Council resolution. The proposed fines for a violation of Chapter 7-12 are $2,500 for a first offense, $5,000 for a second offense, and $7,500 for each additional offense within a 12-month period. Any “new” violation which arises more than 12-months from the date of the first violation would be considered a “first” violation and would trigger the escalating fines indicated above, starting with $2,500.

With regard to cost recovery efforts, the proposed ordinance (Section 5) would delete the City’s existing municipal code section relating to the Police Department’s cost recovery for certain nuisance activities. That existing section, Section 7-2-14, was adopted in 1996 and is part of the City’s Noise Ordinance. It currently allows the Police Department to seek its costs for second and subsequent responses to parties or gatherings that are determined by the officer to be a public nuisance.

II. Resolution Regarding Fine Amounts.

The attached Resolution No. ___ establishes the schedule of fines for administrative citations when there are violations of Chapter 7-13. The schedule represents the City Council’s direction during deliberations about this proposed Chapter. The Resolution is presented to the City Council for adoption and would take effect on the date the Ordinance would go into effect, if adopted.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Council:
1. Waive second reading and adopt Ordinance No. 1568;
2. Adopt Resolution No. ___;
3. Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.
ORDINANCE NO.

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING TITLE 7 OF THE EL SEGUNDO MUNICIPAL CODE TO PROHIBIT LOUD AND UNRULY GATHERINGS

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

SECTION 1: Findings.

A. The City of El Segundo, pursuant to the police powers delegated to it by the California Constitution, has the authority to enact laws which promote the public health, safety and general welfare of its residents. Furthermore, Government Code § 38771 authorizes the City to declare what constitutes a nuisance by ordinance;

B. The occurrence of loud or unruly gatherings on residential property is a threat to the quiet enjoyment of property and to public health, safety, and welfare due to excessive noise, traffic, obstruction of streets, public drunkenness, fights, disturbances of the peace, vandalism and litter;

C. Persons who actively or passively aid, abet, or allow loud and unruly gatherings to occur on their property should be held liable for the nuisances created by such gatherings. To mitigate the negative impacts of loud or unruly gatherings, residential property owners and persons responsible for these gatherings should be held accountable through the issuance of administrative citations and other penalties; and

D. The City Council finds it is in the public interest to adopt this ordinance to deter loud or unruly gatherings; and preserve public health, safety and welfare.

SECTION 2: Environmental Assessment. Pursuant to 14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15060(c)(2) the proposed ordinance is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") because the proposed Code amendment is not considered to be a "project" under CEQA and will not result in direct or indirect physical changes in the environment. The proposed ordinance consists of an amendment to regulate loud or unruly gatherings as a nuisance under the El Segundo Municipal Code, as such, it is an organizational or administrative governmental activity which does not fall under the definition of "project" found in 14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15378(b)(5). Accordingly, this ordinance is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to 14 Cal. Code Regs. §15060.

SECTION 3: ESMC Title 7 (Nuisances and Offenses) is amended to add a new chapter, Chapter 12 (Loud and Unruly Gatherings) to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 12
LOUD OR UNRULY GATHERINGS"
7-12-1: FINDINGS; PURPOSE
7-12-2: DEFINITIONS
7-12-3: LOUD OR UNRULY GATHERINGS PROHIBITED
7-12-4: CITATION AND NOTICE – CONTENTS
7-12-5: CITATION AND NOTICE – PROCEDURE
7-12-6: VIOLATIONS, FINES AND PENALTIES

7-12-1: FINDINGS; PURPOSE

A. Loud or unruly social gatherings frequently become public nuisances since they interfere with the comfortable enjoyment of life, property, and threaten public safety. All such activities detrimentally affect the neighbors that surround these nuisances.

B. Frequently, these loud or unruly gatherings create opportunities for crimes against persons, public peace and property. The City has, both now and in the past, responded to code violations multiple times for enforcement actions.

C. In addition, the public services required for responding to incidents that occur as a consequence of unruly gatherings (for example, driving while intoxicated, increased social violence, and incidents of sexual assault) are also disproportionately greater than what is required within the City’s jurisdiction.

D. It is in the public interest to establish procedures for recovering costs incurred by the City when enforcing any provision of this code through inspections, nuisance abatement, or other similar, administrative or judicial means.

E. Nothing contained in this ordinance is intended to, nor will it, interfere with any California law provision that regulates activities identified by this ordinance; it is intended only to enact measures that are different from, or supplement, California law to further restrict acts associated with loud or unruly gatherings.

7-12-2: DEFINITIONS

Unless the contrary is stated or clearly appears from the context, the following definitions will govern the construction of the words and phrases used in this chapter:

CITATION means an Administrative Citation issued pursuant to Title 1, Chapter 2A of this Code.

CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER has the same meaning as in Section 1-2A-3 of this Code.
LOUD OR UNRULY CONDUCT, as used in this chapter, includes any of the following conduct if in violation of any provision of this Code or State law:

i. Loud noise;

ii. Obstruction of a street or public right-of-way, including a sidewalk or driveway;

iii. Public intoxication or drinking in public;

iv. Assault, battery, fights, domestic violence or other disturbances of the peace;

v. Vandalism or destruction of property;

vi. Litter;

vii. Urinating or defecating in public;

viii. Trespassing; or

ix. Illegal drug use.

Loud or Unruly Conduct does not include any activity that is protected by Article 1, Section 4 of the California Constitution, or protected by the First or Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

LOUD OR UNRULY GATHERING means a gathering of Persons at any Residence where Loud or Unruly Conduct occurs at the Residence and which threatens or interferes with the public health, safety or welfare, or the comfortable enjoyment of life and property.

PERSON means an individual or any firm, association, organization, partnership, trust, business, corporation, company or entity.

RESIDENCE means any lot in a residential zone, and includes any garage, carport, walkway, yard, patio, deck, or other structure or area on said lot, whether owned, leased, rented or used with or without compensation. The term “Residence” also includes any sidewalk, street or alleyway which abuts the lot.

RESPONSIBLE PARTY means:

i. Any Person(s) with a right of possession or ownership interests in the Residence where a Loud or Unruly Gathering occurs; or

ii. Any Person who organizes, supervises, officiates, conducts, or controls the gathering or any other Person(s) accepting responsibility for such a gathering at a Residence.

7-12-3: LOUD OR UNRULY GATHERINGS PROHIBITED

Loud or Unruly Gatherings are prohibited and constitute a public nuisance subjecting the owner and/or Responsible Party to fines and/or penalties under this section. The City may abate a Loud or Unruly Gathering by all available means, including, but not limited to, an order of a peace officer requiring individuals at the Loud or Unruly Gathering to leave the Residence, the issuance of a Citation, and/or the arrest of anyone committing a criminal violation under this section or any other applicable State or local law.
7-12-4: CITATION AND NOTICE - CONTENTS

A peace officer responding to a Loud or Unruly Gathering must post, on the front entrance of the Residence at which the Loud or Unruly Gathering occurs, a notice stating:

A. The name and agency of the officer who responded to the Loud or Unruly Gathering;

B. The address of the Residence and the date of the Loud or Unruly Gathering, along with a description of the Loud or Unruly Conduct observed; and

C. That it is unlawful to alter, tamper with or deface this notice, or remove it prior to 30 days from the date of the posting.

7-12-5: CITATION AND NOTICE - PROCEDURE

A. Referral to Code Enforcement Officer. A copy of any notice caused to be issued by a peace officer during the enforcement of this section will be referred to the Director of Planning and Building and Safety, or his/her designee. Once referred, the Code Enforcement Division will be responsible for processing, investigating and implementing the Citation. However, the peace officer who issued the Citation may be required to submit evidence and/or attend any administrative hearing pertaining to the Citation, if necessary.

B. Notice. The Code Enforcement Officer must serve on all Responsible Parties a copy of the notice posted pursuant to Subdivision A of this section. The delivery of the notice must be by personal service or by depositing in the mail for delivery by the United States Postal Service, in a sealed envelope, postage prepaid. Notice to the property owner must be sent to the address shown on the County's last equalized property tax assessment roll.

C. Administrative Process Applicable to Citations. Unless otherwise specified herein, all Citations issued for violations of this chapter will be subject to the provisions set forth in Chapter 2A of this Code, including, but not limited to, the administrative hearing and appeal process.

7-12-6: VIOLATIONS, FINES AND PENALTIES

A. Any Person who alters, tampers with or defaces a posted notice issued pursuant to this Chapter, and/or who violates Section 7-12-3 of this chapter may be subjected to administrative fines and penalties. Penalties will be established by City Council resolution. Any violation which arises within 12-months from the date of the first violation will trigger escalating penalty amounts, as established by City Council resolution. A violation occurring
after a period of 12 consecutive months of no violations will be considered a first violation.

B. Any escalated penalty amounts in this resolution will apply to the same Responsible Party, regardless of whether different Residents throughout the city are utilized as venues for Loud or Unruly Gatherings.

C. Fine for Removal of Posted Notice. Any Person who alters, tampers with or defaces a posted notice issued pursuant to this chapter will be subject to an administrative fine of $500.

D. Nothing in this chapter shall be deemed to prevent the city from commencing a civil or criminal proceeding to abate a public nuisance or from pursuing any other means available under any other statute, ordinance or law (civil or criminal), to correct conduct regulated by this chapter in addition to or as alternatives to the procedures set forth herein. This chapter in no way limits the authority of law enforcement personnel to make arrests for any criminal offense arising out of conduct regulated by this chapter."

SECTION 4: The definition for "CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER" in Section 1-2A-3 (Definitions) of Chapter 1-2A (Administrative Citations) of Title 1 (Administration and Personnel) is hereby amended to read as follows:

CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER: City employees from the public works department, planning and building safety department, police or fire department with the authority to enforce this code.

SECTION 5: Section 7-2-14 of the El Segundo Municipal Code (Use of Police at Parties; Second Response) is deleted.

SECTION 6: CONSTRUCTION. This ordinance must be broadly construed in order to achieve the purposes stated in this ordinance. It is the City Council’s intent that the provisions of this ordinance be interpreted or implemented by the City and others in a manner that facilitates the purposes set forth in this ordinance.

SECTION 6: ENFORCEABILITY. Repeal of any provision of the El Segundo Municipal Code does not affect any penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred before, or preclude prosecution and imposition of penalties for any violation occurring before this ordinance’s effective date. Any such repealed part will remain in full force and effect for sustaining action or prosecuting violations occurring before the effective date of this ordinance.

SECTION 7: VALIDITY OF PREVIOUS CODE SECTIONS. If this entire ordinance or its application is deemed invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, any repeal or amendment of the ESMC or other city ordinance by this ordinance will be rendered void and cause such previous ESMC provision or other ordinance to remain in full force and effect for all purposes.
SECTION 8: SEVERABILITY. If any part of this ordinance or its application is deemed invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the City Council intends that such invalidity will not affect the effectiveness of the remaining provisions or applications and, to this end, the provisions of this ordinance are severable.

SECTION 9: The City Clerk is directed to certify the passage and adoption of this ordinance; cause it to be entered into the City of El Segundo's book of original ordinances; make a note of the passage and adoption in the records of this meeting; and, within 15 days after the passage and adoption of this ordinance, cause it to be published or posted in accordance with California law.

SECTION 10: This Ordinance will become effective on the thirty-first day following its passage and adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this ___ day of ____________, 2018.

Drew Boyles, 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 Ordinance No. ____ was duly introduced by said City Council at a regular meeting held on the ___ day of ____________, 2018, and was duly passed and adopted by said City Council, approved and signed by the Mayor, and attested to by the City Clerk, all at a regular meeting of said Council held on the ___ day of ____________, 2018, and the same was so passed and adopted by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

________________________
Tracy Weaver, City Clerk
APPROVED AS TO FORM:

______________________________
Mark D. Hensley, City Attorney
RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO AMENDING EXHIBIT A TO RESOLUTION NO. 4313 BY SETTING FORTH THE ADMINISTRATIVE FINES FOR VIOLATIONS OF CHAPTER 7-12 OF THE EL SEGUNDO MUNICIPAL CODE.

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

SECTION 1: The City Council finds and declares as follows:

A. At its regular meeting on July 1, 2003, the City Council introduced Ordinance No. 1364 ("Citation Ordinance") which adds Chapter 2A, entitled "Administrative Citations" (consisting of §§ 1-2A-10 to 1-2A-270), to Title 1 of the El Segundo Municipal Code ("ESMC") and allows the City enforcement officers to issue administrative citations for ESMC violations. The Administrative Citation Ordinance allows fine amounts to be adopted by City Council resolution, pursuant to Government Code § 53069.4(a)(1).

B. On July 1, 2003, the City Council adopted the fine amounts attached as Exhibit "A" to Resolution No. 4313 as the City's fine schedule for purposes of imposing fines pursuant to Chapter 2A of Title 1 of the ESMC.

C. At its regular meeting on June 5, 2018, the City Council introduced Ordinance No. 1568 and adopted Ordinance No. 1568 at its regular meeting on June 13, 2018, which adds Chapter 7-12, entitled "Loud or Unruly Gatherings" and consisting of §§ 7-12-1 to 7-12-6, to Title 7 of the ESMC and allows City enforcement officers to issue administrative citations for a violation of Chapter 7-12.

D. On June 13 and 19, 2018, the City Council held duly noticed public meetings and accepted and considered all of the public testimony on the issue. The City Council finds that such fines are necessary to preserve the health, safety and welfare of the City by deterring the conduct proscribed in Chapter 7-12.

SECTION 2: The fine amounts attached as Exhibit A to Resolution No. 4313 are hereby amended to include the specific fine amounts for a violation of Chapter 7-12 of the El Segundo Municipal Code.

SECTION 3: The fines will take effect on the same day as Ordinance No. 1568.

SECTION 4: This Resolution is effective immediately upon adoption.
**SECTION 5:** The City Clerk shall certify to the passage and adoption of this Resolution.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this ___ day of ______________, 2018.

____________________________________
Drew Boyles,
Mayor

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

I, Tracy Weaver, City Clerk of the City of El Segundo, California, hereby certify that the whole number of members of the City Council of the City is five; that the foregoing Resolution No. ______ was duly passed and adopted by said City Council, approved and signed by the Mayor of said City, and attested to by the City Clerk of said City, all at a regular meeting of said Council held on the ______ day of ______________, 2018, and the same was so passed and adopted by the following roll call vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

ATTEST:

____________________________________
Tracy Weaver,
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

____________________________________
Mark D. Hensley,
City Attorney
EXHIBIT A

FINE SCHEDULE FOR ADMINISTRATIVE CITATIONS

A. Except as otherwise provided, violations of the ESMC for which administrative citations are issued will have fines imposed as follows:

1. A fine not exceeding one hundred dollars ($100.00) for the first violation;

2. A fine not exceeding two hundred dollars ($200.00) for a second violation of the same provision within one year;

3. A fine not exceeding five hundred ($500.00) for each additional violation of the same provision within one year of the first violation.

B. Notwithstanding Section A, violations of Chapter 7-12 of the El Segundo Municipal Code are subject to an administrative fine in the following amounts:

1. A fine not exceeding two thousand five hundred ($2,500) for the first violation;

2. A fine not exceeding five thousand ($5,000) for a second violation of the same provision within 12 months;

3. A fine not exceeding seven thousand five hundred ($7,500) for each additional violation of the same provision within 12 months of the first violation.
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action to announce the appointments to the Recreation and Parks Commission, Planning Commission, Technology Committee, Investment Advisory Committee, Capital Improvement Program Advisory Committee, Senior Citizen Housing Corporation Board, Arts and Culture Advisory Committee and Environmental Committee. (Fiscal Impact: None)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1. Announce the appointees; and/or,
2. Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

FISCAL IMPACT: None

Amount Budgeted: $None
Additional Appropriation: N/A
Account Number(s):

STRATEGIC PLAN:

Goal: 1 Enhance Customer Service Engagement
Objective: 1(b) The City engages in regular, intentional information gathering

ORIGINATED BY: Mishia Jennings, Executive Assistant
REVIEWED BY: [Signature]
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee/Commission and Board</th>
<th>Number of Openings</th>
<th>Appointee(s)</th>
<th>Term Expiration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Parks Commission</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>Julie Stolnack</td>
<td>Full Term Expires May 30, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>Michelle Keldorf</td>
<td>Full Term Expires June 30, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Committee</td>
<td>Four</td>
<td>Joe Lipsey</td>
<td>Partial Term Expires June 30, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Madelon Smith</td>
<td>Partial Term Expires June 30, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jessica Davis</td>
<td>Full Term Expires June 30, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Advisory Committee</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>Stephen Smetana</td>
<td>Full Term Expires August 30, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIPAC</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>Eric Kari</td>
<td>Full Term Expires November 30, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Housing Corporation Board</td>
<td>Three</td>
<td>Paul Lanyi</td>
<td>Partial Term June 30, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Expiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Committee</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>Kevin Maggay</td>
<td>Full Term Expires June 30, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

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

I certify as to the accuracy of the Demands and the availability of fund for payment thereof.
For Approval: Regular checks held for City council authorization to release.

CODES:

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

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: 6-11-18

DATE: 6-11-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND CODE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>TRAFFIC SAFETY FUND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>STATE GAS TAX FUND</td>
<td></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>COMM.DEVEL BLOCK GRANT</td>
<td>3,257.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>PROP &quot;A&quot; TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>PROP &quot;C&quot; TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>10,275.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>AIR QUALITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>HOME SOUND INSTALLATION FUND</td>
<td>619.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>HYPERION MITIGATION FUND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>TDA ARTICLE 3 - 98-921 BIKEWAY FUND</td>
<td>71.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>MTA GRANT</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>123</td>
<td>P.S.R. PROPERTY TAX PUBLIC SAFETY</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>5,955.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>INFRASTRUCTURE REPLACEMENT FUND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>FACILITIES MAINTENANCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>WATER UTILITY FUND</td>
<td>17,008.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>902</td>
<td>WASTEWATER FUND</td>
<td>213,192.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>903</td>
<td>GOLF COURSE FUND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT</td>
<td>30,549.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>LIABILITY INSURANCE</td>
<td>4,503.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>WORKERS COMP. RESERVE INSURANCE</td>
<td>25,025.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701</td>
<td>RETIRED EMP. INSURANCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>EXPENDABLE TRUST FUND - DEVELOPER FEES</td>
<td>18,145.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703</td>
<td>EXPENDABLE TRUST FUND - OTHER</td>
<td>29,965.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705</td>
<td>OUTSIDE SERVICES TRUST</td>
<td>5,523.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL WARRANTS $ 969,206.19
# CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
## PAYMENTS BY WIRE TRANSFER
### 5/28/18 THROUGH 6/10/18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Payee</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/29/2018</td>
<td>Cal Pers</td>
<td>8,508.66</td>
<td>EFT Retirement Safety-Police-PEPRA New 25021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/29/2018</td>
<td>Cal Pers</td>
<td>24,420.90</td>
<td>EFT Retirement Misc - PEPRA New 26013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/29/2018</td>
<td>Cal Pers</td>
<td>49,614.93</td>
<td>EFT Retirement Misc - Classic 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/29/2018</td>
<td>Cal Pers</td>
<td>53,742.61</td>
<td>EFT Retirement Safety Fire- Classic 30168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/29/2018</td>
<td>Cal Pers</td>
<td>3,942.60</td>
<td>EFT Retirement Sfty Police Classic-2nd Tier 30169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1/2018</td>
<td>Manufacturers &amp; Traders</td>
<td>24,045.38</td>
<td>457 payment Vantagepoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1/2018</td>
<td>Manufacturers &amp; Traders</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>IRA payment Vantagepoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1/2018</td>
<td>Nationwide NRS EFT</td>
<td>31,537.91</td>
<td>EFT 457 payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1/2018</td>
<td>Health Comp</td>
<td>2,242.44</td>
<td>Weekly claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/4/2018</td>
<td>State of CA EFT</td>
<td>1,865.10</td>
<td>EFT Child support payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/4/2018</td>
<td>IRS</td>
<td>227,883.20</td>
<td>Federal 941 Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/4/2018</td>
<td>Employment Development</td>
<td>49,721.15</td>
<td>State PIT Withholding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/4/2018</td>
<td>Employment Development</td>
<td>3,905.64</td>
<td>State SDI payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/6/2018</td>
<td>Cal Pers</td>
<td>6,724.09</td>
<td>EFT Retirement Safety-Police-PEPRA New 25021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/6/2018</td>
<td>Cal Pers</td>
<td>24,533.78</td>
<td>EFT Retirement Misc - PEPRA New 26013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/6/2018</td>
<td>Cal Pers</td>
<td>49,612.89</td>
<td>EFT Retirement Misc - Classic 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/6/2018</td>
<td>Cal Pers</td>
<td>53,742.61</td>
<td>EFT Retirement Safety Fire- Classic 30168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/6/2018</td>
<td>Cal Pers</td>
<td>3,942.60</td>
<td>EFT Retirement Sfty Police Classic-2nd Tier 30169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/6/2018</td>
<td>Health Comp</td>
<td>1,455.00</td>
<td>Weekly claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/6/2018</td>
<td>Cal Pers</td>
<td>496,832.70</td>
<td>EFT Health Insurance Payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/7/2018</td>
<td>Lane Donovan Golf Ptr</td>
<td>22,672.88</td>
<td>Payroll Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/21/18-5/27/18</td>
<td>Workers Comp Activity</td>
<td>1,872.47</td>
<td>SCRMA checks issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/28/18-6/3/18</td>
<td>Workers Comp Activity</td>
<td>11,275.93</td>
<td>SCRMA checks issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/21/18-5/27/18</td>
<td>Liability Trust - Claims</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Claim checks issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/28/18-6/3/18</td>
<td>Liability Trust - Claims</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Claim checks issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/21/18-5/27/18</td>
<td>Retiree Health Insurance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Health Reimbursement checks issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/28/18-6/3/18</td>
<td>Retiree Health Insurance</td>
<td>17,113.32</td>
<td>Health Reimbursement checks issued</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DATE OF RATIFICATION: 6/7/18**

**TOTAL PAYMENTS BY WIRE:**

1,314,115.78

Certified as to the accuracy of the wire transfers by:

**Deputy City Treasurer II**

Date: 6/7/18

**Director of Finance**

Date: 6/7/18

**City Manager**

Date: 6/7/18

Information on actual expenditures is available in the City Treasurer's Office of the City of El Segundo.
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MEETING OF THE EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 2018 – 4:00 PM

4:00 P.M. SESSION

CALL TO ORDER – Mayor Boyles at 4:00 PM

ROLL CALL

Mayor Boyles - Present
Mayor Pro Tem Pirsztuk - Present
Council Member Brann - Present
Council Member Pimentel - Present
Council Member Nicol - Present

PUBLIC COMMUNICATION – (Related to City Business Only – 5 minute limit per person, 30 minute limit total) None

SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS:

1. Consideration and possible action to interview candidates of the Planning Commission, Recreation and Parks Commission, Environmental Committee and Arts and Culture Advisory Committee.
   (Fiscal Impact: None)

Council interviewed candidates and will announce appointment(s) at the 7:00 PM, June 16, 2018 City Council meeting.

The following candidates were selected; Recreation and Parks Commission – Julie Stolnak, Technology Committee – Joe Lipsey, Madelon Smith and Jessica Davis (6/30/18), Investment Advisory Committee – Eric Kari, Senior Citizen Housing Corporation Board – Paul Lanyi and Paula Rotolo (6/30/18), Arts and Culture Advisory Committee – Natalie Strong and Brian Mitchell (6/30/18), Environmental Committee – Kevin Maggay and Planning Committee – Michelle Keldorf

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

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)(1): -1- matters


CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION

Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to Government Code §54956.9(d)(2): -2- matters.


DISCUSSION OF PERSONNEL MATTERS (Gov’t Code §54957): -1- matters

1. Public Employee Review
   Position: City Manager

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): -0- matters

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

Adjourned at 6:57 PM
REGULAR MEETING OF THE EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 2018 - 7:00 P.M.

7:00 P.M. SESSION

CALL TO ORDER – Mayor Boyles at 7:00 PM

INVOCATION – Pastor Wes Harding, The Bridge Church

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – Council Member Brann

PRESENTATIONS – None

ROLL CALL

Mayor Boyles - Present
Mayor Pro Tem Pirsztuk - Present
Council Member Brann - Present
Council Member Pimentel - Present
Council Member Nicol - Present

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS – (Related to City Business Only – 5 minute limit per person, 30 minute limit total)
Nayeli Soon, Tree Musketeer Volunteer, invited the Community to attend either the June 26th or the August 5th event to clean up Memory Row along Imperial Highway. Lee Davis, resident and Recreation and Parks Commission, spoke regarding item #2. Tracey Miller-Zanneke, resident and CSS PTA President, thanked the Community and Community leaders for their support of the recent Ice Cream Social Event.

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.

MOTION by Council Member Brann, SECONDED by Council Member Pirsztuk 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)

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING
JUNE 5, 2018
PAGE NO. 3
1. Consideration and possible action to open the Public Hearing and receive testimony concerning adopting a Resolution approving new fees for aquatics programs and facility rentals at the El Segundo Aquatics Center (300 Duley Road) and the Urho Sari Swim Stadium (219 W. Mariposa Ave.).
(Fiscal Impact: Estimated Annual Revenue of $541,500+)

Mayor Boyles stated this was the time and place to conduct a public hearing regarding the proposed fees to the El Segundo Aquatics Center and the Urho Saari Swim Stadium.

Clerk Weaver stated that proper notice had been given in a timely manner and that no written communication had been received in the City Clerk’s office.

Greg Carpenter, City Manager, introduced the item.

Meredith Petit, Recreation and Parks Director, gave a report and answered Council questions on the item.

Stu Issac, President, The Issac Sports Group, reported and answered Council questions.

Public comment:
Michelle Keldorf, resident, had several questions concerning the poo; hours of utilization by the districts, where is the demand for other clubs, is hourly rate variable and for Learn to Swim, is the pool available to 3rd parties for a rental fee?
Chris Busse, resident, commented on the spectator fee and confirmed spectator fees are required at most pools.
Kurt Fry, South Bay United Water Polo Club, questioned our fees, felt they were a bit high for water polo fees.

MOTION by Council Member Nicol, SECONDED by Mayor Pro Tem Pirsztuk, to close the public hearing. MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE. 5/0

Meredith Petit and Stu Issac answered questions concerning Public Comment.

Council Discussion

Mark Hensley, City Attorney, read by title only:

RESOLUTION NO. 5085

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING NEW FEES FOR THE RECREATION AND PARKS DEPARTMENT
MOTION by Mayor Boyles, SECONDED by Council Member Brann, approving Resolution No. 5085, with the following amendments.... MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE. 5/0

Recessed at 8:44 PM

Reconvened at 8:53 PM

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

2. Consideration and possible action related to Special Event Permit Application from Huck Street Productions agreement no. 5543, for utilizing The Lakes at El Segundo Golf Course and Driving Ranges for the purposes of hosting a Craft Beer & Music Festival. (Fiscal Impact: Not less than $12,500 in Revenue to the Golf Course Fund)

Greg Carpenter, City Manager, introduced the item

Meredith Petit, Recreation and Parks Director, gave an updated report and answered Council questions.

Applicants, Huck Street Productions, answered Council questions.

Council Discussion

MOTION by Mayor Boyles, SECONDED by Mayor Pro Tem Pirsztuk, to approve the Special Event Permit Application with the following amendments; increase parking fees from $20.00 to $25.00, develop a clearly defined Uber/Lyft/Cab – transportation/parking plan for drop offs and pick-ups from the event and employ one security guard to rove the Chevron lots along El Segundo Blvd. MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE. 5/0

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. Approve Warrant Numbers 3021188 through 3021433 and 9000411 through 9000451 on Register No. 16 in the total amount of $2,069,595.74 and Wire Transfers from 5/7/18 through 5/27/18 in the total amount of $3,205,173.36.
Ratified Payroll and Employee Benefit checks; checks released early due to contracts or agreement; emergency disbursements and/or adjustments; and wire transfers.


5. Authorize City Manager to execute an agreement amendment no. 4810G to Agreement Number 4810, in a form approved by the City Attorney, with Robert Half International, Inc. (dba Accountemps) Agreement Number 4810 for temporary staffing in the Departments of Information Systems, Human Resources, and Finance. (Fiscal Impact: $200,000.00)

6. Adopt Resolution No. 5086 appointing City Council Mayor, Drew Boyles, City Council Member Chris Pimentel, and Director of Finance, Joseph Lillio, to serve as board member, alternate board member, and substitute alternate board member, respectively, on the Independent Cities Risk Management Association (ICRMA) governing board. (Fiscal Impact: None)

7. Authorize the acceptance of $139,125 in grant funds agreement no. 5544 the UASI 2016 grant program and allow for Amendments as outlined in subsection 3.12 of the Sub-recipient agreement, authorize the City Manager to sign the Amendment no. 5348B to the Professional Services Agreement, in a form approved by the City Attorney, with Michael T. Little dba Counter Risk, Inc.; authorize an increase of the blanket purchase order by $139,125 to enable the Fire Department to receive the services provided by Michael T. Little dba Counter Risk, Inc.; and authorize and approve additional appropriation to expense account 124-400-3785-6214.

MOTION by Council Member Brann, SECONDED by Mayor Pro Tem Pirsztuk, approving Consent Agenda items 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7. MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE. 5/0

F. NEW BUSINESS

8. Consideration and possible action to approve new part-time classifications of Lifeguard and Senior Lifeguard, for the purposes of clearly defining the roles, responsibilities and minimum qualifications for these positions and designating an hourly pay rate commensurate with the responsibilities of the positions. (Fiscal Impact: Estimated $48,800 Annually)

Greg Carpenter, City Manager, introduced the item
Meredith Petit, Recreation and Parks Director, gave a presentation.

Council Discussion

MOTION by Mayor Boyles, SECONDED by Mayor Pro Tem Pirsztuk, approving the part-time classifications and job descriptions of Lifeguard and Senior Lifeguard and approved the proposed hourly pay rate schedule for Lifeguard and Senior Lifeguard with an amendment; match lifeguard wages with the City of Los Angeles. MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE. 5/0

9. Consideration and possible action on two proposed ordinances which would prohibit loud and unruly gatherings and gatherings where underage drinking or illegal drug use occurs and provide a means for the City to hold responsible persons liable by imposing civil penalties and, for repeat offenders, holding them accountable for enforcement response costs associated with responding to recurring nuisances.
   (Fiscal Impact: Unknown at this time)

Greg Carpenter, City Manager, introduced the item.

Sam Lee, Planning and Building Safety Director, gave a report

Bill Whalen, Chief of Police, answered Council questions

Public Comment:
Cheryl Smith, resident and PTA Council VP, thanked all those involved in bringing the item to Council and commented on the item with statistics on underage drinking.
Paulette Caudell, resident and Reach Out Against Drugs (ROAD) President, strongly recommends passing the Social Host Ordinance regarding underage drinking and illegal drug use.
Melissa McCaverty, resident, Richmond Street Past PTA President and current Council of PTA's President, in favor of the Social Host Ordinance, along with all PTA Council's at all the schools.
Rhonda Jones, Behavioral Health Services (Teen Alcohol & Drug Prevention), commented on the item and in favor of the Social Host Ordinance and gave examples of other cities who have adopted the Ordinance.
Heather Longwrench, Behavioral Health Services (Teen Alcohol & Drug Prevention), commented on the Social Host Ordinance and commented on the age that underage drinking begins for males and females as seen by counselors.
Robin Arnold, resident, commented on the Unruly Gatherings Ordinance and is in favor of passing the Ordinance.
Carol (unknown last name, Los Angeles Asian American Drug Abuse Program, in favor of the Social Host Ordinance and sited data on underage drinking.
Mona Eisman, resident, commented on the Unruly Gatherings Ordinance and is in favor of passing the Ordinance. Currently living near an AirBnB, which is a repeat offender of Unruly Gatherings.

Council Discussion

ORDINANCE 1567

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING TITLE 7 OF THE EL SEGUNDO MUNICIPAL CODE TO PROHIBIT LOUD AND UNRULY GATHERINGS AND TO PERMIT THE CITY TO RECOVER COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT, FIRE AND OTHER PUBLIC SERVICES WHEN RESPONDING TO RECURRING NUISANCES

With the following amendments: Fines are as follows $2500.00 (1st offense within 90 days), $5,000.00 (2nd offense within same 90 days) and $7,500.00 (3rd offense within or after the first two offenses, as long there has not been a 90 day break in the offense, otherwise, the fine reverts back to $2,500.00). The 90 days restart, after no offenses for a 90 day period.

Mayor Pro Tem Pirsztuk introduced Ordinance No. 1567

Mark Hensley, City Attorney, read by title only;

ORDINANCE NO. 1568

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO ADDING CHAPTER 13 TO TITLE 7 OF THE EL SEGUNDO MUNICIPAL CODE PROHIBITING THE HOSTING, PERMITTING OR ALLOWING OF GATHERINGS AT WHICH PERSONS UNDER 21 YEARS OF AGE ARE CONSUMING ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES AND/OR USING MARIJUANA ILLEGALLY

With the following amendments: Fines are as follows $1000.00 (1st offense), $2,000.00 (2nd offense), and $5,000.00 (3rd offense) within a twelve (12) month period.

Council Member Nicol introduced Ordinance No. 1568

The second reading of both Ordinances will be brought back to the continued regular meeting on June 13, 2018, (Special Strategic Planning Session Meeting).

Council consensus to review both Ordinances after they have been in effect for 90 Days.

G. REPORTS – CITY MANAGER – Thanked the El Segundo Rotary Club for honoring Shawn Green, Employee of the Year, Kevin Darringer, Police Officer of the Year and Kevin Heronema, Firefighter of the Year, mentioned the Downtown
Committee would like the Council and the public to take a look at the “up lighting” on Main Street trees and give feedback and introduced Melissa McCollum, El Segundo’s new Library Director.

H. REPORTS – CITY ATTORNEY – Followed up on Accessory Dwellings Unit’s, making Council aware of what has been taking place with this item.

I. REPORTS – CITY CLERK

10. Consideration and possible action regarding Council consensus to cancel the July 3, 2018 City Council Meeting.
(Fiscal Impact: None)

Council Discussion

MOTION by Council Member Nicol, SECONDED by Council Member Brann, approving the cancellation of the July 3, 2018 City Council Meeting. MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE. 5/0

J. REPORTS – CITY TREASURER – Not present

K. REPORTS – CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

Council Member Pimentel – None

Council Member Nicol – Attended Medal of Valor event, attended NRG/Kiwanis Beach Clean Up Day Event, attended Ribbon Cutting for Tocaya Organica restaurant, attended the PCH unveiling event, attended Civic Day, attended RSS/CSS Inaugural Golf Cup, attended Fill the Pool event and attended Center Street’s Ice Cream Social.

Council Member Brann – None – will give a report at the next meeting

Mayor Pro Tem Pirsztuk – Attended the opening of ESMoA’s new exhibit, GROUNDED and congratulated all the El Segundo students Promoting and/or Graduating in June.

Mayor Boyles – Commented on scooters seen around town.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS – (Related to City Business Only – 5 minute limit per person, 30 minute limit total)
Chris Busse, resident, commented on the meeting dynamics and the two Ordinances introduced this evening.

MEMORIALS – None

CONTINUED the meeting to June 13th, 2018 at 11:22 PM.
Returned to discuss Commission's, Committee's and Board selections at 11:25 PM

Finished Commission's, Committee's and Board selections at 12:10 AM.

Tracy Weaver, City Clerk
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action regarding authorizing the City Manager to pre-pay the City’s annual unfunded liability contribution (UAL) to California Public Employees Retirement System (CalPERS) for the CalPERS Fiscal Year 2018-19. (Fiscal Impact: savings of $297,671: $74,418 for fiscal year (FY) 2017-18 and $223,253 in FY 2018-19)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
1. Authorize City Manager to execute the annual unfunded liability (UAL) prepayment option to CalPERS in the total amount of $8,218,670 resulting in a total savings of $297,671 to the City.
2. Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
A. Exhibit A - Public Safety required contributions.
B. Exhibit B - Miscellaneous required contribution.

FISCAL IMPACT: None
Amount Budgeted: $8,218,670 ($2,054,667 in FY 2017-18 for July-September and the difference of $6,164,003 will be budgeted in FY 2018-19)
Additional Appropriation: N/A
Account Number(s): N/A

STRATEGIC PLAN:
Goal: 5(b) Champion Economic Development and Fiscal Sustainability:
El Segundo approaches its work in a financially disciplined and responsible way
Objective: 2 The City will maintain a stable, efficient, and transparent financial environment

ORIGINATED BY: Joseph Illilla, Director of Finance
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:
CalPERS provides member cities with a discount for prepayment of their annual unfunded liability contribution (UAL). The UAL is the employer annual payment toward the unfunded pension liability as measured on the actuarial valuation date. CalPERS is providing a discount
rate in the amount of 3.55% towards the City of El Segundo’s (the “City”) UAL of $8,516,341, resulting in a savings of $297,671 for a total discounted payment due of $8,218,670. The prepayment of the UAL must be made between July 1 and July 13, 2018 and is based on the CalPERS fiscal year of July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019. Attached for reference is the CalPERS required contributions statement for both Public Safety (Exhibit A) and Miscellaneous (Exhibit B). Also, table 1 below depicts the difference in paying the UAL on a monthly basis at the full rate versus the prepayment lump sum at the discounted rate.

Table 1 – Monthly payment versus discounted prepaid annual payment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CalPERS Plan</th>
<th>CalPERS FY 2018-19 Annual Unfunded Liability Contribution (if paid in monthly installments)</th>
<th>Prepayment of Annual Unfunded Liability Contribution</th>
<th>Difference (Savings)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety – PD Classic 1st Tier</td>
<td>$3,239,891</td>
<td>$3,126,647</td>
<td>-$113,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety – PD Classic 2nd Tier</td>
<td>5,002</td>
<td>4,827</td>
<td>-$175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety – PEPRA</td>
<td>$862</td>
<td>$832</td>
<td>-$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety – Fire Classic</td>
<td>$2,934,107</td>
<td>$2,831,551</td>
<td>-$102,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety – Fire PEPRA</td>
<td>$1,280</td>
<td>$1,236</td>
<td>-$44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$2,335,199</td>
<td>$2,253,577</td>
<td>-$81,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,516,341</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,218,670</strong></td>
<td><strong>-$297,671</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City’s current overall investment portfolio is currently earning an annualized return of 1.73% (as of April 2018). The City’s portfolio return of 1.73% is significantly lower than the return CalPERS is applying (3.55%) towards the City’s prepayment; resulting in a more effective use of City funds.

Staff recommends prepaying the UAL payment in the amount of $8,218,670, resulting in a direct savings of $297,671 to the City.

As a comparison and for historical information, last year City Council approved staff’s recommendation to prepay the UAL payment in the amount of $7,019,291, resulting in a direct savings of $258,464 to the City.
April 5, 2018

CalPERS ID: 2657082556
Employer Name: CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
Rate Plan: SAFETY POLICE FIRST TIER PLAN [28]
Re: Lump Sum Payment to reduce the Unfunded Actuarial Liability

Dear Requestor:

As requested, 2018-2019 employer contribution rate information on your lump sum payment follows.

If you are aware of others interested in this information (i.e. payroll staff, county court employees, port districts, etc.), please inform them.

The information is based on the most recent annual valuation and assumes payment by April 20, 2018 and no further contractual or financing changes taking effect before June 30, 2018. The Unfunded Liability will be reduced or eliminated by a lump sum payment in the amount of $683,010. The payment will be applied to the Special (Gain)/Loss 6/30/11 and Payment (Gain)/Loss 6/30/12 bases.

There will be no change to your 2017-18 contributions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valuation as of June 30, 2016</th>
<th>Pre-Payment</th>
<th>Post Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected 6/30/18 Total Unfunded Liability¹</td>
<td>$55,891,526</td>
<td>$683,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment on 4/20/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 6/30/18 Total Unfunded Liability¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019 Employer Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Total Normal Cost for Formula</td>
<td>28.405%</td>
<td>28.405%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surcharges for Class 1 Benefit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) FAC 1</td>
<td>1.140%</td>
<td>1.140%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) PRSA</td>
<td>1.790%</td>
<td>1.790%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase out of Normal Cost Difference</td>
<td>0.482%</td>
<td>0.482%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan's Total Normal Cost</td>
<td>31.817%</td>
<td>31.817%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula's Expected Employee Contribution Rate</td>
<td>8.989%</td>
<td>8.989%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Normal Cost Rate</td>
<td>22.828%</td>
<td>22.828%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment on Special (Gain)/Loss 6/30/11 base</td>
<td>$29,601</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment on Payment (Gain)/Loss 6/30/12 base</td>
<td>$15,326</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment on all other bases</td>
<td>3,239,891</td>
<td>3,239,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019 Employer Unfunded Liability Payment</td>
<td>$3,284,818</td>
<td>$3,239,891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Calculated amounts were projected from June 30, 2017 to June 30, 2018 based on a discount rate of 7.25%, which will be used in the June 30, 2017 valuation, rather than the 7.375% used in the June 30, 2016 valuation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Employer Contribution</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employer Normal Cost Rate</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plus Either</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Monthly Employer Dollar UAL Payment</td>
<td>$ 269,990.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Annual UAL Prepayment Option</td>
<td>$ 3,126,647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total minimum required employer contribution is the sum of the Plan's Employer Normal Cost Rate (expressed as a percentage of payroll) plus the Employer Unfunded Accrued Liability (UAL) Contribution Amount (billed monthly in dollars).

Only the UAL portion of the employer contribution can be prepaid (which must be received in full no later than July 31). Plan Normal Cost contributions will be made as part of the payroll reporting process. If there is contractual cost sharing or other change, this amount will change.

To initiate this change, the enclosed Lump Sum Payment Request must be completed and returned to the Fiscal Services Division with a wire transfer or a check by April 20, 2018. A copy should be sent to us.

If you have questions, please call (888) CalPERS (225-7377).

PAUL TSCHIDA, FSA, EA, MAAA
Senior Pension Actuary, CalPERS
January 2018

Business Partner Name: CITY OF EL SEGUNDO  
CalPERS ID: 2657082556  
Rate Plan: SAFETY POLICE SECOND TIER PLAN  
Rate Plan ID: 30169

Re: Decision to Fresh Start Liability Over a 10 Year Period

Dear Business Partner:

This letter is in response to your decision to reduce the amortization period on your unfunded accrued liability to a ten-year period. This request would result in a "Fresh Start", wherein all liability bases from your 6/30/16 valuation would be merged into a single "Fresh Start" base that would then be amortized over a period of ten years.

If you are aware of others interested in this information (i.e. payroll staff, county court employees, port districts, etc.), please inform them.

A comparison of the changes to your unfunded liability payment resulting from this action is displayed below. The information displayed in this letter is based on the unfunded liability shown on page 9 of your June 30, 2016 valuation report. It also reflects the payment of $11,849 received on 10/12/17.

The information contained in the June 30, 2016 annual valuation report reflects the benefit provisions and member data as of June 30, 2016. The valuation report is appropriate for reporting and disclosure purposes.

Shown below is a comparison of changes to your plan’s unfunded liability assuming enactment of a 10-year fresh start. This includes a comparison of the changes to your required employer contribution for 2018-19. This action will not change your 2017-18 or 2018-19 Normal Cost contribution.

Please note that there will be no changes to your 2017-18 unfunded liability contribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valuation as of June 30, 2016</th>
<th>Before Fresh Start</th>
<th>After Fresh Start</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected UAL Balance as of 6/30/2018</strong>&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unfunded Liability Balance</td>
<td>$ 40,537</td>
<td>$ 40,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018-2019 Employer Contributions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Total Normal Cost for Formula</td>
<td>26.598%</td>
<td>26.598%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surcharges for Class 1 Benefit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) FAC 1</td>
<td>1.063%</td>
<td>1.063%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) PRSA</td>
<td>1.739%</td>
<td>1.739%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase out of Normal Cost Difference</td>
<td>0.000%</td>
<td>0.000%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan's Total Normal Cost</td>
<td>29.400%</td>
<td>29.400%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula's Expected Employee Contribution Rate</td>
<td>8.984%</td>
<td>8.984%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Normal Cost Rate</td>
<td>20.416%</td>
<td>20.416%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019 Employer Unfunded Liability payment</td>
<td>$ 2,374</td>
<td>$ 5,002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>Newly calculated amounts were based on a discount rate of 7.25%, which will be used in the June 30, 2017 valuation, rather than the 7.375% used in the June 30, 2016 valuation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Employer Contribution</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2018-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employer Normal Cost Rate</td>
<td>20.416%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Either</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Monthly Employer Dollar UAL Payment</td>
<td>$ 416.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Annual Lump Sum Prepayment Option</td>
<td>$ 4,827</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total minimum required employer contribution is the sum of the Plan’s Employer Normal Cost Rate (expressed as a percentage of payroll) plus the Employer Unfunded Accrued Liability (UAL) Contribution Amount (billed monthly in dollars). Only the UAL portion of the employer contribution can be prepaid (which must be received in full no later than July 31). Plan Normal Cost contributions will be made as part of the payroll reporting process. If there is contractual cost sharing or other change, this amount will change. § 20572 of the Public Employees’ Retirement Law assesses interest at an annual rate of 10 percent if a contracting agency fails to remit the required contributions when due.

If you have questions, please call (888) CalPERS (225-7377).

Kung-pei Hwang

KUNG-PEI HWANG, ASA, MAAA
Senior Pension Actuary, CalPERS
January 2018

Business Partner Name: CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
CalPERS ID: 2657082556
Rate Plan: PEPRA SAFETY POLICE PLAN
Rate Plan ID: 25021

Re: Decision to Fresh Start Liability Over a 10 Year Period

Dear Business Partner:

This letter is in response to your decision to reduce the amortization period on your unfunded accrued liability to a ten-year period. This request would result in a "Fresh Start", wherein all liability bases from your 6/30/16 valuation would be merged into a single "Fresh Start" base that would then be amortized over a period of ten years.

If you are aware of others interested in this information (i.e. payroll staff, county court employees, port districts, etc.), please inform them.

A comparison of the changes to your unfunded liability payment resulting from this action is displayed below. The information displayed in this letter is based on the unfunded liability shown on page 9 of your June 30, 2016 valuation report. It also reflects the payment of $8,687 received on 10/12/17.

The information contained in the June 30, 2016 annual valuation report reflects the benefit provisions and member data as of June 30, 2016. The valuation report is appropriate for reporting and disclosure purposes.

Shown below is a comparison of changes to your plan's unfunded liability assuming enactment of a 10-year fresh start. This includes a comparison of the changes to your required employer contribution for 2018-19. This action will not change your 2017-18 or 2018-19 Normal Cost contribution.

Please note that there will be no changes to your 2017-18 unfunded liability contribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valuation as of June 30, 2016</th>
<th>Before Fresh Start</th>
<th>After Fresh Start</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected UAL Balance as of 6/30/2018</strong>^</td>
<td>$ 6,988</td>
<td>$ 6,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018-2019 Employer Contributions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Total Normal Cost for Formula</td>
<td>24.141%</td>
<td>24.141%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surcharges for Class 1 Benefit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) PRSA</td>
<td>1.574%</td>
<td>1.574%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase out of Normal Cost Difference</td>
<td>0.000%</td>
<td>0.000%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan's Total Normal Cost</td>
<td>25.715%</td>
<td>25.715%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula's Expected Employee Contribution Rate</td>
<td>12.750%</td>
<td>12.750%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Normal Cost Rate</td>
<td>12.965%</td>
<td>12.965%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019 Employer Unfunded Liability payment</td>
<td>$ 321</td>
<td>$ 862</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^Newly calculated amounts were based on a discount rate of 7.25%, which will be used in the June 30, 2017 valuation, rather than the 7.375% used in the June 30, 2016 valuation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Employer Contribution</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2018-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employer Normal Cost Rate</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.965%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plus Either</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Monthly Employer Dollar UAL Payment</td>
<td>$ 71.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Annual Lump Sum Prepayment Option</td>
<td>$ 832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total minimum required employer contribution is the sum of the Plan’s Employer Normal Cost Rate (expressed as a percentage of payroll) plus the Employer Unfunded Accrued Liability (UAL) Contribution Amount (billed monthly in dollars). Only the UAL portion of the employer contribution can be prepaid (which must be received in full no later than July 31). Plan Normal Cost contributions will be made as part of the payroll reporting process. If there is contractual cost sharing or other change, this amount will change. § 20572 of the Public Employees' Retirement Law assesses interest at an annual rate of 10 percent if a contracting agency fails to remit the required contributions when due.

If you have questions, please call (888) CalPERS (225-7377).

KUNG-PEI HWANG, ASA, MAAA
Senior Pension Actuary, CalPERS
April 5, 2018

CalPERS ID: 2657082556
Employer Name: CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
Rate Plan: SAFETY FIRE PLAN [30168]

Re: Lump Sum Payment to reduce the Unfunded Actuarial Liability

Dear Requestor:

As requested, 2018-2019 employer contribution rate information on your lump sum payment follows.

If you are aware of others interested in this information (i.e. payroll staff, county court employees, port districts, etc.), please inform them.

The information is based on the most recent annual valuation and assumes payment by April 20, 2018 and no further contractual or financing changes taking effect before June 30, 2018. The Unfunded Liability will be reduced or eliminated by a lump sum payment in the amount of $618,603. The payment will be applied to the Special (Gain)/Loss 6/30/11 and Payment (Gain)/Loss 6/30/12 bases.

There will be no change to your 2017-18 contributions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valuation as of June 30, 2016</th>
<th>Pre-Payment</th>
<th>Post Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected 6/30/18 Total Unfunded Liability$1</td>
<td>$50,606,549</td>
<td>$49,979,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment on 4/20/2018</td>
<td>$618,603</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 6/30/18 Total Unfunded Liability$1</td>
<td>$49,979,472</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2018-2019 Employer Contributions

| Base Total Normal Cost for Formula | 26.598% | 26.598% |
| Surcharges for Class 1 Benefit | | |
| a) FAC 1 | 1.063% | 1.063% |
| b) PRSA | 1.739% | 1.739% |
| Phase out of Normal Cost Difference | (3.001%) | (3.001%) |
| Plan’s Total Normal Cost | 26.399% | 26.399% |
| Formula’s Expected Employee Contribution Rate | 8.984% | 8.984% |
| Employer Normal Cost Rate | 17.415% | 17.415% |
| Payment on Special (Gain)/Loss 6/30/11 base | $26,810 | $0 |
| Payment on Payment (Gain)/Loss 6/30/12 base | 13,881 | 0 |
| Payment on all other bases | 2,934,107 | 2,934,107 |

2018-2019 Employer Unfunded Liability Payment | $2,974,798 | $2,974,107 |

$1Calculated amounts were projected from June 30, 2017 to June 30, 2018 based on a discount rate of 7.25%, which will be used in the June 30, 2017 valuation, rather than the 7.375% used in the June 30, 2016 valuation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employer Normal Cost Rate</td>
<td>17.415%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plus Either</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Monthly Employer Dollar UAL Payment</td>
<td>$244,508.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Or</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Annual UAL Prepayment Option</td>
<td>$2,831,551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total minimum required employer contribution is the sum of the Plan's Employer Normal Cost Rate (expressed as a percentage of payroll) plus the Employer Unfunded Accrued Liability (UAL) Contribution Amount (billed monthly in dollars).

Only the UAL portion of the employer contribution can be prepaid (which must be received in full no later than July 31). Plan Normal Cost contributions will be made as part of the payroll reporting process. If there is contractual cost sharing or other change, this amount will change.

To initiate this change, the enclosed Lump Sum Payment Request must be completed and returned to the Fiscal Services Division with a wire transfer or a check by April 20, 2018. A copy should be sent to us.

If you have questions, please call (888) CalPERS (225-7377).

PAUL TSCHIDA, FSA, EA, MAAA
Senior Pension Actuary, CalPERS
August 2017

PEPRA SAFETY FIRE PLAN OF THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
(CalPERS ID: 2657682556)
Annual Valuation Report as of June 30, 2016

Dear Employer,

As an attachment to this letter, you will find a copy of the June 30, 2016 actuarial valuation report of the pension plan.

Because this plan is in a risk pool, the following valuation report has been separated into two sections:

- Section 1 contains specific information for the plan including the development of the current and projected employer contributions, and
- Section 2 contains the Risk Pool Actuarial Valuation appropriate to the plan as of June 30, 2016.

Section 2 can be found on the CalPERS website at (www.calpers.ca.gov). From the home page, go to "Forms & Publications" and select "View All". In the search box, enter "Risk Pool Report" and from the results list download the Miscellaneous or Safety Risk Pool Actuarial Valuation Report as appropriate.

Your June 30, 2016 actuarial valuation report contains important actuarial information about your pension plan at CalPERS. Your assigned CalPERS staff actuary, whose signature appears in the Actuarial Certification section on page 1, is available to discuss the report with you after August 31, 2017.

The exhibit below displays the minimum employer contributions, before any cost sharing, for Fiscal Year 2018-19 along with estimates of the required contributions for Fiscal Years 2019-20 and 2020-21. Member contributions other than cost sharing (whether paid by the employer or the employee) are in addition to the results shown below. The employer contributions in this report do not reflect any cost sharing arrangements you may have with your employees.

**Required Contribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Employer Normal Cost Rate</th>
<th>Employer Payment of Unfunded Liability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>12.965%</td>
<td>$1,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected Results</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>$51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The actual investment return for Fiscal Year 2016-17 was not known at the time this report was prepared. The projections above assume the investment return for that year would be 7.375 percent. *If the actual investment return for Fiscal Year 2016-17 differs from 7.375 percent, the actual contribution requirements for the projected years will differ from those shown above.*

Moreover, the projected results for Fiscal Years 2019-20 and 2020-21 also assume that there are no future plan changes, no further changes in assumptions other than those recently approved, and no liability gains or losses. Such changes can have a significant impact on required contributions. Since they cannot be predicted in advance, the projected employer results shown above are estimates. The actual required employer contributions for Fiscal Year 2019-20 will be provided in next year's report.

For additional details regarding the assumptions and methods used for these projections please refer to the "Projected Employer Contributions" in the "Highlights and Executive Summary" section.

The "Risk Analysis" section of the valuation report also contains estimated employer contributions in future years under a variety of investment return scenarios.
Required Employer Contribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Required Employer Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>Employer Normal Cost Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Plus Either</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) Monthly Employer Dollar UAL Payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Annual Lump Sum Prepayment Option</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total minimum required employer contribution is the sum of the Plan's Employer Normal Cost Rate (expressed as a percentage of payroll) plus the Employer Unfunded Accrued Liability (UAL) Contribution Amount (billed monthly in dollars).

Only the UAL portion of the employer contribution can be prepaid (which must be received in full no later than July 31). Plan Normal Cost contributions will be made as part of the payroll reporting process. If there is contractual cost sharing or other change, this amount will change.

§ 20572 of the Public Employees’ Retirement Law assesses interest at an annual rate of 10 percent if a contracting agency fails to remit the required contributions when due.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Development of Normal Cost as a Percentage of Payroll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>Base Total Normal Cost for Formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surcharge for Class 1 Benefits²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase out of Normal Cost Difference³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan’s Total Normal Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan’s Employee Contribution Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employer Normal Cost Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projected Payroll for the Contribution Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated Employer Contributions Based on Projected Payroll

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Estimated Employer Contributions Based on Projected Payroll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>Plan’s Estimated Employer Normal Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan’s Payment on Amortization Bases⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Projected Payroll (Illustrative only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated Total Employer Contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Projected Payroll (Illustrative only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The results shown for Fiscal Year 2017-18 reflect the prior year valuation and may not take into account any lump sum payment, side fund payoff, or rate adjustment made after June 30, 2016.

2 Section 2 of this report contains a list of Class 1 benefits and corresponding surcharges for each benefit.

3 The normal cost difference is phased out over a five year period. The phase out of normal cost difference is 100 percent for the first year of pooling, and is incrementally reduced by 20 percent of the original normal cost difference for each subsequent year. This is non-zero only for plans that joined a pool within the past 5 years. Most plans joined a pool June 30, 2003, when risk pooling was implemented.

4 See page 9 for a breakdown of the Amortization Bases.
January 2018

Business Partner Name: CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
CalPERS ID: 2657082556
Rate Plan: MISCELLANEOUS PLAN
Rate Plan ID: 27

Re: Decision to Fresh Start Liability Over a 22 Year Period

Dear Business Partner:

This letter is in response to your decision to reduce the amortization period on your unfunded accrued liability to a twenty-two-year period. This request would result in a "Fresh Start", wherein all liability bases from your 6/30/16 valuation would be merged into a single "Fresh Start" base that would then be amortized over a period of twenty-two years.

If you are aware of others interested in this information (i.e. payroll staff, county court employees, port districts, etc.), please inform them.

A comparison of the changes to your unfunded liability payment resulting from this action is displayed below. The information displayed in this letter is based on the unfunded liability shown on page 15 of your June 30, 2016 valuation report. It also reflects the payment of $578,992 received on 10/12/17.

The information contained in the June 30, 2016 annual valuation report reflects the benefit provisions and member data as of June 30, 2016. The valuation report is appropriate for reporting and disclosure purposes.

Shown below is a comparison of changes to your plan’s unfunded liability assuming enactment of a 22-year fresh start. This includes a comparison of the changes to your required employer contribution for 2018-19. This action will not change your 2017-18 or 2018-19 Normal Cost contribution.

Please note that there will be no changes to your 2017-18 unfunded liability contribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valuation as of June 30, 2016</th>
<th>Before Fresh Start</th>
<th>After Fresh Start</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected UAL Balance as of 6/30/2018</strong>¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unfunded Liability Balance</td>
<td>$ 33,524,557</td>
<td>$ 33,524,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018-2019 Employer Contributions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Normal Cost</td>
<td>14.803%</td>
<td>14.803%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Contribution</td>
<td>6.722%</td>
<td>6.722%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Normal Cost</td>
<td>8.081%</td>
<td>8.081%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019 Employer Unfunded Liability payment</td>
<td>$ 2,048,237</td>
<td>$ 2,335,199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Newly calculated amounts were based on a discount rate of 7.25%, which will be used in the June 30, 2017 valuation, rather than the 7.375% used in the June 30, 2016 valuation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Employer Contribution</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2018-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employer Normal Cost Rate</td>
<td>8.081%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Either</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Monthly Employer Dollar UAL Payment</td>
<td>$ 194,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Annual Lump Sum Prepayment Option</td>
<td>$ 2,253,577</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total minimum required employer contribution is the **sum** of the Plan’s Employer Normal Cost Rate (expressed as a percentage of payroll) **plus** the Employer Unfunded Accrued Liability (UAL) Contribution Amount (billed monthly in dollars). Only the UAL portion of the employer contribution can be prepaid (which must be received in full no later than July 31). Plan Normal Cost contributions will be made as part of the payroll reporting process. If there is contractual cost sharing or other change, this amount will change. § 20572 of the Public Employees’ Retirement Law assesses interest at an annual rate of 10 percent if a contracting agency fails to remit the required contributions when due.

If you have questions, please call (888) CalPERS (225-7377).

KUNG-PEI HWANG, ASA, MAAA
Senior Pension Actuary, CalPERS
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action to award a standard Public Works Contract to Ramona, Inc. for the Storm Drain Pipe Abandonment on Eucalyptus Drive Project, Project No. PW 18-11. (Fiscal Impact: $116,150)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1. Authorize the City Manager to execute a standard Public Works Contract in a form as approved by the City Attorney with Ramona, Inc. in the amount of $101,000 and approve an additional 15% contingency of $15,150 for unforeseen conditions.

2. Alternatively, discuss and take other possible actions related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

Location Map

FISCAL IMPACT: Included in Adopted Budget

Amount Budgeted: $116,150
Additional Appropriation: No.
Account Number(s): $80,000 from 301-400-8205-8313 (Eucalyptus Storm Drain Abandonment)
$36,150 from 001-400-4302-6215 (Storm Drain Repairs)

STRATEGIC PLAN:

Goal: 4 Develop Quality Infrastructure and Technology

Objective: (a) El Segundo’s physical infrastructure supports an appealing, safe, and effective City

ORIGINATED BY: Floriza Rivera, Principal Engineer
REVIEWED BY: Ken Berkman, Public Works Director
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

In the late 1950s, a 28-inch corrugated metal pressurized storm drain pipeline (the Eucalyptus force main) was constructed along Eucalyptus Dr. to convey stormwater from the southwest section of the Smoky Hollow area around Eucalyptus Dr. and Franklin Ave. to Storm Drain Pump Station 6 at 408 Eucalyptus Drive. In the mid-1990s, the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works constructed the Arena Street Pump Station and reconfigured the storm drain system to route the stormwater flow previously conveyed by the Eucalyptus line to the new pump station to provide the required design capacity and safety. As a result of the County Project, the Eucalyptus force main has been out of service for the last 20 years.
A sinkhole incident along Eucalyptus Drive occurred last year, and appeared to be situated along the force main’s alignment. Staff investigated the force main using closed circuit television (CCTV) and found numerous breaks, offsets, intruding tree roots, debris, and water inside the pipe. A project was subsequently created and approved for this fiscal year in the Capital Improvement Program Budget.

This project will fill the ~1,000 feet of existing force main with a cement-based material known as Controlled Low-Strength Material (CLSM). As opposed to a complete removal option, the CLSM provides the desired result with minimal pipe and roadway section removals and subsequently, a lower cost and reduced public construction inconvenience.

On April 3, 2018, the City Council adopted plans and specifications for the Storm Drain Pipe Abandonment on Eucalyptus Drive Project and authorized staff to advertise for bids.

On May 15, 2018, the City Clerk received and opened one (1) bid as follows:

Ramona, Inc. $101,000

The sole bidder was Ramona, Inc. and their bid was in line with the Engineer's Estimate, given the project’s small, specialized scope of work. Staff checked their references and contractor's license status and they are in good standing. The contractor has successfully completed similar projects for other public agencies, and for the City itself.

Staff respectfully recommends that Council award a standard public works contract to Ramona, Inc. in the amount of $101,000 and approve an additional 15% contingency of $15,150 for unforeseen conditions. With Council approval, the project is expected to start in July and be completed in September of this year.
Storm Drain Pipe Abandonment

Abandon existing 28" storm drain pipe

DISCLAIMER: The information shown on this map was compiled from different GIS sources. The land base and facility information on this map is for display purposes only and should not be relied upon without independent verification as to its accuracy. The City of El Segundo will not be held responsible for any claims, losses or damages resulting from the use of this map.

Notes
PW 18-11: Storm Drain Pipe Abandonment on Eucalyptus Drive
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action authorizing the City Manager to execute a Professional Services Agreement in a form approved by the City Attorney with EMG to complete a Citywide Facilities Condition Assessment. (Fiscal Impact: $96,403.50 to the General Fund)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
1. Authorize the City Manager to execute a Professional Services Agreement with EMG in a form approved by the City Attorney in the amount of $96,403.50; or,
2. Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
EMG Proposal

FISCAL IMPACT: Included in Adopted Budget
Amount Budgeted: $200,000
Additional Appropriation: No
Account Number(s): 301-400-8203-6679

ORIGINATED BY: Ken Berkman, Public Works Director
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:
The City owns and maintains over 260,000 square feet (SF) of building area with Public Works Department staff, or in the case of Park Vista Senior Housing’s ~60,000 SF, consultant staff. Unlike the Master Plans that the Department has prepared for the City’s Water, Wastewater, and Pavement systems, for example, a Master Plan has never been prepared for the City’s facilities and appurtenant building systems. Thus, City staff is primarily in a reactive maintenance mode for building improvements and repairs where unknown and/or unanticipated major costs can, and do, occur. Funding is set aside each year based upon staff’s expertise and historical knowledge of our facilities; however, it is critical that a study be conducted and a short- and long-term capital improvement plan be prepared so staff and the City Council can properly budget the expected maintenance workload in the future from both a staffing and financial perspective.

With this goal established, the City Council authorized the preparation and execution of a Request for Proposals (RFP) to prepare a Citywide Facilities Condition Assessment (FCA) as part of this fiscal year’s budget.
An RFP for the FCA was released in March 2018. The scope of work included:

- Facilities Condition Assessment Report with Facilities Condition Indices (FCI’s)
- Short-Term (Five-Year) CIP Program (most urgent priorities)
- Long-Term Prioritized CIP Program (5+ to 20 years)
- City Council Meetings – one (1) Study Session with presentation; one (1) Final Report with presentation.

Assessments of the following at a minimum:

- Building envelope, to include the outer shell, walls, doors, windows and roof.
- Structural integrity, including walls and foundations.
- Interior walls, ceilings, and flooring.
- Mechanical systems, HVAC, exhaust, ventilation, controls and instrumentation.
- Electrical systems, both interior and exterior, including distribution and lighting.
- Plumbing systems, both interior and exterior.
- Fire/life safety systems.
- ADA accessibility/path-of-travel, including public common areas.
- Site assessments of parking, walkways, fencing, and utilities.
- Reports and CIP Programs that present individual facility recommendations as well as the overall CIP recommendations.

On March 29th, staff received 11 proposals. A panel comprised of the Public Works Director and two Senior Civil Engineers reviewed the proposals and unanimously ranked the top three firms to continue to the interview phase of the procurement. The General Services Manager, who oversees the Facilities Maintenance Section, joined the proposal panel to conduct interviews, which were held on May 3rd and 8th. EMG was selected as the top-ranked firm based upon their qualifications, and was also one of the most competitively-priced proposals. Negotiations have been completed and the resulting scope of work and fee are attached.

Staff respectfully recommends Council authorize the City Manager to execute a Professional Services Agreement in a form approved by the City Attorney with EMG to complete a Citywide Facilities Condition Assessment in an amount of $96,403.50. With Council’s approval, the assessment process is expected to commence in August with final reports anticipated for completion in February 2019.
June 11, 2018

Via Email: kberkman@elsegundo.com

Mr. Ken Berkman
Public Works Director
City of El Segundo
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

RE: City-wide Facility Condition Assessments, El Segundo, California
EMG Proposal No: 131118.18P – revision v1

Dear Mr. Berkman:

We are pleased to provide the City of El Segundo (hereinafter referred to as “Client”) with the following proposal. If accepted, EMG will perform the services listed below (collectively, the “Services”) meeting the specifications hereafter described.

PROPERTY(IES)
Various Properties – El Segundo, CA – See Property List

PROPOSED SERVICE & LUMP SUM FEE(S)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service(s)</th>
<th>Lump Sum Fee</th>
<th>Initial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility Condition Assessment</td>
<td>$55,137.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset / Equipment Inventory</td>
<td>$5,102.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventive Maintenance Plans</td>
<td>$5,102.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcoding</td>
<td>$3,827.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Survey and Transition Plan (Entrances and Public Areas)</td>
<td>$27,235.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed fees are limited to the specific Services described in this Proposal, performed according to the requirements of the corresponding ASTM standard practices, or Client-specified Protocols. The fee includes up to one (1) hour of post-delivery consulting time (per report) to discuss findings and/or make requested revisions.

DELIVERABLE(S)
The quoted price includes the delivery of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of</th>
<th>Report Type</th>
<th>Method of Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>Email Full Report (PDF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Email Full Report (PDF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bound Copy</td>
<td>2 Copies of Each Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unless otherwise specified, EMG will submit all reports in Final format. Timing for completion of any requested post-delivery modifications to the report will be determined at the time of the request. Factors affecting this timing include (but are not limited to): (a) Complexity of the requested modification(s); (b) Number of reports affected by the request, and (c) EMG’s capacity at the time of the request. In order to serve you best, we require that all requests for changes to reports be submitted within 30 days of initial delivery. Additional charges may be requested for report changes after 30 days.

If different deliverables are required, please indicate the correct quantities, types and methods of delivery on the Project Authorization page of this proposal.
TIMING

EMG’s report(s) will be delivered within 90 full business/working days after receipt and approval of the signed proposal document. EMG reserves the right to extend the report delivery schedule as a result of any delay caused by:

- a delay by Client in providing EMG an acceptable written authorization to proceed; or
- a failure by Client to provide an accurate site address or an accurately identified and cooperative point of contact for access to the property, where applicable.

During the course of the assignment, a call will be placed to the designated onsite Point of Contact (POC) provided by the Client in order to schedule the site visit(s), where applicable. The Client acknowledges that the Point of Contact provided shall be deemed an agent of the Client for the purposes of providing access and conveying information pertaining to the Site.

PROJECTS PLACED ON HOLD OR CANCELED

Should the Client place the awarded project on hold or cancel the engagement after contract execution, the Client agrees to pay project-specific costs incurred by EMG, such as administrative processing, regulatory database searches and non-recoverable travel fees, as well as a percentage of the project fee, depending upon the time the project is placed on hold or cancelled. Please note that EMG invoices canceled jobs at the time of cancellation. Jobs on hold will be automatically invoiced 30 days from the date of the hold request. Requests to cancel or place projects on or off hold must be received by EMG in writing (email acceptable) from the Client. Invoices billed as a result of projects being placed on hold or canceled are fully collectible.

TERMS & CONDITIONS

EMG will perform its Services subject to the City of El Segundo’s “Professional Services Agreement.”

Please feel free to contact me at (800) 733-0660 x.2704 or epiller@emgcorp.com should you have any questions. EMG welcomes the opportunity to be of service.

Sincerely,

EMG

[Signature]

Erik S. Piller
Senior Vice President

Attachments:
Property List
Description of Services
Terms & Conditions
Project Authorization
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIVIC CENTER - CITY HALL</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>27,961</td>
<td>350 MAIN ST.</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVIC CENTER- POLICE STATION</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>27,368</td>
<td>348 MAIN ST.</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVIC CENTER - FIRE STATION #1</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>314 MAIN ST.</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVIC CENTER- HOSE TOWER</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>314 MAIN ST.</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATION CENTER- POLICE</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>1348 MAIN ST.</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATION CENTER ADDITION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRE STATION II COMPLEX- FIRE STATION #2 (NEW)</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>2261 MARIPAFA AVE.</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC PARK MAIN COMPLEX- CHECKOUT BUILDING</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>2,016</td>
<td>300 EAST PINE</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC PARK MAIN COMPLEX- CLUBHOUSE</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>11,623</td>
<td>300 EAST PINE</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC PARK MAIN COMPLEX- CONCESSION RESTROOMS</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>300 EAST PINE</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC PARK MAIN COMPLEX- SCOREKEEPERS BOOTH</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>300 EAST PINE</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC PARK MAIN COMPLEX- STORAGE OUTREACH BUILDING</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>339 SHELDON</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC PARK MAIN COMPLEX-JOSLYN RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>7,010</td>
<td>339 SHELDON</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC PARK MAIN COMPLEX- ELEVATOR</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>339 SHELDON</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC PARK MAIN COMPLEX- PARK OFFICE SHOP BUILDING</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1,848</td>
<td>339 SHELDON</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC PARK MAIN COMPLEX- SCOREKEEPERS RESTROOMS</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>EUCALYPTUS AND HOLLY</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC PARK MAIN COMPLEX- CONCESSION RESTROOMS</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>EUCALYPTUS AND GRAND</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HILLTOP PARK- WATER FACILITY- RESTROOMS</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>MARYLAND AND GRAND</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACACIA PARK- RESTROOMS</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>600 ARCADIA</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARY PARK- LIBRARY</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>14,686</td>
<td>111 WEST MARIPAFA</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARY PARK- LIBRARY ANNEX ADDITION</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>15,643</td>
<td>111 WEST MARIPAFA</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARY PARK- BAND STAND</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>111 WEST MARIPAFA</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEEN CENTER - TEEN CENTER</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>5,480</td>
<td>405 EAST GRAND AVE.</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY MAINTENENCE FACILITY- ADMINISTRATION BUILDING</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>150 ILLINOIS ST</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY MAINTENENCE FACILITY- MAINTENANCE SHOP</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>17,170</td>
<td>150 ILLINOIS ST</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY MAINTENENCE FACILITY- VEHICLE STORAGE</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>8,814</td>
<td>150 ILLINOIS ST</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY MAINTENENCE FACILITY- WAREHOUSE STORAGE</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>4,320</td>
<td>150 ILLINOIS ST</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER DIVISION- OFFICE AND MAINTENANCE BUILDING</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>5,476</td>
<td>400 LOMITA</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER DIVISION- CABLE BUILDING</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>400 LOMITA</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER DIVISION STATION- STORAGE BUILDING</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>2,412</td>
<td>2151 E. EL SEGUN</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMP EUCALYPTUS</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>641 CALIFORNIA ST.</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK VISTA SENIOR LIVING CENTER</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>615 EAST HOLLY AVE.</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES

Facility Condition Assessments, Inventory, Preventive Maintenance

Project Understanding

EMG understands that the Facility Condition Assessment for the City of El Segundo ("Client") will:
- Include a comprehensive facility condition assessment (FCA) of all buildings, building systems, and infrastructure. The FCA will meet or exceed the ASTM E2018-15 Standard Guide for Property Condition Assessments.
- Determine the present condition and estimated life expectancy of various building systems and components.
- Identify and document present condition of all physical assets including grounds, facilities, and infrastructure.
- Establish anticipated renewal and replacement costs for the various systems and components.
- Recommend corrections for all deficiencies and provide cost estimates for corrections.
- Prioritize and categorize deficient conditions, associated corrective actions, and information concerning building systems and deficiency categories.
- Result in strategic plan for capital repairs, lifecycle component replacement, and building modernization.
- Calculate the Current Replacement Value (CRV) and Facility Condition Index (FCI) for each facility and site.
- Establish a protocol for facility condition data to migrate/transfer to a CMMS system.
- Collect Equipment Inventory data for Client properties.
- Prepare a Preventive Maintenance plan for assets.

We understand that a key factor to performing Facility Condition Assessments is the evaluation of physical needs and accurate forecasting for capital repair and replacement budgets. Pre-emptive measures to manage maintenance budgets and programs are essential in ensuring the elimination of potential issues, which can range from deferred maintenance, or premature replacement of building systems that can prove costly.

With each identified replacement or repair, the assessment results include estimates of cost and a numerical ranking of importance based upon the Client’s priorities and estimated useful lives of the building systems and components. Also reflected in the assessment’s results is the incorporation of any previously collected information in the Client’s possession. EMG reviews all information collected to ensure accuracy.

In summary, EMG’s Project Approach has been developed to address the specific requirements of Client. EMG has demonstrated experience in the assessment of various types of facilities similar to those at Client and understands the special implementation, sensitivities, management and communication associated with each.

Data gathering and Interview

Our project plan details three distinct phases of the project. During each phase, we will require coordination and support from facility management.

Data Gathering Phase – During this phase, we will need the support of staff who can provide us access to drawings and records. The following is a typical list of exhibits requested.

- Inspection Reports (sewer, boiler, chiller, etc)
- Building Systems Maintenance Records
- Owner Elected Repair list (if available)
- Current CMMS Data (export to Excel if possible)
- Original Building Plans (can be viewed on-site)
- Capital Expenditure Schedules (prior or planned)
- Fire Protection/Life Safety Plans
- Rehabilitation budget & scope (draft or final)
- Certificates of Occupancy/Facility License
- Prior Assessments
- Site Plan/Floor Plans
- Accessibility Transition Plans/Self Evaluations
In addition to the drawings and records, we will supply a pre-survey questionnaire for each facility. Our expectation is that someone with knowledge of maintenance and operations of the facility will complete this survey and be prepared to discuss it with us while on-site.

**Site Phase** – During the site phase, we will need support in the form of escorts while in the facilities to help us access mechanical areas, to discuss with us any known issues in the facility, and to answer other technical questions.

**Report Review Stage** – During the reports review stage – we will provide a complete report for each building. This report will include a narrative discussion of building systems and issues, as well as a 15-year projection of all capital needs. We need the support of facilities management to review these reports and provide feedback. These reports will be reviewed individually with facilities personnel most knowledgeable about the sites, and findings will be reviewed with stakeholders at the department head and campus level.

**Client Coordination**

**Project Directory**: EMG will become familiar with Client’s existing property directory and contact list for each location. We will contact or interview the facilities contacts as part of our process to determine current use requirements and priority of properties based on agency goals.

**Facility Access**: Working with Client we will develop procedures to gain access to each facility. Our visits will be coordinated and pre-approved by Client prior to the visit. We will work with Client to establish a protocol that will ensure that our activities will have minimal disruption to the operation of each facility and will maintain a safe work environment.

**Existing Documentation**: We will become familiar with the contents of existing documents and verify the accuracy of the information provided including the history of changes if appropriate. We will return any documentation at the end of the project (or earlier if requested). All paper documentation provided to Client will be digitized and an electronic copy given to Client.

Where applicable - any existing equipment inventory will be loaded into our data collection platform and will be updated and added to during the field assessment. The goal will be to have all available studies and data loaded into our system for use in the field phase.

**Technical Approach**

Prior to assessments beginning, EMG will conduct a Kickoff session to review requirements and to consolidate exhibits such as drawings and prior completed reports.

During the term of the project, EMG will conduct regular Progress Meetings to maintain open communication with the entire project team and Client. In these meetings, EMG will lead with an agenda that includes a focus on work plan, schedule, and project needs. This will permit the opportunity to proactively address challenges encountered, so that course adjustments may be made. Each meeting will conclude with task assignments, schedules, and goals to be met. EMG will provide Client with a weekly written status report that tracks and monitors the progress of the assessments against the schedule submitted. EMG has allocated the following in-person meetings: Kick Off Meeting, City Council Meeting, and a Final Findings Presentation meeting. Any additional in-person meetings will be on a time and expense basis.

**Assessment Team Composition**

The project will be managed by a Program Manager who will be your single point of contact for the project.

Reporting to the Program Manager will be several Project Managers who are architectural and engineering subject matter experts (SME) in the evaluation of building systems and generating the reports. We evaluate the building portfolio to determine which team members will be assigned to particular sites. Larger or more complex sites will typically have both an architect and an engineering SME assessment team. Smaller or simpler buildings will have a single SME field assessor that understands all building systems.

EMG will utilize the same assessment team used in the pilot program for the entire project to ensure continuity.
EMG has several support staff that assist with the report and data development which include:

- Asset Management Team Leader who manages and configures the cost estimating database
- Technical Report Reviewers who review reports for accuracy and consistency
- Quality Assurance Manager for oversight of quality controls
- IT Manager who assists with data development and export

**Pilot Program**

To begin the work EMG proposes a Piloting Program where we will perform an assessment of a single building and prepare a written Draft Report for review. A meeting will be held with Client staff to review the draft report before assessing the remaining buildings. The assessment team will visit the building to evaluate the general condition of the buildings and site improvements, review available construction documents in order to become familiar with, and be able to comment on the in-place construction systems, life safety, mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems, and the general built environment.

The assessment team will conduct a walk-through survey of the facility and site in order to observe systems and components, identify physical deficiencies and formulate recommendations to remedy the physical deficiencies.

- As a part of the walk-through survey, the assessment team will survey 100% of each facility. In addition, EMG will survey the exterior and grounds, including the building exterior, roofs, sidewalk/pavement, and recreational other areas as applicable.
- The assessment team will interview the building maintenance staff about the subject property’s historical repairs and replacements and their costs, level of preventive maintenance exercised, pending repairs and improvements, and frequency of repairs and replacements.
- The assessment team will develop opinions based on their site assessment, interviews with Client’s building maintenance staff, and interviews with relevant maintenance contractors, municipal authorities, and experience gained on similar properties previously evaluated. The assessment team may also question others who are knowledgeable of the subject property’s physical condition and operation or knowledgeable of similar systems to gain comparative information to use in evaluation of the subject property.
- The assessment team will review documents and information provided by Client’s maintenance staff that could also aid the knowledge of the subject property’s physical improvements, extent and type of use, and/or assist in identifying material discrepancies between reported information and observed conditions.

**Site Assessments**

The facility condition assessment will focus on the following facility systems and components:

**Site + Infrastructure**

- Topography: Observe the general topography and note any unusual or problematic features or conditions observed or reported.
- Ingress and Egress: Identify the major means of access and egress at the facility. Note the locations of the major means of access and egress, and note any unusual or restraining conditions observed or reported.
- Paving, Curbing, and Parking: Identify the material types of paving and curbing systems at the subject property.
- Flatwork: Identify the material flatwork at the subject property (sidewalks, plazas, patios, etc.).
- Landscaping and Appurtenances: Identify the material landscaping features, material types of landscaping (fences, retaining walls, etc.), and site appurtenances (irrigation systems, fountains, lighting, signage, ponds, etc.).
- Utilities: Identify the type and provider of the material utilities provided to the property (water, electricity, natural gas, etc.). We will assess condition, physical deficiencies, life cycle repair, and replacement issues.

**Structural Frame + Building Envelope**

- Identify the material elements of the structural frame and exterior walls, including the foundation system, floor framing system, roof framing system, facade or curtain-wall system, glazing system, exterior sealant, doors, commercial overhead doors, sliders, windows, and stairways, etc.
• Observe the general conditions and note any physical deficiencies identified or any unusual items or conditions observed. Observations may be subject to grade, and rooftop vantage points.
• Visual inspection of observable areas for cracking and moisture infiltration as well as areas of apparent foundation settlement and displacement.
• In the event more information or exploratory testing is required, in order to provide remedial measures, the report may include recommendation for additional investigative testing (Tier 1 or Tier 2).

Wall Evaluation
• Photograph elevations and details both from internal and external vantage points, as well as from adjacent structures where possible.
• Observe representative operable and fixed panels on all facades, operating a representative sample of units to assess hardware, and to visually inspect exterior conditions and the condition of waterproofing seals.
• Assess curtain wall condition to determine water infiltration, damage, caulk degradation, metal panel degradation, stone degradation and anchoring, and other related curtain wall issues.

Curtain Wall – As Required
• Review curtain wall condition and a sampling of fixed panels on facades to assess hardware and visually review exterior conditions and the condition of waterproofing seals, where accessible without the use of lifts, ladders, scaffolding, suspension devices, or the like; this may include observations from internal and external vantage points, as well as from adjacent structures. Observations are limited to grade and may include accessible balconies or rooftop vantage points.
• Review provided drawings and records of repair, replacement, and maintenance of framing and glazing

Roofing (Non-Invasive Visual)
• Identify the material roof systems including roof type, reported age, slope, drainage, etc. Also identify any unusual roofing conditions or rooftop equipment.
• Observe the general conditions of the roof system such as membranes, attachment methods, flashings, counter flashings, pitch pans, gravel stops, parapets, miscellaneous appurtenances, insulation, etc.
• Observe for evidence of material repairs, significant ponding, or evidence of material roof leaks. Note if a roof warranty is in effect. Note any physical deficiencies identified or any unusual items observed or reported.
• Identify the material rooftop equipment or accessories including antennas, lightning protection, HVAC equipment, solar equipment, etc. Include any material problems reported.
• Clarification: Walking on pitched roofs or roofs lacking built-in access are not part of this scope.

Plumbing
• Identify the material plumbing systems at the subject property including domestic water supply, sanitary sewer, or any special or unusual plumbing systems (such as water features, fuel systems, gas systems, etc.).
• Identify the type and condition of restroom fixtures, drinking fountains and/or other miscellaneous plumbing equipment.
• Observe the general conditions and note any physical deficiencies identified or any unusual items or conditions observed. Include any reported material system inadequacies.

Heating
• Identify the material heat generating systems at the subject property.
• Observe the general conditions, identify the reported age of the equipment, note past material component replacements/upgrades, note the apparent level of maintenance, and identify if a maintenance contract is in place. If heating equipment is not operational at the time of the walk-through survey, provide an opinion of the condition to the extent reasonably possible.
• Identify and observe any special or unusual heating systems or equipment present (such as fireplaces, solar heat, etc.) and note any reported material problems or inadequacies.
Air-Conditioning + Ventilation
- Identify the material air-conditioning and ventilation systems at the subject property. Include material equipment such as cooling towers, chillers (include type of refrigerant used), package units, split systems, air handlers, thermal storage equipment, etc.
- Identify the material distribution systems (supply and return, make-up air, exhaust, etc.) at the subject property.
- Observe the general conditions, identify the reported age of the equipment, note past material component upgrades/replacements, note the apparent level of maintenance, and identify if a maintenance contract is in place (and the name of the contractor). If air-conditioning and ventilation systems are not operational at the time of the walk-through survey, provide an opinion of the condition to the extent reasonably possible.
- Observe the general conditions and note any physical deficiencies identified or any unusual items or conditions observed. Additionally, include any material reported system inadequacies or operating deficiencies.
- Identify and observe any special or unusual air-conditioning and ventilation systems or equipment (cold storage systems, special computer cooling equipment, etc.) and note any material reported problems or system inadequacies.

Electrical
- Identify the electrical service provided and distribution system at the subject property. Include material switchgear disconnects, circuit breakers, transformers, meters, emergency generators, general lighting systems, and other such equipment or systems.
- Observe general electrical items such as distribution panels, type of wiring, energy management systems, emergency power, lightning protection, etc.
- Observe the general conditions and note any physical deficiencies identified or any unusual items or conditions observed. Also note the presence of any special or unusual electrical equipment, systems, or devices at the subject property, and include reported material problems or system inadequacies.

Elevators + Vertical Transportation
- Identify the vertical transportation systems at the subject property. Include the equipment manufacturer, equipment type, location, number, capacity, etc.
- Observe elevator cabs, finishes, call and communication equipment, etc.
- Identify the company that provides elevator/escalator maintenance at the subject property. Observe the general conditions and note any physical deficiencies identified or any unusual items or conditions observed or reported including any reported material system inadequacies.
- Out of Scope Issues: Performing any calculations, examination of operating system components such as cables, controller, motors, etc. Entering elevator/escalator pits or shafts.

Life Safety + Fire Protection
- Identify the material life safety/fire protection systems at the subject property, including sprinklers and stand pipes (wet or dry), fire hydrants, fire alarm systems, water storage, smoke detectors, fire extinguishers, emergency lighting, stairwell pressurization, smoke evacuation, etc.
- Observe the general conditions and note any material physical deficiencies identified or any unusual items or conditions observed or reported including any reported system inadequacies.

Interior Elements
- Identify offices, special use areas and building standard finishes, including flooring, ceilings, walls, etc. Furnishings and fixed components will be reviewed and included in the cost estimate tables for replacements. Additionally, EMG will identify material building amenities or special features.
- Observe the general conditions and note any physical deficiencies identified or any unusual items or conditions observed or reported.
Food Service Spaces and Equipment
• Assess all Food Service equipment and spaces including kitchen, cafeteria, and dining and serving areas. Food service equipment (fixed equipment) will be evaluated for adherence to life/ safety code and ventilation requirements as well for condition and capital replacement.

Special Systems and Equipment
• Include all special systems and equipment, such as Emergency Medical Systems (EMC), chillers, radio towers, equipment lifts, chair lifts, chemical storage or treatment areas, storage tanks, dumbwaiters, vaults, public address systems, and telephone systems.

Accessibility Compliance
• Provide a general statement of the subject building’s compliance to the Americans with Disabilities Act to help identify whether Client may be exposed to issues and whether there is the need for further review.
• We use an ADA Compliance checklist compliant with ASTM E2018-15. This review does not constitute a measured study and a more detailed ADA evaluation or transition plan is available as an additional service.
• EMG will evaluate interior and exterior elements that could present external or internal barriers to accessibility by disabled persons.

Moisture Affected Materials (Mold)
• EMG will perform a limited assessment of accessible areas for the presence of mold, conditions conducive to mold growth, and/or evidence of moisture. We will also interview project personnel regarding the presence of any known or suspected mold, elevated relative humidity, water intrusion, or mildew-like odors. Potentially affected areas will be photographed and recommendations for any additional moisture intrusion studies will be made.

Environmental Features
• EMG will review environmental features of the property, to include appearance, cleanliness, acoustics, ventilation, and humidity.

Lead-based Paint
• A review of existing testing data and other documentation regarding lead-based paint that is available onsite is included in the cost of the Facilities Condition Assessment. EMG will evaluate physical condition and will develop cost estimates for remediation of paint necessitated by pending renovations.
• EMG has the capability to provide a licensed lead-based paint inspector to conduct testing using an x-ray fluorescence analyzer at the Project as an additional service. The instrument is completely non-destructive and yields instantaneous results.

Asbestos
• A review of existing testing data and other documentation regarding asbestos that is available onsite is included in the cost of the Facilities Condition Assessment. EMG will evaluate physical condition and will develop cost estimates for remediation of asbestos likely to be disturbed by renovations.
• If asbestos testing is requested, EMG will provide a licensed asbestos inspector to collect samples of suspect asbestos-containing materials at the Project as an additional service. Scope of this sampling will be determined after review of existing data, costs will be based on daily rate plus the cost of analysis.

Energy Conservation Analysis
• As part of the analysis of all evaluated systems mentioned above, EMG will consider energy conservation savings when making repair or replace recommendations and include these projects in the project prioritization.
• EMG can provide as additional services an Energy Audit (ASHRAE Level I, II, or III) or Benchmarking (EnergyStar) services.
Ranking and Classification

Based upon our observations, research and judgment, along with consulting commonly accepted empirical Expected Useful Life (EUL) tables; EMG will render our opinion as to when a system or component will most probably necessitate replacement.

Accurate historical replacement records provided by the facility manager are typically the best source for this data. Exposure to the weather elements, initial system quality and installation, extent of use, the quality and amount of preventive maintenance exercised are all factors that impact the effective age of a system or component. As a result, a system or component may have an effective age that is greater or less than its actual age. The Remaining Useful Life (RUL) of a component or system equals the EUL less its effective age.

The analysis will include all cost observations be ranked by Priority Classes. The five classes below are typical but can be altered to meet your specifications and needs:

Priority 1: Currently Critical (Immediate): Requiring immediate action including a cited safety hazard and areas of accelerated deterioration, returning a building component to normal operation.

Priority 2: Potentially Critical (Year 1): Requiring action in the next year including components experiencing intermittent operations, potential life safety issues, and rapid deterioration, returning a building component to normal operation.

Priority 3: Necessary – Not Yet Critical (Years 2-3): Requiring appropriate attention to preclude predictable deterioration, potential downtime, additional damage, and higher costs to remediation if deferred further.

Priority 4: Recommended (Years 4-10): Representing a sensible improvement to the existing conditions (not required for the most basic function of the facility; however, will improve overall usability and/or reduce long-term maintenance costs).

Priority 5: Does Not Meet Current Code but “Grandfathered”: No Action required at this time but substantial work be undertaken correction would be required.

The deficiencies observed will be classified into categories such as those below using the Uniformat System:

- Site
- Architectural
- Exterior Systems
- Exterior Finishes
- Life Safety Systems
- Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning Systems
- Plumbing Systems
- Electrical and Service Distribution Systems
- Special Electrical Systems
- Fire Suppression Systems
- Special Construction
- Interior Systems
- Interior Finishes
- Vertical Transportation
- Telephone infrastructure and systems
- Data Infrastructure and server rooms

Cost Estimating

Each report will include a Capital Needs Analysis including an estimated cost for each system or component repair or replacement anticipated during the evaluation term. The report narrative will discuss options for repair of the deficiency, and the capital needs analysis will be presented as an Excel-based cost table that includes a summary of the description of each component, the age and estimated remaining useful life, the anticipated year of repair or replacement, quantity, unit cost and total cost for the repair of each line item.
A consolidated Capital Needs Analysis will be presented that includes all anticipated capital needs for all buildings. In addition to the detailed description of the deficiencies, we will provide cost estimates for the deficiencies noted. The cost estimate for capital deficiencies will be based on the estimate for maintenance and repair, but may at Client’s option, also include project management costs, construction fees, and design fees. Project management costs, construction fees, and design fees will be derived using actual costs from previous projects. After determining these costs, we will confirm these costs with Client’s staff.

EMG’s cost estimating database is comprised of both Whitestone Research and RS Means data, and further customized with proprietary cost tables developed by EMG, based on historical and localized actual costs. EMG maintains and updates our cost estimating system with information received from the field. Through construction monitoring work, we have current cost data from hundreds of in-progress construction and rehabilitation projects. This data allows us to calculate costs based on local conditions to maintain a cost database that is typically more current than Whitestone Research and RS Means’ models.

Report Deliverables

EMG will provide a report including a description of each of the building components and systems as described in the approach sections above. Each report is organized by building system and will include digital photos of major systems and components and of all deficiencies identified. Reports will include discussion of current and anticipated repairs and deficiencies, recommended repair and component life-cycle replacements, and applicable options for repair or maintenance of building components.

EMG will provide the following reports depending on the size of the buildings or campus:

- **Building Condition Report – Standard**: Each report will be generally organized by building system and will include an analysis of all building systems and components. Each report will include color digital photos of all major systems and components, and will include photos of all deficiencies identified. In addition to the description of each building component and system, each report will include an analysis of current, anticipated repairs, deficiencies, and any applicable options for repair or maintenance of building components. These deficiencies will be summarized in a capital needs analysis table included throughout each report.

- **Building Condition Report – Abridged**: For buildings less than 5,000 SF the report format in comparison with the standard will be abbreviated due to the fact that there are less major systems and conditions to observe and report on.

- **Group Building Condition Report**: This report format is for sites with multiple buildings. An overall report will represent the multiple building site, with individual building assessments contained within. In addition to the hardcopy campus report, the data collection/capital planning software allows individual building data reports to be generated.

The Capital Needs analysis will include a cost database sorted by building system and ranked by priority for repair. The format of the database will allow for the customization of reporting by building, by system, or by priority for repair, and a year-by-year analysis of capital needs.

**Facility Condition Index**

A Facility Condition Index will be calculated for each building. This index will be a function of required repairs compared to building replacement costs. The Facility Condition Index will be generated from the data collection/capital planning database and will be updated as components age or are replaced.

**Capital Plan**

A 1, 5, and 20 year capital plan will be provided based on EMG’s 20-year building system evaluation. The analysis will include a cost table sorted by building and system and ranked by priority for repair. Tables will allow for the customization of reporting and a year-by-year capital needs analysis. The report will include:

- A 1, 5,-and 20 year Capital Plan with an Executive Summary with graphic presentation of results to provide a quick, user-friendly summary of the property’s observed condition and estimated costs assigned by category.
These estimated costs shall be cross-referenced to report sections where an elaboration of cost issues will be presented.

- Components observed that are exhibiting deferred maintenance issues and provide estimates for immediate and capital repair costs based on observed conditions, available maintenance history and industry-standard useful life estimates. If applicable, this analysis will include the review of any available documents pertaining to capital improvements completed within the last five-year periods, or currently under contract. EMG shall also inquire about available maintenance records and procedures and interview current available on-site maintenance staff.

- Recommended schedule for replacement or repairs (schedule of priorities).

- Digital photographs for the buildings including photos of deficiencies.

- General description of the property and improvements and comment generally on observed conditions.

- Critical repairs and life safety issues separately from repairs anticipated over the term of the analysis.

- Facility Condition Index (FCI) number for the building.

Program-wide Report
In addition to each building report, EMG will develop a program-wide report that includes a ranked system-wide Capital Plan for all facilities with programmatic conclusions and recommendations. The Program Report includes a brief narrative description of each facility/building component and system, and discusses the current, anticipated repairs, deficiencies, and of all buildings assessed. The Program Report analyses will include tables sorted by building system and ranked by priority for repair. The format of the tables will allow for the several perspectives of reporting by FCI, building, system, or priority for repair, and a year-by-year analysis of capital needs. EMG can also prepare city-wide reports prioritized by major system repair/replacement data so the City can compare building needs to each other.

Individual facility reports are submitted as drafts, and once finalized, the program summary report is provided to include a roll-up of all prioritized capital needs across all facilities.

EMG will provide draft reports electronically via an Adobe Acrobat PDF. EMG can deliver bound hard copy final reports (per the contract requirements) and CDs with complete reports on each. All electronic copies of the report will include all text, deficiency tables, digital photos, and supporting documentation and report appendices.

Assessment Software: AssetCALC™

EMG will utilize AssetCALC™ as its platform for all data collected on this project. AssetCALC™ is a cloud platform developed, licensed, maintained, and supported solely by EMG for our clients. The use of this software is at your option and there are no licensing fees for this software for one (1) year.

AssetCALC™ is a web-based SQL database platform that enables users to:

- query, edit, and analyze their facility condition data
- plan immediate and short-term repairs
- budget capital expenditures throughout the life-cycle of a building or an entire portfolio

The system unites EMG’s experienced field data collection methods with advanced planning and reporting tools, construction cost libraries, location mapping (GIS) features, digital photo management, and document storage.

Data Development
- AssetCALC™ includes a configurable facility hierarchy and asset data architecture - this will include all of your assets grouped based on site location, asset group, and function.
- Data can be exported to an Excel, XML, or an ODBC database format compatible for upload into your CMMS, EAM, or work-order systems.
Features Include:

- Facility Condition Assessment access:
  - Component/system descriptions
  - Locations
  - Conditions and EUL/RUL
  - Repair and replace recommendations
  - Digital photos
- Search and Sorting Functionality
- Prioritization of maintenance projects
- UniFormat II Cost Database
- Project Budgets and Capital Plans
- Unlimited concurrent user licensing
- Secure IT platform and back-ups
- Client is the owner of data collected and residing in the database
- Online User Training and Documentation

Reporting:
AssetCALC™ includes more than a dozen standard options for data summaries and reports:

- Facility Condition Index (FCI) Calculation Reporting
- Rank and Prioritize Capital Improvement Projects
- Deferred Maintenance Backlog
- Facility Queries (by building, priority, system, or dollar deficiency amount)
- Capital Budget Planning
- Year-by-Year Capital Needs Analysis
- 5, 10, or 20-Year Replacement Reserve Reports
- Custom 3rd party form automation available

Screen Shots
Actual screen shots of EMG’s AssetCALC™ Database and a live demo is available upon request.

Integration with CMMS

EMG will be delivering to Client a live asset management plan that can be maintained and kept up-to-date by staff. EMG will provide training to staff on maintaining the on-going monitoring program to track facilities, work performed, re-prioritization of maintenance projects, and how to update this information in the database. The data from the FCA can be exported to Excel or ODBC Database for data migration to most CMMS or work-order systems (ie. MaintenanceConnection).

Equipment Inventory

During the assessment, each field team will be responsible for collection and storing all of the inventory and condition assessment data in an electronic format that is readily transferable to a standardized CMMS system.

EMG will collect information on the major pieces of facility equipment. Specifically, the data collection will focus on the following components:

- HVAC (level of detail for which Preventive Maintenance would be performed)
  - Heating System
    - Identify boilers, furnaces, unit heaters and major labeled equipment.
  - Ventilation System
    - Identify the major labeled equipment; exhaust hoods, fans.
Air Conditioning System
- Identify the material air-conditioning components, including cooling towers, compressors, chillers, package units, roof top units, split systems and major labeled equipment. Excluded are window units, terminal units, VAV boxes, thermostatic controls.

Electrical
- Major panels only-for identification to track maintenance.
- Transformers
- Switchgear

Equipment
- Building Automation System,

Plumbing
- Pumps external to HVAC systems
- Domestic Hot Water heaters over 80 gallons
- Other major labeled equipment.

Commercial Kitchen- major equipment (above approximately $2000 value)
- Walk-in freezer and refrigerator equipment
- Ovens, stoves, broilers, grills
- Reach-in refrigerators and freezers
- Dishwashers
- Fryers

Life Safety/Security
- High Level (system level) only-for identification to track maintenance
  - Alarm Panels
  - Emergency generators
  - Exhaust hood fire suppression

Vertical Transportation

Where appropriate, the following data will be collected for each component:
- Date placed in service (provided by Client)
- Inventory tag number (bar coded tag directly attached to the component, or to an attached tag)
- Location data
- Manufactured Date (if available)
- Manufacturer
- Model
- Serial Number
- Voltage Durable barcode tag to be attached to each piece of equipment.

Barcoding – For the above referenced equipment, EMG will apply a durable barcode with unique bar code number for use as an identifier in the CMMS system. We will use a vinyl tag for indoor applications, and a durable foil tag for outdoor use. Barcode numbers will be recorded in the database and all future work orders etc., can be tied back in to a single piece of equipment or system. The cost of Barcoding will add 1.5 cents per square foot to the project.

Preventative Maintenance and Operations Plan

EMG will prepare a preventive maintenance plan for each facility based on industry standards and Original Equipment Manufacturers' recommendations. The intent of the preventive maintenance plan will be to identify required procedures and inspections required to maintain and extend the useful life of existing equipment.
EMG will consult with Client to develop equipment naming conventions and to discuss options where appropriate. The PMP will be delivered in a database or spreadsheet format and is intended to be uploaded to a CMMS or work order management system.

The following is meant to establish detail of the deliverable that EMG will provide in the Preventive Maintenance Plan.

- Inventory data collection, tagging of equipment and naming conventions will be established during the data collection phase of the project
- The inventory will obtain major component level detail.
- The deliverable for this phase of the project will include a narrative introduction, a table for each building with equipment, recommended preventive maintenance routines, frequencies and time requirements.
- EMG will develop an export of the data customized for upload into the selected Maintenance Management software system
- The preventive maintenance plan will be prepared following completion of field data collection and final entries into the database
- It is important that room numbers and locations of equipment appear on work orders so technicians can easily locate equipment. During the field data collection phase EMG will determine facility buildings, locations, and area naming convention to be used, and will establish room and facility numbers consistent with any existing Client conventions. Where no numbering exists, EMG will recommend best practices.
- During data collection phase EMG will determine Equipment nomenclature to be used (Air Handling Unit (AHU), Unit Ventilator (UV) etc.), as directed by Client.
- During the data collection and equipment inventory stage, EMG will determine equipment schemes (Groups, Classifications, and Types) to be used. Conduct a meeting with Client to review individual equipment maintenance schedules (by wing, equipment type, etc).
- During data collection phase EMG will gather and record equipment locations and types through visual, on-site, walkthrough and referencing facility documentation obtained from the Client (excludes equipment in concealed spaces, crawl spaces or other inaccessible areas)
- Develop maintenance procedures referencing manufactures’ printed recommendations and/or industry standards for facility equipment.
- Maintenance procedures will include:
  - Safety Points
  - Start Up Procedures
  - Appropriate tools required
  - Time to complete maintenance
  - Industry standards time to complete each maintenance work order
  - Life expectancy of equipment
  - Step-by-step procedure to complete maintenance work order
- The preventive maintenance plan will include the establishment of key performance indicators or effective maintenance including
  - Planning and Scheduling
    - Percent of planned work
    - Schedule compliance
  - Work Category
    - Percent of corrective maintenance
    - Percent of preventive maintenance
    - Percent of predictive maintenance (condition monitoring)
  - Work Type
    - Percent of routine maintenance
    - Percent of turnaround maintenance
  - Percent of maintenance capital
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Maintenance Schedule</th>
<th>Model Number</th>
<th>Serial Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Cooled Chiller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Cooled Condensing Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaged A/C Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaporator-Air Conditioning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaporative Fluid Cooler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Cooled Chiller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condenser Pump</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Handling Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humidifier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boiler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Fired Rooftop Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooftop Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravity Roof Ventilator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Roof Exhauster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boiler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Compressor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Separator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sediment Remover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion Tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main System Pump</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sump Pump</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Expansion Tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Storage Tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat Exchanger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Softener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InLine Exhaust Fan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling Fan</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant Air Volume Unit</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Air Volume Unit</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convector</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan Coil Unit</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finned Tube Radiation</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat Pump</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat Pump Console</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Ventilator</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Unit Heater</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Heater</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Heater</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen Exhaust Hood</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Asset Management Protocol**

Many agencies that have instituted facility condition assessment programs have set protocol to re-inspect facilities on a cycle of every 3 to 5 years or longer depending on what industry they are in. Best practice is to have your facility condition assessments updated every 5 years.

We suggest that you include in your contract the option to have EMG revisit your sites on an annual basis with the goal of assessing 20% of your properties each year. This allows you strategically budget for updates without a large single expenditure every 5 years and keep your facility condition assessment program updated continually.
Additional Services Available

Many of our services can be combined with our Facility Condition Assessment field mobilization. By having our assessors collect additional data while we are in the field, this can save you money on other planning and risk management endeavors you may have scheduled for in the future. These services include:

- Energy Audit – ASHRAE Level II
- Space Utilization Planning
- Security Threat Assessment
- Environmental Assessments
- Roof Coring and Testing
- CAD Drawing Updates
- Seismic / Structural Studies
- CMMS Consultation
- Construction Monitoring (QA/QC)
- Project Management

Project Management – Additional Service

After a capital plan has been approved, EMG has the expertise to help you implement a program to get priority projects planned and completed. EMG has a full-service project management division that can assist with:

- Pre-Construction Services
  - Property Inspection
  - Budgeting and Specs
  - Bidding - Review and Analysis
- Construction Phase Services
  - Scheduling
  - Contractor Management
  - QA / QC Monitoring
- Post Construction Services
  - Warranty Review
  - Punch Lists
  - Close Out
ADA Evaluation and Transition Plan

PROJECT UNDERSTANDING

EMG understands that we will provide consulting services to ensure that the City of El Segundo ("Client") complies with all aspects of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the State of California, and local accessibility regulations with regards to its public buildings. The work will ultimately culminate in the production of an ADA Transition Plan, which will include a schedule of improvements necessary to meet the ADA, the State of California, and local accessibility requirements, associated order of magnitude cost estimates for barrier removal, a prioritized list of improvements, and a timeline for completion of needed improvements or modifications.

The scope of the work, as defined by the City of El Segundo, includes:

- ADA Evaluation / Survey
  - Physical Assessment of Access to Facilities and Sites
  - Public Areas
- ADA Report / Transition Plan
  - List of Prioritized Barrier Improvements
  - Order of Magnitude Cost Estimates

The City of El Segundo has requested services for:

- Thirty-One (31) public building facilities – 15 Sites

EMG has based our pricing on the following scope level – Limited Assessment. If the City of El Segundo is interested in exploring other levels of ADA assessment, we can formulate a strategy and adjust fees. Below are examples of scope types:

- **Comprehensive Scope** – assessment of elements which are subject to accessibility regulation within all areas – including both public and employee areas.
- **Limited Scope** – assessment of limited facilities including exterior access (parking and entrances) and interiors for public areas only, excluding employee only areas.
- **Risk-based Scope** – assessment of a short list of specific and/or high-risk barrier groups, such as parking and exterior accessible routes.

EMG will complete the following:

- Accessibility assessment and inventory of facilities identified on the above Buildings/Facilities list.
- Compliance with applicable standards, regulations, and codes for accessibility
- Site visits to observe, document, and photograph specific conditions and modifications of facilities and components subject to federal, state, and local access requirements.
- Criteria development and application to prioritize facilities and/or categories of work for a phased approach to implementation.
- Order of magnitude (pre-planning level) estimated costs for each barrier removal necessary to make facilities accessible.
- Electronic database the Client can use to track barrier removals as each is completed, which serves as a living Transition Plan.
APPRAOCH

EMG will conduct a kick-off meeting with the Client to define communication channels, define the scope of work, and to review the facility information available. Discussions will include recent and proposed capital improvements at each of the facilities.

Prior to the kick-off meeting, EMG will provide a pre-assessment questionnaire for each site and other documentation. Documents requested, if readily available, are:

- Prior Accessibility Transition Plans or Self Evaluations
- Identification of any/all Historic Structures
- Description of Purpose for each Facility
- Site Plans
- Floor Plans
- As-built Drawings (with dates of construction)
- Current Reasonable Accommodation Policy
- Intersection / Street / Curb Plans

The initial discussions with the Client staff will include the following elements:

- Roles and lines of communication between and within both the Client and the consultant.
- Protocols for interaction between all parties throughout the project: Contact information should include the office and cell numbers for a minimum of two contacts with the appropriate Client and the consultant.
- Field assessment logistics: Normally, EMG does not require escorts to perform the field assessments, except where escorts may be required within restricted areas. Outline areas of client’s highest priority for any assessment to be completed during any training phases, likely complexity of assessment data processing, efficient workflow each day of the assessment, and client requests.
- Mapping for facilities.

Field schedules and facility management interviews will be conducted once the schedule is approved by the Client. Once the field schedule is approved, EMG will deploy trained accessibility assessors with backgrounds in Landscape Architecture, Architecture, Engineering, and Building Systems for facility assessments. All field resources assigned have been professionally trained in accessibility assessments and have performed numerous assessments.

FACILITY ADA ASSESSMENTS

An architect, engineer, or accessibility specialist will visit each property to observe the general condition of the facility interior and exterior improvements, review available documents in order to familiarize themselves with each facility’s specific accessibility issues. The field observer will conduct a walk-through visit of each facility in order to observe and identify physical accessibility deficiencies and formulate recommendations to eliminate the physical barriers.

As a part of the walk-through visit, the field observer will meet with an on-site representative in order to gain a clear understanding of the overall features and programs, property condition, and completion dates of additions and/or renovations. The areas to be observed include all interior and exterior features of the property, including parking lots, sidewalks, recreational assets, exterior access ramps, all interior areas accessible to the public, and employee areas.

The field observer will develop recommendations based on the walk-through visit and interviews with Client representatives. EMG’s vast experience gained on similar properties previously evaluated. The field observer may also question others who are knowledgeable of the subject property’s physical condition and operation, or question those knowledgeable of similar systems to gain comparative information to use in evaluation of the subject property.
The field observer will review documents and information provided by Client that could aid EMG's knowledge of the subject property's physical improvements, extent and type of use, and/or assist in identifying material discrepancies between reported information and observed conditions.

During the walk-through, the observer will utilize a field checklist based on the 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design, which are the current ADA accessibility guidelines (ADAAG), as well as any more stringent accessibility standards defined by the State of California and local accessibility codes.

The field observer will utilize a digital level, measuring tape, door pressure gauge, light and sound meters, and digital camera to evaluate existing elements to determine if barriers are present. The field observer will identify and prioritize any existing improvements not in accordance with ADA, state, and local accessibility requirements, in the order of preference advised by the Department of Justice in Title II requirements, or as modified through agreement with the Client, such as:

- Physical access to the property and parking
- Access to interior public areas
- Access to common areas, including recreation facilities and other observable space
- Access to public restrooms
- Removal of remaining barriers

The field checklists will incorporate the applicable standards. An excerpt of the field checklist for public restrooms follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHEELCHAIR STALLS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
<th>Regulatory Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there 48” min. from the door side of compartment to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CBC Chap 11B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any wall or obstruction when approach to compartment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>604.8.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is parallel approach to the latch side of the door?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement must be made perpendicular to compartment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>door when fully closed from outside of door to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obstruction outside compartment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does door have door pulls on both sides of door</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CBC Chap 11B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near the latch?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>604.8.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is centerline of water closet 17” min. to 18”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CBC Chap 11B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maximum from side wall?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>604.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The EMG team will assess exterior areas and interior common areas that are defined as areas of public accommodation. EMG will identify existing non-compliant conditions, including but not limited to, the elements specified below (if applicable):

- Space allowance/ranges
- Accessible routes, vestibules, corridors
- Protruding object
- Ground/floor surfaces
- Loading zones
- Curb ramps
- Ramps
- Stairs
- Elevators
- Platform lifts
- Windows
- Doors
- Hardware
- Work surfaces
- Entrances and exits
- Drinking fountains and water coolers
- Water closets
- Toilet stalls
- Urinals
- Lavatories and mirrors
If proposed solutions to the identified barriers to accessibility would place an undue administrative or financial burden on the Client, EMG will discuss these solutions in advance with Client staff. EMG will provide an order of magnitude (pre-planning level) estimate for all items of work necessary to bring each facility into compliance. All estimates will be based upon current year costs without escalation. Escalation factors can be included if preferred by the Client.

TRANSITION PLAN

The field assessment data and costs will be brought together in one document to form the Transition Plan. Once the assessments of the buildings, facilities, and sites are complete, the data can be analyzed and prioritized. The Transition Plan document will include all identified barriers to accessibility, associated costs for barrier removal, and tentative solutions.

The solutions will be discussed with Client staff and presented to stakeholders, as needed. Once all facility assessments have been completed, a Draft Transition Plan will be prepared. The Transition Plan will provide a framework for full compliance with the accessibility regulations. It is based on the self-evaluation of facilities and programs. The Transition Plan process comprises the following components:

- Identification of physical and programmatic barriers in facilities under the Client’s jurisdiction.
- Determination of the barrier removal remedy and an order of magnitude estimate of the cost of the barrier removal required to eliminate the physical barrier or discriminatory practice.
- Assignment of priority level to the barrier removal.

Within the Transition Plan, EMG notes work that shall remove physical barriers in existing facilities, including communication barriers structural in nature where such removal is readily achievable, for instance, easily accomplishable and able to be carried out without much difficulty or expense. This document will outline in detail the steps required for the Client to achieve accessibility compliance. Where the Transition Plan identifies work which will take longer than one year to complete, a multi-year schedule with priorities will be provided.

The Transition Plan can establish phases of barrier removal, without a calendar timeframe. EMG will meet via teleconference with the ADA Compliance Team to present a Draft Transition Plan and gain its input and commentary on the Draft Transition Plan. EMG will again meet with the ADA Compliance Team to review all applicable commentary and to make choices regarding the draft final plan to be presented to the Client. Regular maintenance or rehabilitation projects and that accessibility projects are blended into other scheduled work, when possible.

EMG will submit the Final Transition Plan in printed and electronic copies to the designated parties and stakeholders. The Final Transition Plan will include an executive summary, and a description of how the entire self-evaluation and transition planning process was conducted. EMG will present the Final Transition Plan to the Client at a scheduled meeting.
DATA MANAGEMENT SOLUTION - ADA ASSETCALC™ SOFTWARE

EMG is providing access, at no additional charge, to ADA AssetCALC™. The Client is not required to utilize this software as we will provide hardcopy reports and we can export the data to Excel and Word formats. We have included ADA AssetCALC™ licenses for one (1) year with unlimited users. If the Client wishes to use the software after the initial year, the annual license fee will be $3,000.

ADA AssetCALC™ is a web-based SQL database platform that enables users to query, edit, and analyze their facility condition data to plan immediate and short-term repairs, and budget capital expenditures throughout the lifecycle of a building or an entire portfolio. The system unites EMG’s experienced field data collection methods with advanced planning and reporting tools, construction cost library, location mapping features, digital photo management, and document storage.

ADA AssetCALC™ will provide the Client with the ability to list, prioritize, query, and track deficiencies recorded through the Self-Assessment Process. ADA AssetCALC™ is Windows-based, easy to use, and populated with accessibility requirements pertinent to the Client. EMG recognizes that budgets change and the Transition Plan must be able to account for unplanned occurrences. ADA AssetCALC™ provides a process to complete work on those barriers that have been corrected over time. Reports can be queried instantaneously to reflect the barriers corrected. ADA AssetCALC™ provides the ability to track progress over time.

Prior to populating the database, EMG will work with the Client to establish required attributes and data points associated with each asset. This will include a discussion of the relative priority of the asset requiring barrier removal. This will include all Client physical assets and will be grouped in a hierarchy based on site location, asset group, and function.

EMG will utilize ADA AssetCALC™ to track physical accessibility needs associated with the Implementation/Transition Plan. The AssetCALC™ database contains a capital planning and transition planning module, in which accessibility construction projects may be established, including barrier removal priorities. It will provide the Client with a consolidated database of capital projects related to barrier removal. Capabilities of ADA AssetCALC™ include, but are not limited to:

- Microsoft.net web-enabled software
- Customizable fields, groupings, and reporting
- Reports, charts and graphs to forecast capital needs for individual buildings and construction projects
- Progress reports and tracking of the corrective measure progress
- Capital budget planning tools to assign and track progress over fiscal years
- Corrective action work completed/progress complete
- Access to the observed site conditions of barriers with photographs and GPS positions of exterior barriers
- Updateable cost library makes budgets more accurate over time
- Customizable priority framework and search tools to help decision makers
- Export tools to take data to other applications, including Microsoft Excel
- Repository for storing and searching documents related to buildings and component
- ADA compliance library to plan and track accessibility improvements
- Administrative tools for managing user access

Software demo and sample screen shots of ADA AssetCALC™ are available upon request.
ADA COST ESTIMATING

The ADA AssetCALC™ cost estimating database is based on both Whitestone Research and RS Means data, and further customized with proprietary cost tables developed by EMG, based on historical and localized actual costs. EMG maintains and updates the cost estimating system with information received from the field. Through ADA project management and construction monitoring work, EMG has current cost data from hundreds of in-progress construction and rehabilitation projects. This data allows EMG to calculate costs based on local conditions to maintain a cost database that is typically more current than Whitestone Research and RS Means’ models.

Typically, barrier removal planning level cost estimates are based upon the removal of the specific element, for example, a parking stall or curb ramp. In some site-specific instances, barrier removal may affect an area beyond the specific location of the barrier. Grading plans based on field surveys using land surveyor instrumentation, or architectural plans requiring wall relocation could result in significantly different material quantities and subsequent higher project costs. The database contains standardized order of magnitude cost estimates for barrier removal for use in prioritizing the work in the Transition Plan. At the implementation stage, it is anticipated a detailed specification will be prepared and bids will be generated. The scope of work and details on adjacent impacted spaces have an impact on overall project costs.

DELIVERABLES

The deliverables are:

- ADA Evaluation / Survey
  - Physical Assessment of Access to Facilities, Sites, and Parking
  - Public Areas

- ADA Report / Transition Plan
  - List of Prioritized Barrier Improvements
  - Order of Magnitude Cost Estimates

The facility assessment reports are provided in electronic format and are typically represented in three formats:

- Word® document converted to an Adobe PDF, with photographic images of barriers and GPS positioning of exterior barriers.
- Excel® spreadsheet containing code references, existing conditions, resolution of the barrier, and cost data for each barrier.
- Cloud-based database ADA AssetCALC™.

EMG will provide a narrative ADA report for each facility assessment with a description of each barrier observed and recorded, and will define the location, recorded measurements, barrier description, applicable ADAAG/state/local code reference, viable corrective action, priority, and pre-planning level cost estimate of repair. Color photographs of each barrier are included with the barrier record. Barriers will be identified and presented by individual facility. Each report will include an executive summary, including an order of magnitude (pre-planning level) summary cost table identifying the estimated cost to correct each facility.

EMG will use our web-based database, ADA AssetCALC™, for the facility assessments, and for components of the Transition Plan. ADA AssetCALC™ will provide the Client with the ability to generate cost tables for all facilities, or for each individual facility. Similar types of barriers can be queried within the ADA AssetCALC™ database across all facilities. This provides the Client with the ability to improve purchasing and contracting power. Barriers can be ranked by priority for removal. Photos will be uploaded to ADA AssetCALC™ to be viewed as a photo log or individually, when reviewing a specific barrier.

EMG will provide electronic draft reports (per individual facility/site) for review. The reports include texts, tables, digital photos, field notes, and supporting documentation. Final reports will be provided after all Client comments have been addressed.
EMG will provide a Transition Plan in a Word document converted to an Adobe PDF, with the data exportable to an Excel format.

EMG provides ADA AssetCALC™ access, at no additional charge, for a period of one (1) year. It is a cloud-based system that allows users to query information regarding specific items or across the entire asset portfolio. This streamlines the Capital Planning and ADA Transition Planning process by compiling funding requirements for barriers and creating budget models based on project priority, life cycle maintenance, and repair requirements. Seat licenses and on-going hosting agreements are not required with AssetCALC™ for a period of one (1) year. Agreements for additional years are available.
TERMS & CONDITIONS
EMG will be adhering to the City of El Segundo's "Professional Services Agreement."
PROJECT AUTHORIZATION

To contract with EMG for this project, please review and edit the information below, sign, and return the entire agreement to EMG.

Client Contact & Report Addressee:
Address: Mr. Ken Berkman
Public Works Director
City of El Segundo
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
Phone: 310-524-2300
Email: kberkman@elsegundo.com

Report & Invoice Recipient:
Address: See Property List

Project Information:
Property Name: Various Properties
City/County: El Segundo / Los Angeles County

Building Information:
Type of Project: Municipal
Stories: Various
Buildings: 31 Buildings (15 Sites)
Square Feet: 255,084

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service(s)</th>
<th>Lump Sum Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility Condition Assessments</td>
<td>$ 55,137.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset / Equipment Inventory</td>
<td>$ 5,102.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventive Maintenance Plans</td>
<td>$ 5,102.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcoding</td>
<td>$ 3,827.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Survey and Transition Plan (Entrances and Public Areas)</td>
<td>$ 27,235.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report Delivery Date: 90 business days from receipt of signed "Project Authorization" to proceed and mobilization fee, if required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Reports</th>
<th>Report Type</th>
<th>Delivery Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>Email Full Report (PDF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Email Full Report (PDF)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Point of Contact: (the POC shall be deemed an agent of the client for providing access and conveying site data)

POC: POC Phone:
POC E-mail: POC Cell:

Invoicing Requirements: (Select ONE of the following to assure invoices appear as required by your Accounts Payable Department)
Consolidated Invoicing by: [ ] One (1) Consolidated Invoice (e.g. 1 invoice per signed Engagement)
Individual Invoicing by: [ ] Property(ies) [ ] Service Type(s) [ ] Property and Service Type

I have read and verified the accuracy of the information set forth above, and in Proposal No. 131118.18P, including the legal name of the Client. I hereby certify that I am an employee authorized to sign this contract on behalf of the Client, and by my signature below I hereby accept the Proposal, as addressed to my company, including the attached Terms and Conditions, and authorize EMG to proceed with the Services as described. Should any project information change, I understand that additional fees may accrue and the due date may be extended.

Authorized Signature (Printed Name) Phone #

Company Name Title Date
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action to 1) award a standard Public Works Contract to All American Asphalt for FY 17/18 Pavement Rehabilitation, Project No. PW 18-18, and 2) award a standard Professional Services Agreement to KOA Corporation for construction inspection services (Fiscal Impact: $1,236,730)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
1. Authorize the City Manager to execute a standard Public Works Contract, in a form approved by the City Attorney, with All American Asphalt in the amount of $1,050,770 for FY 17/18 Pavement Rehabilitation, Project No. PW 18-18, and authorize an additional $105,000 for construction related contingencies; and,

2. Authorize the City Manager to execute a standard Professional Services Agreement, in a form as approved by the City Attorney, with KOA Corporation in the amount of $73,660 for construction inspection and testing services, and authorize an additional $7,300 for construction related contingencies; or,

3. Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
Location Map

FISCAL IMPACT: Included in Adopted Budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Budgeted</th>
<th>Additional Appropriation</th>
<th>Account Number(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,291,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$997,000 from 106-400-8203-8943 (State Gas Tax Fund) and $94,000 from 128-400-0000-8383 (SB-1 Expenditures) $200,000 from 110-400-8203-8943 (Measure R Local Return)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STRATEGIC PLAN:
Goal: 4 Develop Quality Infrastructure and Technology

Objective: (a) El Segundo’s physical infrastructure supports an appealing, safe, and effective City

ORIGINATED BY: John Gilmour, Senior Engineering Associate
REVIEWED BY: Ken Berkman, Public Works Director
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:
On April 30, 2018, City Council adopted the plans and specifications for the FY 17/18 Pavement Rehabilitation Project and authorized staff to advertise for construction bids for work on the following streets.

- Sheldon St. – between Grand Ave. and El Segundo Blvd.
- Kansas St. – between El Segundo Blvd. and Holly Ave.
• Kansas St. – between Holly Ave. and Mariposa Ave.
• Holly Ave. – between Kansas St. and Illinois St.
• Pine Ave. – between Kansas St. and Washington St.
• Washington St. – between Holly Ave. and Mariposa Ave.
• Illinois St – between El Segundo Blvd. and Franklin Ave.
• Illinois St – between Grand Ave. and Mariposa Ave.
• Mariposa Ave. EB – between Nash St. and Douglas St.
• Mariposa Ave. WB – between Nash St and Douglas St.
• Nash St. – between Rosecrans Ave. and Park Pl.
• Park Pl. – between Continental Way and Douglas St.
• Douglas St. – between Rosecrans Ave. and Park Pl.
• Douglas St. – between Coral Cir. and El Segundo Blvd.

On May 29, 2018, the City Clerk received and opened four (4) bids as follows:
1. AKM Consulting Engineers N/A
2. All American Asphalt $1,050,770
3. Excel Paving Co. $1,199,110
4. Sully-Miller Contracting Co. $1,219,000

AKM Consulting Engineers’ (AKM) bid was mistakenly included in this bid opening. It was actually a proposal for consulting services for this project, which is separate. Therefore, for the analysis of construction bids, it is considered not applicable (N/A). The lowest responsive and responsible bidder was All American Asphalt. Staff checked references and the contractor’s license status and found them satisfactory. All American Asphalt has successfully completed similar projects for other public agencies, and for the City itself.

Staff also prepared a Request for Proposals (RFP) for construction inspection and testing services for the project, for which KOA Corporation (KOA) and AKM submitted. Staff reviewed the proposals and conducted interviews; and selected KOA to provide construction inspection and testing services. Staff determined that KOA has satisfactorily provided these services on several similar projects for other public agencies and has the requisite knowledge and expertise to help staff successfully complete the project. KOA’s rates are typical of the market for this type of service and are competitive.

Therefore, staff respectfully recommends that City Council:

1. Authorize the City Manager to execute a standard Public Works Contract, in a form approved by the City Attorney, with All American Asphalt in the amount of $1,050,770 for FY 17/18 Pavement Rehabilitation, Project No. PW 18-18, and authorize an additional $105,000 for construction related contingencies; and,

2. Authorize the City Manager to execute a standard Professional Services Agreement, in a form as approved by the City Attorney, with KOA Corporation in the amount of $73,660 for construction inspection and testing services, and authorize an additional $7,300 for construction related contingencies.

With approval, construction is anticipated to commence in early August and be completed in September.
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action to authorize an additional budget appropriation of $7,115 for an existing Professional Services Agreement with MIG, Inc. for planning and environmental services related to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Update Project. (Fiscal impact—$0)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
1. Approve a budget appropriation of $7,115 and transfer from the General Plan Maintenance Fund (GPMF) to provide planning and environmental services;
2. Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
1. MIG Additional Scope of Services Request
2. Expenditure Status Report for “Trust Funds-Project Deposits Nonrefundable” account

FISCAL IMPACT:
None
- Amount Budgeted: $0
- Additional Appropriation: $7,115
- Account Number(s): From General Plan Maintenance Fund - #708-278-0000-1278 to Trust Funds-Project Deposits Nonrefundable - #708-400-2402-6206

STRATEGIC PLAN:
- Goals: 4(a) Physical infrastructure & 5(a) Economic growth and vitality
- Objectives: Optimization of city resources & encourage vibrant business climate

ORIGINATED BY: Gregg McClain, Planning Manager
Reviewed BY: Sam Lee, Planning and Building Safety Director
Approved BY: Joseph Lillio, Finance Director

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:
The requested appropriation of $7,115 from the General Plan Maintenance Fund (GPMF) is in addition to $396,000 that was appropriated in 2014 for the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Update Project. Work continues on the project through the efforts of the City’s consulting firm, MIG, Inc. The requested budget appropriation will cover unanticipated costs related to additional traffic analysis work required to complete the project's Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The $7,115 appropriation will result in a total, not to exceed contract amount with MIG, Inc. of $403,115.

The project was originally authorized and funded by the General Plan Maintenance Fund (GPMF), which is a restricted-use revenue fund that is linked to a surcharge on building permits and is not part of the General Fund. Subsequently, the funds were transferred to an expenditure account where the funds are reserved. A new purchase order cannot be prepared without this appropriation.
RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the City Council authorize the appropriation of $7,115 for planning and environmental services related to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Update Project.
April 30, 2018

City of El Segundo
Attn: Paul Semaras, Tina Gall, Gregg McClain, and Sam Lee

Re: Additional Traffic Analysis Requested by Caltrans

Dear team,

As Genevieve Sharrow and Brian Marchetti (KOA) discussed with you on a call on April 25, 2018, the following Scope of Services summarizes additional work and fees that are above and beyond the original contract, to respond to Caltrans’ request for additional information for the EIR for the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan. We propose the following additional services to our original contract, dated October 1, 2014 and amended July 19, 2016. All other terms in the original contract remain in effect.

Scope
The following describes new services outside of the original scope:

1. KOA Data Collection ($3,800)
   - At three freeway off-ramp intersection locations and three on-ramp meter locations, KOA will collect peak-hour vehicle volume data at the intersection or adjacent roadway link and also compile relevant Caltrans data on daily ramp volumes.
   - The analysis locations will be visited in the field during a.m. and p.m. peak hours, to document queuing conditions and other operational details.

2. KOA Data Analysis and Response ($2,500)
   - Analyze pre-project and post-project LOS and vehicle approach delay, using the analyzed and input project volumes, for the off-ramp intersections and the on-ramp meters.
   - Share the results with MIG and the City and determine approach to response.
   - Draft response to Caltrans, providing to MIG, which will include the analysis results summary table and data and analysis sheets as attachments, as appropriate.

3. MIG Coordination/RTC/Subconsultant Fee ($815)
   - MIG will coordinate with KOA on this additional work and incorporate the new information into the Responses to Comments component of the EIR.
   - MIG’s subconsultant management fee of 5% applies.

Fee
These additional services will be billed on a Percent Complete basis, with a Not to Exceed Total of $7,115. We will not perform any future work beyond the efforts described in this additional services letter without written approval from the City.
Schedule
KOA will complete data collection and data analysis tables and conclusions within three weeks from City authorization and verification of scope by Caltrans (in process). A formalized response to Caltrans comments will be completed within one week from that point.

We look forward to continuing to work with you on the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan update. Please feel free to contact me at (626) 744-9872 for any questions or additional information needed.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Laura Stetson, AICP
Principal

Please sign below to indicate your agreement to the terms outlined in this letter as a revision to the original contract and budget.

[Signature]
Date: 5/1/18.

Sam Lee
Director of Planning and Building Safety
### TRUST FUNDS-PROJECT DEPOSITS NONREFUNDAB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Beginning Balance</th>
<th>Debits</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>YTD Debits</th>
<th>YTD Credits</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>Debits</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>YTD Debits</td>
<td>YTD Credits</td>
<td>Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>Designated General Plan Maintenance</td>
<td>621,473.13 CR</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>621,473.13 CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278-0000-1278</td>
<td>Designated General Plan Maintenance</td>
<td>621,473.13 CR</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>621,473.13 CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Designated General Plan Maintenance</td>
<td>621,473.13 CR</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>621,473.13 CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Equities</td>
<td>621,473.13 CR</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>621,473.13 CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>TRUST FUNDS-PROJECT DEPOSITS</td>
<td>621,473.13 CR</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>621,473.13 CR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Fund Not in Balance***
## Grand Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beginning Balance</th>
<th>Debits</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>YTD Debits</th>
<th>YTD Credits</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Assets</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Liabilities</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Equities</td>
<td>621,473.13 CR</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>621,473.13 CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budgetary</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Funds</td>
<td>621,473.13 CR</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>621,473.13 CR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA STATEMENT

MEETING DATE: June 19, 2018
AGENDA HEADING: Consent Agenda

AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action to adopt a Resolution identifying which projects will be funded with SB-1, “Road Repair and Accountability Act” funds. (Fiscal Impact: approximately $700,000 in FY 18-19 in SB1, Gas Tax and Prop C funds)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1. Adopt the attached Resolution identifying which projects will be funded with SB-1, “Road Repair and Accountability Act” funds.

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

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

Resolution

FISCAL IMPACT: To be included in FY18-19 Budget

Amount Budgeted: $700,000

Additional Appropriation: N/A.

Account Number(s): $279,709 from Account# 128-400-0000-8383 (SB-1 Expenditures)

Prop C and Gas Tax Accounts as needed (account numbers to be determined)

STRATEGIC PLAN:

Goal: 4 Develop Quality Infrastructure and Technology

Objective: (a) El Segundo’s physical infrastructure supports an appealing, safe, and effective City

ORIGINATED BY: Orlando Rodriguez, Senior Civil Engineer

REVIEWS BY: Ken Berkmann, Public Works Director

APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

Senate Bill 1 (SB-1), the “Road Repair and Accountability Act” of 2017, was signed into law on April 28, 2017 and will provide over $50B over the next decade to fix roads, freeways and bridges in communities across California. These funds will be split equally between the State and local governments. SB-1 “Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account” (RMRA) funds are provided by voter-approved increases in gasoline and diesel excise taxes; the diesel sales tax; and vehicle fees, which went into effect on November 1, 2017.

Prior to receiving its portion of RMRA funds from the State Controller in the State’s (July to June) Fiscal Year 2018/19, the City must submit to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) a list of projects proposed to be funded with RMRA funds pursuant to an adopted City
resolution by June 1, 2018 (with a 60-day grace period). The project list must include a
description and the location of each proposed project, a proposed schedule for each project’s
completion, and the estimated useful life of the improvement. The RMRA funds from the State
are anticipated to be received October 1st. The RMRA funds shall then be used to subsequently
pay invoices for the adopted project(s). An expenditure report must also be submitted to the
CTC for their records and auditing purposes.

The Public Works Department administers a 5-year (2016-2021) Pavement Management
Program (PMP) to ensure public health and safety and efficiently and effectively manage the life
of the City’s roadway system. Based upon existing records and field reviews, the PMP assigns a
Pavement Condition Index (PCI) to all roadway segments in the City on a scale from 0-100, with
100 representing like-new pavement. Scores below 75 require some type of preventive
maintenance depending on the extent of the roadway distress, which can range from a slurry seal,
to an overlay, to complete reconstruction.

Staff has identified and selected Center Street, Maple Avenue, and Imperial Avenue from the
PMP as the next applicable roadways to rehabilitate with FY 2018-19 RMRA funds as part of the
Annual Pavement Rehabilitation Project. The following roadway segments will receive a
removal and replacement treatment of the top 2” of asphalt concrete, along with more extensive
localized repairs of the most deteriorated pavement areas:

- Center Street – between Imperial Ave. and Mariposa Ave. (PCI of 45)
- Maple Avenue – between Sheldon St. and Sepulveda Blvd. (PCI of 55)
- Imperial Avenue – between Sheldon St. and California St. (PCI of 59)

The pavement rehabilitation improvements will reduce maintenance costs, improve traffic
conditions and safety, and extend pavement life for at least ten years.

Staff estimates the following timeline for the project, which is specifically scheduled when
school is not in session to minimize construction and traffic impacts:

Plan Approval and Authorization to Seek Construction Bids: March 2019
Contract Award: May 2019
Construction Start: July 2019
Construction Complete: August 2019

Staff respectfully recommends Council adopt the attached Resolution identifying which projects
will be funded with SB-1, “Road Repair and Accountability Act” funds.
RESOLUTION NO. __

RESOLUTION TO ADOPT PROJECT NO. 19-01, CENTER, MAPLE AND IMPERIAL PAVEMENT REHABILITATION TO BE FUNDED BY SB 1: THE ROAD REPAIR AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

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

SECTION 1: The City Council finds and declares as follows:

A. Senate Bill 1 (SB 1), the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 (Chapter 5, Statutes of 2017) was passed by the Legislature and Signed into law by the Governor in April 2017 in order to address the significant multi-modal transportation funding shortfalls statewide; and

B. SB 1 includes accountability and transparency provisions that will ensure the residents of City of El Segundo are aware of the projects proposed for funding in our community and which projects have been completed each fiscal year; and

C. The City of El Segundo must adopt a list of all projects proposed to receive funding from the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA), created by SB 1 by resolution, which must include a description and the location of each proposed project, a proposed schedule for the project’s completion, and the estimated useful life of the improvement; and

D. The City of El Segundo will receive and estimated $279,709 in RMRA funding in Fiscal Year 2018-19 from SB 1; and

E. The City of El Segundo has undergone a robust public process to ensure public input into our community’s transportation priorities/the project list; and

F. The City of El Segundo used a 5-year (2016-2021) Pavement Management Program to develop the SB 1 project list to ensure revenues are being used on the most high-priority and cost-effective projects that also meet the community’s priorities for transportation investment; and

G. The funding from SB 1 will help the City of El Segundo maintain and rehabilitate Center St., Imperial Avenue, and Maple Ave. this year and many similar projects into the future; and

H. The 2016 California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment found that the City of El Segundo streets and roads are in a fair condition and this revenue will help us increase the overall quality of our road system and over the next decade will bring our streets and roads into a good condition; and
I. Without revenue from SB 1, the City of El Segundo, would have otherwise been canceling projects throughout the community; and

J. If the Legislature and Governor failed to act, city streets and county roads would have continued to deteriorate, having many and varied negative impacts on our community; and

K. Cities and counties own and operate more than 81 percent of streets and roads in California, and from the moment we open our front door to drive to work, bike to school, or walk to the bus station, people are dependent upon a safe, reliable local transportation network; and

L. Modernizing the local street and road system provides well-paying construction jobs and boosts local economies; and

M. The local street and road system is also critical for farm to market needs, interconnectivity, multimodal needs, and commerce; and

N. Police, fire, and emergency medical services all need safe reliable roads to react quickly to emergency calls and a few minutes of delay can be a matter of life and death; and

O. Maintaining and preserving the local street and road system in good condition will reduce drive times and traffic congestion, improve bicycle safety, and make the pedestrian experience safer and more appealing, which leads to reduce vehicle emissions helping the State achieve its air quality and greenhouse gas emissions reductions goals; and

P. Restoring roads before they fail also reduces construction time which results in less air pollution from heavy equipment and less water pollution from site run-off; and

Q. The SB 1 project list and overall investment in our local streets and roads infrastructure with a focus on basic maintenance and safety, investing in complete streets infrastructure, and using cutting-edge technology, materials and practices, will have significant positive co-benefits statewide.

SECTION 2: The City Council finds that the foregoing recitals and true and correct and adopts the following projects to be funded with Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account revenues:

**Annual Pavement Rehabilitation Project** in the following locations:
- Center Street – between Imperial Ave. and Mariposa Ave.
- Maple Avenue – between Sheldon St. and Sepulveda Blvd.
- Imperial Avenue – between Sheldon St. and California St.

The project is expected to extend pavement life for at least ten years and anticipated to be constructed in 2019.
SECTION 3: **Construction.** This Resolution must be broadly construed in order to achieve the purposes stated in this Resolution. It is the City Council’s intent that the provisions of this Ordinance be interpreted or implemented by the City and others in a manner that facilitates the purposes set forth in this Resolution.

SECTION 4: **Severability.** If any part of this Resolution or its application is deemed invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the City Council intends that such invalidity will not affect the effectiveness of the remaining provisions or applications and, to this end, the provisions of this Ordinance are severable.

SECTION 5: The City Clerk is directed to certify the adoption of this Resolution, record this Resolution in the book of the City’s original resolutions, and make a minute of this adoption of the Resolution in the City Council’s records and the minutes of this meeting.

SECTION 6: This Resolution will become effective immediately and will remain effective unless repealed or superseded.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 19th day of June, 2018.

__________________________________________
Drew Boyles,
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 and adopted by said City Council, approved and signed by the Mayor, and attested to by the City Clerk, all at a regular meeting of said Council held on the ___ day of _____, 2018, and the same was so passed and adopted by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:
Tracy Weaver, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Mark D. Hensley, City Attorney
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action regarding approval of an amendment to the Prosum Technology Services agreement number 5346 for temporary staffing in the Information Systems Department. (Fiscal Impact $200,000)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
1. Authorize the City manager to execute an agreement amendment, in a form approved by the City Attorney, with Prosum Technology Services to provide additional temporary staffing for the Information Systems Department.
2. Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
First Amendment to Agreement No. 5346

FISCAL IMPACT: $200,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Budgeted:</th>
<th>$200,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Appropriation:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Number(s):</td>
<td>001-400-2505-4101 Salary Savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>001-400-2505-6214 Professional/Technical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STRATEGIC PLAN:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal:</th>
<th>4B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Segundo’s technology supports effective, efficient and proactive operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective:</th>
<th>a.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successfully implement new technology as prioritized in the Technology Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORIGINATED BY: Charles Mallory, Information Systems Director
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

In July 2017, the City Manager approved a 1 year agreement for staffing services with Prosum Technology Services to provide project based consulting and technical services to aid in implementing, upgrading and supporting critical business systems. The contract has been used to compliment staff skills in the Information Systems Division (ISD). In the coming months, there are a number of projects that need specialized skills to augment staff; therefore, it is anticipated an additional amount of $200,000 will be necessary to meet the operational and project needs of the Information Systems Department. Currently there are vacant positions within the department that result in salary and benefit savings which can be used towards the contract increase. This amendment, if approved, will bring the contract total to an amount not to exceed $300,000.
Through the strategic planning and budgeting process for 2019, the Information Systems Department will reassess staffing needs for the coming years. Additionally, staff in conjunction with the Technology Committee has determined the most efficient way to currently execute the projects is with the addition of program/project managers and business analysts to aid in the following activities:

- Assist with the management of the project portfolio of over 20 projects
- Manage the projects selection criteria, plans and budgets
- Lead the design, testing, data migration
- Ensure consistency of stakeholder communication
- Develop and document policy, standards and operating procedures
- Manage the vendor and City staff selections and implementation teams

These professionals will work with City staff, as well as the vendors contracted by the City to ensure the successful and timely completion of projects. It is anticipated that an additional amount of $200,000 will be necessary to meet the project and operational needs of the department. Amending the professional services contract with Prosum will allow ISD to continue to deliver projects and enhanced services that meet the needs of the residential and business community.

There are over twenty projects in queue, of which ten are active. Many of these projects need specialized skills to augment staffing shortfalls. Staff would like to enter into a longer agreement with Prosum Technology Services for an additional calendar year, with an increase of $200,000 to the contract allowance. The salary savings and professional services fund are sufficient to cover the increase. Given the current working relationship with Prosum Technology Services, a local El Segundo company, we would like to continue this partnership.

At this time, staff recommends approving a first amendment to agreement #5346, extending the term of the agreement to June 19, 2019, adding an additional amount of $200,000 for Prosum Technology Services to provide temporary staffing services to the Information Systems Department.
FIRST AMENDMENT TO
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT BETWEEN
THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO AND
PROSUM, INC.

THIS FIRST AMENDMENT ("Amendment") is made and entered into this 19th day of June, 2018, by and between CITY OF EL SEGUNDO, a general law city and municipal corporation existing under the laws of California ("CITY"), and PROSUM, INC., a California Corporation ("CONSULTANT").

1. Pursuant to Paragraph 12 of Professional Services Agreement No. 5346 ("Agreement"), Paragraph 1 of the Agreement is amended to read as follows:

"1. CONSIDERATION,

A. As partial consideration, CONSULTANT agrees to perform the work listed in the SCOPE OF SERVICES, below;

B. As additional consideration, CONSULTANT and CITY agree to abide by the terms and conditions contained in this Agreement;

C. As additional consideration, CITY agrees to pay CONSULTANT an additional Two Hundred Thousand Dollars ($200,000.00) for CONSULTANT's services not to exceed a total of Three Hundred Thousand Dollars ($300,000)."

2. Pursuant to Paragraph 8 of the Professional Services Agreement dated July 7, 2017 ("Agreement"), CONSULTANT and CITY desire to extend the term of the Agreement, which took effect retroactively beginning July 7, 2017, and was effective for nine (9) months. Effective June 19, 2018, the term of the Agreement is extended an additional one (1) year, so that the Agreement will now expire on June 19, 2019, unless terminated as set out in Paragraph 16 of the Agreement.

3. This Amendment may be executed in any number of counterparts, each of which will be an original, but all of which together constitutes one instrument executed on the same date.

4. Except as modified by this Amendment, all other terms and conditions of the Agreement will remain the same.

[SIGNATURES ON NEXT PAGE]
IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties hereto have executed this Amendment the day and year first hereinabove written.

CITY OF EL SEGUNDO, a general law city

PROSUM, INC. a California corporation

Greg Carpenter, City Manager

Rick Tyner, VP Business Development

ATTEST:

Tracy Weaver, City Clerk

Taxpayer ID No.: 33-0776224

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Mark D. Hensley, City Attorney
EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA ITEM STATEMENT

MEETING DATE: June 19, 2018
AGENDA HEADING: Consent Agenda

AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action regarding the acceptance of a donation from American Youth Soccer Organization (AYSO) Region 92 in the amount of $50,000 to help fund the capital improvement project to install shade structures at Campus El Segundo Athletic Fields, and authorize the City Manager to execute an agreement in a form approved by the City Attorney designating the use of funds. (Fiscal Impact: $50,000 Revenue)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
1. Accept the donation from AYSO; and,
2. Authorize the City Manager to execute an agreement in a form approved by the City Attorney designating the use of funds; and/or,
3. Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS: None

FISCAL IMPACT: $50,000 Revenue
Amount Budgeted: $75,000
Additional Appropriation: N/A
Account Number(s): N/A

STRATEGIC PLAN:
Goal: 4A El Segundo’s physical infrastructure supports and appealing, safe and effective community
Objective: 1 The City optimizes its physical resources

PREPARED BY: Meredith Petit, Director of Recreation and Parks
REVIEWED BY: Meredith Petit, Director of Recreation and Parks
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:
The adopted FY 2017/2018 budget included $250,000 to be allocated to various capital improvement projects within the Recreation and Parks Department, to be identified and prioritized by the Recreation and Parks Commission. One of the high priority projects that was recommended for completion this year, and subsequently approved by City Council, was the installation of shade structures at the Campus El Segundo Athletic Fields. The local AYSO youth soccer organization had previously indicated to the Department their intention to partner with the City on this project, and have pledged a donation of $50,000 to the project. This supplemental funding was a major factor in naming the project as a high priority. The Department has allocated $75,000 of the $250,000 towards this project, for a total source of funds of $125,000 to date.

AYSO is seeking to provide the funds to the City within their budget year for the purposes of this designated purpose of installing shade at Campus El Segundo, and the City’s municipal code requires
the City Council to formally accept donations over $25,000. Additionally, staff and AYSO are working towards agreeable language to memorialize the use of funds as well as general guidelines for collaborating on the design and scope of the project, timing of installation, and identifying alternative funding sources. This agreement will be approved in a form approved by the City Attorney and executed by the City Manager upon both parties' agreement.
EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL  
AGENDA STATEMENT  

MEETING DATE: June 19, 2018  
AGENDA HEADING: Consent Agenda

AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action to adopt a resolution approving two new part-time classifications of Lifeguard and Senior Lifeguard and establishing an hourly pay rate for such positions. (Fiscal Impact: N/A)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
1. Adopt the resolution approving new part-time classifications Lifeguard and Senior Lifeguard and establishing an hourly pay rate for such positions; and/or,
2. Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
1. Draft Resolution with Job Description Exhibits

FISCAL IMPACT: N/A

<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>

STRATEGIC PLAN:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal:</th>
<th>3a El Segundo is a City employer of choice and consistently hires for the future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective:</td>
<td>3 The City has a comprehensive, intentional approach to staff development, training and succession</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORIGINATED BY: Meredith Petit, Director of Recreation and Parks
REVIEWED BY: Joe Lillio, Acting Director of Human Resources / Director of Finance
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:
On June 5, 2018, the City Council approved the creation of two new part-time job classifications for Lifeguard and Senior Lifeguard. The new classifications, originally incorporated into the Recreation Leader III and Recreation Leader IV classifications, will provide better defined roles and responsibilities as well as offer a competitive pay rate to enable the City to recruit and retain the most qualified employees. The approved hourly pay rates are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Step A</th>
<th>Step B</th>
<th>Step C</th>
<th>Step D</th>
<th>Step E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lifeguard</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$15.75</td>
<td>$16.54</td>
<td>$17.36</td>
<td>$18.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lifeguard</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$18.90</td>
<td>$19.85</td>
<td>$20.84</td>
<td>$21.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff recommends that the City Council adopt the resolution, approving of the classifications and establishing the pay rates.
RESOLUTION NO.__________

A RESOLUTION APPROVING NEW PART-TIME JOB CLASSIFICATIONS FOR LIFEGUARD AND SENIOR LIFEGUARD AND ESTABLISHING AN HOURLY PAY RATE FOR SUCH POSITIONS

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

SECTION 1: The classifications of Lifeguard and Senior Lifeguard, attached as Exhibits A and B, are hereby approved, and the hourly pay rate for such positions are established as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Step A</th>
<th>Step B</th>
<th>Step C</th>
<th>Step D</th>
<th>Step E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lifeguard</td>
<td>$ 15.00</td>
<td>$ 15.75</td>
<td>$ 16.54</td>
<td>$ 17.36</td>
<td>$ 18.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lifeguard</td>
<td>$ 18.00</td>
<td>$ 18.90</td>
<td>$ 19.85</td>
<td>$ 20.84</td>
<td>$ 21.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 2: Authority. The City Manager or his designee is authorized to take any steps necessary in order to effectuate this Resolution.

SECTION 3: Construction. This Resolution must be broadly construed in order to achieve the purposes stated in this Resolution. It is the City Council’s intent that the provisions of this Ordinance be interpreted or implemented by the City and others in a manner that facilitates the purposes set forth in this Resolution.

SECTION 4: Severability. If any part of this Resolution or its application is deemed invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the City Council intends that such invalidity will not affect the effectiveness of the remaining provisions or applications and, to this end, the provisions of this Ordinance are severable.

SECTION 5: The City Clerk is directed to certify the adoption of this Resolution, record this Resolution in the book of the City’s original resolutions, and make a minute of this adoption of the Resolution in the City Council’s records and the minutes of this meeting.

SECTION 6: This Resolution will become effective immediately and will remain effective unless repealed or superseded.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 19th day of June, 2018,

Drew Boyles,
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 and adopted by said City Council, approved and signed by the Mayor, and attested to by the City Clerk, all at a regular meeting of said Council held on the ___ day of _____, 2018, and the same was so passed and adopted by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

______________________________
Tracy Weaver, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

______________________________
Mark D. Hensley, City Attorney
EXHIBIT A

City of El Segundo

Lifeguard

SALARY RANGE

$15.00-$18.23 Hourly

DEFINITION: This is a seasonal, part-time, hourly position working under the direction of the Aquatics Recreation Supervisor, Aquatics Recreation Coordinator and Senior Lifeguards.

ESSENTIAL JOB FUNCTIONS: Duties include, but are not limited to working and communicating effectively with children, the general public and other staff members; promote a positive, friendly and energetic attitude; follow oral and written instructions; have the ability to assist and protect the life and well-being of each and every patron by implementing the latest safety procedures, policies, rules, regulations and ordinances set forth by both the American Red Cross and City of El Segundo. Surveys a public swimming pool; prevents patron accidents; rescues swimmers in distress; conducts beginning to advanced swim level courses; enforces regulations and codes; and performs other related duties, as assigned.

The primary responsibility of the lifeguard is the safety and protection of pool patrons by preventing accidents, and when required, making rescues. The lifeguard must be alert and take action in enforcing safety rules and ordinances. In an emergency, the lifeguard must think quickly and clearly, in some cases taking personal risks and exerting considerable physical effort. The lifeguard is required to work day and evening hours including weekends.

QUALIFICATIONS: Current American Red Cross certification in the following: First Aid, CPR & AED for the Professional Rescuer, Lifeguard Training. Previous aquatic work experience, strong leadership skills and athletic background highly desirable. As a condition of employment, a lifeguard must attend all in-service trainings.

Individuals in this classification are required to successfully pass a background check that complies with Public Resources Code section 5164, which mandates that a city that hires a person to work at a park, playground, recreational center or beach, in a position having supervisory or disciplinary authority over a minor, shall complete an application that inquires whether that individual has been convicted of specified criminal offenses.

WORKING CONDITIONS: The work is regularly performed indoors and outdoors in variable weather conditions. Must be able to work in an outdoor public pool environment. May be required to work a varied schedule, which may include days, evenings, weekends and holidays. Will be required to wear uniform while on duty.

AGE: 15 years of age.

MEDICAL: City medical exam required after successful completion of the swim test and interview.

DOCUMENTS: All new city employees must show satisfactory proof of identity and a legal right to work in the United States.

TESTING PROCESS: Oral interview, swim test and rescue technique skills test. As a condition of employment, candidates must pass a fingerprint check and provide proof of successfully passing a screening exam for tuberculosis.
DEFINITION: This is a seasonal, part-time, hourly position working under the direction of the Aquatics Recreation Supervisor and Aquatics Recreation Coordinator. This position monitors and coordinates the work activities of Pool Lifeguards and instructs swim lessons as assigned.

ESSENTIAL JOB FUNCTIONS: Duties include, but are not limited to, working and communicating effectively with children, the general public and other staff members; promote a positive, friendly and energetic attitude; follow oral and written instructions; have the ability to assist and protect the life and well-being of each and every patron by implementing the latest safety procedures, policies, rules, regulations and ordinances set forth by both the American Red Cross and City of El Segundo. Surveys a public swimming pool; prevents patron accidents; rescues swimmers in distress; conducts beginning to advanced swim level courses; enforces regulations and codes; and performs related work. Assists with coordinating various aquatic activities. Perform pool maintenance and cleaning. Completes various forms and paperwork pertinent to the day-to-day operation of an aquatic facility. Performs minor facility clean up and maintenance. Performs pool chemistry check every two hours. Ensures that the pool, decks, and dressing rooms are safe, clean and orderly. Perform other related duties, ass assigned.

KNOWLEDGE OF: Teaching principles and practices, swimming instruction techniques and methods. Water safety practices, basic recordkeeping procedures and effective customer service techniques.

QUALIFICATIONS: Current American Red Cross certification in the following: First Aid, CPR & AED for the Professional Rescuer, Lifeguard Training. Minimum one year of recent, paid lifeguard experience or two summer seasons of experience as a lifeguard, which must include experience teaching organized swim lessons and experience working with the public. Strong leadership skills and athletic background highly desirable.

American Red Cross Lifeguard Instructor and Water Safety Instructor certifications preferred but not required.

As a condition of employment, a lifeguard must attend all in-service trainings.

Individuals in this classification are required to successfully pass a background check that complies with Public Resources Code section 5164, which mandates that a city that hires a person to work at a park, playground, recreational center or beach, in a position having supervisory or disciplinary authority over a minor, shall complete an application that inquires whether that individual has been convicted of specified criminal offenses.

WORKING CONDITIONS: The work is regularly performed indoors and outdoors in variable weather conditions. Must be able to work in an outdoor public pool environment. May be required to work a varied schedule, which may include days, evenings, weekends and holidays. Will be required to wear uniform while on duty.

AGE: 15 years of age.

MEDICAL: City medical exam required after successful completion of the swim test and interview.

DOCUMENTS: All new city employees must show satisfactory proof of identity and a legal right to work in the United States.

TESTING PROCESS: Oral interview, swim test and rescue technique skills test. As a condition of employment, candidates must pass a fingerprint check and provide proof of successfully passing a screening exam for tuberculosis.
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action to increase the previously approved Professional Services Agreement in the amount of $75,916.40 with Wiland Associates LLC for Incident Management Training and Consulting Services by $36,083.60 for a total of $112,000.00. (Fiscal Impact: $112,000.00)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
1. Approve the vendor and procurement of training services of RFP # 18-03 so that a contract can be established with Wiland Associates LLC.
2. Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
April 17, 2018 Staff Report and Attachments

FISCAL IMPACT: None
Amount Budgeted: 117,500.00
Additional Appropriation: N/A
Account Number(s): 001-3255-400-6214

STRATEGIC PLAN:
Goal: 1 Support Community Safety and Preparedness
Objective: 1 The city participates in proactive communication and community engagement.

ORIGINATED BY: Randy A. Collins, Emergency Management Coordinator
REVIEWED BY: 
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:
The emergency management office presented a program of emergency management strategic plan for emergency management for El Segundo which was filed and received by the City Council on November 21, 2017. The first goal of that plan was to build an All-Hazards Incident Management Team to manage the city during times of disaster in accordance with national qualification standards.

In March, emergency management, in conjunction with the city’s finance department and the city clerk’s office completed an RFP for incident management training services to provide several courses needed to meet the qualification standards. The city received only one valid bid (a second
was disqualified because it was received late). The pricing of the listed training is consistent with national averages of the same training courses.

In April, Council approved $75,916.40 in expenses for four training courses enabling the city’s Emergency Manager and City Attorney to develop a scope of work and negotiate pricing. Now that pricing is set and agreed upon, there is room in the budget for an additional three courses, highlighted below. The following will be provided for an amount not to exceed $112,000.00:

USFA O-305 All-Hazards Incident Management Team Course $33,976.80
EMI L-958 All-Hazard Operations Section Chief Course $13,085.62
EMI L-962 All-Hazards Planning Section Chief Course $13,085.62
EMI L-967 All-Hazards Logistics Section Chief Course $15,009.19
EMI L-950 All-Hazards Incident Commander Course $15,392.52
EMI L-956 All-Hazards Liaison Officer Course $8,301.94
EMI L-954 All-Hazards Safety Officer Course $13,085.62

Total: $111,937.31

By providing these courses, it will bring El Segundo closer to the objective of having fully trained personnel according to stringent national standards for our All-Hazards Incident Management Team.
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action to authorize the City Manager to execute a Professional Services Agreement in a form approved by the City Attorney with Wiland Associates LLC for Incident Management Training and Consulting Services. (Fiscal Impact: $75,916.40)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
1. Approve the vendor and procurement of training services of RFP #18-03 so that a contract can be established with Wiland Associates LLC.
2. Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
Vendor Bid Pricing sheet and Clerk’s Log

FISCAL IMPACT: None
Amount Budgeted: 117,500.00
Additional Appropriation: N/A
Account Number(s): 001-3255-400-6214

STRATEGIC PLAN:
Goal: 1 Support Community Safety and Preparedness
Objective: 1 The city participates in proactive communication and community engagement.

ORIGINATED BY: Randy A. Collins, Emergency Management Coordinator
REVIEWED BY:
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:
In the FY17-18 budget, City Council approved funding for enhanced/accelerated disaster response incident command training. The emergency management office presented an Emergency Management Strategic Plan for El Segundo which was received and filed by the City Council on November 21, 2017. The first goal of that plan is to build an All-Hazards Incident Management Team to manage the city during times of disaster in accordance with national qualification standards.

In March 2018, Emergency Management, in conjunction with city Finance and the Clerk’s office completed an RFP for incident management training services to provide several courses needed to meet the qualification standards. The city received only one valid bid (a second was disqualified
because it was received late). The pricing of the listed training is consistent with national averages of the same training courses.

Emergency management requests that the City Council approve the vendor and procurement of training services so that a contract can be established with Wiland Associates LLC for the provision of the following courses by the end of the fiscal year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USFA O-305 All-Hazards Incident Management Team Course</td>
<td>$34,320.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMI L-958 All-Hazard Operations Section Chief Course</td>
<td>$13,270.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMI L-962 All-Hazards Planning Section Chief Course</td>
<td>$13,270.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMI L-967 All-Hazards Logistics Section Chief Course</td>
<td>$15,160.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$75,916.40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By providing these courses, it will bring El Segundo closer to the objective of having fully trained personnel according to stringent national standards for our All-Hazards Incident Management Team.
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO  
BID LOG  
BID NO. RFP 16-03  
City of El Segundo – Emergency Management Department  
Incident Management Training and Consulting Services

Date of BID Opening: Monday, April 2, 2018  
Time of BID Opening: 11 AM  
Place of BID Opening: City Clerk’s Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPANY NAME/ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Wiland Associates LLC  
Richard Andring  
1661 Collins Road  
Selah, WA 98942 |
| 2. |
| 3. |
| 4. |
| 5. |
| 6. |
| 7. |
| 8. |
| 9. |
| 10. |

Staff Present:

City Clerk’s Office
City Clerk’s Office
E.M. Representative

FORMS\BID\OPENLOG1
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March 29, 2018

City of El Segundo
Attn: Maria Cerritos, Purchasing Agent
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

Dear Ms. Cerritos:

Wiland Associates LLC (Wiland) is pleased to provide the following quotes in response to your Request for Proposal #18-03, Incident Management Training and Consulting Services.

Our quotes are based upon our firm having the responsibility for:

- Providing the requisite instructional cadre to include a qualified lead instructor,
- All costs related to providing the instructional cadre to include but not limited to instructor fees, lodging, airfare, per diem, rental vehicles, fuel, mileage parking, etc.
- Providing all instructional materials to include but not limited to instructor guides, student manuals, ICS-forms, wall charts, Planning P’s, registration forms, final examinations, handouts, etc.
- Providing a post course documentation package to the City of El Segundo Emergency Management POC.
- Providing Wiland Associates LLC “Certificates of Completion” for all attendees whom successfully complete the course of completion.

For several of the requested course deliveries Wiland is providing multiple deliver options and pricing.

**USFA O-305 All Hazards Incident Management Team Course Options**

Option #1

**USFA O-305**

All-Hazards Incident Management Team Course

- 24 Attendees
- 3 Member Cadre
- 5-Day Course Delivery

$21,955.30
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option #2</th>
<th>USFA O-305</th>
<th>$28,540.50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All-Hazards Incident Management Team Course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 30 Attendees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 4 Member Cadre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5-Day Course Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option #3</th>
<th>USFA O-305</th>
<th>$34,320.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All-Hazards Incident Management Team Course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 32 Attendees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5 Member Cadre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5-Day Course Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NFA O-337</th>
<th>Command and General Staff Functions for Local IMT's</th>
<th>$21,855.30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 24 Attendees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2 Member Cadre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 8-Day Course Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMI L-950</th>
<th>All-Hazards Incident Commander Course</th>
<th>$15,548.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 24 Attendees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2 Member Cadre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5-Day Course Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMI L-952</th>
<th>All-Hazards Public Information Officer</th>
<th>$15,160.80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 24 Attendees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2 Member Cadre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5-Day Course Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMI L-954</th>
<th>All-Hazards Safety Officer</th>
<th>$13,217.80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 24 Attendees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2 Member Cadre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 4-Day Course Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMI L-956</th>
<th>All-Hazards Liaison Officer</th>
<th>$8,385.80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 24 Attendees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2 Member Cadre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2-Day Course Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EMI L-958 All-Hazard Operations Section Chief $13,217.80
  • 24 Attendees
  • 2 Member Cadre
  • 4-Day Course Delivery

EMI L-960 All-Hazards Division/Group Supervisor $10,833.80
  • 24 Attendees
  • 2 Member Cadre
  • 3-Day Course Delivery

EMI L-984 All-Hazards Strike Team / Task Force Leader $10,833.80
  • 24 Attendees
  • 2 Member Cadre
  • 3-Day Course Delivery

EMI L-962 All-Hazards Planning Section Chief $13,217.80
  • 24 Attendees
  • 2 Member Cadre
  • 4-Day Course Delivery

EMI L-964 All-Hazard Situation Unit Leader $15,160.80
  • 24 Attendees
  • 2 Member Cadre
  • 8-Day Course Delivery

EMI L-965 All-Hazards Resource Unit Leader $13,217.80
  • 24 Attendees
  • 2 Member Cadre
  • 5-Day Course Delivery

EMI L-967 All-Hazards Logistics Section Chief $15,160.80
  • 24 Attendees
  • 2 Member Cadre
  • 8-Day Course Delivery

EMI L-969 Communications Unit Leader $10,883.80
  • 24 Attendees
  • 2 Member Cadre
  • 3-Day Course Delivery
EMI L-870 All-Hazards Supply Unit Leader w/Ordering Manager $15,160.80
- 24 Attendees
- 2 Member Cadre
- 8-Day Course Delivery

EMI L-971 All-Hazards Facilities Unit Leader $15,160.80
- 24 Attendees
- 2 Member Cadre
- 8-Day Course Delivery

EMI L-973 All-Hazards Finance/Administrator Section Chief $10,883.80
- 24 Attendees
- 2 Member Cadre
- 3-Day Course Delivery

EMI L-975 All-Hazards Finance/Administration Unit Leader $10,833.80
- 24 Attendees
- 2 Member Cadre
- 3-Day Course Delivery

The RFP did not specify a student count for the requested courses. Based upon our experience our firm has provided three (3) options for the delivery of the USFA O305 All-Hazard IMT course and based out calculations for the EMI Position Specific Training course on a student count of twenty-four (24). If requested out firm can easily provide addition pricing reflecting higher or lower anticipated attendee counts.

If there are any questions regarding our pricing please contact Richard J. Andring directly at Office: (509) 697-9773 or Cell: (509) 728-3507.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Richard J. Andring, Partner
Wiland Associates LLC
INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS

Buyer: Maria Cerritos, Purchasing Agent
Visit our Website: www.elsegundo.org
Telephone: (310) 524-2331

(4) To have the ability to provide, as required, future maintenance, repair, parts and service for the use of goods purchased;
(5) To have a record of satisfactory or better performance under prior contracts with the city or others; and
(6) To have complied with applicable laws, regulations, policies (including city council policies), guidelines and orders governing prior or existing contracts performed by the bidder.

14. Period of Firm Pricing: Unless stated otherwise, prices shall be firm for 120 days after the RFP closing date. If the City is required to negotiate beyond the 120-day period the City may request bidder’s prices be firm for an additional period of time to complete negotiations and award the contract.

15. Method of Award: The City reserves the right to reject any or all offers, to waive any discrepancy or technicality and to split or make the award in any manner determined by the City to be most advantageous. The City recognizes that prices are only one of several criteria used in judging an offer and the City is not legally bound to accept the lowest offer. The City also reserves the right to make no award.

16. Other Terms and Conditions: The terms and conditions as indicated in this document and/or attached are hereby included with full force and effect as if set forth herein.

17. Return of Bid/Closing Date/Return to: The bid response shall be delivered to the City Clerk’s office on behalf of the El Segundo Purchasing Division, 350 Main Street, Room 5, El Segundo, CA 90245-3813 by 11:00 a.m. PST on April 3, 2018. Bid responses not received by the City Clerk’s office by the closing date and time indicated above will not be accepted and the Bidder will be deemed disqualified. The closing date time and the R.F.P. number referenced above shall appear on the outside of the sealed envelope. A duly executed copy of the signature page of this bid document must accompany Bidder(s) response. The City will not be responsible for and will not except late bids due to delayed mail delivery or courier services.

18. Records Retention/Auditing: The Bidder agrees that City of El Segundo or designated representatives shall have the right to review and copy any records and supporting documentation pertaining to the performance of this contract. Bidder agrees to maintain such records for possible audit for a minimum of seven (7) years after final payment, or until closure of pending matter unless a longer period of records retention is stipulated. Bidder agrees to allow auditor(s) access to such records during normal business hours and allow interviews of any employees or others who might reasonably have information related to such records.

BIDDER TO READ

I have read, understood, and agree to the terms and conditions on all pages of this proposal. The undersigned agrees to furnish the commodity or service stipulated on this proposal as stated above.

WILAND ASSOCIATES LLC

Company or Individual

RICHARD A. WILAND

Name

SENIOR PARTNER

Title of Person Signing Bid

P.O. BOX 119, SELAN, CA 98742

Address

Signature

Contact number

(c) 562-228-3507
SECTION 3: REQUEST FOR QUOTATION/PROPOSAL AND BIDDER REQUIRED INFORMATION.

Bidder Company: WILARD ASSOCIATES LLP  

Bidder Information
Provide the information requested below or Indicate "not applicable," if appropriate.

A. Name and Address of Bidder
WILARD ASSOCIATES LLP
1651 CALLING ROAD
SELMA, IDA 83672

Telephone: 800-692-9273
Facsimile: 509-692-9273
Email: RICHARD@WILARDASSOCIATES.COM
Website Address: WILARDASSOCIATES.COM

B. Bidder is a:

☐ California Corporation

☐ Corporation organized under the laws of the State of: ☐

☐ With head offices located at: ☐

☐ and offices in California located at: ☐

☐ Sole Proprietorship: ☐ Proprietor

☐ Other: Attach Addendum and with explanatory details

C. Have you (or your company) previously worked for the City of El Segundo? ☐ Yes / ☐ No

☐ if yes, please provide Information on additional sheets.

D. If required Contractor's license number & type:

E. The Bidder represents that it has not retained a person to solicit or secure a City contract (upon an agreement or understanding for a commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee) except for retention of bona fide employee or bona fide established commercial selling agencies for the purpose of securing business.

F. During the Quotation process there may be changes to the Quotation documents, which would require an issuance of an addendum or addenda. City disclaims any and all liability for loss, or damage to any Bidder who does not receive any addendum issued by City in connection with this RFP. Any Bidder in submitting a Quotation/Proposal is deemed to waive any and all claims and demands Bidder may have against City on account of the failure of delivery of any such addendum to Bidder. Any and all addenda issued by City shall be deemed included in this RFP and the provisions and instructions therein contained shall be incorporated to any Quotation submitted by Bidder.

G. The firm and individuals listed below, certify that: they do not and in the performance of this contract they will not discriminate in employment of any person because of race, skin color, gender, age, religion, disability, national origin, ancestry, sexual orientation, housing status, marital status, familial status, weight or height of such person; and further certify that they are in compliance with all Federal, State and local directives and executive orders regarding nondiscrimination in employment.

Signature

Print Name/Title of Signer
March 30, 2018

City of El Segundo  
City Clerk’s Office  
350 Main Street, Room 5  
El Segundo, CA 90245—3813

To Whom It May Concern,

Wiland Associates, LLC, is this Nation’s premier provider of Incident Command System (ICS), Incident Management Team (IMT), and Emergency Management (EM) training and exercises. For the past 15 years, Wiland and our Associates has provided over 1,000 training courses and exercises to police; fire; EMS; Emergency Management; Public Health; hospitals and medical systems; private enterprise and NGOs; the Coast Guard; the US military; and many other local, state and federal agencies in 44 US states.

Almost half of our annual work is repeat business. Our company is known for its ability to provide excellent training/exercises that target the needs of the customer and their employees. Our Instructors are known for their excellent delivery and outstanding interaction with the students/participants. Many agencies chose Wiland as their only provider of ICS/IMT/EOC training after using other providers. Their reasons have consistently been the excellent quality of our training; the credibility of our instructors; and our ability to understand, target and deliver what is needed to make their agencies successful in their missions. We can provide dozens of references (written and/or live interaction) for your review.

Wiland Associates, LLC is willing, able, and committed to providing the Incident Management Training and Consulting Services, as outlined in the City of El Segundo’s Request for Proposal (RFP) #18-03. We understand that the contract will be issued for a period of six (6) months with the option to renew for two (2) years—in one (1)-year increments, unless the agreement is terminated earlier.

We understand that the City is looking for assistance in training/development of a Type-3 Incident Management Team (IMT) that operates within established national standards; training Disaster Service Workers assigned as Task Force/Strike Team Leaders and Division/Group Supervisors; and development of a customized All-Hazards Incident Management Team Response and Planning Guide specific to the City of El Segundo All-Hazards Incident Management Team with distribution to all (approximately 300) City of El Segundo employees.

Wiland can provide the requested consulting, and all of the classes requested in this RFP. These classes will fulfill all applicable FEMA, AHIMTA, and other related requirements. Having one vendor provide all the listed classes provides continuity for the students—avoiding significant differences in the interpretation of the curricula; as well as possible disconnects in the philosophy of operation/interaction among Team positions that could occur between differing groups of instructors who have significantly different training/experience/application of IMT principles.
Wiland is excited to bid on this RFP and has the capability, desire, and wherewithal to complete the project—with the intent to far exceed the expectations of the City of El Segundo. We do not subcontract our assignments. You will get only known and experienced Wiland professionals who are experts in the world of Incident Command, Incident Management, and Emergency Management; have extensive Incident Management Team experience; and are recognized for their ability to coach/mentor students to be successful in the dynamic ICS/IMT/EOC world. We find your Professional Services Agreement to be perfectly acceptable.

Wiland has a Zero Tolerance Policy for discrimination of any type. We will obtain all required permits, licenses, and insurance; will fulfill all requirements of this RFP, as published; and will honor all pricing for at least 120 days beyond closure of the bid period—including inclusion of any other cities/agencies that wish to purchase off this RFP if we are awarded a contract for service.

We appreciate this opportunity to bid on your project. You will find that we have done many similar projects over the last 15 years. We encourage you to contact our customers to better understand the excellent service that Wiland provides to help you in fulfilling your desired mission.

Sincerely,

Richard Andring, Partner
Wiland Associates LLC
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BIDDER BACKGROUND INFORMATION
Introduction
Wiland Associates LLC (Wiland) is pleased this response to the El Segundo RFP #18-03
Wiland is a Washington State, Limited Liability Company formed under the Washington Limited Liability
Company Act (Revised Code of Washington, Ch 25.15) on September 20, 2002. Physical address is 1651
Collins Road, Selah, Washington 98942. Mailing address is P.O. Box 117, Selah, Washington 98942.

Dunn & Bradstreet Number: 141936687

Federal E.I.N.: 58-2679959

Wiland Associates LLC
Wiland Associates has achieved the reputation as this nation’s Premier provider of NIMS-ICS. All-Hazard
Incident Management Team, Emergency Operations Center Training and HSEEP Compliant Exercises.
Our firm consistently provides instructors and consultants whom are the most qualified and sought after
in the nation. With decades of practical management experience, our dedicated affiliates provide
unparalleled oversight and logistical support to each project, no matter the size.

The training courses provided by Wiland are pre-approved for the use of Homeland Security Grant
funding, including the State Homeland Security Program and the Urban Area Security Program. Wiland
Associates follows the delivery and curricula requirements of the National Incident Management System
(NIMS). The ICS, AHIMT, and Position Specific courses provided by our firm are listed in the Federal
Emergency Management Agency’s Federal Sponsored Course Catalog.

Since 2002, Wiland Associates, and our affiliates, have been involved in nearly all aspects of the
development of ICS and All-Hazard Incident Management Team programs. The depth of our affiliates’
All-Risk experience makes Wiland Associates uniquely qualified to provide your USFA O305 All-Hazard
Type 3 Incident Management Team Training courses. With over 1,000 ICS, Position Specific, and AHIMT
courses delivered over the past fifteen years, Wiland Associates is the nation’s most experienced
providers of the USFA O305 All-Hazard IMT course.

Wiland was the first contractor authorized by the United States Fire Administration to deliver their
fledgling O305 All-Hazard Incident Management Team course in 2005. Since that time, Wiland and our
associates have been involved in presenting well over 185 deliveries of the USFA O305 courses. In 2008,
our firm was the second contractor certified to deliver the newly developed USFA Type 3 All-Hazard
Position Specific Training courses, the precursor to the current EMI Position Specific Training courses.
Since 2008, Wiland has delivered hundreds of EMI Position Specific Training courses to clients nationally.

The logistical support for each course presentation is provided by Wiland Associates’ newly expanded
office and support center, located in Selah, Washington. Our expanded facilities enhance our ability to
provide your agency with a truly all-inclusive and Turn-Key approach to managing your specific project.
Our firm is committed to provide your agency with the highest quality training available at a reasonable price. With over a decade of experience in the design and delivery of All-Risk ICS training courses our firm is able to provide proprietary materials specifically designed to enhance each course delivery and each attendee’s learning experience. Wiland has established itself as the nation’s leader in All-Risk ICS, Incident Management Team, Position Specific and Emergency Operations Center training.

Protecting public health and safety in southern California creates special challenges for local emergency managers. The convergence of local, state, District, federal, and international governments within the region necessitates strong coordination among agencies who must work in an environment of escalated risk. Preparing for high-profile regional events for the possibility of terrorist-inspired lone wolf or coordinated attacks, and the for the complex challenge of climate change depends on successfully integrating emergency planning, training, and exercises to ensure full community response capability.

Outstanding reputation
In the world of consulting, your reputation means everything. It is more valuable than an expensive marketing campaign, the biggest, most sophisticated tradeshow booth, or quirky gadgets. A consultant’s reputation can make the difference between getting the job or not. Wiland has worked very hard to earn and maintain strong reputations. Wiland is known in responder circles across the country for our unparalleled level of quality for delivering tailored ICS, All-Hazard Incident Management Team and Emergency Operations Center training. Our reputation is evidence by our history of return business, and consistent reputation among clients and other consultants alike.

Organizational and Staff Experience
Wiland Associates is well poised to immediately begin supporting El Segundo immediately upon notification of intent to award the contract. Our logistics team has supported over 1,000 training courses and exercises across the country and has developed many best practices and "Turn-Key" solutions to support premier ICS/USFA O305 All-Hazard IMT/EMI Position Specific Training course deliveries and HSEEP Compliant Exercises. With a dedicated Project Manager and a great support team, we will ensure that all project requirements are completed within the desired timeframes. We utilize detailed internal tracking methods to ensure that all work is performed in a timely manner.

Our firm’s project management staff has worked together since Wiland Associates was formed in 2002. Drawing from Wiland Associates’ experience in providing support for over one thousand course deliveries in forty-two states, our staff has developed processes that simplify the logistical coordination and support of each of our premier course deliveries. Wiland Associates has developed an unrivaled reputation as the provider of choice for the delivery of superior quality ICS/Type 3 AHIMT/Position Specific Training/EOC Development courses and HSEEP-Compliant exercises.
The Wiland Team believes firmly that our instructors and team member cadres must offer decades-deep level of experience. Our instructors have experience with both response and recovery aspects of many incidents that mirror the caliber and complexity of incidents that may be faced here in the City of El Segundo and southern California. Examples include the 9/11 World Trade Center and Pentagon Attacks, Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, Irene and Sandy. Further, each and every one of the instructors and consultants provided by the Wiland Team to support the ICS, USFA O305 Type 3 IMT, EMI Position Specific, Emergency Operations Center Training course are fully qualified and credentialed.

**Project Manager – Richard J. Andring**

Richard will represent Wiland Associates as the Project Manager and will be the primary Point of Contact for El Segundo. Richard will be available for conference calls, as deemed necessary, throughout the planning, scheduling, and follow-up phases of the project. Richard has managed the delivery of over 850 All-Hazard Incident Management Team, USFA/EMI Position Specific, and ICS courses, and consulted for dozens of All-Hazard Incident Management Team development projects nationally. Richard has been actively involved in emergency response and management for over forty-seven years, and currently serves as an alternate Type 2 Incident Commander for the Washington State Type 2 Interagency Incident Management Teams and a Type 3 IC for the Southwest Washington All-Hazard Incident Management Team.

**Organizational Experience**

Based upon our extensive experience in All Hazards Incident Management Team and Position Specific Training, the selection of the instructional cadre is one of the most important steps and is best accomplished with the input of you, our customer. Every Wiland Associate Lead Instructor, Instructor, and Mentor is qualified at the highest technical level, possesses all requisite operational experience, and is assigned based upon the relevance of qualifications to our client needs, agency profiles, disciplines, and local requirements. Each instructor/mentor our firm proposes has been fully vetted and approved by Stephen Foley, USFA AHIMT Program Manager (retired) and/or Robert Ridgeway EMI PST Program Manager (retired).

Wiland Associates shall provide the El Segundo Emergency Management with a cadre of seasoned professionals whom, for the past decade, have lead the national effort in the development of local, regional, and state Type 3 All-Hazard Incident Management Teams. Members of our instructional team have participated in literally hundreds of Area Command, Type 1 and Type 2 deployments across the nation, fulfilling all Command & General Staff roles. All instructors presented for consideration will have a minimum of ten years of experience instructing similar courses and at least five years of experience on an Area Command, Type 1, 2 or 3 Incident Management Team.
The following provides a small “sampling” of our instructor’s extensive experience:

- New York City and Pentagon attacks, September 11, 2001
- Papal Visit Washington DC and New York City 2016
- Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, Hugo, Ivan, Ike, Charlie, Gustav, Irene and Sandy
- Republican and Democratic National Conventions
- G8 World Leaders Summit, Savannah, Georgia
- Avian Influenza and H1N1 Virus
- NFL Super Bowls & Pro Bowl
- BP Deep Water Horizon Oil Disaster, 2010
- National Area Command, Type 1, and Type 2 wildfire assignments
- National Level Exercises, including TOPOFF 2 & TOPOFF 4
- Asian Pacific Economic Conference 2011
- World Trade Organization (WTO) Riots, Seattle 1999
- Columbia Shuttle Recovery, Texas 2003
In many cases, our associates have actually developed the curricula they now teach. They bring decades of experience, expertise and passion to the classroom and continually work to improve training at a national level, including:

- Participation in the initial focus and development group responsible for the development of the original O305 Type 3 All Hazard Incident Management Team course for the United States Fire Administration (USFA);
- Authored the 2007 version of the USFA All Hazard Incident Management Team course;
- Were involved in the rewrite of ICS-300 & ICS-400 curricula that are now the national standard for those courses;
- Were members of the Incident Management Working Group for DHS, this group is responsible for training, credentialing, and ICS forms;
- Were involved in the development of position specific training curricula;
- Helped author revisions of the National Wildfire Coordinating Group's S-420, S-520, and S-620 courses;
- Participated, as developers and subject matter expertise, for the National Association of State Foresters Complex Incident Management course;
- Participated in the development of the L480 – Organizational Leadership in the Fire Service;
- Helped author the most recent revisions of Command & General Staff for Local IMTs and Executive Analysis of Fire Service Operations in Emergency Management.

Our associates are current or veteran members from the National Type 2, Type 1, and Area Command Teams. The experience of these individuals in response to large, complex, natural or manmade incidents make them uniquely qualified to present both the USFA (O305) AHIMT and EMI Position Specific Training courses.

In addition to extensive incident management experience and on-going contributions to curriculum development, our associates consistently receive high scores on student evaluations due to their ability to effectively communicate and positively interact with their students.
QUALIFICATIONS
OF
COMPANY/ORGANIZATION
Delivering Incident Management Training to the US Federal Government.

Wiland Associates, LLC has documentation which shows that we have provided training to the following elements of the Federal Government:

- US Coast Guard / Seattle Metro IMT
- US Forest Service
- National Fire Academy
- Emergency Management Institute
- United States Fire Administration
- National Park Service (Mount Rainer National Park)
  - We have been invited back for follow-up training this Spring and Summer

Additional Examples Available Upon Request


Wiland Associates, LLC has documentation which shows that Wiland and its Associates contributed to the development of:

- United States Fire Administration O305 All-Hazard Incident Management Team course
- National Fire Academy O-337 Command & General Staff Functions for Local IMT’s
- National Wildfire Coordinating Group (NWCG S-420 & NWCG S-520)
- FEMA / USFA ICS-300 & 400 course curriculums
- National Associates of State Foresters Complex Incident Management Course.
- NWCG Position Specific Training Curriculums

Additional examples available upon request

Providing over One-Thousand ICS and All-Hazards National Incident Management System Position-Specific Courses.

Wiland Associates, LLC has documentation which shows that Wiland and its Associates have provided over 1,000 O-305 (IMT Team), EMI Position-Specific, NIMS ICS, and NWCG Training courses during the last 15 years. Our course deliveries span a period from October of 2002 to present day. Additionally, Wiland has provided a wide variety of ICS and Emergency Management (EOC) classes using NIMS and FEMA curricula.
To provide a few examples of our instructional activities our firm:

- Has conducted or participated in the delivery of more than 185 USFA sanctioned USFA O305 Type 3 All-Hazard Incident Management Team courses nationally.
- Is currently scheduled to deliver twenty-four (24) training sessions in the months of April and May of 2018.

**Providing Training in Over Fifteen (15) States.**

Wiland Associates, LLC has documentation which shows that we have provided Incident Command System (ICS) Training and Incident Management Team (IMT) Training (to include FEMA/EMI O-305 Team Training and Position-Specific Training classes) in 42 US States.

The following is a sampling of projects which document our activity within the required fifteen states.

1. New York City Police Department, NY
2. State of Florida Division of Emergency Management, FL
3. National Capital Region Incident Management Team, VA
4. City of Saint Paul Emergency Management, MN
5. Los Angeles County Fire Department, CA
6. Phoenix Fire Department, AZ
7. Seattle Metro Incident Management Team, WA
8. City of Las Vegas, NV
9. Ashville Fire Department, NC
10. New Orleans, LA
11. City of Portland Fire Department, OR
12. Boise Fire Department, ID
13. South Carolina Division of Forestry, SC
14. City/County of Honolulu, HI
15. Oakland County Emergency Management, MI

A complete list of clients will be made available upon request
Assisting State or Local Governments in Establishing a Program of Incident Management that Includes an Incident Management Personnel Qualification System.

Wiland Associates, LLC has documentation which shows that we have provided consulting, ICS/IMT training, and initiated a Personnel Qualification System for the following agencies:

- Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency—Washington, DC
- Henrico County All-Hazard Type 3 Incident Management Team
- Central Virginia All-Hazard Type 3 Incident Management Team
- Seattle Metro Type 3 Incident Management Team
- State of Florida Division of Emergency Management

Evaluation Records for Ten Training Courses from a Previous Client Indicating an Above Average Rating from Students in All Those Courses Provided to that Customer.

Wiland Associates, LLC has volumes of documentation that shows our Instructors/Coaches/Mentors consistently receive outstanding ratings from Students. We have Evaluations from several Clients—who each hosted ten or more Wiland classes—where Student feedback was, typically, well above average. Wiland personnel are constantly recognized for their knowledge/skills/abilities, their real-world experience, and their excellent rapport with both Students and Leadership.

Agencies that fulfill this requirement include:

- Washington State Department of Health
- Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency (HSEMA) of Washington, DC
- Los Angeles County Fire Department
- Honolulu City / County Fire Department
- City of Baltimore
- Central Virginia All-Hazard Incident Management Team
- City of Las Vegas
- Municipality of Anchorage
- City of Saint Paul
- Bloomington Fire Department
- State of Florida Emergency Management

Wiland is willing to provide course evaluations for any of our course deliveries upon request. It is our belief that our clients express their level of satisfaction best in the “Letters of Reference” which are provided as part of our response to the RFP. We have selected “Letters of Reference” which span a period beginning in 2005 to present day. Additional “Letters of Reference” can be made available upon request. Wiland firmly believes that our clients say it best and reinforced by the fact that we have never lost a client.
Providing the Listed Training Courses with Qualified Instructors Who Have Completed the Train-the-Trainer Course and the ICS L449 Train-the-Trainer Course and Qualified for Type-3 level (or higher), per the listed Qualification Systems, for the Classes they Teach for this RFP.

Wiland Associates, LLC has documentation of instructor qualifications which shows that our instructors either are—or have been—Type-1, Type-2, or Type-3 Incident Management Team Members. We don’t allow our Associates to teach any subject matter that they are not appropriately qualified (TTT, L449, etc.) to present AND which they have not performed that function in The Field.

Each of our instructors are fully qualified and listed by position in the EMI Position Specific Training Instructor database maintained by Robert Patrick the Program Manager.

Examples of Similar Services Provided

The Washington State Department of Health asked us, four years ago, to help them build an Incident Management System capable of dealing with large-scale public health emergencies. Position-specific training, IMT Team Training, and exercises were held. Performance was documented in Position Task Books. We evaluated the WaDoH IMT’s performance at the Cascadia Rising, West Coast multi-day exercise. Training and exercises continue as new Health personnel arrive and the System matures and increases its capability to deal with catastrophic scenarios (i.e., pandemics, magnitude 9.0 earthquakes, weapons of mass destruction, etc.).

Washington, DC’s Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency (HSEMA) asked us, three years ago, to help them build an Incident Management System capable of dealing with large-scale emergencies and planned events (usually protests) in the Nation’s capital. After reviewing resumes and applications, we assigned personnel to IMT positions for EOC support. Position-specific training, IMT Team Training, and exercises were held for HSEMA and members of DC’s fire and police departments. Performance was documented in Position Task Books. We evaluated HSEMA’s IMT performance during the Pope’s visit. Training and exercises continue as new personnel arrive and the System matures and increases its capability to deal with catastrophic scenarios (i.e., extreme civil unrest, hazardous material incidents in the core of DC, weapons of mass destruction, etc.). We designed a Member Qualification System to meet the differing requirements for job performance found in both an EOC and in the Nation’s Capital (home to virtually ALL the Alphabet Agencies).
The City of Saint Paul (MN) Department of Emergency Management asked us, 6 years ago, to help them build an Incident Management System capable of dealing with large-scale emergencies. Position-specific training, IMT Team Training, and exercises were held for fire, police, emergency management personnel, and government employees. Performance was documented in Position Task Books. We have also conducted several exercises for the City of Saint Paul and various state and federal agencies—including the US Coast Guard (the last exercise involved over 180 participants and over 40 agencies). Training and exercises continue as new personnel arrive and the System matures and increases its capability to deal with large-scale incidents and events (i.e., severe weather, civil unrest, pollution in the Mississippi River, etc.).

We encourage you to contact these folks to hear, first-hand, about the training that has been—and continues to be—delivered to them; the interaction between their students and our instructors; the growth of their capacity and their confidence; and the benefits and value that Wiland brings to their agencies.

We are qualified to teach all of the classes that you have listed in your RFP. Wiland has more than 70 Associates who provide training and conduct exercises. We conduct an average of two or three classes each week—so we have the capacity to provide your training and exercises. We can, generally, provide training with as little as 30–45 days’ notice — although more is always appreciated. If we conduct several simultaneous classes (i.e., Operations Section Chief, Safety Officer, Logs Section Chief, and Plans Section Chief) it may take a little longer to coordinate Instructor schedules, but our Customers have found that such grouped arrangements are very beneficial to both student understanding and Team development (Team dynamics, Team-Member communication, battle rhythm, meetings and briefings, etc.). In fact, Wiland is known for its flexibility when accommodating student availability and sign-ups, accommodating schedule conflicts due to emergencies, etc.

Wiland is fully committed to providing you with the classes that you desire at the time(s) and location(s) you desire. To that end, please know that Wiland has never failed to provide contracted training—nor have we ever had a class terminated for poor performance. Our only contract amendments have been to add additional training or exercises at the Host Agency’s request—which occurs on a fairly regular basis.
INSTRUCTOR RESUMES

Here is a small sample of instructors who could be assigned to this project
Instructor Resumes

Additional Resumes Available Upon Request
Areas of Expertise

INCIDENT MANAGEMENT TEAM (IMT) DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING; EXERCISES, EDUCATION, AND TRAINING; EMERGENCY RESPONSE; FIRST RESPONSE; FIRE SAFETY AND RESCUE; HAZARDOUS MATERIALS (HazMat); SEARCH AND RESCUE; FOREST MANAGEMENT; OPERATIONAL AND TACTICAL PLANNING

Highlights

- More than 40 years of experience in disaster response, fire safety and rescue, emergency management, and IMT development and training.
- Extensive experience in the National Capital Region (NCR) providing training, workshops and exercises. Instructor, evaluator, and subject matter expert for the District of Columbia All-Hazard Incident Support Team certification and credentialing program development, implementation and execution.
- Participated in the delivery of more than 150 NIMS ICS, All-Hazard Incident Management Team and Position-Specific Training courses and workshops over the past decade.
- Extensive experience in IMT leadership, training, and education, having developed and directed a Type 3 IMT for Haywood County, North Carolina and taught National Incident Management System (NIMS), Incident Command System (ICS), All-Hazards IMT (AHIMT), and IMT Complex Incident Management courses in professional and collegiate settings.
- Helped to develop the Federal Incident Response Team (FIRST) for the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).
- Served for 30 years as the Fire and Emergency Response Coordinator for the North Carolina Division of Forest Resources, coordinating statewide emergency response and training Division personnel.
- Response experience includes incidents of national and international scale, including Hurricanes Katrina, Isaac, and Sandy; the 9/11 attacks; human and animal disease outbreaks; Democratic and Republican Conventions; and State of the Union addresses.
- Qualified National Type 1 Safety officer and Operations Section Chief; Qualified National Type 3 Incident Commander

Relevant Experience

Haywood County, Waynesville, NC
Assistant Director of Emergency Management and Assistant Fire Marshal, 2006–present

- As Assistant Fire Marshal, investigates and litigates fire-related issues.
- Oversees operations, including response to complex land searches; HazMat incidents, including vehicle, railroad, and aircraft crashes; landslides; building collapses; structural and industrial fires; weather-related emergencies, including flooding and winter storms; as well as law enforcement shooter and hostage incidents.
- Developed and trained members of a Type III IMT, which responds to HazMat, search and rescue, high-angle rescue, fire suppression, natural, and human-related disasters.
Independent Consultant, Various Locations
Instructor, 2005–present
- Teaches NIMS position-specific classes and IMT classes nationally and internationally, including the Complex Incident Management Course and the USFA O305 Type 3 AHIMT course; past experience includes the NIMS/ICS series, instructor training, and incident suppression classes.
- Provides exercise development and implementation support for emergency response agencies, including HSEEP instruction.

National Disaster Medical System (NDMS), National Veterinary Response Team 2 (NVRT), Various Locations
Deputy Team Commander, 1998–present
- Coordinates and directs Team incident response.
- Served as a NVRT/NDMS subject-matter expert (SME) for NIMS/ICS, disaster response, and national security issues.
- Participated in the initial response to the World Trade Center disaster, as well as Hurricanes Sandy, Katrina, Rita, Ivan, Marilyn, Gloria, Francis, Hugo, Isaac, and Matthew.
- Served in security support role during events of national importance, including the Democratic and Republican National Conventions, G8 World Leaders Summit, Avian Influenza, State of the Union address, Columbia Shuttle recovery response, and Presidential Inaugurations.
- Served as an NIMS/ICS technical advisor during the Deepwater Horizon oil spill response.

NC Department of Community Colleges, Various Locations
Instructor, 1993–present
- Teaches courses in ICS/NIMS, position-specific incident organizational management, disaster and emergency response at community colleges across the State.

U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service, Various Locations
Incident Responder, 1977–present
- Responds to wildfires nationwide as an Operations Section Chief Type I and/or Safety Officer Type 1; develops tactical plans and incident safety procedures, directs tactical resources, identifies hazards and risks, and mitigates these issues.

NC Division of Forest Resources, Raleigh, NC
Fire and Emergency Response Training Coordinator, 1987–2004
District Manager and District Forester, 1979–1986
- Developed and managed the training program for 1500 emergency and fire response personnel; designed courses relevant to national and state related emergency response needs.
- Served as Agency Liaison to the NC State Emergency Response Team (SERT) and NC Division of Emergency Management (DEM) State Emergency Operations Center (EOC).

Education
Graduate coursework, Fire Behavior Science and Fuels Management, Arizona State University, 1986-1988
B.S., Forest Management, North Carolina State University, 1975
A.S., Biology, Brevard College, 1973
EDWARD A. LEWIS

35525 N. CEDAR RD.                     CELL: (509) 993-0330
DEER PARK, WA 99006                     E-MAIL: CHIEF401ED@GMAIL.COM

MANAGEMENT EXPERTISE

Major Incident Management Experience

A Member of Pacific Northwest National Interagency Incident Management Team 3 from 2002 to present. This is one of 17 Type 1 teams nationally that responds to all risk incidents. Currently serve as Deputy Incident Commander with other positions previously held including: Incident Commander, Liaison Officer, Branch Director, and Operations Section Chief.

➤ Assigned to over 30 major incidents throughout the United States including Hurricanes Francis, Ivan and Katrina. Participated in the Space Shuttle Recovery and numerous wildfires. In 2015 as Incident Commander, managed the North Star/Tunk Block fire, the largest fire in Washington State history.

➤ To date I have served as IC eight times, Deputy IC 15 times, Liaison Officers 10 and numerous other C & G positions during past fifteen years.

➤ Establish and accountable for overall strategies, objectives, and priorities for incidents.

➤ Allocate and prioritize critical resources for every aspect of the organization.

➤ Collaborate and involve agencies and stakeholders to meet customer expectations.

➤ Establish incident command posts, camps, and staging areas.

➤ Function within and report to EOC’s on numerous major incidents.

Emergency Management Planning and Implementation

➤ Managed the activation of the communities Emergency Coordination Center during two incidents and provided oversight during two Stafford Act Declared Disasters.

➤ Conducted four community wide table top exercises in the past 36 months.

➤ Developed initial and extended fire district response plans for complex incidents.

➤ Developed and implemented numerous mutual aid agreements with supporting agencies to assure prompt and effective response.

Community Relations & Outreach

➤ Established and maintained a systematic and effective working relationship with citizens and community stakeholders that included: a customer-based planning process, 360 degree customer service feedback, community newsletters and other creative community outreach tools.

Organizational Effectiveness

➤ Proven ability to provide strong leadership in a fast paced environment to diverse high performing, reliable organizations.

➤ Transformed a large County Fire District from nine independent stations into a coordinated, highly functional organization with a mission centered focus.

➤ Developed and implemented a highly efficient fire district management staffing model that included a focus on mentoring and leadership succession.

➤ Successfully managed a combination of career and volunteer fire fighting personnel that relied on volunteer participation and involvement.

➤ Implemented two strategic planning efforts.

Interagency Coordination

➤ Oversaw the development and implementation of the Spokane County All-Hazard Field Operations Guide.
Significant leadership and involvement in the funding, design and implementation of the Spokane Regional Emergency Communications System.

Co-founded the Joint Public Safety Leadership Forum for law and fire agencies.

**Budgets: Annual, Capital and Incident Management**

- Developed and managed an annual budget in excess of six-million dollars.
- Organized eight successful ballot measures to support maintenance/operations and capital improvements.
- Managed all risk incidents within specific cost parameters provided by local, state and federal agency administrators with a daily cost over one-million dollars.

**PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greater Spokane Emergency Management</th>
<th>Spokane County, WA</th>
<th>Jan. 2014 – June 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deputy Director of Emergency Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Represents Emergency Management in all dealings with Public, Partner agencies and non-governmental organizations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Serves in a critical leadership role during emergencies and disasters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ensures the readiness of the Emergency Coordination Center and assumes the role of ECC manager when activated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chelan County Fire District 1</th>
<th>Chelan County, WA</th>
<th>Nov. 2012 – Jan. 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Battalion Chief, Volunteer Coordinator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Directed the District’s Volunteer Recruitment and Retention Program; established and implemented guidelines and procedures that enhance volunteer participation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Augments the district as a command officer on emergency incidents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provides coaching, guidance and mentoring to the district’s administrative staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spokane County Fire District 4</th>
<th>Spokane County, WA</th>
<th>1990 – September, 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire Chief</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination department serves a population of 40,000 in North Spokane County. Staffing was 14 full-time and 30 part-time firefighters with 130 volunteers. Responded to over 2,000 incidents annually with an annual budget in excess of six-million dollars.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Managed risk and assured safety by developing and implementing effective policies and procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Developed and maintained a tactical and strategic fiscal and operational planning process to meet current and future service demands. Provided advice and counsel to the Board of Fire Commissioners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deputy Chief Training / Education / Prevention / EMS 1986-1990</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Developed and implemented the District’s Training, Emergency Medical and Public Education Programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL REFERENCES AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST**
Richard Andring
Instructor/SME

Areas of Expertise

Emergency Management; Incident Management Teams (IMT); Emergency Operations Center Program Development; Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP); Exercises; Training and Facilitation; Project Management; Fire Safety; Classroom Instruction; Curriculum Development; Emergency Medical Services (EMS); Budgeting

Highlights

- More than 40 years of emergency response experience, serving in progressively more responsible leadership positions including Battalion Chief and Deputy Chief of Operations at the Yakima Fire Department from 1985 until 2004.

- Instructor, evaluator, and subject matter expert for the District of Columbia All-Hazard Incident Support Team certification and credentialing program development, implementation and execution.

- More than 14 years of experience with interagency IMTs in Washington, serving as Type 2 National Incident Commander since 2001, and having served as Type 1 Washington State All-Risk Incident Commander from 2002 to 2010 and as Type 2 National Operations Section Chief from 2000 to 2011.

- Managed planning, development, training, exercise, and certification processes leading to the development of IMTs in dozens of locations throughout the United States, including the National Capital Region (NCR).

- Serves as Senior Partner of Wiland Associates, LLC; overseeing the delivery of more than 750 emergency management and IMT courses in 44 states since the company's formation in 2002.

- Qualified as a lead instructor for the U.S. Fire Administration (USFA) O305 Type 3 IMT and National Fire Academy (NFA) Command and General Staff courses, and as an instructor for the Emergency Management Institute (EMI) Position Specific and advanced Incident Command System (ICS) courses.

- Helped to develop the NFA ICS 300 and ICS 400 curricula and served as a subject matter expert (SME) for the latest revision of the USFA All-Hazard IMT and NFA Command and General Staff courses.

Relevant Experience

Wiland Associates LLC, Selah, WA
Senior Partner, 2002–present

- As project manager, oversaw the delivery of more than 750 emergency management and IMT courses in 44 states since the formation of Wiland Associates, LLC in 2002.

- Managed planning, development, training, exercise, and certification processes leading to the development of IMTs in dozens of locations throughout the United States, including the National Capital Region; the State of Florida; Seattle, WA; Saint Paul, MN; Oakland County, MI; Honolulu, HI; Maui County, HI; Bloomington, MN; Las Vegas, NV; Chesterfield County, VA; and Haywood County, NC.
City of Yakima Fire Department, Yakima, WA
Deputy Chief of Operations, 2000–2004
Battalion Chief, 1990–2000
Captain, 1985–1990

- Performed administrative, personnel, managerial, budgetary, and command functions.
- Coordinated, supervised, and directed the department's internal operations.
- Participated in the negotiation and administration of four labor contracts.
- Helped develop the Department's annual emergency readiness table-top exercise (TTX) and full scale exercises (FSEs).

Education
B.S., Fire Service Administration, Eastern Oregon University, 1998
A.S., Fire Service Administration, Yakima Valley Community College, 1999
A.S., Fire Science, Yakima Valley Community College, 1996

Certification and Training
Executive Fire Officer, NFA
HSEEP-trained
Physicians Trained Mobile Intensive Care Paramedic, Yakima County Health Department
Fire Service Administrators Institute, Oregon Department of Public Safety Standards and Training (DPSST)

Professional Affiliations
All-Hazard IMT Association
Yakima County Fire Chiefs Association
Washington State Fire Chiefs Association
Yakima County EMS and Trauma Care Council
International Association of Fire Chiefs
National Fire Academy Alumni Association
National Society of Executive Fire Officers
Areas of Expertise

**Emergency Preparedness, Command and Control; Training and Instruction; Incident Management Team (IMT); Exercise Design; Terrorism Preparedness and Response;**

**Highlights**

- Fire Department New York (FDNY) Battalion Chief with decades of response experience.
- Serves as Finance Section Chief on the National Type 2 Incident Management Team (IMT).
- Developed FDNY Interagency Response to Active Shooter Incidents with full-scale exercise series.
- Developed and presented tabletop, functional, and full-scale exercises to prepare FDNY to respond to disasters, both natural or human-caused.
- Developed and Presented Mass Casualty Incident Awareness class to FDNY officers.

**Relevant Experience**

**FDNY Center for Terrorism and Disaster Response, New York, NY**
Chief of Emergency Preparedness, 2014–present

- Develops emergency preparedness initiatives and long-term planning to prepare the Department for current and future threats and vulnerabilities.
- Creates partnerships between stakeholders, both public and private, in concert with the Intelligence Section of the CTDP to enable stakeholders to determine their capabilities and limitations to respond to identified threats and vulnerabilities.
- Developed and presented tabletop, functional, and full-scale exercises to prepare FDNY to respond to disasters, both natural or human-caused.
  - Notable exercises included UN Headquarters Emergency Preparedness, Eastside Access Tunnel emergency response, and Empire State Building emergency response.
- Developed and presented Mass Casualty Incident Awareness class to FDNY officers

**FDNY, New York, NY**
Firefighter, Battalion Chief

**Education**

B.S., Civil Engineering, Temple University, 1991

**Certification and Training**

Master Exercise Practitioner (MEP)
FDNY/USMA West Point Counterterrorism Leadership Course, 2010
FDNY Advanced Leadership Course, 2012
Finance/Administration Section Chief Course
National Association of State Forester Complex Incident Management Course, 2015
NIMS ICS All-Hazard Finance / Administration Train-the-Trainer, Emergency Management Institute
Naval Postgraduate School Master's Program (expected graduation March 2018)

Professional Affiliations

Committee Seat, NFPA Standards for Fixed Guideway and Passenger Rail Systems
Committee Seat, NFPA 502 Standards for Road tunnels, bridges and other limited access highways
Northern Rocky Type 1 IMT member, Cost Unit Leader (CUL). Deployments Family Peak Complex, Choteau, MT (9/2015), Observation Fire, Darby, MT (7/2016)
Fire Prevention Committee Member, Northeastern Forest Fire Protection Compact.
Areas of Expertise

First Responder; Hazmat Tech 2 Safety Officer; Safety Officer/Tech; Disaster Response; Disaster Recovery; Command Staff; Type 1 Public Information Officer; All Hazards Liaison Officer; Joint Field Office Operations Center Manager; Emergency Operations Drill Designs; Intergovernmental Liaison

Highlights

- 30-year veteran of the Fire Department New York (FDNY), currently detailed to aid the Department Chief of Safety.
- Serves on the Type 2 FDNY Hazard Incident Management Team (IMT) and Type 1 National IMT as a Public Information Officer.
- Currently an USFA O305 All-Hazards Type 3 IMT and L-952 Public Information Office Instructor.
- Responded to more than 33 wild land fires and all-hazard deployments, including floods, snow storms, large fires, hurricanes, and gas explosions, and served as Liaison Officer for funerals and memorial services.

Relevant Experience

Fire Department New York (FDNY), New York City, NY
Firefighter, Safety Technician, Public Information Officer, Type 1 All-Hazard Liaison Officer, 2005–present

- Deployments Include:
  - Floods Liaison Officer Lead: Binghamton, N.Y.
  - Instructor: Brookhaven Wildfire Academy, Upton, N.Y. (2008)
  - PIO, Area Command: Wallow Fire, Ariz. (2011)
  - Memorial service for 19 wild land firefighters who died in the line of duty, Yarnell Fire, Yarnell, Ariz. (2013)

Certification and Training

Certification 1 American Marine Institute 1985
Certification 2 Suzuki School Technician 1986
Certification 3 Fire Department Academy 1998
Certification 4 First Responder 1999
Marine Mechanic Certified/license, Firefighter.
Training 1 2005 ICS classes and PIO ICS position specific course
Training 2 2007 PIO type 2 Certified
Training 3 2010 PIO type 1 Task book complete
Training 4 2011 All Hazard LOFR Certified
Training 5 2014 CIMCI graduate

Professional Affiliations
International Association of Firefighters
Bryan Swanson
Instructor/Subject Matter Expert

Areas of Expertise

TRAINING, INSTRUCTION, AND EVALUATION; INCIDENT MANAGEMENT TEAMS; INCIDENT COMMAND SYSTEM (ICS); PUBLIC SAFETY FIRE/EMS RESPONSE; DISASTER RESPONSE; DISASTER RECOVERY; COMMAND AND CONTROL; EMERGENCY PLANNING/MANAGEMENT; EMERGENCY OPERATIONS; LOGISTICS; INTERGOVERNMENTAL LIAISON

Highlights

- 25-year veteran of Chesterfield Fire/EMS, Chesterfield, VA; currently serving as Battalion Chief.
- Currently serves as Program Manager/Incident Commander for the Central Virginia All Hazard Incident Management Team.
- Currently serves as Liaison Officer on the Southern Area Gold Team, a Federal multi-agency T2 team mostly responsible for wildfire mitigation—based out of Atlanta Georgia.
- Qualified as Type 3 Planning Section Chief, Type 2 Liaison Officer, and Type 3 Incident Commander.
- Skills Include all-hazard response and mitigation, wildland/urban interface response, emergency operations center and Incident management team (IMT) Integration, and planned event management and IMT integration.
- Instructs numerous U.S. Fire Administration courses nationally.

Relevant Experience

Chesterfield County Fire and EMS, Chesterfield County, VA
Emergency Operations Battalion Chief, 1989–present

- Serves as program manager and incident commander for the Central Virginia All Hazard Incident Management Team.
- Adjunct Instructor for Virginia Department of Emergency Management for ICS 300 and 400
- National Emergency Training Center (NETC) Emergency Management Institute (EMI)–qualified Instructor for training for Operations Section Chief (all sub units), Planning Section Chief (all sub units), and Liaison Officer positions.
- Served as Liaison Officer on the Mud Lake Complex wildland fire on the Big Cypress Preserve in Ochoppe, Fla. (2015).
- Served as Liaison Officer on the Bald Knob wildland fire on the Pisgah National Forest in Marion, N.C. (2015).
- Served as Liaison Officer on the Rock Mountain In Clayton, Ga. (2016).

Education

B.S., Human Resource Management (major), Leadership Studies (minor), University of Richmond, 2007
A.A., Fire Science Technology, Westmoreland County Community College, 1991
Professional Affiliations
All Hazard Incident Management Association
Areas of Expertise

TRAINING AND EVALUATION; TYPE 3 PLANNING SECTION CHIEF; ALL-HAZARDS DISASTER RESPONSE; DISASTER RECOVERY; ALL-HAZARDS MITIGATION; COMMAND AND CONTROL; PLANNING AND COORDINATING PREPLANNED EVENTS; EMERGENCY PLANNING/MANAGEMENT; EMERGENCY OPERATIONS; INTERGOVERNMENTAL LIAISON

Highlights

- 25 years of experience in disaster response; 22-year veteran of the Henrico County Division of Fire; currently Planning Section Chief for Incident Management Team.
- 10 years of experience providing instruction for personnel training for various emergency response specialties, including Incident Team Management (IMT), dive rescue, and maritime firefighting.
- FEMA-credentialed position-specific Instructor for Planning Section Chief, Situation Unit Leader, and Resource Unit Leader.
- 10 years of experience supporting planning and coordination of emergency resources for special events, including NASCAR races, PGA tournaments, and the UCI World Bike Championship.
- Served as mentor, coach, and instructor for delivery of HSEMA O-0305.
- 8 years of experience in disaster recovery.

Relevant Experience

Wiland Associates, Selah, WA
Instructor/Consultant, 2016–present

- Responsible for teaching various Incident Management Team courses nationally.
- Specialized in delivery of USFA O-305 course and position-specific courses within the Planning section.
- HSEMA O-0305 Course Delivery, responsible for delivery of critical foundational Information related to Incident Management Teams. Provided coaching and mentoring of students through Planning process.

Central Virginia Incident Management Team, North Chesterfield, VA
Planning Section Chief, 2009–present

Appomattox Tornado Disaster Response

- Served as Planning Section Chief responsible for creating the Initial Incident Action Plan.
- Coordinated state, local, and volunteer responders.


- Created an Incident Action Plan to establish a common operating picture for a search that covered the entire City of Charlottesville.
Henrico County Division of Fire, Henrico County, Va.
Battalion Chief, 1992–present

- Responsible for coordination and training of a 60-member battalion charged with protecting an estimated 200,000 citizens.
- Provides for all hazard command and control for all hazard emergency responses.
- Serves as Planning Section Chief on Henrico County's Incident Management Team.
- Serves as Incident Command of Richmond NASCAR Race, responsible for ensuring the safety and mitigation of hazards.
  - Race is held twice a year and has an attendance of approximately 50,000 spectators.
- Serves as Incident Commander of PGA Golf Tournament, responsible for ensuring safety and mitigation of hazards.
  - Tournament is held once a year and has an attendance of approximately 15,000 spectators.

Education
B.A., Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness, Virginia Commonwealth University, 2018 (anticipated)
A.A., Fire Science, J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College, 1994
A.A., Administration of Justice, J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College, 1992

Certification and Training
NFPA Fire 1 & 2
NFPA Instructor 1 and 2
NFPA Fire Officer I, II, III
NREMT-P
Diver Medical Technician
ICS 100, 200, 300, 400, O-0305,
Planning Section Chief
Situation Unit Leader
Planning Section Chief T-t-T
SDI / ERDI Instructor 19019
Shipboard Firefighting Instructor
Numerous Technical Rescue Certifications

Professional Affiliations
International Association of Fire Chiefs
Virginia Fire Chief Associations
Areas of Expertise

INCIDENT COMMAND SYSTEM; INCIDENT MANAGEMENT; TRAINING AND EVALUATION; FIREFIGHTING; HOMELAND SECURITY EXERCISE AND EVALUATION PROGRAM (HSEEP); FIRE DISTRICT PROGRAM MANAGEMENT; ALL HAZARDS PLANNING; DISASTER PLANNING

Highlights

- Seasoned firefighting professional with more than 4 decades of management, planning, and hands-on experience as a fire chief, firefighter and paramedic for fire departments in rural and urban settings.

- Instructor, evaluator, and subject matter expert for the District of Columbia All-Hazard Incident Support Team certification and credentialing program development, implementation and execution.

- Extensive experience as Incident Commander and Planning Section Chief for Incident Management Teams.

- Managed multiple combined fire districts serving thousands of residents and business.

- Designated Chief Fire Officer (CFO) by the Center for Public Safety Excellence.

- Instructor for FEMA EMI and National Fire Academy courses.

Relevant Experience

East County Fire & Rescue, Camas, WA
Fire Chief/EMT, August, 2001–January 2015

- Merged two FDs into a combination fire district serving 9,860 customers in 60 square miles via 6 Fire Stations and 65 Personnel with an annual budget of $4 million.

- Served as Incident Commander on larger Incidents, and as one of six County Mobilization Officers.

- Received over $1.8 million in grants from local, state and federal Sources.

- Performed disaster planning and operated area coordination center for fire district and two neighboring cities.

- Served as Planning Section Chief of Southwest Washington Type 3 All-Hazards Incident Management Team (FEMA qualified and listed).

- Served as Deputy Planning Section Chief for Washington Type 2 Incident Management Team.

- Served as Planning Section Chief for Pacific Northwest Team 2-Type 1 Incident Management Team.

- Instructs FEMA All Hazards Planning Section Chief and Public Information Officer Classes.

- Serves as Adjunct Instructor for National Fire Academy Incident Command System and Incident Safety Officer Programs.
City of Stanwood FD, Stanwood, WA
Fire Chief/EMT, December 2001–July 2002
  • Managed combination fire district serving 10,000-25,000 customers in 40 square miles via 5 fire
    stations and 80 personnel with an annual budget of $3.1 million.
  • Served as Incident Commander on large incidents, including large-scale natural disasters.

Nestucca Rural Fire District, Cloverdale, OR
Fire Chief/Paramedic, May 1993–June 2001
  • Managed Volunteer Fire District serving over 4,000 customers in 100 square miles via 6 fire
    stations and 40 personnel with an annual budget of more than $400,000.
  • Served as Incident Commander on larger incidents.

City of Hillsboro Fire Department, Hillsboro, OR
Fire Cadet, Volunteer Firefighter/EMT, Firefighter/Paramedic, Lieutenant/Paramedic, September
1973–October 1990
  • Taught EMT and Paramedic Recertification Classes County.
  • Served as Department’s EMS Coordinator; served on County EMS Advisory Board.
  • Served as Engine Company Officer- Incident Commander on small and medium-sized events.

Education
M.B.A., Columbia Southern University, 2012
B.S., Fire Administration, Western Oregon University, 1989

Certification and Training
Planning Section Chief 1, 2, and 3—PSC1, 2, and 3
Situation Unit Leader—SITL
Resource Unit Leader—RESL
IS-100, IS-200, IS-300, IS-400, IS-700, and IS-800
FEMA All Hazard IMT Training (6-day Class)
FEMA Finance Section Chief, Incident Commander, Planning Section Chief, Public Information Officer, and
Safety Officer Training
Train-The-Trainer-FEMA All Hazards Planning Section Chief, Public Information Officer, and Safety Officer
S520 Advanced Incident Management Class
S420 Command and General Staff Class
S440 Planning Section Chief
S346 Situation Unit Leader
S348 Resource Unit Leader

Professional Affiliations
International Association of Fire Chiefs
Washington Fire Chiefs Association
National Fire Protection Association
Fire Department Safety Officer’s Association
Areas of Expertise

TRAINING, INSTRUCTION, AND EVALUATION; PUBLIC INFORMATION; JOINT INFORMATION SYSTEMS (JIS); INCIDENT COMMAND; INTERGOVERNMENTAL LIAISON; COMMAND AND CONTROL; EMERGENCY PLANNING/MANAGEMENT; EMERGENCY OPERATIONS; DISASTER RESPONSE; DISASTER RECOVERY

Highlights

- 32-year veteran of the Fire Department of the City of New York (FDNY); currently ranked Captain and Company Commander of Ladder Company 111.
- NWCG Type-1 Public Information Officer. Currently serves as lead Information officer for the Southwest Area Type 1 Incident Management Team 2.
- NWCG Liaison Officer. Served as liaison for the New York City Fire Department (FDNY) to the New York City Emergency Operations Center during Hurricane Sandy.
- All-Hazards Incident Commander (IC). Currently serves as the Deputy-IC for the 317-person FDNY Type-2 Incident Management Team and responsible for all aspects of the team, including recruitment, training, exercise development, equipment, succession planning, administration, personnel, team development, inter-agency relations, field operations, and coordination with FDNY leadership.

Relevant Experience

New York City Fire Department (FDNY), New York, NY
Captain, 2004–present
Lieutenant, 1997–2004
Firefighter, 1985–1997

Incident Management Team (2005–present)

- Liaison Officer (LOFR): qualified 2006
- Incident Commander (IC): qualified 2014

Southwest Area Type-1 Incident Management Team #2

- Served as primary trainee (type-1) (2011)
- Qualified as type-1 (2012) and assigned as Deputy PIO on team.
- Assigned as lead PIO (2016)

Deployments and Relevant Incident Management Team (IMT) Experience:

- Liaison Officer: Manhattan Steam Explosion, N.Y. (2007)
- PIO: Jaroso Fire, Espanola, N.M. (2013)
Certification and Training

ICS 100, 200, 300, 400
S-203 Introduction to Incident Information
L-381 IMT Leadership
P-403 All-Hazards Public Information Officer
S-420 Command and General Staff
S-445 Incident Training Specialist
L-480 IMT Leadership
L-580 Advanced Leadership – Gettysburg Staff Ride
L-950 Incident Commander
CIMC Complex Incident Management (S-520 Equivalent)

31 IS courses, including:
00700: Introduction to the National Incident Management System (NIMS)
0701a: NIMS Multagency Coordination Systems
0702a: NIMS Public Information

0703a: NIMS Resource Management
00704: NIMS Communications and Information Mgt.
00706: NIMS Intrastate Mutual Aid

Professional Affiliations

All-Hazard Incident Management Team Association
National Fire Protection Association
Uniformed Fire Officers Association
Areas of Expertise

INCIDENT MANAGEMENT TEAM DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING; DISASTER RESPONSE; COMMAND AND CONTROL; EMERGENCY PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT; EMERGENCY OPERATIONS

Highlights

- More than 18 years of experience serving in various leadership and incident response capacities for the U.S. Department of Agriculture–Forest Service.
- Served as one of three National Area Commanders from 2013–2016.
- Assisted in the coordination of activities related to response and deployment on a national level.
- Served as Operations Section Chief as part of the Initial National IMT Response to the 9/11 Trade Center attack.
- Served in the capacity of United State Department of Agriculture Fire Management Officer.

Relevant Experience

Northwest Fire District, Arizona
Battalion Chief, Special Operations, 2006–present

U.S. Department of Agriculture—Forest Service
National Area Commander, 2013–present

U.S. Department of Agriculture—Forest Service
National Type 1 Incident Commander, 2008–present

U.S. Department of Agriculture—Forest Service
National Type 1 Operations Section Chief, 1999–present

U.S. Department of Agriculture—Forest Service
Southwest Coordination Center Manager, 2003–2006

U.S. Department of Agriculture—Forest Service
Coconino and Prescott National Forests, Zone Fire Management Officer, 1999–2003

Education

B.S., Police Science and Administration, Northern Arizona University, 1978

Instructor Qualifications

USFA O305 Type 3 IMT Instructor
EMI L958 Operations Section Chief Instructor
EMI L950 Incident Commander Instructor
EMI L954 Safety Officer Instructor
EMI L960 Division/Group Supervisor Instructor
EMI L962 Planning Section Chief Instructor
NWCG S-420, S-520 and S620 cadre member

Certification and Training

National Area Commander
National Type 1 Incident Commander and Operations Section Chief
National Type 2 Incident Commander and Operations Section Chief
Division Group Supervisor
Dispatch Coordinator
Interagency Resource Representative
NWCG S-420, S-520 and S620 cadre member
Experience Summary

30 years of public safety and emergency response experience, to include 10 years with the Marine Corps, 6 years of law enforcement experience, and 14 years of fire service. Spent three years at Camp Pendleton in California as military police patrol supervisor, and served as a reserve Deputy Sheriff with San Diego County before focusing his studies on fire and emergency medical services and starting a career with the Northwest Fire District (Tucson, AZ). Stuart currently serves as a Battalion Chief with the Northwest Fire District, Tucson, Arizona and as a logistics section chief on one of the two Southwest Region National Type 1 Incident Management Teams.

Chief Rodeffer has assisted in the delivery of numerous USFA O305 All-Hazard Type 3 Incident Management Team courses servicing as both an Instructor and team coach.

Areas of Expertise

Teaching Experience

- Various Para-medic Training course
- NWCG Logistics Section course
- USFA O305 All-Hazard Type 3 IMT course
- NWCG Leadership Series: L380, L480 and L580
- Cadre member for the Gettysburg Staff ride.
- Cadre member S-420 and S-520

Current NWCG Qualifications

- National Logistics Section Chief Type 1
- National Logistics Section Chief Type 2

Significant Deployments

- Ortega Fire
- Laguna Fire
- Bullock Fire
- Ryan Fire
- Old Fire
- Rodeo-Chediski Fire
- Santiago Fire
- Lime Complex Fires
- Big Bar Fire
- Hurricanes Katrina and Rita
Areas of Expertise

INCIDENT MANAGEMENT TEAM TRAINING; NATIONAL INCIDENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (NIMS); INCIDENT MANAGEMENT TEAM (IMT); FIREFIGHTING; HOMELAND SECURITY EXERCISE AND EVALUATION PROGRAM (HSEEP)

Highlights

- 30-year veteran of the Fire Department of the City of New York (FDNY), with service in the ranks of Firefighter, Lieutenant, Captain, and Battalion Chief.
- Instructor, evaluator, and subject matter expert for the District of Columbia All-Hazard Incident Support Team certification and credentialing program development, implementation and execution.
- Qualified Logistics Section Chief on the FDNY’s Type 1 Incident Management Team.
- Developed and conducted numerous Tabletop (TTX), Functional (FE), and Full Scale Exercises (FSE) for the FDNY's Center for Terrorism and Disaster Preparedness.
- Served as Exercise Coordinator and developer of a joint effort FSE with the FDNY Incident Management Team and the FDNY Search and Rescue Task Force; mobilized to West Virginia Center for National Response with more than 200 responders.
- Served on multiple Incident Management Team deployments to Louisiana (Hurricanes Katrina and Gustav), Texas (Hurricane Rita), New York (Hurricanes Irene and Sandy).
- Instructor at the FDNY Fire Academy.
- Qualified United States Fire Administrator O305 All-Hazard Type 3 Incident Management Team and Emergency Management Institute Position Specific Training Instructor.

Relevant Experience

Fire Department of the City of New York, New York, NY
Battalion Chief, 2003–present
Captain, 1999–2003
Lieutenant, 1984–1999
Firefighter, 1983–1984

- Charter member of the Fire Department New York City Incident Management Team
- Qualified National Type 1 Logistics Section Chief
- Qualified National Facilities and Supply Unit Leader
- Qualified National Type 1 Safety Officer assigned to the FDNY Safety Battalion
- Deployed on multiple multi-operation period incidents and special events within the City of New York.

Education

B.B.A., Accounting and Business Administration, Temple University, 1980
Certification and Training

Master Exercise Practitioner (MEP)
HSEEP-trained
FDNY/Military Academy at West Point Joint Counterterrorism Program graduate
National Association of State Foresters Complex Incident Management Course (CIMC) graduate
All-Hazard Safety Officer II
Logistics Section Chief – FDNY Type 1 Incident Management Team
USFA 0305 All-Hazard Incident Management Team lead instructor
Emergency Management Institute Position-Specific Training lead instructor
NIMS ICS Instructor
Areas of Expertise

TRAINING AND EVALUATION; INCIDENT MANAGEMENT; FIREFIGHTING; NATIONAL INCIDENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (NIMS); HAZARDOUS MATERIALS (HAZMAT); PUBLIC SAFETY

Highlights

- 30-year veteran firefighter, fire chief, and battalion Commander with the Fire Department of New York (FDNY).
- Serves as Battalion Commander for Battalion 50 (Queens, NY) of the FDNY Incident Management Team (IMT).
- Taught more than 25 courses as a USFA 0305 All-Hazard Type 3 IMT Instructor, and participated in more than 24 deliveries of the EMI Logistic Section position-specific courses.
- Incident management qualifications include New York Type I All-Hazard Logistics Section Chief, National Type II Logistics Section Chief, National Facilities Unit Leader, and National Supply Unit Leader.

Relevant Experience

FDNY, Queens, NY
Chief/Battalion Commander, 1983–present

- Significant IMT deployments include Hurricanes Katrina (Louisiana), Gustav (Louisiana), Irene (New York), and Sandy (New York), as well as multiple deployments with Southwest Region Type I on wildland and wildland-urban interface incidents.
- Deployed nationally as Logistics Section Chief Type II.
- Taught NIMS ICS-100, -200, -300, -400, -700-, -800, and -402 courses; Hazmat Awareness and Operations level courses; and FDNY Battalion Chiefs Command, EMI L967 Logistics Section Chief, EMI L970 Supply Unit Leader, EMI L971 Facilities Unit Leader, and USFA 0305 All-Hazard Type 3 IMT courses.

Education

B.S., Education, State University College
A.S., Education, Nassau Community College

Certification and Training

USFA 0305 ALL-Hazard Type 3 IMT Instructor
Bureau of Fire Investigation, Fire Marshal Academy
FDNY Operation Command School, Rescue Battalion
FDNY Hazmat School, Hazmat Battalion
FDNY Safety Command School
Experience Summary

Chief LaPlant has over 34 years of fire service and emergency response experience. After 8 years as a Fire Protection Specialist with the United States Air Force, Chief LaPlant joined the Ventura County Fire Department and has served as a firefighter, Captain, Battalion Chief, Assistant Chief and currently the Deputy Chief of the department. Worked extensively with local and County Emergency Mangers in establishing Emergency Operations Center, Training EOC Staff members and evaluating EOC activities

Areas of Expertise

Teaching

- Master Instructor as Certified by the California State Fire Marshal’s Office
- Adjunct Instructor at the National Fire Academy, Emmitsburg, MD
- Instructor California Community College System
- EMI Position Specific Course Instructor
- USFA O305 Type 3 IMT Instructor
- NIMS – ICS Instructor
- Specializes in emergency command and control, Incident Command System training and application, and EOC activities

Incident Command

- Chief LaPlant serves as Planning Section Chief on a Federal Type II Incident Management Team
- Qualified Type II Operations Section Chief and had managed the Operation Section on multiple fires
- Qualified National Type 1 Planning Section Chief

Professional Interests

- Master Instructor as certified by the California State Fire Marshal’s Office
- An adjunct instructor at the National Fire Academy in Emmitsburg, MD
- Teaches for two (2) Community Colleges in Southern California
- Specializes in emergency command and control, Incident Command System Training and application and EOC activities
Jim Whittington

Professional Accomplishments

Incident Management
- Serve on a National Incident Management Team as a Public Information Officer and Liaison Officer.
- Participated on over 65 Type I or Type II incidents.
- Media spokesperson for a number of high profile incidents, including the Yarnell Hill Fire and Granite Mountain Memorial Service, Wallow Fire, Castle Rock Fire, and Iron 44 Memorial Service.

Incident Command System Training
- Qualified as a National Wildfire Coordination Group Lead Instructor.
- First PIO to be selected as a Team Coach/Evaluator for S-520
- Taught all or portions of several courses, including Intermediate and Advanced ICS, Advanced Incident Information, Prescribed Fire Burn Boss, Smoke Management, You Will Not Stand Alone, and Fire Program Management.
- Completed over 16 NWCG courses, including Advanced Incident Management, You Will Not Stand Alone, Learning from Unintended Outcomes: FLA Workshop, Facilitative Instructor, and Organizational Leadership.

Public Affairs
- Responsible for the Public Affairs program on the Bureau of Land Management’s Medford District, the largest District in the BLM.
- Member of the District Leadership Team, helping to direct the day-to-day actions and plan for future personnel, budget, and operational contingencies.
- Primary contact with media and local congressional staff on Medford District, regional, and national issues.

Employment History

5/16/2007 – 12/29/2017
Public Affairs Officer
Medford District, Medford, OR

Public Affairs Specialist
Kingman District, Kingman, AZ

Fire Education and Information Specialist
Bandelier National Monument, Los Alamos, NM

Public Affairs Specialist (Detail)
Valles Caldera National Preserve/Santa Fe NF, Los Alamos, NM

4/12/1999 - 6/2/2000
Support Services Supervisor
Manti-La Sal National Forest, Moab, UT

7/12/1993 - 4/11/1999
Archivist
Environmental Protection Agency, Atlanta, GA

12/7/87 - 7/11/1993
Archivist
United States National Archives, Washington, DC

1/4/1987 - 12/6/87
Legislative Assistant
Congressman George E. Brown, Jr., Washington, DC
Education

1986  
M.A., United States History  
University of Virginia

1985  
B.A., History, English Minor  
University of North Texas

NWCG Instructor or Cadre

S-203, Introduction to Incident Information  
S-403, Advanced Incident Information  
L-952, NIMS ICS All-Hazards Public Information Officer  
I-100/1-200, Basic Incident Command System  
I-300, Intermediate Incident Command System  
I-400, Advanced Incident Command System  
S-420, Command and General Staff  
S-520, Advanced Incident Management  
Rx-310, Introduction to Fire Effects  
Rx-410, Smoke Management Techniques  
M-410, Facilitative Instructor  
You Will Not Stand Alone  
M-581, Fire Program Management/LFML

References

Jim is able and willing to stretch his limits and go outside his comfort zone if he determines that it is going to help the situation or project be successful. He is able to rapidly determine priorities and direction. Jim has a deliberative and confident delivery, a great vocabulary, and an innate ability to effectively facilitate open dialog and discussion. Most importantly, Jim is confident and comfortable, with a great sense of humor. However, he is not full of himself, which goes a long way in a classroom or instructional setting. -- Chris Schulte, Pacific Northwest National IMT Incident Commander

Everyone needs to know how dedicated Jim is to the community of emergency response, of teaching others how to handle emergency situations, and how experiential learning is a cornerstone of what he can bring to any endeavor. Jim has a great interest in being able to help others know, recognize, and deal with internal stressors in the proverbial heat of the moment. It is a skill that many leaders lack, especially those that are more tactical and involved in the fight rather than the caring of the responders. As far as teaching and writing, Jim’s affability, charm, wit and candor will translate well in any setting. -- Abble Jossie, BLM Associate State Director, Utah

Jim has an agile mind and possesses an uncanny way of discerning the important elements of an emergent issue; and in emergency services, he is a quick study of organizational responses and adapting actions to sudden needs. Jim is also kindly and good humored, which are attributes helpful with faculty and students, everywhere, and of any age. -- L. Dean Clark, National Park Service Fire Management Officer (Retired)
EMLOYMENT HISTORY

United States Coast Guard (active duty):
National Strike Force (NSF) – Force Manager
Atlantic Area Incident Management – Portsmouth, VA
July 2016 – Present

- Monitored readiness of 275+ personnel, $45M+ inventory and $3.4M budget for five Deployable Specialized Forces units to maintain International and domestic oil, hazardous materials and chem/bio/rad/nuclear (CBRN) response capabilities.
- Standardized doctrine, training and deployment procedures. Developed Courses of Action for NSF capability integration into force packages for Federal/CG On-Scene Incident Commanders in support of National Contingency Plan, National Special Security Events and Emergency Support Functions.
- ICS led responses:
  o 2017 Presidential inauguration – Planning Section Chief/Resource Unit Leader
  o 2016 Democratic National Convention – Planning Section Chief/Resource Unit Leader
  o Federal response to Hurricane Hermine (2016), Matthew (2016), Harvey (2017), Irma (2017), and Maria (2017) – Crisis Action Team
- Certified ICS 300 Instructor for nation-wide, traveling course. To-date, taught 300+ students in intermediate/advanced ICS principles.
- Refined processes and procedures related to federal implementation of ICS for emergent and planned events.

Environmental Specialist
District Response Advisory Team – Portsmouth, VA
October 2014 – June 2016

- Provided Marine Environmental Response (MER) policy and operational guidance, training, and support to District staff, four Sectors, four Area Committees, and two Regional Response Teams.
- Oversaw MER cases in coastal zone & navigable waters for four states & managed exercises and maintenance of MER equipment.
- Advises Environmental Protection Agency and CG Federal On-Scene Coordinators with appropriate technical advice during incidents.
- Assisted development of Environmental Sensitivity Indices and Geographic Response Plans district-wide.
- Served as District Emergency Response Coordinator and Trainer for 70+ operational units.
- Liaison to Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).
- Certified as FEMA Planning Section Chief instructor
- ICS led responses:
  o D5 Hurricane Exercise – evaluator
  o Sector Hampton Roads Preparedness for Response Exercise Program – Evaluator
  o Henrico County Annual Exercise - Evaluator

Marine Environmental Response Industry Training
Virginia Department of Emergency Management/Maritime Incident Response Team – Norfolk, VA
May 2014 – September 2014

- Arranged and executed junior executive training program with industry partners.

EDUCATION
- MS – Environmental Policy and Management, American Military University, 2010
- BS – Aquatic Biology, University of California, Santa Barbara, 2007
- BS – Microbiology, University of California, Santa Barbara, 2007

CREDENTIALS & LICENCES
- Certified Emergency Manager (CEM)
- Certified Hazardous Materials Technician (CHMT), NFPA/DOD
- FEMA Planning Section Chief Instructor
- U.S. Coast Guard ICS 300 Instructor
- NIMS Certified:
  o Type 2 Planning Section Chief
  o Type 3 Incident Commander
  o Type 3 Operations Section Chief
  o Type 3 Situation Unit Leader
  o Type 3 Resources Unit Leader
  o Type 3 Demobilization Unit Leader
  o Type 3 Documentation Unit Leader
  o Division/Group Supervisor

CERTIFICATION & TRAINING
- FEMA/NIMS Certifications:
  o All-Hazards Incident Commander
  o All-Hazards Operations Section Chief
  o All-Hazards Planning Section Chief
  o All-Hazards Intermediate ICS
  o All-Hazards Advanced ICS
  o IS-1.a, IS-3, IS-10.a, IS-100, IS-100.b, IS-120.a, IS-200, IS-230.b, IS-240.a, IS-241.a, IS-244.a, IS-293, IS-546.a, IS-700.a, IS-702.a, IS-800.b
- Other Certifications:
  o Secret Security Clearance Holder
  o CBRN Dismounted Reconnaissance, U.S. Army

AFFILIATIONS
- International Association of Emergency Managers (IAEM)
Mandy Le Monde, CEM

- Developed and expanded knowledge of local/state first responder training programs including qualification process, methods, and tracking mechanisms.
- Worked alongside company executives and managers to maximize direct observations & personal interactions w/ daily operations managers, regulatory compliance divisions, and working groups.
- Participated in development of Standard Operating Guidelines, Port-wide training programs, and Area Contingency Plan amendments to reflect Other Government Agency assets and capabilities.
- ICS led responses:
  - Kinder Morgan Sodium Hydroxide Release – Situation Unit Leader

Response Officer/Assistant Operations Officer
Pacific Strike Team – Novato, CA
August 2011 – April 2014

- Supervised three divisions (37 personnel) and managed $15M inventory of response equipment for deployment & readiness of expert maritime oil/hazmat/CBRN response team.
- Coordinated deployments of personnel and equipment for CG, EPA, and other Federal Agency Incident Commanders in dynamic 14 Western states & Pacific Islands area of responsibility for response to pollution and CBRN high-level emergencies, and pre-staging for major planned/forecasted events
- On call 24/7 to assume field tactical leadership of emergency response resources or primary ICS position for EPA/CG On Scene Coordinators.
- ICS led responses:
  - S.S. Montebello – Deputy Finance Section Chief
  - Tug Tiger – Situation Unit Leader
  - F/V Deep Sea – Operations Section Chief
  - TSMY Cylinder Neutralization – Response Officer, Planning Section Chief
  - Vicksburg Barge Collision – Planning Section Chief
  - M/V Jireh – Planning Section Chief
  - Hurricane Sandy – Liaison Officer
  - Honolulu Harbor Molasses Release – Planning Section Chief

Marine Inspector
Sector Puget Sound – Seattle, WA
May 2008 - July 2011

- Assistant Chief, Port State Control (PSC) branch for 2200+ vessel arrivals in largest west coast port.
- Supervised 18 personnel and directed PSC activities for 60+ reservists.
- Conducted safety and security exams on foreign and domestic flagged commercial vessels to ensure compliance with lifesaving, stability, structural, fire protection, and machinery inspections throughout Pacific Northwest. Determined foreign vessel examination priorities and directed detention of non-compliant vessels.
- ICS led responses:
  - Nehalem Salvage – Operations Section Chief
  - Deepwater Horizon – Group/Division Supervisor, Branch Director
  - Fukushima Radiation Contaminated Vessels – Operations Section Chief

REFERENCES

LCDR Ryan Erickson (Supervisor)
Deputy Chief, Incident Management Branch
U.S. Coast Guard - Atlantic Area
Ryan.H.Erickson@uscg.mil
757.398.6418

Ms. Kristy Plourde
U.S. Coast Guard Training Center Yorktown
ICS Instructor
Kristy.L.Plourde@uscg.mil
757.855.2940

CAPT William Carter
Deputy Director, Response
U.S. Coast Guard - Headquarters
William.Carter@uscg.mil
202.372.2098

Ms. Heather Kostekl
Emergency Management Services International (EMSI)
ICS Instructor
Heather.M.Kostecki@gmail.com
757.641.6574
REFERENCES
REFERENCES

Reference Name: Washington Department of Health IMT Development
Project Description: Organized and Delivered Type 3 All-Hazard Incident Management Team Training and Exercise. To date fifteen (15) courses have been delivered with additional courses scheduled for delivery in 2018.
Multiple contracts with estimated dollar value exceeding $300,000.00

Reference Information
Reference name: Nathan Weed, Emergency Preparedness Director
Telephone Numbers:
Office: 360.236.4534
Cell: 360.480.0308
email Address: Nathan.Weed@DoH.WA.Gov

Reference Name: IEM for HSEMA—Washington, DC
Project Description: Organize, train, and exercise a Type 3 All-Hazard Incident Management Team w/Development and Implementation of IMT and Individual IMT Member Qualification System. To date our firm has provided twenty-one (21) USFA O305 AHIMT and/or EMI Position Specific Training courses. Current under contract to provide an addition nine (9) courses in 2018.
Cost/Amount of Contract: Multiple contract and task order awards, estimated contract value exceeds $350.00.00.

Reference Information
Reference name: Michael Coen, IEM Supervisor
Telephone Number:
Office: 703.414.8141
Cell: 202.494.1844
Email Address: Michael.coen@iem.com
Reference Name: City of Saint Paul Emergency Management

Project Description: Organize, train, and exercise a Type 3 All-Hazard Incident Management Team w/Development and Implementation of IMT Policy and Procedures. Additionally, our firm developed and customized EOC training program with an emphasis on the interface between the Saint Paul EOC and IMT.

To date our firm has provided thirteen (13) USFA O305 AHIMT and/or EMI Position Specific Training courses. Currently under contract to provide an additional training and exercises in 2018.

Project Start and End Dates:

Our relationship with the City of Saint Paul Emergency Management Started in 2013 and continues today. Our firm is currently under contract by the City of Saint Paul to provide additional training and exercise services through 2018.

Cost/Amount of Contract: Multiple contract awards with estimated value exceeding $350,000.00

Reference Information

Reference name: Mike Sands, Emergency Management Planner

Telephone Numbers: Office: 651.266.5489
Cell: 651.245.1328

Email Address: Mike.Sand@ci.stpaul.mn.us
TRADE SECRETS
TRADE SECRETS
Wlandin Associates, LLC seeks protection for NO TRADE SECRETS in this bid.
COST ESTIMATE
COST ESTIMATES

Costs are listed, by individual subject, in the required separate, sealed envelope.
March 23, 2017

IEM subcontracted with Wiland Associates in 2015 to provide planning and training support for a project IEM was conducting for the District of Columbia Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency (HSEMA). This project was designed to create a credentialing and certification program for EOC support personnel. The customer POC had specifically requested that Wiland be on IEM’s team based on their reputation for IMT and ICS training.

For this project Wiland provided instructors for two sessions of the USFA O-305 AHIMT course, and for six ICS position-specific courses. The ICS courses included Incident Commander, Operations Section Chief, Finance/Administration Section Chief, Resource Unit Leader, Logistics Section Chief, and Planning Section Chief. Wiland also helped IEM develop and conduct a workshop to initiate the certification program, evaluate certification applications, and provide evaluators to observe EOC personnel during a two-day EOC planned event activation and sign-off on Position Task Books where appropriate.

Based on the success of this project, IEM received a second contract to continue the credentialing and certification process, and Wiland again participated on the team to provide O-305 and ICS position-specific training. For this contract the ICS courses included Liaison Officer, Incident Commander, Operations Section Chief, and Situation Unit Leader.

IEM’s assessment is that Wiland fully completed all subcontracted tasks, and met or exceeded our expectations for performance in three specific areas:

- Subject Matter Expertise – all the instructors and evaluators provided by Wiland were knowledgeable in the subject area and had extensive operational experience which they brought to the training deliveries and evaluation discussions. Our customer repeatedly expressed appreciation for the quality of the training personnel provided by Wiland.
- Flexibility – Faced with a compressed training schedule and periodic last minute changes by the customer, Wiland personnel quickly pivoted to accommodate changing requirements without any disruption in schedule or quality. Additionally, Wiland effectively adapted the field operations-oriented ICS position training to address responsibilities of EOC personnel, which the customer required.
- Attitude – Although the customer’s initial scope of work required additional refinement and in some cases changed during the period of performance, Wiland not only willing and agreeably adapted to these changes, but also offered suggestions and recommendations for improving what the customer has requested. This greatly improved the quality of the service provided and was acknowledged by the customer.

Given the opportunity again, I would not hesitate to re-engage Wiland Associates for future work involving emergency management training, exercises, or program development.

Mark A. Scott
IEM Senior Subject Matter Expert

I Think :: IEM
April 19, 2012

Richard Andring
P.O. Box 117
Selah, Washington 98942

Richard,

On behalf of the Central Virginia All Hazard Incident Management team, we would like to extend our sincere thanks and gratitude for the professional delivery of the USFA 0-305 (All Hazard Incident Management Team Training) class that Wiland Associates LLC recently provided to our team. This was second delivery of this training class that we have provided to our members, and we could not be more pleased with the results. As a newly formed T3 IMT it is important that we provide our members with a strong foundation of KSA’s for them to build upon. The talented group of instructors that Wiland provided during that five day class energized our members to a whole new level. We would like to personally extend our sincere thanks and gratitude to the below instructor cadre;

Richard Andring  Bill Miller  
Paul Tauber  Paul McDonagh  
Dan Oltrogge  Tom Hatcher

During the past six months, the Central Virginia All Hazard IMT has successfully sent 96 team members through the All Hazard class. That initiative could not have been accomplished without the cooperative support that Wiland Associates continues to provide to our team. We value the professional relationships that we currently share and look forward to beginning our Position Specific (PST) classes.

We also hope that we provided a valued overview of our region by showing you some of the local highlights of our area. The historic dinner at Hanover Tavern and the presentation of the civil war bullets even impressed me. However, the staircase at the Jefferson Hotel came in a close second.

Respectfully,

Lee Williams  
Central Virginia AHIMT Program Manager
October 21, 2015

To Whom It May Concern:

I am happy to write this letter of recommendation concerning Incident Command System (ICS) training and Wiland Associates. After large scale civil unrest experienced by the City of Baltimore in the spring of 2015 a severe gap in incident management skills within the Baltimore Police Department (BPD) was identified. After searching the country and consulting many experienced professionals it was quite clear that Richard Andrings’s team was the best suited for our needs.

Initially, Richard flew to Baltimore to discuss a training plan and identify the best suited courses for BPD members to receive training on. During this initial consultation I requested that every course be customized for law enforcement members with scenarios that involved civil unrest in the City of Baltimore. Wiland Associates delivered on every promise and this made all of the difference in delivering meaningful training. Additionally, I specifically requested instructors that had a law enforcement background and extensive background in ICS. This requirement was honored throughout the course of trainings and the level of trust that participants had with a peer instructor was pivotal.

Another benchmark of my satisfaction with the services provided was the professionalism and customer service by the entire team. From the office staff, to every single instructor that came to Baltimore, the team was incredibly customer focused and professional. There were several instances we experienced with schedule conflicts or credential requests and they were all handled with patience and courtesy.

Based on my experience any jurisdiction requiring ICS training, regardless of agency type or background, would be in extremely capable hands with Wiland Associates. Please feel free to contact me directly if you have any specific questions or would like to discuss my experience in greater detail.

Sincerely,

Brian Bovard
Director of Operations
brian.bovard@baltimorecity.gov
(410) 396-6188
January 8, 2014

Anna M. McRay, PEM (Virginia)
Deputy Coordinator of Emergency Management
Office of Emergency Management
County of Henrico Division of Fire
Post Office Box 90775
Henrico, VA 23273-0775

Re: Wiland Associates - Letter of Reference

Greetings;
It is with pleasure that I would like to express my recommendation for Wiland Associates for your Incident Management and Emergency Management training needs.

The City of Saint Paul has utilized Wiland Associates extensively for Incident Management and Emergency Operations Center training since 2012. Specifically, the City of Saint Paul has delivered over 14 classes to support our Incident Management and Emergency Management capability. Wiland also was the selected provider of a major city sponsored Table-Top Exercise involving over 150 city personnel and regional response partners.

Wiland utilizes a customer-focused approach and has always provided a quality product, based upon our needs and our objectives. The credible and experienced instructor cadre that represents Wiland has always shared experience where valuable and helpful insights based on the students level of experience.

Specifically, Wiland helped our city plan and deliver two courses – one dealing with the IMT/EOC Interface (FEMA course G-191), one dealing with EOC Operations (G-775) and followed up with an exercise involving our field responders and our EOC team. These two classes and exercise was the top rated training and exercise experience in our Department of Emergency Management history!

In short, Saint Paul's Homeland Security and Emergency Management efforts have been greatly enhanced through our relationship with Wiland as our preferred training vendor.

If I can provide any further assistance regarding this reference, please don’t hesitate to contact me.

Best regards;

Rick Larkin
Emergency Management Director
City of Saint Paul, Minnesota.
December 21, 2011

To Whom It May Concern:

I am pleased to offer this letter of recommendation regarding the professional services of Richard Andring as well as those of Wiland Associates, LLC.

Mr. Andring and his associates have provided the expertise, training and guidance necessary to help bring an urban area Type III Incident Management Team (IMT) to life in the Seattle Metropolitan region.

I was fortunate to participate in one of the Command and General Staff classes instructed by Mr. Andring and Mr. Schwanke and have talked with many of my colleagues in the region from many disciplines (fire, police, public works, emergency management) who have also attended their classes. Their style, knowledge and experience are routinely praised and appreciated by all audiences. It is not just that they “know their stuff.” It is equally evident that they fervently want you to understand how to do your own job when it comes to managing complex events.

Mr. Andring coached our IMT Oversight Task Force through the logistical and strategic processes involved in selecting regional Incident Commanders then assisted us in the process of filling a multiple team roster. His advice in anticipating and resolving issues regarding personnel, policies, training, and team maintenance has been invaluable and much of our success is directly attributable to his commitment and dedication to our efforts.

Wiland Associates offers professional management and training services through reliable, highly respected, and personable individuals whose vast experience offers credibility and value to tangible outcomes. They will have my personal respect and gratitude for a long time to come.

Sincerely,

Barb Graff  
Director, Seattle Office of Emergency Management  
Chair, Seattle Metro IMT Oversight Task Force

Disaster Ready...Prepared People, Resilient Community
Multnomah County Health Department

Emergency Preparedness & Response

May 13, 2014

Hamilton County Indiana  
Hamilton County Health Department

To whom it may concern,

With great pleasure, I am drafting this letter of reference for Wiland Associates LLC. I have a fair amount of experience with their services as both a student of their courses and as client for their contracted services.

Earlier this fiscal year, I contracted with Wiland to come and provide the AHIMT course instruction to our 3 Incident Management Teams. Having been a student of their courses in the past, I was confident of the level of knowledge, skill, and expertise that would be provided and I was not disappointed in the least. Our post course surveys included the comments "best training I have ever taken" and "I was skeptical that a 40 hour course would keep me engaged, but I was wrong".

I would highly recommend that you engage Wiland's training cadre to instruct your public health staff in any portions of the Incident Command System of management. Our teams now feel as though they have skills and the confidence that they didn't have before, even though they had checklists and other information available to them. Wiland's training platform specializes in pulling all the ICS concepts together and really delivering on the practical application of those concepts that are often hazy to even the individuals who seem to have a sound understanding of NIMS.

Please feel free to contact me personally should you have more questions that I can assist with.

Best,

Jerusha Kasch, MS CCJS  
Multnomah County Health Department Emergency Manager  
426 SW Stark St.  
Portland, OR 97204  
jerusha.kasch@multco.us  
(971) 263-0850
January 2, 2014

Richard Andring
P.O. Box 117
Selah, Washington 98942

Richard,

On behalf of the Washington County Sheriff’s Office and the Emergency Management Department staff, we would like to take the opportunity to say thank you for the excellent training your team from Wiland Associates LLC recently provided for our county. Delivering the AHIMT (All Hazard Incident Management Team) and IMT/EOC G191 Interface courses in back to back weeks in the middle of December was challenging; however, your experienced and professional staff made the experience worthy of our efforts.

In particular, your lead instructor for the G191 Interface Course – Jeff Galloway did an outstanding job. His experience and patience as we worked over a period of several months to develop a specific understanding as to our county needs and objectives for this course/exercise were greatly appreciated. We received positive feedback from department directors and administrators that were in attendance. The course provided a solid foundation for the understanding of our EOC mission, goals, and objectives during a full activation.

Thanks again for putting together a highly qualified instructor cadre for both of our trainings. We look forward to the opportunity to work with your organization in the future.

Sincerely,

Doug Berglund
Emergency Manager
Washington County Sheriff’s Office
June 2, 2017

Richard J. Andring  
Partner  
Wiland Associates LLC  
P.O. Box 117  
Selah, WA  98942

Dear Richard:

Incident Management Team Training

On behalf of NV Energy, I wanted to commend you and your team for the engaging training sessions you conducted with our emergency response organization in December 2016.

Your flexibility in tailoring the training program to our organization, while keeping the ICS principles intact, were commendable. The instructors who provided the training were knowledgeable, skilled in relaying the information, and entertaining. Many of our employees expressed their gratitude for the training, because it helped them improve their understanding of the ICS principles and how to effectively use them in responding to an emergency situation.

The exercise helped us practice what we had learned and kept everyone engaged.

Thank you again for the training, as it was a pleasure working with you. We hope to see you again in the future.

Sincerely,

David Pectol  
Mgr. Infrastructure Security and Emergency Management
January 2, 2014

Richard Andring
P.O. Box 117
Selah, Washington 98942

Richard,

On behalf of the Washington County Sheriff's Office and the Emergency Management Department staff, we would like to take the opportunity to say thank you for the excellent training your team from Wiland Associates LLC recently provided for our county. Delivering the AHIMT (All Hazard Incident Management Team) and IMT/EOC G191 Interface courses in back to back weeks in the middle of December was challenging; however, your experienced and professional staff made the experience worthy of our efforts.

In particular, your lead instructor for the G191 Interface Course – Jeff Galloway did an outstanding job. His experience and patience as we worked over a period of several months to develop a specific understanding as to our county needs and objectives for this course/exercise were greatly appreciated. We received positive feedback from department directors and administrators that were in attendance. The course provided a solid foundation for the understanding of our EOC mission, goals, and objectives during a full activation.

Thanks again for putting together a highly qualified instructor cadre for both of our trainings. We look forward to the opportunity to work with your organization in the future.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Doug Berglund
Emergency Manager
Washington County Sheriff’s Office
June 2, 2017

Richard J. Andring  
Partner  
Wiland Associates LLC  
P.O. Box 117  
Selah, WA 98942  

Dear Richard:

Incident Management Team Training

On behalf of NV Energy, I wanted to commend you and your team for the engaging training sessions you conducted with our emergency response organization in December 2016.

Your flexibility in tailoring the training program to our organization, while keeping the ICS principles intact, were commendable. The instructors who provided the training were knowledgeable, skilled in relaying the information, and entertaining. Many of our employees expressed their gratitude for the training, because it helped them improve their understanding of the ICS principles and how to effectively use them in responding to an emergency situation.

The exercise helped us practice what we had learned and kept everyone engaged.

Thank you again for the training, as it was a pleasure working with you. We hope to see you again in the future.

Sincerely,

David Pectol  
Mgr. Infrastructure Security and Emergency Management
December 20, 2010

To: Whom it May Concern

Re: Letter of Reference

To All-Hazards Team Members and Potential Members,

Over the past three years, we have been working on credentialing, training, and forming our Type III All-Hazards teams in the Las Vegas and greater State of Nevada regions. The process in and of itself can and has been extremely challenging and is part of the nature of the business.

However, one of the best finds I have made in assisting us in the process is the discovery of Wiland Associates and ALL they have to bring to the table. They bring one of the most real world experienced AHIMT cadres that I believe exist. This “real world” experience; coupled with the course curriculum from the USFA and EMI, not only makes for a solid learning experience, but also brings a level of understanding second to none!

Wiland Associates also believes in, and teaches, the same collaborative philosophies you and your personnel are going to have to have for any real hope of a successful and positive outcome on any incident. As the Southern Nevada Unified Command Incident Management Team Manager and IC, Wiland Associates has been one of the best tools found, developed and purchased in our pursuit of our Preparedness and Incident Management and Mitigation.

Respectfully Submitted,

Chief Jess L. Campbell | SNUC IMT - Program Manager

POC for DHS for Nevada State Type III AHIMT
Southern Nevada Unified Command Incident Management Team
Las Vegas Fire & Rescue – Assistant Chief of Operations & Training
Las Vegas Fire & Rescue Training Center
633 N. Mojave Rd | Las Vegas, NV, 89101
Phone: 702-229-0735 | Fax: 702-388-2504
December 10, 2011

Mr. Richard Andring
Wiland Associates, LLC
P. O. Box 117
Selah, Washington 98942

Dear Richard:

On behalf of the Central Virginia All Hazard Incident Management team, we would like to extend our sincere thanks and gratitude for the professional delivery of the USFA 0-305 (All Hazard Incident Management Team Training) class that Wiland Associates LLC recently provided to our team. This was the first organized team training class that we have provided to our members and we could not be more pleased with the results. As a newly formed Type 3 IMT, it was important that we provide our members with a strong foundation of KSA’s for them to build upon. The talented group of instructors that Wiland provided during the six day class energized our members to a whole new level. By the end of the week, the common theme of all 48 students was; “this was the best incident management training I have ever attended”. Some of the more personal comments from the students included;

“The instructors truly have a passion for the students to learn”
“The instructors take the time to explain how and why the process is important”
“The instructors provide individual assistance to the students when needed”
“Is Wiland going to teach anymore of our team training?”
“The instructor cadre has the real world IMT experience to better relate to the course content”

Wiland has helped provide the “spark” that our newly formed Type 3 IMT was hoping for. We look forward to continuing our relationship with Wiland Associates LLC as our team develops.

Sincerely,

Lee Williams
Central Virginia AHIMT Program Manager

Bryan Swanson
Course Point of Contact

Prepared to help when you need us most.
April 14, 2010

Richard J. Andring
Wiland Associates, LLC
1651 Collins Road
Selah, Washington 98942

Dear Richard:

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you and your instructional staff for the outstanding job delivering the All Hazard Incident Management Team course to members of the Orange County Fire Rescue Department March 8-13, 2010.

Both the course delivery and instructors were top notch and I would not hesitate to contract with your company for additional incident command training. The cadre of instructors you provided ensured an exceptional instructional experience and provided a wealth of knowledge to our team. This was one of the best programs I have attended during my 30 year career.

In closing, I would like to once again thank you for the quality program you provided to Orange County Fire Rescue's Incident Management Team and look forward to working with you again in the future.

Sincerely,

William E. Sturgeon
Division Chief
Orange County Fire Rescue
To Whom It May Concern:

I write on behalf of Wiland Associates, LLC in reference to the presentation of All Hazards Incident Management Team training. I have had the opportunity to participate in two of Wiland’s Type III IMT training programs. I have found the instructors to be very knowledgeable and they possess the “been there and worked on that” experience that can only be gleaned from having lived through their respective emergency management activities. The instructors have been very adaptable to the student demographics. The program’s coordinator, Richard Andring, was very accommodating while at the same time very set on following the curriculum and course delivery hours. I recommend them for IMT program delivery. Please feel free to contact me for further information or qualification of my recommendation.

Sincerely,

Mike McKendrick
Assistant Chief
michael.mckendrick@tucsonaz.gov
520-837-7014
Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services
CHARLES H. BRONSON, Commissioner
The Capitol • Tallahassee, FL 32399-0800
www.doacs.state.fl.us

Please Respond to:
Florida Division of Forestry
865 Geddie Road
Tallahassee, FL 32304

January 5, 2009

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

RE: Wiland Associates LLC

I have had the distinct pleasure to work closely with Richard Andring, Owner, Wiland
Associates, over the past two years in the State of Florida’s effort to develop Regional Type III IMT’s.

To date, I have coordinated four US Fire Academy endorsed AHIMT training sessions. Mr.
Andring was the lead instructor and point of contact for all instructor coordination for each session. I have
found Richard to be a prompt and professional instructor. He takes great effort to provide top notch
instructors and quality classroom presentations. Each instructor that he brings to the classroom provides a
balanced All-Risk approach that makes the course well rounded for any emergency response discipline.

During the course, Richard and his team take charge of the audience and manage the course.
Students leave the class with a sense of fulfillment and have made numerous comments about the
excellent quality of instruction that has been presented. I have yet to get any negative feedback from
students.

It has been a pleasure to have had the opportunity to work with Richard Andring, Wiland
Associates, and his staff. Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

CHARLES BRONSON

COMMISSIONER

Chris Worrell
Florida Division of Forestry
State AHIMT Training and Development
850-627-6156
worreclc@doacs.state.fl.us

Florida Agriculture and Forest Products
Urban Staging Area Management (USTAM) Course

USTAM serves as an introduction to the position of Staging Area Manager in an Urban environment. This course is intended to enhance and exercise the student’s knowledge of NIMS and ICS as it pertains to performing the numerous duties of the Staging Area Manager within an Urban environment throughout an incident. The USTAM course provides both emergency and non-emergency responders with a strong understanding of the duties, responsibilities, and skills of an effective STAM in an urban environment.

This course is an instructor-led training that supports through lectures, discussion and active participation in multiple custom exercises that provide a hands-on approach to mastering the skills required of a USTAM.

Mission
To manage all activities within a staging area and respond to requests to assign resources and status of their deployment and/or readiness.

Target Audience
Personnel assigned as a Urban Staging Area Manager for an event or incident.

Duration
Course is designed to be delivered over Two (2) days

Topics
- Roles and responsibilities of the STAM
- Establishing the staging area/areas
- Management of a Staging Area in the urban environment
- Co-locating functions within the urban staging area
- Staging area logistical support
- Logistic Staging Areas
- Demobilization process

Exercises
Each course delivery features multiple localized student activities and exercises.

Pre-requisites (recommended)
Successful completion of NIMS ICS-100, ICS-200 and ICS-300
Featured Course Descriptions

All-Hazard Field Reconnaissance

This three-day course is intended to address the needs of mapping and developing situational awareness at an all hazards incident. The course describes the duties and responsibilities as well as provides basic skills necessary to persons likely to be assigned to conduct field reconnaissance (RECON) at an all hazards incident similarly to a Field Observer (FOBS) on a wildfire incident. Topics include overview of maps, geographic location services, use of compass and laser range finder, basic damaged structure assessment and digital data collection. The course concludes with a field exercise to apply the skills learned.

Urban Staging Area Manager Workshop

ALL HAZARDS APPROACH to STAGING AREA development and management. Stresses proactive planning for, development of and management/maintenance of an All Hazard Staging Area. More than just a part of the operations, course stresses the logistical components of a functional staging area as well as the needed qualifications and skill sets a staging area manager should possess.

Local Incident Management Teams – “Process 101”

This three-day course is intended to prepare “Local Jurisdiction” to manage local emergencies efficiently, effectively and safely. Local hazards, vulnerabilities and capabilities dictate the size and complexity of incident response strategies. Over recent years, we have learned how to manage extended incidents, but how do we safely and effectively fill the gap between the Initial response and transitioning to a larger staffed incident Management Team? This course is designed precisely for those jurisdictions.

Target Audience – Small teams from a local jurisdiction responsible for working together. Students will be placed into 6 person teams by the host agency prior to the course beginning based upon the following positions: Team Leader, Safety Officer, Public Information Officer, Operations Section Chief, Planning Section Chief and Logistics Section Chief.

P.O. Box 117, Selah, WA 98942  Phone: (509) 697-9773  info@wilandassociates.com
e-ISuite

e-ISuite is the next generation version of I-Suite and when fully implemented will replace the current I-Suite Application. It is used on incidents to track resources, facilitate timekeeping, generate payment documents, track incident costs and generate Incident Action Plans. The I-Suite system is a web browser (e.g. Internet Explorer) enabled I-Suite application for use at the Incident Command Post (ICP) and in agency offices to manage emergency incidents and planned events.

How can I-Suite help manage an incident?

- Produce IAP (Incident Action Plan)
- Track Resources
- Track Costs
- Facilitate Timekeeping

What types of incidents use e-ISuite?

- Type 3, 4 & 5 incidents – All Hazard (Tornado, Flood, Fire, Civil Disturbance, etc.)
- Planned Events
- Type 1 & 2 incidents – (Hurricanes, Wildfire, etc.)

What are the benefits of using e-ISuite?

- Allows for sharing of resource data in a network environment
- Software does not need to be installed on every computer
- No software licenses are required
- Internet connection is not required

Understanding EMAC for All-Hazard Incident Management Teams

This (2-Day) Training / Workshop emphasizes the following and provides a AHIMT – EMAC Finance Exercise at its conclusion:

✓ Writing mission ready packages
✓ EMAC Reimbursement process
✓ EMAC Intrastate vs. Interstate deployments
✓ EMAC procurement process
✓ EMAC typing for local & State Incident Management Teams
✓ EMAC typing for single resources
✓ EMAC typing for strike teams & task forces
All Hazards Situation Unit Leader 2-Day Workshop
(Rob Rowley)

My first assignment as a Situation Unit Leader (SITL) after completing my training was at a large sporting event that my team has managed many times at the Richmond International Raceway here in central Virginia. To be quite honest, I was so new to the position that it was all I could do to keep up with what I had to do much less spend much time considering why I was doing it. The fact that the event was a repeat performance also limited the amount of thought and creative problem solving that had to go into the planning process.

Fortunately for me I was able to be involved in several other, smaller events and exercises that were not a cookie cutter performance of a prior event. This began to reinforce to me the wide variety of incidents an all hazards team can face, how well the process can work at meeting the challenges of them all and the wide variety of work the all hazards situation unit may be called upon to perform and the incredibly diverse field of information that may need to be collected, analyzed and communicated.

In August 2014 I was very fortunate to deploy with the Central Virginia All Hazards IMT to Wenatchee, WA for a training assignment in the situation unit of a large wildfire. The experience was great but the conversations were priceless. The Wenatchee incident convinced me that there is a complexity and sense of hitting a moving target present in the all hazards environment that has not been adequately addressed in most training classes. A variety of incidents and events have also convinced me that running a situation unit benefits from the same sort of systematic approach that the planning process itself enjoys.

Following these incidents, I came up with a system, a few forms and job aids that helped by manage a situation unit. These included methods for figuring out what information the unit needed to gather, how to use and present it and how to organize the unit to get it all done. I was very fortunate to get input from many knowledgeable people while developing my process. I was also fortunate to have several opportunities to try it out and refine it. Training environments included a large-scale search and rescue exercise at Rocky Knob state park as well as a three-day functional exercise hosted by the Henrico County Office of Emergency Management that included marine, HAZ-MAT and technical rescue response assets. The system served the situation unit well during the 9-day, multi-jurisdiction UCI bike races that came to central Virginia in September 2015. The event was not only large and high profile but also attracted spectators from around the globe.

The focus of this two-day workshop is to let students work through the process of defining what duties need to be carried out, what information needs to be gathered and analyzed and what products need to come out of the situation unit for any given incident. Students will also practice organizing a situation unit and information flows. The emphasis is hands on application and an understanding of not just what to do but why it is done. Exercises and group discussions will ensure that students can use the learned principles in their unique situation.
ALL HAZARDS INCIDENT MANAGEMENT TEAM WORKSHOPS

Our workshops build on the information presented in the United States Fire Administration's (USFA) five-day AHIMT course and the Emergency Management Institutes (EMI) Position Specific Training Courses. It offers a unique opportunity for functional areas to work together to improve their overall team interactions and performance.

The workshops provide an overview of team management, functional roles and responsibilities as well as important team interactions required for success. Four concurrent functional breakouts are presented and provide an opportunity for Command Staff, Operations, Planning and Logistics/Finance to discuss functional operating procedures, interactions and internal team agreements.

"Just a short note to say THANK YOU. After 48 years in the Fire Service, 30 years teaching, and going to school all over the USA, Canada, Mexico, South Africa and the UK ... I've NEVER had a learning experience like yours. It was AWESOME."

Dwight Clark, Deputy Fire Chief
Forsyth, GA

The workshop also offers an operational demonstration program of the various meetings involved in the planning process and the creation of an Incident Action Plan. All of the workshop components are then fully exercised during a day and a half simulation that fully tests each position and the team. The workshop closes with an After-Action Review of the simulation and offers an opportunity for the Individual Incident Management Team to meet and further discuss mobilization and operating procedures, formulation of team "go-kits", and future training opportunities.

We utilize only the most qualified and experienced All Hazards Incident Management Team instructors available. Our instructors are not only practitioners of ICS, but gifted educators capable of transferring field experience into relevant knowledge for each student. Our workshops draw from hundreds of years of real-life experience managing national and global events.

Wiland Associates LLC
Richard Andring, President
PO Box 117
Selah, WA 98942
Office: (509) 697-9773
Cell: (509) 728-3507
Richard@WilandAssociates.com
All Hazard Field Reconnaissance Course

All Hazard Field Reconnaissance (RECON) is an adaptation of the Field Observer position designed for the wildfire community with focus and emphasis placed on the skills and techniques necessary to gather operational intelligence in an urban environment.

As the All Hazard Incident Management community continues to evolve and grow it has become readily evident that many positions originally conceived for fighting wildfires do not translate well to an urban setting. The wide spread devastation of the Northeast caused by Super Storm Sandy in 2012 exposed the need to modify the Field Observer position and to develop a new position better suited for the demands of All Hazard Incident Management Team operating in urban environments.

As technology continues to proliferate more aspects of our lives and the availability of affordable internet connected devices continue to climb, Incident Management Teams have a host of exciting new tools at their disposal. The RECON course exposes students to many of these digital tools and techniques (both free and subscription based) and the experienced instructional cadre explains how they have been utilized in recent real world All Hazard Incidents and how RECON personnel might leverage these powerful tactics at future incidents and events.

The skills developed through this training focused on the following:

- What type of information is important to identify at various incidents & events

- How to collect and record this intelligence using a wide variety of tools ranging from electronics and smart devices to pencil and paper

- Information and intelligence sharing as force multipliers aiding in the Continuity of Operations and a Common Operating Picture among multiple operating agencies

- How this common operating picture allows agencies to operate more efficiently and safer than in the past

The "RECON" course meets all course requirements for the S-244 course as established by the National Wildfire Coordinating Group (NWCG). NWCG S-244 Course Certificates of Completion will be made available upon request.
The first thirty minutes can be a critical time to evaluate the injured and save lives. Using the most advanced techniques in medical, tactical and rapid incident management, this 1 ½ day training will give participants the practical skills needed to respond to hostile events including post blast and active shooter incident.

**Target Audience**
The target audience includes law enforcement, fire & rescue personnel, emergency medical services, emergency communication and command staff for all first responder agencies.

**Overview**
The purpose of this course is to teach a new, integrated approach for First Responders in a hostile event situation when there are viable victims—to reduce morbidity and mortality. The 3 ECHO response model is an integrated approach for First Responders that moves beyond the separation of law enforcement and rescue/medical personnel during active shooter, post-blast response and other hostile events. The integration of disciplines is completed as soon as possible during an event response, with the goal of rescuing viable victims while the response to the hostile event is ongoing, with the intent to mitigate risk to all responders.
A successful IMT program takes more than just training.

It takes a strong administrative foundation to support an IMT – and we have the strength and experience to help you build it.

You've got questions...

Team Development
What does the training path look like?
How many courses will we need? Who should be invited?
When do we select team members? How many members? How many teams?

Governance
Do we need a Governing Board? Who should sit on it?
What authority do they have? How do they function?
What decisions are made by them, and which are made by the team?

Fiscal
How do we fund the training courses?
How will the team be funded long-term? Where does the money live?
Who can authorize spending? Who will be responsible for financial reporting?

Legal
What options do we have for legal structure? Which should we use?
Who is liable for the team's activities during activation? Can we protect our agency?
What documentation do we need in order to deploy?
Who can legally bind the team?

Administrative Support
How do we securely manage all the personnel data?
Where does all the training and activation documentation live? Can we just box it up?
Can we fire people off the team? How?

We have the answers...

We've worked through all of these questions with our clients, and we can help you too.

Creating a self-sustaining team requires administrative infrastructure... Documentation, agreements, details. It's the kind of work that first responders don't particularly like to do.

We don't mind it one bit. We enjoy it. And we're good at it.

In addition to providing the industry's strongest cadre of instructors, Wiland has Project Managers that can build the admin structure you need to keep your team going strong.

Documents such as:

- Team bylaws
- Governance docs
- Policy Manual
- Team Handbook
- Budgets

Procurement contracts
Ongoing training schedules
Mutual aid agreements
and more...

Wiland ASSOCIATES LLC
### Not sure what type of IMT you need?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Team</th>
<th>All-Hazard Type 3 Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How many team members are deployed to an incident?</strong></td>
<td>7 – 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What level is the team formed at?</strong></td>
<td>City / County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How many agencies are on the team?</strong></td>
<td>Single or Multi-agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How many jurisdictions are represented?</strong></td>
<td>Typically one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Typically, how long should the team expect to support an incident?</strong></td>
<td>Resolution within one operational period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected response time</strong></td>
<td>Immediately following initial response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wiland can provide a customized training solution to suit your agency's unique needs.

- **Are you an emergency responder?** ICS-100 and ICS-200 or equivalent
- ** Might you be involved in managing an incident?** ICS-300 and ICS-400 or equivalent
- **Are you, or might you become a member of a Local IMT?** CGSF for Local IMTs
- **Are you assigned to a Type 3 IMT?** ICS-100, ICS-200, ICS-300, ICS-400, Multi-agency Incident Management Training, Multi-disciplinary Incident Management Training

---

Wiland ASSOCIATES LLC

**Advancing Proactive Incident Management**

A Comprehensive Approach to Building an IMT

Type 3 All-Hazard Incident Management Team Training Guide

For further information contact:
Richard J. Andring, Partner
Office: 509-697-9773
Cell: 509-728-3507
Richard@WilandAssociates.com
"All-hazards" should mean more than just one discipline.

Addressing the unique complexities of an all-hazard response requires an intimate, experiential knowledge of multiple disciplines.

The urban landscape presents new challenges, unseen in the wildfire arena. Competing operational objectives, differing priorities and diverse stakeholders add new levels of complexity.

In training for these incidents, your agency needs instructors who understand the multi-faceted nature of an all-hazards response and have experience in navigating the thorny issues.

The depth of our instructors' experience includes National Area Command, Multi-agency Coordination Group, Type 1 and Type 2 ICS responses on incidents including:

WTO Riots (Seattle, 1999)
New York City and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001
National Governors' Conference (Preplanned event, Seattle, 2004)
Hurricanes Katrina & Rita (Gulf Coast, 2005)
TOPOFF 2 / TOPOFF 4 (National response exercises)
Jewish Federation Shooting (Seattle, 2006)
California Fire Siege (N. California, 2008)

Wiland instructors helped develop the curricula they now teach:

ICS 300 & 400 curriculum (USFA/NFA)
All Hazard Incident Management Team (USFA/NFA)
Unified Command for Multi-agency and
Catastrophic Incidents (USFA/NFA)
Command & General Staff Functions (USFA/NFA)

We have the answers...

We've worked through all of these questions with our clients, and we can help you too.

Creating a self-sustaining team requires administrative infrastructure... Documentation, agreements, details. It's the kind of work that first responders don't particularly like to do.

We don't mind it one bit. We enjoy it. And we're good at it.

In addition to providing the industry's strongest cadre of instructors, Wiland has Project Managers that can build the admin structure you need to keep your team going strong.

Documents such as:

- Team bylaws
- Governance docs
- Policy Manual
- Team Handbook
- Budgets
- Procurement contracts
- Ongoing training schedules
- Mutual aid agreements
- and more...

Wiland ASSOCIATES LLC
Not sure what type of IMT you need?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Team</th>
<th>All-Hazard Type 3 Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many team members are deployed to an incident?</td>
<td>7 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What level is the team formed at?</td>
<td>City / County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many agencies are on the team?</td>
<td>Single or Multi-agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many jurisdictions are represented?</td>
<td>Typically one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typically, how long should the team expect to support an incident?</td>
<td>Resolution within one operational period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected response time</td>
<td>Immediately following initial response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wiland can provide a customized training solution to suit your agency's unique needs.

Are you an emergency responder? ICS-100 and ICS-200 or equivalent

 Might you be involved in managing an incident? ICS-300 and ICS-400 or equivalent

 Are you, or might you become a member of a Local IMT? CGSF for Local IMTs

 Are you assigned to a Type 3 IMT? All-Hazard IMT, Field Mentoring, ICS Position Specific training, Exercise
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action to appoint Lily Craig to the South Bay Workforce Investment Board (SBWIB). (Fiscal Impact: None)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1. Ratify the El Segundo Chamber of Commerce nomination to appoint Lily Craig to seat #18 of the SBWIB;
2. Request the City Clerk to forward a certified copy of Council’s action to the SBWIB;
3. Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

Letters of request from the El Segundo Chamber of Commerce, dated May 23, 2018 and a letter of request from SBWIB dated May 24, 2018

FISCAL IMPACT: $

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

STRATEGIC PLAN:

Goal: 1 Enhance Customer Service Engagement

Objective: 1 The City is available as a virtual City with online services that are convenient & efficient for all residents and businesses

PREPARED BY: Mishia Jennings, Executive Assistant
REVIEWED BY: 
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:

The South Bay Workforce Investment Board (SBWIB) provides guidance for programs administered under the Federal Workforce Investment Act, under a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA), for the eight cities of El Segundo, Gardena, Hawthorne, Hermosa Beach, Inglewood, Lawndale, Manhattan Beach and Redondo Beach. The JPA is the instrument that allows the cities to pool and utilize available federal funds. Pursuant to the amended JPA dated May 16, 2002, Section 3, Sub-Part 3 of Section 4 of Agreement No. 83-100 requires that each of the SBWIB member cities shall appoint at least two private-sector employees, to serve on the SBWIB as representative of their respective cities’ private-sector businesses. The process specified by the JPA requires that nominees originate from a business group. Historically, the chambers of the member cities are the business group. The chambers nominate a business representative to the SBWIB, which nomination is then ratified by the respective city council.
May 23, 2018

Honorable Mayor and City Council
City of El Segundo
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

Dear Mayor Boyles and Members of the City Council:

On behalf of the Board of Directors of the El Segundo Chamber of Commerce, please accept the nomination of the following individual to be appointed to serve on the South Bay Workforce Investment Board for the 4-year term of office commencing July 1, 2018, as a representative of the El Segundo business private-sector:

Lily Craig, Chevron External Affairs Manager, to serve the 4-year term of office from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2022.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Marsha Hansen

Marsha Hansen
CEO/President

El Segundo Chamber of Commerce
427 Main Street • El Segundo, CA 90245
director@elsegundochamber.org
www.elsegundochamber.com
May 24, 2018

Mr. Greg Carpenter, City Manager
City of El Segundo
350 Main Street,
El Segundo, CA 90245

Dear Mr. Carpenter:

Currently, there is one El Segundo business private sector vacancy on the South Bay Workforce Investment Board (SBWIB), which needs to be filled. The term of office for this seat, will take effect on July 1, 2017 and will expire on June 30, 2021.

On May 23, 2018, the El Segundo Chamber of Commerce nominated Ms. Lily Craig External Affairs Manager at Chevron, to fill the El Segundo Business Private Sector Seat. We are requesting that the Mayor and City Council please initiate the process to appoint Ms. Craig at the City of El Segundo’s next regularly scheduled City Council Meeting or at your earliest convenience.

Your cooperation in this matter is greatly appreciated. If you have any questions or require assistance, please contact me, or my assistant, Sha’Ron Berry, at (310) 970-7700. Thank you!

Sincerely,

Jan Vogel
Executive Director

Attachments
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action to adopt a resolution approving the Statement of Investment Policy, as amended, to allow investment in Joint Powers Authority Pools for the California Asset Management Program and receive and file the Quarterly Investment Report for the period ending March 31, 2018.

(Fiscal Impact: None)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1. Adopt a resolution approving the Statement of Investment Policy, as amended;
2. Receive and file the Quarterly Investment Report for the period ending March 31, 2018;
3. Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

Proposed Resolution and Updated Authorized Investment Schedule and March 31, 2018 Quarterly Investment Report.

FISCAL IMPACT: $ None

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

STRATEGIC PLAN:

| Goal: | 5 | Champion Economic Development & Fiscal Sustainability |
| Objective: | 3 | The City will maintain a stable, efficient, and transparent financial environment |

PREPARED BY: Crista Binder, Treasurer and Dino Marsocchi, Deputy Treasurer II
REVIEWED BY: Crista Binder, Treasurer
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:

The City of El Segundo Investment Policy (Policy) establishes the cash management and investment guidelines for the City Treasurer. The City of El Segundo invests public funds in a prudent manner with the primary objectives of, in priority order, safety of principal, adequate liquidity and investment return, in conformance with all applicable state laws (Gov. Code §§53600 and 53635 et seq.) and local statutes governing the investment of public funds.

On April 5, 2018, the City Council authorized by Resolution 4974 an update to the City of El Segundo Statement of Investment Policy. State law provides that any change in the City’s Investment Policy is to be considered by the City Council at a public meeting. (Gov. Code §53646(a)(2)). In addition, on an annual basis, the City Treasurer will report to the City Council any material changes to the policy as
reviewed and approved by the City's Investment Advisory Committee (IAC). The IAC is required to review and approve the policy annually and any material changes (Council Resolution 3764, June 2, 1992).

On April 26, 2018, the IAC reviewed and approved an update to the Authorized Investments Section 7.0 of the Statement of Investment Policy to include participation in Joint Powers Authority Pools (Gov. Code §53601(p)).

Gov. Code. §6509.7 permits two or more public agencies that have authority to invest funds to jointly exercise that power and invest in authorized investment subject to (p) of Section 53601. Local agencies may participate in these pools as investors or participants as long they issue shares of beneficial interests.

The City of El Segundo is updating the Statement of Investment Policy to include participation in the California Asset Management Program (CAMP). To be a Joint Powers Authority pool CAMP must meet the following requirements.

(1) The adviser is registered or exempt from registration with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

(2) The adviser has not less than five years of experience investing in the securities and obligations authorized in subdivisions (a) to (o), inclusive, of §53601.

(3) The adviser has assets under management in excess of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000).

CAMP meets these requirements and currently has over $3.2 billion in managed assets.

The City of El Segundo will benefit from adding this investment type to the Statement of Investment Policy to provide an additional liquidity facility for idle cash that exceeds current rates in the Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF).

RECOMMENDATION:

The City Treasurer and staff recommend the City Council adopt the attached, proposed resolution, approving the Statement of Investment Policy, as amended and effective June 1, 2018, and that the Council receive and file the City Treasurer’s and staff’s presentation of the Quarterly Investment Report for the period ending March 31, 2018.
RESOLUTION NO.__________

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE STATEMENT OF INVESTMENT POLICY, AS AMENDED, AND TO TAKE EFFECT JUNE 1, 2018

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

SECTION 1: The City Council finds and declares as follows:

1. The City of El Segundo is required to have a Statement of Investment Policy that regulates the investment of public funds.

2. Pursuant to Government Code §53646(a), the City Treasurer may submit the Statement of Investment Policy to the City Council for its consideration at a public meeting.

3. Since the Statement of Investment Policy was last approved by the City Council, the policy has been amended to update Section 7.0, Authorized Investments to include Joint Powers Authority Pools pursuant to Government Code §53601(p).

SECTION 2: Approval. The City Council approves the Statement of Investment Policy, as amended and attached as Exhibit A. The Statement of Investment Policy will take effect retroactively, as of June 1, 2018.

SECTION 3: The City Clerk is directed to certify the adoption of this Resolution, record this Resolution in the book of the City's original resolutions, and make a minute of this adoption of the Resolution in the City Council's records and the minutes of this meeting.

SECTION 4: This Resolution will become effective immediately and will remain effective unless repealed or superseded.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 19th day of June, 2018.

Drew Boyles,
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 and adopted by said City Council, approved and signed by the Mayor, and attested to by the City Clerk, all at a regular meeting of said Council held on the ___ day of ______, 2018, and the same was so passed and adopted by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Tracy Weaver, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Mark D. Hensley, City Attorney
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO

STATEMENT OF INVESTMENT POLICY

EFFECTIVE June 1, 2018

Crista Binder, CTP, CFIP
City Treasurer
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
INVESTMENT POLICY
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City of El Segundo
Investment Policy

1.0 Policy

The City of El Segundo Investment Policy (Policy) establishes the cash management and investment guidelines for the City Treasurer. The City of El Segundo invests public funds in a prudent manner with the primary objectives of, in priority order, safety of principal, adequate liquidity and investment return, in conformance with all State of California Code Sections (53600 and 53635 et seq.) and local statutes governing the investment of public funds.

State of California Code 53646 (a) (2) does not mandate that investment policies be updated annually. However, on an annual basis, the City Treasurer will report to the City Council any material changes to the policy as reviewed and approved by the City’s Investment Advisory Committee (IAC). The IAC will be required to review and approve the policy annually.

The City Treasurer will prepare a quarterly report to the City council, City Manager and Director of Finance listing investment transactions made during the reporting period pursuant to Government Code Section 53607.

State of California Code (53607) still requires that the City Council delegate investment authority to the City Treasurer on an annual basis.

2.0 Scope

This investment policy applies to all investment activities and financial assets of the City under management by the City Treasurer. This policy pertains to the City funds which are pooled for investment purposes and funds held in depository agencies.

It is the City’s policy to pool funds for investment purposes to maximize efficiencies, reduce transaction costs, streamline cash flow forecasting, and provide greater access to the market.

The pooled funds include:

- General Fund
- Special Revenue Funds
- Capital Project Funds
- Enterprise Funds
- Trust and Agency Funds
- Debt Service Funds
Assets not under management of the City Treasurer are investments in the City's defined benefit plans, health savings plans, and pension plans.

3.0 Prudence

State of California Government Code Section 53600.3 states that "...all governing bodies of local agencies or persons authorized to make investment decisions on behalf of those local agencies investing in public funds pursuant to this chapter are trustees and therefore fiduciaries subject to the prudent investor standard. When investing, reinvesting, purchasing, acquiring, exchanging, selling, or managing public funds, a trustee shall act with care, skill, prudence, and diligence under the circumstances then prevailing, including, but not limited to, the general economic conditions and the anticipated needs of the agency, that a prudent person acting in a like capacity and familiarity with those matters would use in the conduct of funds of a like character and with like aims, to safeguard the principal and maintain the liquidity needs of the agency. Within the limitations of this section and considering individual investments as part of an overall strategy, investments may be acquired as authorized by law."

The City Treasurer and persons that the City Treasurer delegates to manage City investments, shall use the "Prudent Investor" standard. Investment officers acting in accordance with this Policy, written portfolio guidelines and procedures, and exercising due diligence shall be relieved of personal responsibility for individual security's credit risk or market price changes, provided deviations from expectations are reported in the quarterly investment reports to the City Council, and appropriate action is taken to control adverse developments.

When investing and managing City funds, the City Treasurer and employees shall act with care, skill, prudence and diligence to meet the aims of the investment objectives listed in order in Section 5.0, Investment Objectives.

4.0 Ethics and Conflict of Interest

The City Treasurer, employees involved in the investment process, and the members of IAC shall refrain from all personal business activity that could conflict with the management of the investment program. All individuals involved with the investment of City funds, or review of investment transactions, will be required to file a Form 700 – Statement of Economic Interests on an annual basis in accordance with California state law.

5.0 Investment Objectives

Safety: Safety of principal is the foremost objective of the investment program. Investments of the City of El Segundo shall be undertaken in a manner that seeks to ensure the preservation of capital in the overall portfolio. To attain this objective, the City shall only invest in high quality securities and it shall diversify its investments in order that potential losses on individual securities do not exceed the income generated
from the remainder of the portfolio so as not to harm the City's cash flow and principal. The City shall also structure its portfolio so as to prevent the need to sell securities prior to maturity and it shall not take short positions, that is, selling securities that the City does not own.

Two risks are monitored to help ensure safety of the investments. They are credit risk and market or interest rate risk.

Credit Risk: Credit risk is defined as the risk of loss due to the failure of an issuer to redeem the outstanding debt at the stated maturity date. Within this concept, credit risk also applies to the overall market perception of the financial strength and capacity of the issuer. Diversification of the investment portfolio by issuer, maturity date and amount invested will ensure that in the event of a failure of any one issuer, the event will not unduly harm or compromise the City's cash flow.

Market or Interest Rate Risk: Market or Interest Rate risk is the risk that the market value of investment securities in the portfolio may decline due to changes in general interest rates. Market rate risk can be mitigated by diversifying the investment of funds by maturity date and by investing funds to a specific cash requirement that would reduce the need to sell the security prior to maturity to meet immediate City cash flow needs.

Liquidity: The City of El Segundo's investment portfolio will remain sufficiently liquid to meet all operating requirements that might be reasonably anticipated.

Return on Investments: The City of El Segundo shall manage funds to optimize the return on investments consistent with the two primary objectives of safety and liquidity. The rate of return on investment should be designed to attain a market rate of return through budgetary and economic cycles consistent with the risk limitations, prudent investment principles and cash flow requirements identified by the City's Investment Policy.

6.0 Delegation of Authority

Pursuant to State of California Code Section 53607, the City Council hereby authorizes the City Treasurer to invest and reinvest the City's funds, to sell or exchange securities so purchased, and to deposit securities for safekeeping in accordance with established procedures.

No person may engage in an investment transaction except as provided under the terms of this policy and the procedures established by the City Treasurer. The City Treasurer may delegate all, or a portion of the investment authority to subordinates pursuant to State of California Government Code Section 41006. Such delegation by the City Treasurer shall not remove or abridge the Treasurer's investment responsibility.
The City Treasurer shall establish written procedures for the operation and management of the City's investment program consistent with this investment policy, including appropriate written agreements with financial institutions.
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
7.0 - AUTHORIZED INVESTMENTS
Allowable Investment Instruments per State Government Code Applicable to All Local Agencies
As of January 1, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INVESTMENT TYPE</th>
<th>MAXIMUM MATURITY</th>
<th>MAXIMUM % OF PORTFOLIO</th>
<th>QUALITY REQUIREMENTS</th>
<th>CITY OF EL SEGUNDO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency Bonds</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; Rating</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Treasury Obligations</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Obligations - CA and Others</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Local Agency Obligations</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Agency Obligations</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankers' Acceptances</td>
<td>180 days</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Paper-Pooled Funds</td>
<td>270 days</td>
<td>40% of the agency's money</td>
<td>&quot;A-1&quot; if the issuer has issued long-term debt it must be rated &quot;A&quot; without regard to modifiers**</td>
<td>10% (no more than 3% per issuer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Paper-Non-Pooled Funds</td>
<td>270 days</td>
<td>25% of the agency's money</td>
<td>&quot;A-1&quot; if the issuer has issued long-term debt it must be rated &quot;A&quot; without regard to modifiers**</td>
<td>10% (no more than 3% per issuer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiable Certificates of Deposit</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>30% (combined with placement service CDs)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-negotiable Certificates of Deposit</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement Service Deposits</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>30% (inclusive of placement service CDs)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement Service Certificates of Deposit</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>30% (combined with negotiable CDs)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repurchase Agreements</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse Repurchase Agreements and Securities Lending Agreements</td>
<td>92 days</td>
<td>20% of the base value of the portfolio</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-Term Notes</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; Rating</td>
<td>15% (no more than 3% per issuer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Funds and Money Market Mutual Funds</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateralized Bank Deposits</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage Pass-Through Securities</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; Rating</td>
<td>Not Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Pooled Investment Funds</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Powers Authority Pool</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF) (Up To Maximum Allowed)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Investment Program Fund</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supranational Obligations</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>&quot;A A&quot; Rating</td>
<td>10% and &quot;A A A&quot; Rating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* If less than State Code Maximum % of Portfolio
* Pursuant to Government Code Sections: 16340, 16429.1, 53601, 53601.8, 53635, 53635.2, 53635.8 and 53638
** Issuing corporation must be organized and operating within the U.S. and have assets in excess of $500 million
8.0 Investment Pools/Mutual Funds

The City of El Segundo will be required to conduct a thorough investigation of any
government sponsored pool and/or mutual fund prior to investing and on a continual
basis. There shall be a questionnaire completed which will provide the following:

1. A description of eligible investment securities, and a written statement of
investment policy and objectives.
2. A description of interest calculations and how it is distributed, and how gains and
losses are treated.
3. A description of how the securities are safeguarded (including the settlement
process), and how often the securities are priced and the program audited.
4. A description of who may invest in the program, how often, what size deposits and
withdrawals are allowed.
5. A schedule for receiving statements and portfolio listings.
6. A description of how the pool/fund utilizes reserves, retained earnings, etc.
7. A fee schedule, including when and how fees are assessed.
8. The eligibility of the pool/fund to invest in bond proceeds and a description of its
practices.

9.0 Diversification Guidelines

The City of El Segundo will diversify its investments by security type, issuer and maturity
dates. Concentration limits are indicated in the Authorized Investments Section 7.0 for
all investment categories except Treasury securities.

10.0 Maximum Maturities

To the extent possible, the City of El Segundo will attempt to match its investments with
anticipated cash flow requirements. The City will not directly invest in securities
maturing more than five (5) years from the date of purchase pursuant to Government
Code Section 53601.

11.0 Benchmarks

The City of El Segundo Quarterly Investment Report will include benchmark reporting.
The benchmark reporting will be used as a reference tool only to communicate
investment performance against established benchmarks. The use of benchmarks will
not imply that the City Treasurer will assume more risk to the portfolio as safety of
principal and liquidity of funds are the first two primary objectives of the City's portfolio.
The City will use the following benchmark to compare and evaluate portfolio
performance.

Interpolated Yield: The market yield of US Treasury securities as compared to the
portfolio's weighted average maturity (WAM) for the long-term and short-term
investments in the portfolio.
12.0 Investment Advisory Committee

The City of El Segundo has established an Investment Advisory Committee (IAC) to provide advice and assistance of persons with experience in the investment field on the investment of City funds to ensure that City funds are invested in a safe and prudent manner.

The City of El Segundo Investment Advisory Committee (IAC) was established by City Council resolution 3764 on June 12, 1992.

The IAC shall have four (4) members appointed by the City Council to serve at their discretion. The committee members shall be the City Treasurer, the Director of Finance, one member who shall be a resident of the City of El Segundo and one member who may be a non-resident of the City. Desirable qualifications of IAC members include, but are not limited to, work experience or educational background in banking, investments or finance.

The IAC shall review and make recommendations on City investment policy and guidelines, list of banking institutions working with the City, list of brokers and dealers working with the City, and investments in the City portfolio. IAC members shall review and vote on recommendations of any new type of investment.

The IAC shall meet on a quarterly basis to discuss the City's investments and investment objectives.

The City Treasurer will prepare a quarterly report to the City council, City Manager and Director of Finance listing investment transactions made during the reporting period pursuant to Government Code Section 53607.

13.0 Collateralization

California Government Code, Sections 53652, et seq., requires depository institutions to post certain types and levels of collateral for public funds above the FDIC insurance amounts. The collateral requirements apply to bank deposits, both active (checking and savings accounts) and inactive (non-negotiable time certificates of deposit).

14.0 Safekeeping and Custody

The City of El Segundo shall require that all investment transactions be conducted through the delivery-versus-payment (DVP) process pursuant to Government Code Section 53601. Securities shall be held by a third party custodian designated by the City Treasurer and evidenced by safekeeping receipts pursuant to Government Code Section 53608.
15.0 **Reporting**

The City Treasurer will prepare a quarterly report to the City council, City Manager and Director of Finance listing investment transactions made during the reporting period pursuant to Government Code Section 53607. At a minimum, the quarterly report must include type of investment, issuer name, dollar amount of each security, date of maturity, par value, book value and current market value of securities, rate of interest, funds managed by contracted parties, percentage of the portfolio in each investment category, weighted average maturity, statement of ability to meet expenditure requirements for the next six months, and Treasurer indication of compliance with the City's Investment Policy.

In addition to the quarterly report, the City Treasurer will prepare a monthly statement of investments and transactions to the Director of Finance.

16.0 **Internal Controls**

The City Treasurer shall establish a system of written internal controls, which shall ensure compliance with this Investment Policy and state law. The controls shall be designed to prevent loss of public funds due to fraud, employee error, and misrepresentation by third parties, or imprudent actions of employees. The City Treasurer shall evaluate any audit reports in a timely manner with the Director of Finance.

Investment transactions and holdings shall be verified by the Director of Finance on a monthly basis and reviewed annually by the City's external auditor.

17.0 **Authorized Financial Dealers and Institutions**

The City Treasurer shall transact business only with banks, savings and loans, state and federal credit unions, and securities dealers. The Treasurer shall select and maintain a current list of broker/dealers, as defined by Corporations Code Section 25004, authorized to provide the City investment services. This list of broker/dealers shall be included in the Treasurer's quarterly investment report to the City Council. The broker/dealers shall meet the requirements of Government Code Section 53635.5 and Securities & Exchange Commission Rule 240.15c3-1 (uniform net capital rule). The Treasurer shall keep on file with the City an audited financial statement for each authorized broker/dealer's last complete fiscal year. Each authorized broker/dealer shall execute an acknowledgement that it has read the City's current Investment Policy and that it will abide by the terms and conditions of the Policy. Additionally, each such broker/dealer shall complete the questionnaire attached hereto. City funds shall only be placed in and invested with depositories that meet the requirements of Government Code Sections 53630 et seq.
18.0 Continuing Education

The City of El Segundo recognizes that employees engaged in investment and management of public funds should be provided with continuing education on all aspects of public fund management. At a minimum, the City Treasurer, Deputy Treasurer I and Deputy Treasurer II, should complete, at a minimum, five hours of continuing education in investment management on an annual basis through qualified institutions. Staff engaged in the management and investment process are encouraged to complete more than the minimum amount of continuing education as required in this policy. The Treasurer will include in the quarterly investment report the continuing education hours for the employees listed in this section.
City of El Segundo
Office of the City Treasurer

Date: June 19, 2018
From: Office of the City Treasurer
To: El Segundo City Council
RE: Investment Portfolio Report – As of March 31, 2018

Introduction:

This report will serve as a summary for the City of El Segundo’s Treasury Department investment reporting, compliance, investment environment and future plans; as well as subsidiary schedules which will support the Portfolio Summary and provide additional analysis of our investments.

Investment Summary:

The investments as of March 31, 2018 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security Type</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Market value</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>20,355,328.55</td>
<td>20,146,814.50</td>
<td>22.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corp. Bonds</td>
<td>8,421,450.02</td>
<td>8,266,486.31</td>
<td>9.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPRA's</td>
<td>2,479,183.00</td>
<td>2,467,355.00</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD's</td>
<td>13,429,638.95</td>
<td>13,225,458.30</td>
<td>14.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Bank Trust</td>
<td>44,685,600.52</td>
<td>44,106,114.11</td>
<td>48.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza Bank CBD</td>
<td>5,000,000.00</td>
<td>5,000,000.00</td>
<td>5.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIF Immediate</td>
<td>17,637,207.83</td>
<td>17,637,207.83</td>
<td>19.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIF Sr. Housing</td>
<td>1,106,170.63</td>
<td>1,106,170.63</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIF - LAWA</td>
<td>10,437,590.72</td>
<td>10,437,590.72</td>
<td>11.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIF Subtotal</td>
<td>29,180,969.18</td>
<td>29,180,969.18</td>
<td>31.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Invested</strong></td>
<td><strong>78,866,569.70</strong></td>
<td><strong>78,287,083.29</strong></td>
<td><strong>85.74%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Acct. Cash</td>
<td>684.66</td>
<td>684.66</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase Bank - Cash</td>
<td>13,014,601.82</td>
<td>13,014,601.82</td>
<td>14.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Portfolio</strong></td>
<td><strong>91,881,856.18</strong></td>
<td><strong>91,302,369.77</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The portfolio Breakdown by Short Term (< 1 year) and Long Term is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Long Term</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio Value (Market)</td>
<td>$43,375,910</td>
<td>$34,911,858</td>
<td>$78,287,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Yield</td>
<td>1.452%</td>
<td>1.959%</td>
<td>1.678%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Wtd. Maturity</td>
<td>41 Days</td>
<td>2.60 Years</td>
<td>1.22 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Yield</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
<td>2.39%</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Benchmark value is the Interpolated Treasury Yield to the Portfolio's Avg. Weighted Maturity

The interest income received during the period was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Invested Cost</th>
<th>Interest Received</th>
<th>% Yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>67,670,127</td>
<td>121,252.87</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>70,882,510</td>
<td>59,245.76</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>78,866,570</td>
<td>47,160.45</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg/Total *</td>
<td>72,473,069</td>
<td>227,659.08</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: the monthly fluctuation is because interest on most bonds is paid semi-annually, with LAIF paid quarterly, and some investments paid monthly.

**Compliance:**

It is the intention of the City Treasurer’s office to ensure that our investments are in compliance with the maturity time limits and percentage allocation limits with all of our investments. The City is currently in compliance as demonstrated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partial List of Allowable Investment Instruments for Local Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S Treasury Obligations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Agency Obligations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiable Certificates of Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateralized Bank Deposits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supranational Obligations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Investment Type: Medium Term Notes & Supranationals - As of March 31, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Type</th>
<th>Issuer</th>
<th>Maximum Specified % of Portfolio</th>
<th>Minimum Quality Requirements</th>
<th>Actual S&amp;P Rating</th>
<th>City of El Segundo Investments</th>
<th>In Compliance Y/N</th>
<th>MARKET VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Notes</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; Rating</td>
<td>9.05%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8,266,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Notes</td>
<td>AMERICAN HONDA FINANCE</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; Rating</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>986,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Notes</td>
<td>BANK OF AMERICA</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; Rating</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>492,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Notes</td>
<td>BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; Rating</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>498,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Notes</td>
<td>BARCLAYS BANK PLC</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; Rating</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>494,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Notes</td>
<td>CATERPILLAR FINANCIAL SVCS</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; Rating</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>487,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Notes</td>
<td>CISCO SYSTEMS</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; Rating</td>
<td>AA+</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>496,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Notes</td>
<td>DANAHER CORP</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; Rating</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>496,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Notes</td>
<td>HSBC USA, INC.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; Rating</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>473,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Notes</td>
<td>IBM CORPORATION</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; Rating</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>423,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Notes</td>
<td>NEW YORK LIFE GLOBAL</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; Rating</td>
<td>AA+</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>483,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Notes</td>
<td>ORACLE CORPORATION</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; Rating</td>
<td>AA+</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>482,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Notes</td>
<td>TOYOTA</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; Rating</td>
<td>AA+</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>490,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Notes</td>
<td>US BANK NA</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; Rating</td>
<td>AA+</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>493,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Notes</td>
<td>WALT DISNEY CO</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; Rating</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>489,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Notes</td>
<td>WELLS FARGO &amp; COMPANY</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; Rating</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>977,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supranational Obl.</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>&quot;AAA* Rating</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2,467,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supranational Obl.</td>
<td>IADB-INTER-AMERICAN DEV BANK</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&quot;AAA* Rating</td>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>1.61%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1,468,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supranational Obl.</td>
<td>IBRD-INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR REON &amp; DEV</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&quot;AAA* Rating</td>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>998,985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### City of El Segundo - Treasury Department

**Continuing Education Tracking - As of March 31, 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>YTD Hours</th>
<th>Excess/(Deficit)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy City Treasurer II</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Investment Environment:

During the first quarter of 2018, rates up to five years increased significantly, continuing the trend from the prior quarter. As of April 12th the rates up to five years have increased from where they were at March 31st, most significantly in the 2-5 year range. The FOMC raised the Federal Funds Rate at the March meeting to 1.50-1.75%, and at this time there is a high probability that the Fed may raise rates two to three more times in 2018. The current expectation is for gradual increases, but this could change depending on the current economic data and the new Federal Reserve Chairperson.

The graphs and charts below show some of the key interest rates on items we invest in. As rates are expected to rise over the next few years, we want to time our investments to take advantage of the increases as they occur.
US Treasury Bonds Yield Curve as of 3/31/18

Composite Bond Rates (as of 4/2/18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maturity</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>Yesterday</th>
<th>Last Week</th>
<th>Last Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Month</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Month</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Year</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Year</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Year</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: http://finance.yahoo.com/bonds/composite_bond_rates
Cash Flow Analysis:

The chart below shows the historical cash flow for the last 12 months. We can see that the majority of our funds are received in the second quarter of the fiscal year, January thru March, primarily due to Business License Renewals and the annual Chevron Payment. We also receive Sales and UUT taxes during the first few months of the year as well.

Our investments will be purchased with the liquidity relative to our cash flow needs.

This chart shows the net change in Cash as related to the Cash Flow Analysis above. Some of the larger disbursements occur in the third and fourth quarters of the fiscal year. During Q-3, March to June, we have a significant payment to CalPers for our Other Post-Employment Benefits, and in Q-4, July-September, a payment to ICRMA for our citywide insurance premiums, a large payment to CalPers for the pension Unfunded Accrued Liability, and a large infrastructure payment for roadwork which was completed several years ago. We have added the prior year to highlight the changes that have occurred this year. The first large CalPers payment for the Unfunded Accrued Liability was made in July of 2017 in the amount of $7,019,291.
**Additional Economic Indicators:**

**Economic Projections from September Meeting**

The Economic Indicators presented below are key items that the Federal Reserve will look at in deciding whether or not to change interest rates going forward.

The GDP, or Gross Domestic Product, represents the market value of all goods and services produced by the economy during the period measured, including personal consumption, government purchases, private inventories, paid-in construction costs and the foreign trade balance (exports are added, imports are subtracted). This is a key indicator the Federal Reserve will look at when deciding on interest rate changes. The target level for GDP is in the 2.5% to 3.5% range.

The Unemployment Rate shows the percentage of the labor force that is unemployed but seeking work. The target level for Unemployment is around 5.6%.

The PCE Inflation is the Personal Consumption Expenditures rate of inflation. This index is essentially a measure of goods and services targeted toward individuals and consumed by individuals. The long term inflation target is around 2% per year. Core PCE Inflation excludes items such as food and energy due to the nature of their potential price swings.
### Fed Economic Projections (central tendencies as of March 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Longer run</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in real GDP</td>
<td>2.6 - 3.0</td>
<td>2.2 - 2.6</td>
<td>1.8 - 2.1</td>
<td>1.8 - 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December projection</td>
<td>2.2 - 2.6</td>
<td>1.9 - 2.3</td>
<td>1.7 - 2.0</td>
<td>1.8 - 1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>3.6 - 3.8</td>
<td>3.4 - 3.7</td>
<td>3.5 - 3.8</td>
<td>4.3 - 4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December projection</td>
<td>3.7 - 4.0</td>
<td>3.6 - 4.0</td>
<td>3.6 - 4.2</td>
<td>4.4 - 4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCE inflation</td>
<td>1.8 - 2.0</td>
<td>2.0 - 2.2</td>
<td>2.1 - 2.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December projection</td>
<td>1.7 - 1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0 - 2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core PCE inflation^4</td>
<td>1.8 - 2.0</td>
<td>2.0 - 2.2</td>
<td>2.1 - 2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December projection</td>
<td>1.7 - 1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0 - 2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memo: Projected appropriate policy path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal funds rate</td>
<td>2.1 - 2.4</td>
<td>2.8 - 3.4</td>
<td>3.1 - 3.6</td>
<td>2.8 - 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December projection</td>
<td>1.9 - 2.4</td>
<td>2.4 - 3.1</td>
<td>2.6 - 3.1</td>
<td>2.8 - 3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unemployment**

![Unemployment chart](http://data.bls.gov/cgi-bin/surveymost?bils)

Inflation:

Inflation Rates by Month

Average Inflation Rates by Year

Source: http://www.usinflationcalculator.com/inflation/current-inflation-rates/
Investment Strategy:

It is the City and City Treasurer’s policy to invest funds in accordance with the Investment Policy and to meet all legal requirements regarding the safeguarding of funds.

In the past we maintained a higher cash balance at the bank in order to offset our bank fees since our Earnings Credit rate was higher than the LAIF rate. Now that the LAIF interest rate exceeds our Earnings Credit rate we have lowered our bank balance and invested more short term funds in LAIF. We will now pay bank fees but earn more interest income, and will continue to monitor our cash flow needs in order to determine which investments will maximize return while providing the proper level of liquidity.

The Liquidity Schedule provides an overview of when our current investments are due to mature. We will plan our future investments to coordinate with these maturities in order to ensure a liquidity balance to our portfolio. The Investments by Security Type schedule provides an additional breakdown of how our funds are presently allocated.

The Portfolio Summary for the month is included as an attachment to this report.

Additional Notes:

The City has funds of $1,106,170.63 which belong to the El Segundo Senior Citizens Housing Fund and is now shown as its own LAIF balance. There are also LAWA RSI (Los Angeles World Airports Residential Sound Insulation) funds of
$10,437,590.72 included in the City's LAIF balances. The applicable interest for these accounts is posted quarterly in the same manner as the regular City LAIF interest posting.

In October, 2016 we deposited $5,000,000 into a Collateralized Bank Deposits account at Plaza Bank. This is a special account structure set up for Government funds and backed by a Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco Irrevocable Letter of Credit. The interest rate is above that of LAIF, and the funds, while intended for a 1 year deposit, are available if needed.

The City of El Segundo utilizes the following Brokers/Dealers to conduct investment trades:

- Cantor Fitzgerald & Co.
- CastleOak Securities, L.P.
- Higgins Capital Management, Inc.
- Multi-Bank Securities, Inc.
- Mutual Securities, Inc.
- Vining Sparks IBG, L.P.
- Wells Fargo Securities, LLC
City of El Segundo  
Investment Advisory Committee  
Liquidity Schedule  
As of: March 31, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Par Value</th>
<th>Cumulative Balances</th>
<th>% of Total Assets</th>
<th>% of Total Assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash in Bank</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>13,014,601.82</td>
<td>$13,015,286.48</td>
<td>14.15%</td>
<td>14.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Bank - Trust Account</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>684.66</td>
<td>$13,015,286.48</td>
<td>14.15%</td>
<td>14.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A.I.F. (State of California)</td>
<td>LAIF</td>
<td>$17,637,207.63</td>
<td>$30,652,494.31</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>19.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Immediate</td>
<td>LAIF</td>
<td>$30,652,494.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A.I.F. - Senior Housing Fund</td>
<td>LAIF</td>
<td>1,106,170.63</td>
<td>$31,758,664.94</td>
<td>34.54%</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A.I.F. - LAWA (Restricted)</td>
<td>LAIF</td>
<td>10,437,590.72</td>
<td>$42,196,255.66</td>
<td>45.89%</td>
<td>11.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza Bank CBD</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000,000.00</td>
<td>$47,196,255.66</td>
<td>51.32%</td>
<td>5.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio Investments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30 Days</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>$48,196,255.66</td>
<td>52.41%</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 90 Days</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,245,000.00</td>
<td>$49,441,255.66</td>
<td>53.76%</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 to 180 Days</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,745,000.00</td>
<td>$52,186,255.66</td>
<td>56.75%</td>
<td>2.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181 to 365 Days</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,245,000.00</td>
<td>$56,431,255.66</td>
<td>61.37%</td>
<td>4.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 Years</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,825,000.00</td>
<td>$66,256,255.66</td>
<td>72.05%</td>
<td>10.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3 Years</td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,603,000.00</td>
<td>$79,859,255.66</td>
<td>86.84%</td>
<td>14.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4 Years</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,940,000.00</td>
<td>$87,799,255.66</td>
<td>95.48%</td>
<td>8.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 5 Years</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,160,000.00</td>
<td>$91,959,255.66</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>4.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$61,306,761.35</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$91,959,255.66</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment Portfolio subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$78,044,653.84</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Investments by Maturity Date**

![Investments by Maturity Date Chart]
City of El Segundo  
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Investments by Security Type  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
<th>Cumulative Balances</th>
<th>Cumulative % of Total Assets</th>
<th>Cumulative % of Total Assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash in Bank</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>13,014,601.82</td>
<td>$13,015,286.48</td>
<td>14.26%</td>
<td>14.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Bank - Trust Account</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>684.66</td>
<td>684.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A.I.F. (State of California)</td>
<td>LAIF Immediate</td>
<td>$17,637,207.83</td>
<td>$30,652,494.31</td>
<td>33.57%</td>
<td>19.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cash Immediate</td>
<td>$30,652,494.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A.I.F. - Senior Housing Fund</td>
<td>LAIF Immediate</td>
<td>1,106,170.63</td>
<td>$31,758,664.94</td>
<td>34.78%</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A.I.F. - LAWA (Restricted)</td>
<td>LAIF Immediate</td>
<td>10,437,590.72</td>
<td>$42,196,255.66</td>
<td>46.22%</td>
<td>11.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza Bank CBD</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000,000.00</td>
<td>$47,196,255.66</td>
<td>51.69%</td>
<td>5.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio Investments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD's</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,225,458.30</td>
<td>$60,421,713.96</td>
<td>66.18%</td>
<td>14.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov't Obligations</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,146,814.50</td>
<td>$80,568,528.46</td>
<td>88.24%</td>
<td>22.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPRA's</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,467,355.00</td>
<td>$83,035,883.46</td>
<td>90.95%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,266,486</td>
<td>$91,302,369.77</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>9.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,649,875.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$91,302,369.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Portfolio subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$78,267,787.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INVESTMENTS BY SECURITY TYPE**

- **Bonds**, $8,266,486
- **SUPRA's**, 2,467,355.00
- **Gov't Obligations**, 20,146,814.50
- **CD's**, $13,225,458
- **Plaza Bank CBD**, $5,000,000
- **LAIF Immediate**, $17,637,208
- **LAIF - Senior Housing**, $1,306,371
- **LAIF - LAWA**, $10,437,591
- **Cash Immediate**, $13,015,286
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AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action to form a City Council Subcommittee to work with staff to develop a Social Media Communications Policy for Council Member (Fiscal Impact: None)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1. Discuss development of a Social Media Policy for Council Members to use in seeking public input and providing information to the public on matters of city business through social media.
2. Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

FISCAL IMPACT: $

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

STRATEGIC PLAN:

Goal: 1 Enhance Customer Service and Engagement
Objective:

PREPARED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager
REVIEWED BY: Scot Nicol, Council Member
APPROVED BY:

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:

The methods of communicating with the public have changed significantly with the advent of social media. The City has not developed an approach that facilitates the use of social media by City Council with the public to seek input or provide information. I recommend that the City Council consider the formation of a Subcommittee to work with staff to review the legal and practical issues and report back with a recommendation that would enable these forms of communication.
EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA ITEM STATEMENT

MEETING DATE: June 19, 2018

AGENDA HEADING: Mayor Drew Boyles, Mayor Pro Tem Carol Pirsztuk

AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action to form an ad hoc Committee to advise City Council regarding issues related to the City of El Segundo Aquatic Programs (Fiscal Impact: None)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1. Discuss the formation of an ad hoc committee to advise the City Council on matters related to the City’s Aquatics Programs.
2. Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

FISCAL IMPACT: $

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

STRATEGIC PLAN:

Goal: 1  Enhance Customer Service and Engagement
Objective:

PREPARED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager
REVIEWED BY:
APPROVED BY:

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:

With the upcoming opening of the El Segundo Aquatics Center and the planned renovation of the Plunge, the City is at a critical point in the planning and decision making process in areas related to Aquatics. The City is fortunate to have members of the community who have subject matter expertise along with the desire and ability to assist city staff, the Recreation Parks Commission and the City Council. As members of the Aquatics Subcommittee, Mayor Boyles and Mayor Pro Tem Pirsztuk recommend that the City Council approve the formation of an ad hoc Aquatics Committee and authorize the Aquatics Subcommittee, with staff’s assistance, to determine the roles, responsibilities and membership.