AGENDA
EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
COUNCIL CHAMBERS - 350 Main Street

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

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

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

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

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

REGULAR MEETING OF THE EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
TUESDAY, AUGUST 5, 2008 - 5:00 P.M.

Next Resolution # 4561
Next Ordinance # 1420

5:00 P.M. SESSION

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

PUBLIC COMMUNICATION – (Related to City Business Only – 5 minute limit per person, 30 minute limit total) Individuals who have received value of $50 or more to communicate to the City Council on behalf of another, and employees speaking on behalf of their employer, must so identify themselves prior to addressing the City Council. Failure to do so shall be a misdemeanor and punishable by a fine of $250.
SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS:

None

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(a) –
-2- matter

1. City of El Segundo vs. City of Los Angeles, et. al. LASC No. BS094279
2. Solomon v. City of El Segundo, LASC No. BC 372401

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION
Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to Government Code §54956.9(b): -1- potential case (no further public statement is required at this time); Initiation of litigation pursuant to Government Code §54956.9(c): -1- matter.

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

1. Public Employee Appointment/Public Employment. Title: City Manager

CONFERENCE WITH CITY’S LABOR NEGOTIATOR (Gov’t Code §54957.6): - 2- matters

1. City Negotiators: Interim City Manager Jack Wayt; Human Resources Director Bob Hyland;
Finance Director Deborah Cullen; Richard Kreisler. Employee Organizations: (a) Unrepresented management/confidential employees (City employees who are not members of bargaining units); (b) Unrepresented management employee – City Manager; (c) El Segundo Police Officers’ Association; (d) El Segundo Firefighter’s Association; and (e) El Segundo Police Management Association.

2. City Negotiator: City Attorney – Unrepresented Employee: City Manager

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

SPECIAL MATTERS: - 0- matter
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REGULAR MEETING OF THE EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
TUESDAY, AUGUST 5, 2008 - 7:00 P.M.

Next Resolution # 4561
Next Ordinance # 1420

7:00 P.M. SESSION

CALL TO ORDER

INVOCATION – Pastor Wes Harding, El Segundo Foursquare Church

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – Mayor Pro Tem Eric Busch

3
PRESENTATIONS

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.

A. PROCEDURAL MOTIONS

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

Recommendation – Approval.

B. SPECIAL ORDERS OF BUSINESS (PUBLIC HEARING)

1. Consideration and possible action to open a Public Hearing and adopt Resolution finding the City to be in conformance with the annual Congestion Management Program (CMP) and adopting the annual CMP Local Development Report, in accordance with California Government Code Section 65089.

Recommendation – (1) Open Public Hearing; (2) Discussion; (3) Adopt Resolution; and (4) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

2. Consideration and possible action to award a Standard Public Works Contract to Armand Gonzales Inc. dba Gonzales Construction for construction of a Fire Station at 2261 East Mariposa Avenue. Approved Capital Improvement Program. Project No.: PW 08-06 (Fiscal Impact: $7,206,298.00)

Recommendation – (1) Waive a minor irregularity in the bid received from Armand Gonzales, Inc. dba Gonzales Construction and Reject the bid protest received from bidder Griffith Company; (2) Add the following options to the contract for a total of $684,283: (a) 8” concrete precast band ($52,034), (b) brick veneer ($55,940), (c) built in desk, nightstand and bed frames ($67,000), (d) ceiling tile above showers ($1,000), (e) gypsum board ceilings ($10,000), (f) epoxy flooring ($5,000), (g) photovoltaic collector panels ($355,000), (h) seismic early warning system ($37,450), (i) precast concrete caps ($21,400), (j) day tank for generator ($4,000), (k) 8” vehicular concrete paving ($50,459), (l) Plymovent vehicle exhaust system ($25,000); (3) Authorize the City Manager to execute a Standard Public Works Contract in a form approved by the City Attorney with Gonzales Construction, Inc for $6,211,443 (Base Bid) plus $684,283 (Options), for a total of $6,895,726; (4) Authorize a construction contingency in the amount of $310,572 for unforeseen additional work; (5) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.
3. Consideration and possible action to introduce and waive first reading of an Ordinance amending the El Segundo Municipal Code’s regulation of filming within the City of El Segundo.

Recommendation – (1) Receive report from the filming ad hoc subcommittee; (2) Introduce and waive first reading of draft Ordinance; (3) Schedule second reading and adoption of an Ordinance for August 19, 2008; (4) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

D. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS AND BOARDS

4. Consideration and possible action to receive and file the Annual Report of the Capital Improvement Program Advisory Committee (CIPAC). Oral presentation will be made by CIPAC Chairman Mr. Jason Aro. (Fiscal Impact: None)

Recommendation – (1) Receive and file the Annual Report of CIPAC; (2) Receive the oral presentation; (3) Alternatively, discuss and take other 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.

5. Warrant Numbers 2566585 to 2566837 on Register No. 20 in the total amount of $2,508,937.28 and Wire Transfers from 7/4/2008 through 7/24/2008 in the total amount of $1,987,225.72.

Recommendation – Approve Warrant Demand Registers 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 – Approval.

7. Consideration and possible action to retain Bob Murray & Associates to conduct an Executive Search for the position of City Manager. (Fiscal Impact: Not to Exceed $25,000)

Recommendation – (1) Authorize the City Manager to execute a Professional Services Agreement, in a form approved by the City Attorney, with Bob Murray & Associates in an amount not to exceed $25,000; and (2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.
8. Consideration and possible action regarding adoption of a Resolution authorizing the establishment of a Public Agency Retirement System (PARS) Supplemental Retirement Plan for eligible members of the El Segundo Supervisory and Professional Employees Bargaining Unit, to be administered by Phase II Systems, PARS Trust Administrator.
Recommendation – (1) Adopt the Resolution; and (2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

9. Consideration and possible action regarding the approval of the examination plans for the Personnel Merit System job classifications of Street Maintenance Supervisor.
(Fiscal Impact: None)
Recommendation – (1) Approve the examination plans; and (2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

10. Consideration and possible action to waive the formal bidding process pursuant to the El Segundo Municipal Code §1-7-10 and authorize the Fire Department to purchase a replacement paramedic rescue ambulance manufactured by Emergency Vehicle Group, Inc. on a sole source basis. (Fiscal Impact: $203,455)
Recommendation – (1) Pursuant to El Segundo Municipal Code §1-7-10, waive the bidding process and authorize the Fire Department to purchase a replacement paramedic rescue ambulance manufactured by Emergency Vehicle Group, Inc.; 2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

11. Consideration and possible action regarding the adoption of a Conflict of Interest Code required by The Political Reform Act (Government Code Section 81000 et. seq.) rescinding Resolution No. 4448 and adopting a new resolution approving a new Conflict of Interest Code.
Recommendation – (1) Adopt Resolution; and (2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

12. Consideration and possible action regarding a new Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) license for on-site sale and on-site consumption of alcohol (Type 47 - On-Sale Beer, Wine and Distilled Spirits) at a new restaurant located at 2361 Rosecrans Avenue, EA No. 792 and AUP No. 08-02. Applicant: Continental Development Corporation – Alex J. Rose (Fiscal Impact: None).
Recommendation – (1) Receive and file a determination that the Cit Council does not object to issuance of a new Type 47 ABC license at 2361 Rosecrans Avenue; and (2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.
13. Consideration and possible action for second reading and adoption of an Ordinance for: (1) the rezoning of approximately 4.25 acres of property at 1700 E. Grand Avenue from Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone to the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Zone; (2) an amendment to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan to further limit permitted uses with the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Zone for the property at 1700 E. Grand Avenue, to general Office and Medical-Dental Office uses only, and; (3) technical changes to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan (SHSP) relating to the environmental review requirements to make the SHSP consistent with the law (CEQA). Applicant: Mar Canyon Grand, LLC. (Fiscal Impact: None)

Recommendation – (1) Waive second reading and adopt Ordinance No. 1419 for Zone Change No. 07-01 and Specific Plan Amendment No. 08-02 for the “MEPS” Project site rezoning to Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Zone with limited uses pursuant to the SHSP; and (2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

14. Consideration and possible action to approve a purchase order to Oldcastle Precast for utility pull boxes that will serve as junction points for the City’s fiber optic cable installation project. (Fiscal Impact: $15,285.00).

Recommendation – (1) Authorize the Purchasing Agent to issue a purchase order to Oldcastle Precast for the amount of $15,285.00; and (2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

15. Consideration and possible action regarding adoption of plans and specifications for the slurry sealing of the streets in the area bounded by Sheldon Street, Mariposa and Imperial Avenues and the west City Limits. Project No.: PW 08-09. (Fiscal Impact: $169,905)

Recommendation – (1) Adopt plans and specifications; (2) Authorize staff to advertise the project for receipt of construction bids; (3) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

16. Consideration and possible action regarding acceptance of the project for the Replacement of the windows at the Urho Saari Swim Stadium (plunge), located at 219 W. Mariposa Avenue. (Fiscal Impact: $68,680.00)

Recommendation – (1) Accept all work under this contract as complete; (2) Authorize the City Clerk to file a Notice of Completion in the County Recorder’s Office; and (3) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.
17. Consideration and possible action to authorize staff to solicit bids for the installation of risers on the Stevenson Field Bleachers in El Segundo's Recreation Park at 339 Sheldon Street. Approved Capital Improvement Program Project No. PW 08-07. (Fiscal Impact: $26,000 General Fund)

Recommendation – (1) Authorize staff to solicit bids for the installation of risers on the Stevenson Field Bleachers; and (2) Alternatively discuss and take other action related to this item.

18. Consideration and possible action regarding approval as per municipal code §1-7-12 for emergency purchases for the leasing of two passenger buses from Nations Bus Corporation to be used for City shuttle service programs until City-owned shuttle buses can be repaired. (Fiscal Impact: $11,158)

Recommendation – (1) As per municipal code § 1-7-12 regarding emergency purchases, approve use of Nations Bus Corporation and the funds needed to lease shuttle buses to be used for current City shuttle service programs until existing City-owned vehicles are repaired; and (2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

19. Consideration and possible action regarding the purchase of a computerized bar code evidence management system and desktop computer for tracking evidence and property in the police department's property room. (Net Fiscal Impact to City $17,500.00 from Police Department's Asset Forfeiture Account)

Recommendation – (1) Approve the purchase of a computerized bar code evidence management system for use in the police department's property room; and (2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

20. Consideration and possible action to pay $250,000.00 to Radio Communications Association in accordance with a fee sharing arrangement relating to the sale of City radio frequency rights. (Net Fiscal Impact to City - $250,000 from Police Department's Asset Forfeiture account.)

Recommendation – (1) Approve paying $250,000 to Radio Communications Association; and (2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

21. Consideration and possible action regarding final acceptance of construction related to the City's Residential Sound Insulation Program Group 20 (21 Homes). Project No. RSI 07-02. (Final contract total = $1,288,700).

Recommendation – (1) Accept the work as complete; (2) Authorize the City Clerk to file the City Planning and Building Safety Director's Notices of Completion in the County Recorder's Office; and (3) Alternatively discuss and take other action related to this item.

CALL ITEMS FROM CONSENT AGENDA
F. NEW BUSINESS

G. REPORTS – CITY MANAGER

H. REPORTS – CITY ATTORNEY

I. REPORTS – CITY CLERK

J. REPORTS – CITY TREASURER

K. REPORTS – CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

Council Member Brann –

Council Member Fisher –

Council Member Jacobson –

Mayor Pro Tem Busch –

Mayor McDowell –
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.

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: July 30, 2008

TIME: 10:40 a.m.

NAME: [Signature]
Consideration and possible action to open a Public Hearing and adopt Resolution finding the City to be in conformance with the annual Congestion Management Program (CMP) and adopting the annual CMP Local Development Report, in accordance with California Government Code Section 65089.

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1. Open Public Hearing;
2. Discussion;
3. Adopt Resolution; and/or
4. Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:

The Congestion Management Program (CMP) became effective with voter approval of Proposition 111 in June 1990. The CMP is a tool to facilitate coordination between transportation and land use decisions. It requires agencies to weigh the impacts of traffic generated by developments and requires the mitigation of additional congestion. In accordance with State law, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) has adopted the CMP for Los Angeles County. Cities within the County are required to comply with the adopted CMP or risk the loss of Gas Tax revenues received pursuant to (Continued on the next page)

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

1. Resolution for adoption.

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

Capital Improvement Program: N/A
Amount Requested: N/A
Account Number: N/A
Project Phase: N/A
Appropriation Required: N/A

ORIGINATED BY:  DATE: 7-29-08

Gary Chicots, Director of Planning and Building Safety

REVIEWED BY:  DATE: 7-30-08

Jack Wayt, Interim City Manager
Proposition III.

The MTA requires that by September 1st of each year, local agencies submit a self-certification Resolution and a Local Development Report pursuant to a noticed public hearing as required by State law.

The self-certification Resolution consists of the following:

1. A finding that the City is in conformance with the CMP.

2. Certification that the City will continue to implement the Transportation Demand Management Ordinance. (ESMC Chapter 15-16).

3. Certification that the City will continue to implement a Land Use Analysis Program. (City Council Resolution No. 3805).


In previous years, the CMP required the City to calculate the total debits and credits accruing from building and demolition permits and transportation improvement strategies and to maintain a positive credit balance. The City's credit balance as of May 31, 2003 was 6,642. On February 18, 2004, MTA suspended the requirement that cities maintain a positive credit balance and suspended the requirement to calculate credits and debits resulting from construction activity and transportation improvements strategies while it prepares a nexus study to explore the feasibility of implementing a congestion mitigation fee to meet CMP Deficiency Plan requirements. The City's current credit balance remains frozen until MTA completes its study.

This year the City is only required to report the number of dwelling units permitted and the floor area of new non-residential buildings and demolitions. The attached Local Development Report summarized the development activity for the June 1, 2007 to May 31, 2008 reporting year.
RESOLUTION NO. ____

A RESOLUTION FINDING THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA TO BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE 2004 CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM AND ADOPTING THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT REPORT PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE § 65089.

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

SECTION 1: The City Council finds that:

A. The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Authority ("MTA"), acting as the Congestion Management Agency for Los Angeles County, adopted the 2004 Congestion Management Program ("CMP") on July 22, 2004;

B. As adopted, the CMP requires that MTA annually determine that Los Angeles County and cities within the County conform with all CMP requirements;

C. Among other things, the CMP requires municipalities within Los Angeles County to submit Local Development Reports to the MTA by September 1 of each year;

D. The City Council held a noticed public hearing on August 5, 2008 during which it considered the evidence presented by staff and the public regarding how the City has implemented measures designed to mitigate the impacts of traffic congestion resulting from new development;

E. Based upon the August 5, 2008 public hearing, the City Council determined that:

1. By June 15 of odd-numbered years the City conducts annual traffic counts and calculated levels of service for selected arterial intersections consistent with the requirements identified in the CMP Highway and Roadway System Chapter;

2. The City adopted and continues to implement a transportation demand management ordinance consistent with the minimum requirements identified in the CMP Transportation Demand Management Chapter;
3. The City adopted and continues to implement a land use analysis program consistent with the minimum requirements identified in the CMP Land Use Analysis Program Chapter; and

4. The City adopted a Local Development Report, which is attached as Exhibit "A," and incorporated by reference, consistent with the requirements identified in the 2004 CMP. This report balances traffic congestion impacts due to growth within the City with transportation improvements, and demonstrates that the City meets its responsibilities under the County-wide Deficiency Plan consistent with the MTA Board adopted 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan.

SECTION 2: In accordance with its findings, the City Council determines that the City of El Segundo is in compliance with all requirements of the CMP, adopted by the Metro Board on July 22, 2004.
SECTION 3: This Resolution will remain effective until superseded by a subsequent resolution.

SECTION 4: This Resolution will take effect immediately upon adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 5th day of August, 2008.

______________________________
Kelly McDowell, Mayor
City of El Segundo

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

By: _____________________________
Karl H. Berger, Assistant City Attorney

ATTEST:

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

I, Cindy Mortesen, 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 of said City, and attested to by the City Clerk of said City, all at a regular meeting of said Council held on the 5th day of August 2008, and the same was so passed and adopted by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

______________________________
Cindy Mortesen, City Clerk

P:\Planning & Building Safety\CMP\CMP 07-08\2008-08-05.CMP resolution.doc
City of El Segundo
2008 CMP Local Development Report
Reporting Period: JUNE 1, 2007 - MAY 31, 2008

Contact: Kimberly Christensen, AICP, Planning Manager
Phone Number: (310) 524-2340

CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY

2008 DEFICIENCY PLAN SUMMARY

* IMPORTANT: All "#value!" cells on this page are automatically calculated.
Please do not enter data in these cells.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT TOTALS</th>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Quarters</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY</th>
<th>1,000 Net Sq.Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (less than 300,000 sq.ft.)</td>
<td>9.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (300,000 sq.ft. or more)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freestanding Eating &amp; Drinking</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NON-RETAIL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY</th>
<th>1,000 Net Sq.Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (less than 50,000 sq.ft.)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (50,000-299,999 sq.ft.)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (300,000 sq.ft. or more)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional/Educational</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University (# of students)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY</th>
<th>Daily Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTER IF APPLICABLE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTER IF APPLICABLE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| EXEMPTED DEVELOPMENT TOTALS | |
|----------------------------||
| Exempted Dwelling Units | 0 |
| Exempted Non-residential sq. ft. (in 1,000s) | 0 |

1. Note: Please change dates on this form for later years.
2. Net square feet is the difference between new development and adjustments entered on pages 2 and 3.
## City of El Segundo

**2008 CMP Local Development Report**

**Reporting Period:** JUNE 1, 2007 - MAY 31, 2008

Enter data for all cells labeled "Enter." If there are no data for that category, enter "0."

### PART 1: NEW DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY

#### RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Quarters</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1,000 Gross Square Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (less than 300,000 sq.ft.)</td>
<td>9.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (300,000 sq.ft. or more)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freestanding Eating &amp; Drinking</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### NON-RETAIL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1,000 Gross Square Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (less than 50,000 sq.ft.)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (50,000-299,999 sq.ft.)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (300,000 sq.ft. or more)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional/Educational</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University (# of students)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Daily Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Attach additional sheets if necessary)</td>
<td>(Enter &quot;0&quot; if none)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENTER IF APPLICABLE

ENTER IF APPLICABLE

---

*Section I, Page 2*
## PART 2: NEW DEVELOPMENT ADJUSTMENTS

IMPORTANT: Adjustments may be claimed only for 1) development permits that were both issued and revoked, expired or withdrawn during the reporting period, and 2) demolition of any structure with the reporting period.

### RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADJUSTMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Quarters</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1,000 Gross Square Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (less than 300,000 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (300,000 sq. ft. or more)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freestanding Eating &amp; Drinking</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NON-RETAIL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1,000 Gross Square Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (less than 50,000 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (50,000-299,999 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (300,000 sq. ft. or more)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional/Educational</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University (# of students)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Daily Trips</th>
<th>(Enter &quot;0&quot; if none)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Attach additional sheets if necessary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CITY OF EL SEGUNDO

**2008 CMP Local Development Report**  
**Reporting Period: JUNE 1, 2007 - MAY 31, 2008**

Enter data for all cells labeled "Enter." If there are no data for that category, enter "0."

### PART 3: EXEMPTED DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY

(NOT INCLUDED IN NEW DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY TOTALS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low/Very Low Income Housing</td>
<td>0 Dwelling Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential Near Rail Stations</td>
<td>0 Dwelling Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use Developments Near Rail Stations</td>
<td>0 1,000 Gross Square Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Agreements Entered into Prior to July 10, 1989</td>
<td>0 1,000 Gross Square Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction of Buildings Damaged in April 1992 Civil Unrest</td>
<td>0 Dwelling Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction of Buildings Damaged in Jan. 1994 Earthquake</td>
<td>0 1,000 Gross Square Feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Dwelling Units                                                     | 0           |
| Total Non-residential sq. ft. (in 1,000s)                                | 0           |

### Exempted Development Definitions:

1. **Low/Very Low Income Housing**: As defined by the California Department of Housing and Community Development as follows:
   - Low-Income: equal to or less than 80% of the County median income, with adjustments for family size.
   - Very Low-Income: equal to or less than 50% of the County median income, with adjustments for family size.

2. **High Density Residential Near Rail Stations**: Development located within 1/4 mile of a fixed rail passenger station and that is equal to or greater than 120 percent of the maximum residential density allowed under the local general plan and zoning ordinance. A project providing a minimum of 75 dwelling units per acre is automatically considered high density.

3. **Mixed Uses Near Rail Stations**: Mixed-use development located within 1/4 mile of a fixed rail passenger station, if more than half of the land area, or floor area, of the mixed use development is used for high density residential housing.

4. **Development Agreements**: Projects that entered into a development agreement (as specified under Section 65964 of the California Government Code) with a local jurisdiction prior to July 10, 1989.

5. **Reconstruction or replacement of any residential or non-residential structure which is damaged or destroyed, to the extent of > or = to 50% of its reasonable value, by fire, flood, earthquake or other similar calamity.**

6. **Any project of a federal, state or county agency that is exempt from local jurisdiction zoning regulations and where the local jurisdiction is precluded from exercising any approval/disapproval authority. These locally precluded projects do not have to be reported in the LDR.**
### 2008 Deficiency Plan Status Summary

1. **Total Current Congestion Mitigation Goal**
   - [from Section I] ..............
   - **-244**

2. **Transportation Improvements Credit Claims**
   - [from Section II] ..............
   - **0**

**Subtotal Current Credit (Goal)** ..............
- **-244**

3. **Carryover Credit from Last Year's (1999)**
   - Local Implementation Report ..............
   - **2,017**

**Net Deficiency Plan Credit Balance** ..............
- **1,773**

### SECTION I - New Development Activity Report

#### Part 1: New Development Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY</th>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Debit Value</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Quarters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (less than 300,000 sq.ft.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (300,000 sq.ft. or more)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freestanding Eating &amp; Drinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NON-RETAIL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (less than 50,000 sq.ft.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (50,000-299,999 sq.ft.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (300,000 sq.ft. or more)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional/Educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description (Attach additional sheets if necessary)</td>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTER IF APPLICABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal New Development Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments (Optional) - Complete Part 2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Congestion Mitigation Goal (Points)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SECTION I - NEW DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY REPORT (Continued)

### PART 2: NEW DEVELOPMENT ADJUSTMENTS

**IMPORTANT:** Adjustments may be claimed only for:
1. Development permits that were both issued and revoked, expired or withdrawn during the reporting period, and
2. Demolition of any structure within the reporting period.

### RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADJUSTMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Adjustment Value</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>34.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>33.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Quarters</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1000 Gross Square Feet</th>
<th>Adjustment Value</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (less than 300,000 sq.ft.)</td>
<td>22.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (300,000 sq.ft. or more)</td>
<td>17.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freestanding Eating &amp; Drinking</td>
<td>65.98</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NON-RETAIL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1000 Gross Square Feet</th>
<th>Adjustment Value</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (less than 50,000 sq.ft.)</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>47.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (50,000-299,999 sq.ft.)</td>
<td>16.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (300,000 sq.ft. or more)</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>15.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional/Educational</td>
<td>20.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER DEVELOPMENT ADJUSTMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Impact Value</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low/Wvery Low Income Housing</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential near Rail Stations</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use Developments near Rail Stations</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1000 Gross Square Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Agreements entered into Prior to July 10, 1989</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction of Buildings damaged in April 1992 Civil Unrest</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1000 Gross Square Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction of Buildings damaged in Jan 1984 Earthquake</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1000 Gross Square Feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Mitigation Goal Adjustments (Points):**

114.44

### PART 3: EXEMPTED DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY

(Not included in new development activity totals)

- Low/Wvery Low Income Housing: 0.00
- High Density Residential near Rail Stations: 0.00
- Mixed Use Developments near Rail Stations: 0.00
- Development Agreements entered into Prior to July 10, 1989: 0.00
- Reconstruction of Buildings damaged in April 1992 Civil Unrest: 0.00
- Reconstruction of Buildings damaged in Jan 1984 Earthquake: 0.00

**Exempted Development Definitions:**

- Low/Wvery Low Income Housing: Includes units intended for low and very low income households.
- High Density Residential near Rail Stations: Developments with high density units located near rail stations.
- Mixed Use Developments near Rail Stations: Developments that include multiple uses and are located near rail stations.
Consideration and possible action to award a Standard Public Works Contract to Armand Gonzales Inc. dba Gonzales Construction for construction of a Fire Station at 2261 East Mariposa Avenue. Approved Capital Improvement Program. Project No.: PW 08-06 (Fiscal Impact: $7,206,298.00)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

(1) Waive a minor irregularity in the bid received from Armand Gonzales, Inc. dba Gonzales Construction and Reject the bid protest received from bidder Griffith Company;

(2) Add the following options to the contract for a total of $684,283: (a) 8" concrete precast band ($52,034) (b) brick veneer ($55,940) (c) built in desk, nightstand and bed frames ($67,000) (d) ceiling tile above showers ($1,000) (e) gypsum board ceilings ($10,000) (f) epoxy flooring ($5,000) (g) photovoltaic collector panels ($35,000) (h) seismic early warning system ($37,450) (i) precast concrete caps ($21,400) (j) day tank for generator ($4,000) (k) 8" vehicular concrete paving ($50,459) (l) Plymovent vehicle exhaust system ($25,000);

(3) Authorize the City Manager to execute a Standard Public Works Contract in a form approved by the City Attorney with Gonzales Construction, Inc for $6,211,443 (Base Bid) plus $684,283 (Options), for a total of $6,895,726;

(4) Authorize a construction contingency in the amount of $310,572 for unforeseen additional work;

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

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:

(Background and discussion continued on the next page........)

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

FISCAL IMPACT: $7,206,298.00

Capital Improvement Program: $7,750,000 (Public Safety)
Amount Requested: $7,206,298.00
Account Number: 301-400-8201-8999
Project Phase: Award of Construction Contract
Appropriation Required: No

ORIGINATED BY: Stephanie Katsouleas, Public Works Director
DATE: 7/30/08

REVIEWED BY: Jack Wayt, Interim City Manager
DATE: 7/30/08
BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION: (continued)

On May 6, 2008, City Council adopted the plans and specifications for construction of a Fire Station to replace the existing Fire Station No. 2 and authorized staff to advertise the project for competitive bids.

The “Notice of Inviting Bids” specified that the successful contractor would be selected based upon the Base Bid amount. Contractors responding to the bid notice were also asked to provide prices for several options. On June 24, 2008, the City Clerk office received eighteen (18) bids. Three Bids were received after the 11:00 a.m. submittal deadline and were returned to the bidders unopened. The following fifteen (15) Base Bids were opened:

1. Gonzales Construction, Inc. $6,211,443.00
2. Griffith Company $7,036,950.00
3. FEI Enterprises, Inc. $7,189,735.00
4. G-2000 Construction, Inc. $7,228,000.00
5. Harbor Construction, Inc. $7,273,000.00
6. Robert Clapper Construction Services, Inc. $7,273,000.00
7. Chegini Enterprises, Inc. $7,495,000.00
8. Tower General Contractors $7,641,000.00
9. Woodcliff Corporation $7,800,000.00
10. TG Construction, Inc. $7,864,921.00
11. Moment Construction, Inc. $7,864,921.00
12. GC Builders, Inc. $7,915,500.00
13. SAIFCO Construction Company $8,200,000.00
14. Morrissey Construction Co., Inc. Incomplete
15. SBS Corporation Incomplete

The total budget allocated for this construction project was $7,750,000. Following the bid opening, the apparent lowest bidder was Gonzales Construction, Inc., whose Base Bid plus options and construction contingencies was $7,206,297.

A review of projects completed by Gonzales Construction, Inc., indicates that they have done extensive work very similar to the work anticipated for the construction of the new fire station. References contacted indicated that this firm was competent and cooperative during construction of various projects. The firm’s contractor license is current and it has the financial capability to undertake this project.

After the bid opening, the second lowest bidder, Griffith Company, protested that Gonzales Construction’s bid submitted included only one original copy submittal, where the Notice of Inviting Bids stated “bidders are required to submit one (1) original set and one (1) copy of the proposal forms.” The City Attorney’s Office characterizes this as a minor irregularity that can be waived by City Council.

Staff recommends that the City Council award the Fire Station construction project to Gonzales Construction, Inc.
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action to introduce and waive first reading of an Ordinance amending the El Segundo Municipal Code’s regulation of filming within the City of El Segundo.

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

(1) Receive report from the filming ad hoc subcommittee; (2) Introduce and waive first reading of draft Ordinance; (3) Schedule second reading and adoption of an Ordinance for August 19, 2008; (4) Alternatively, take such additional, related, action that may be desirable.

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:

On October 17, 2006, the City Council appointed Mayor McDowell and Councilmember Fisher to an ad hoc subcommittee to discuss the City’s film permit processing and current ordinance. The subcommittee was formed in response to filming concerns reported by residents including street closures and parking. The Film Permit Subcommittee met several times during 2007 and made numerous proposed changes to the existing regulations based upon public input. Those changes are reflected in the attached draft ordinance.

(Background and Discussion continued on the next page)

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

Draft Ordinance amending Title 4, section 11 in its entirety.

FISCAL IMPACT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Budget:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount Requested:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Number:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Phase:</td>
<td>First reading of Ordinance to amend in its entirety Municipal Code Title 4, Chapter 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation Required:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORIGINATED BY:  

Steve Jones, Business Services Manager

DATE:  7-30-08

REVIEWED BY:  

Jack Wayt, Interim City Manager

DATE:  7-30-08
Major Subcommittee Changes

- Creating an "impact zone" within a 300 foot radius around a filming site. The impact zone is presumed to be affected by filming and activities ancillary to filming. A completed application must be filed at least three (3) business days before the filming date for low impact filming (limited use of public right of way in a non-residential area, or little or no vehicle traffic, or does not include lighting, noise, or special effects), five (5) business days before for filming involving stunts or traffic control, or ten (10) business days before for filming involving closure of public streets or rights-of-way.

- Setting a maximum number of days allowed at the same filming site of twenty (20) days within the preceding twelve (12) month period. This number can be increased to twenty four (24) days if the permittee obtains 100% neighbor consent.

- Surrounding neighbors may protest a film permit. The protests are calculated based upon one protest per address within an impact zone(s), and must be received at least two (2) business days before filming. Various scenarios are described stating why a film permit cannot be issued. The proposed ordinance assumes 100% neighbor approval if there are no protests. Protests can be filed for all filming within an impact zone and expire at the end of each calendar year.

- Regulations are proposed to restrict the following: filming cannot commence before 7:00 a.m. unless it is outside an impact zone(s); the permit must be in possession of the permittee at all times while filming; permittee must conduct operation in an orderly fashion and area must be clean before leaving filming site; vehicle parking must be in accordance with city administrator’s directions; all camera cars must have a police escort; all filming and ancillary activities must cease by 10:00 p.m., unless the filming has no impact; permittees must protect any neighbors within an impact zone from glare caused by lighting; and production companies must have written consent to place equipment or vehicles on private property.

There are additional changes that were added to the draft Ordinance to make it conform with existing legal requirements and to facilitate the administration of film permits. These are shown in the redlined copy of the ordinance which compares the existing ESMC regulations with the proposed ordinance. As you will see, most of these changes are technical changes which do not substantively affect the manner in which film permits are currently issued and administered. A matrix showing the benefits of the proposed changes is attached.
# Proposed Changes to Filming Policies and Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student filming requires letter from the school identifying the student as working on a school project along with required insurance certificates.</td>
<td>The new ordinance does not apply to Independent Student Media Film Class activities.</td>
<td>This change will eliminate the film permit process for student filming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% signature approval required from owners or tenants affected by filming; 100% signature approval required for any street closures.</td>
<td>50% or less protest received from neighbors required within a low impact filming zone; 10% or less protests received from neighbors required within the impact zone for all other filming sites; 0% protests received from neighbors for street closures.</td>
<td>This eliminates the need to disrupt neighbors for signature approval; expedites the approval process; reduces approval requirement for low impact zones by 40%; reduces all other filming other than street closures from 90% yes to greater than 10% no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All residents and merchants must receive notification of filming on film company letterhead at least 72 hours prior to filming.</td>
<td>All neighbors within the impact zone must receive notification not less than five working days prior to filming to allow a 48 hour response time from neighbors.</td>
<td>This allows enough lead time for the impact zone(s) to protest a filming project prior to filming. Only requires notification without obtaining signatures. The only signature(s) required would be for permission to use private property.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ORDINANCE NO. ____

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING EL SEGUNDO CHAPTER 4-11 IN ITS ENTIRETY TO REGULATE MOTION PICTURE, RADIO AND TELEVISION PRODUCTION WITHIN THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO.

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

SECTION 1: ESMC Chapter 4-11 is amended in its entirety to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 11
MOTION PICTURE, RADIO AND TELEVISION PRODUCTION REGULATIONS

4-11-1: PURPOSE
4-11-2: DEFINITIONS
4-11-3: PERMIT REQUIRED; EXEMPTIONS
4-11-4: ADDITIONAL AGREEMENTS
4-11-5: ADMINISTRATION
4-11-6: APPLICATION FOR PERMIT; CONTENTS; ISSUANCE
4-11-7: APPLICATION AND PERMIT FEES
4-11-8: DIRECT OVERHEAD EXPENSES
4-11-9: CASH DEPOSIT FOR FEES AND SECURITY DEPOSIT
4-11-10: SECURITY DEPOSIT RETENTION; APPEAL
4-11-11: REVIEW BY CITY OFFICERS
4-11-12: TIME REQUIREMENTS
4-11-13: ACTION ON PERMIT APPLICATION – PERMIT ISSUANCE
4-11-14: ACTION ON PERMIT APPLICATION – PERMIT DENIAL
4-11-15: ALTERNATIVE TIME, PLACE, OR MANNER
4-11-16: ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
4-11-17: MAXIMUM NUMBER OF FILMING DAYS ALLOWED
4-11-18: INDEMNIFICATION AGREEMENT
4-11-19: GENERAL PERMIT CONDITIONS – LIABILITY INSURANCE
4-11-20: NOTICE TO RESIDENCES AND BUSINESSES – GENERALLY
4-11-21: IMPACT ZONE PROTESTS
4-11-22: GENERAL PERMIT CONDITIONS – SPECIAL EFFECTS; FIRE PERMIT
4-11-23: GENERAL PERMIT CONDITIONS – ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS
4-11-24: SUBSEQUENT CONDITIONS
4-11-25: EMERGENCY SUSPENSION OF FILMING
4-11-26: LAND USE AND PARKING REGULATIONS INAPPLICABLE
4-11-27: CORDONING OFF THE ROUTE OR FILMING SITE
4-11-28: PUBLIC CONDUCT DURING FILMING
4-11-29: PROHIBITIONS"
4-11-30: MISREPRESENTATION
4-11-31: PERMIT MODIFICATION
4-11-32: PROCEDURE FOR REVOCATION OR SUSPENSION OF PERMIT
4-11-33: APPEALS TO THE CITY COUNCIL
4-11-34: EXPEDITED REVIEW

4-11-1: PURPOSE:

This Chapter is adopted pursuant to the City's police powers for the purpose of establishing a permit system to regulate motion picture and television production in the City of El Segundo. Application of this Chapter is intended to protect community health, safety, welfare, and property rights by ensuring that motion picture and television production within the City has minimal impact upon businesses and residents.

4-11-2: 4-11-1: DEFINITIONS:

For the purpose of this chapter, certain words and phrases shall be construed herein as set forth in this section, unless it is apparent from the context that a different meaning is intended: Unless the contrary is stated or clearly appears from the context, the following definitions govern the construction of words and phrases used in this chapter:

"Administrator" means the city manager or designee.

"Applicant" means a person seeking a filming permit pursuant to this chapter.

"Current news" means regularly scheduled news programs (excluding documentary programs) and special news programs which are not preplanned and are broadcast within seventy-two (72) hours after filming.

MOTION PICTURE, RADIO OR TELEVISION PRODUCTIONS: Includes "Filming" includes all activity attendant to staging or shooting commercial motion pictures, television shows or programs, and commercially prepared radio broadcasts. Filming also includes any noncommercial filming that obstructs, delays, disrupts, or otherwise interferes with the ordinary use of city streets, parking facilities, sidewalks or other public rights-of-way, including, without limitation, on-street parking and vehicle traffic within neighborhoods.

"Filming site" means the location designated by a valid permit issued pursuant to this chapter for filming and all ancillary uses including, without limitation, catering, storage, and parking.
“Impact zone” means the area within a 300 foot radius surrounding a filming site which is presumed to be affected by filming and activities ancillary to filming.

“Low Impact Filming” means filming where (a) the filming site involves limited use of the public right of way, is in non-residential areas, or experiences little or no vehicle traffic; or (b) the filming does not include lighting, noise, or special effects.

“Neighbors” means persons residing at residential dwelling units, including all residents in multi-tenant buildings, or operating at business addresses within an impact zone.

“No impact filming” means filming that occurs pursuant to the terms of a valid permit where light, sound, smell, or vibrations resulting from the filming, or activities ancillary to filming, does not interfere with neighbors’ comfortable enjoyment of life or property.

“Permittee” means any natural person, entity, or combinations thereof possessing a film permit issued by the city pursuant to this chapter.

STILL PHOTOGRAPHY: Means “Still Photography” means and includes all activity attendant to staging or shooting commercial still photographs.

4-11-3: PERMIT REQUIRED; EXEMPTIONS:

A. Permit Required: No person shall use, except as otherwise provided, it is unlawful for any person to engage in, conduct, or carry on filming or commercial still photography on any public or private property, facility, or residence for the purpose of taking commercial motion pictures or television pictures or commercial still photography or for the purpose of any radio broadcast or telecast without first applying for and receiving a permit therefor from the licensing authority without a valid permit issued pursuant to this chapter.

B. A permit is not deemed issued until the administrator receives the applicant’s written acceptance in accordance with this chapter.

C. Exemptions:

1. Current News: The provisions of this chapter shall not apply to or affect reporters, photographers, or cameramen in the employ of a newspaper, news service, radio broadcasting station, or similar entity engaged in on-the-spot broadcasting of current news events concerning
those persons, scenes, or occurrences which are in the news and of general public interest.

2. Studios: The provisions of this chapter shall not apply to or affect a motion picture, television, or radio broadcasting studio operating within its physical confines at an established or fixed place of business in the city.

3. Charitable Purposes: No permit fee shall be required for any motion picture, radio, or television production when found by the licensing authority to be permit issued for filming when the administrator determines, based upon reasonable evidence, that filming is conducted or carried on wholly for a charitable or nonprofit purpose either directly or indirectly, by any individual; provided, however, a permit as provided for in this chapter shall be required.

4. Educational Purposes: This chapter does not apply to or affect student and class photographs, sports pictures, Independent Student Media Film Class activities, Photography Class activities and student cable filming.

4-11-4: ADDITIONAL AGREEMENTS: In addition to, or in lieu of, a permit required by this chapter, use of any public facility within the City may require a rental or use agreement.

4-11-5: ADMINISTRATION: The administrator is authorized to receive applications, issue and revoke permits, and otherwise implement this chapter.

4-11-6: APPLICATION FOR LICENSE: CONTENTS;
ISSUANCE:

A. Issuing Authority: The issuing authority shall be the licensing authority.

B. Filing Of Application And Documents: No application shall be considered unless it is filed together with all the necessary supporting documents not less than ten (10) full working days before the date for which the permit is first sought.

A. C. Information Required: The following information shall be included in the application:

1. The name, mailing address, and daytime telephone number of the person who will be present during, and responsible for, the filming
2. The address or place at which the activity is to be conducted;

3. The specific location(s) at such address or place;

4. The inclusive times and dates such activity will transpire;

5. A general statement of the character or nature of the proposed activity;

6. The number of personnel to be involved;

7. Anticipated use of any animals, pyrotechnics, fire, or explosives;

8. The food servicing arrangements;

9. Requests for special assistance at the location, including, without limitation, street closure, traffic control, and emergency services;

10. Whether the activity to be filmed includes vehicle chases or other activities dangerous to the participants or to the public, with a description of the activity to be filmed;

11. The amount and type of equipment to be involved including without limitation, the number and size of vehicles, location of all vehicles and ancillary equipment, and the name of the person responsible for keeping the filming site clear and clean.

12. A declaration regarding notification of residences and businesses within the impact zone as required by this chapter; and

13. Such other information as the licensing administrator deems appropriate.

D. Issuance Of Permit: Upon a finding by the licensing authority that the applicant has complied with the rules and regulations referred to in subsection 4-11-8C of this chapter, a permit shall be issued in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

B. In addition to the provisions of this Chapter, any applicant engaging in activity that requires compliance with federal, state, or local regulations.
including additional licenses or permits, must present evidence of satisfactory compliance with those requirements.

4-11-7: 4-11-5: APPLICATION AND PERMIT FEES:

A. Motion Picture, Radio, Or Television Productions:

1. A nonrefundable application fee for motion picture, radio or television productions as set by resolution of the city council shall be paid.

2. A permit fee as set by resolution of the city council shall be paid whenever the permittee uses any portion of any public street, road, right of way or building, other than a building located in a public park, owned or controlled by the city.

3. The use of public parks and buildings located in public parks to the exclusion of the general public shall be discouraged; however, when such permit is granted, the permit fee shall be fixed by resolution of the city council resolution.

B. Still Photography:

1. A nonrefundable application fee for still photography commercial advertising as set by resolution of the city council shall be paid.

2. A permit fee as set by resolution of the city council shall be paid whenever the permittee uses any portion of any public street, road, right of way or building, other than a building located in a public park, owned or controlled by the city.

3. The use of public parks and buildings located in public parks to the exclusion of the general public shall be discouraged; however, when such permit is granted, the permit fee shall be fixed by resolution of the city council resolution.

4-11-8: 4-11-6: DIRECT OVERHEAD EXPENSES:

In addition to the fees and charges established, the permittee shall pay all costs and direct overhead of the city for supervising, controlling, and managing permittee's operation. This shall include, but not be limited
to include, without limitation, all personnel costs, all material and supply costs, and all other direct costs and expenses of the city. These costs and expenses shall will be computed at the conclusion of the project and shall be deducted from the deposit required.

4-11-9: 4-11-7: CASH DEPOSIT FOR FEES AND SECURITY DEPOSIT REQUIRED:

A. Cash Deposit: After the application fee is paid and the application approved and before any permit is issued, permittee shall must deposit with the licensing authority city a cash deposit computed as follows: Twice the amount determined by the licensing authority city to be the total cost to the city plus a sum equal to all permit and license fees.

B. Conditions For Refund Of Security Deposit: At the conclusion of the project, the total of the deposit shall will be applied to the city’s permit and license fees and to the city’s costs and direct overhead of administering and supervising the permit; and the balance, if any, shall will be deemed a security deposit. The security deposit shall must be refunded by the city to the permittee if the permittee has fully complied with all of the conditions of the permit and all requirements of law. If the permittee has not complied with all conditions of the permit and all requirements of law, the security deposit shall will be retained by the city.

4-11-10: 4-11-8: SECURITY DEPOSIT RETENTION; APPEAL:

Any person aggrieved by the administrator’s determination of the licensing authority concerning the amount of the deposit or the amount of any refund may file a written appeal as provided in section 4-11-13 of this chapter.

4-11-11: REVIEW BY CITY OFFICERS:

A. After a film permit application is filed, the administrator must forward the application to directors, or designees (collectively “reviewing officers”), whose departments are affected by the proposed event for their recommendations. The reviewing officers may include, without limitation:

1. The fire chief;
2. The police chief;
3. The recreation and parks director; and/or
4. The public works director.
5. The El Segundo Unified School District superintendent when filming will occur along a route or at a location adjacent to a school or classroom.

B. Upon receiving an application, the reviewing officers must consider the application, conduct any necessary investigation, and provide the administrator with written recommendations regarding:

1. Any special conditions for a permit;

2. Whether, based on the scope of the proposed filming, a pre-filming operational meeting is required. Should such a meeting be necessary, the administrator will notify the applicant of the time and place of the meeting within a reasonable time before filming; and

3. Any additional recommendations.

C. The reviewing officers must complete their review before the administrator can make a decision on the application.

4-11-12: 4-11-9: TIME REQUIREMENTS AND DUTIES; RULES:

A. Except as provided in this Chapter, completed applications for a film permit must be filed in the administrator's office at least:

1. Three (3) business days before the filming date for a permit that does not require City services and is low impact filming; or

2. Five (5) business days before the filming date for filming involving stunts or traffic control; or

3. Ten (10) business days before the filming date for filming involving closure of public streets or rights-of-way, or use of pyrotechnics, fire, or explosives for special effects, except that an application may be filed pursuant to subsection A(1) if special effects are limited to the use of "squibs" as defined in Title 19, Section 980 of the California Code of Regulations, or any successor regulation, and the fire department determined the pyrotechnic operator's license to be in good standing within the previous twelve (12) months.

B. Except as provided in this Chapter, completed applications for a film permit must be denied, approved, or conditionally approved by the administrator within the applicable time periods established by
Subsections A(1-3). Following his/her decision, the administrator will promptly attempt to notify the applicant orally and in writing.

C. Unless otherwise provided, the applicant's acceptance of the approval or conditional approval must be received by the administrator before the filming date. Failure to accept the decision or failure to file a request for appeal constitutes a withdrawal of the application.

4-11-13: ACTION ON PERMIT APPLICATION – PERMIT ISSUANCE:

A. The administrator must issue a permit if

1. The application was complete in accordance with this Chapter;

2. There are no grounds for denying the permit; and

3. Applicant accepts the permit approval or conditional approval in writing.

B. Use of any permit issued pursuant to this Chapter must conform to the general permit conditions of this Chapter and, if applicable, special permit conditions reasonably deemed necessary by the administrator to protect public safety and/or welfare. Such special conditions may include, without limitation, conditions for controlling pedestrian and/or vehicle traffic, for protecting public and/or private property, and/or for protecting public health and safety.

4-11-14: ACTION ON PERMIT APPLICATION – PERMIT DENIAL:

A. Provisions Supplemental To Business License Regulations: The provisions of this chapter are intended to augment and be in addition to the provisions of section 4-2-33 of this title. Whenever the provisions of this chapter impose a greater restriction upon persons, premises, or practices than is imposed by the general business license regulations, the provisions of this chapter shall control. A permit may be denied for the following reasons:

1. The application is incomplete;

2. The applicant failed to provide reasonable supplemental application information requested by the administrator;

3. Information submitted by the applicant is materially false;
4. Applicant seeks approval for filming that is so close in time and location to another event scheduled for the same date as to cause unreasonable traffic congestion and/or to overextend public safety and/or emergency services;

5. Filming time and/or methodology will unreasonably interrupt the safe and orderly movement of traffic contiguous to the filming site;

6. The concentration of persons, animals, and/or vehicles at the filming prevents public safety and/or emergency services from reaching areas at or contiguous to the event;

7. The concentration of persons, animals, and/or vehicles at the filming on or adjacent to public institutions or schools prevents normal egress and ingress into the facility;

8. The size of filming will overextend public safety and/or emergency services to the extent that the safety of filming participants, attendees, and/or the remainder of the City will be seriously jeopardized; provided, however, that nothing authorizes denial of a permit because of the need to protect participants from the conduct of others if reasonable permit conditions can be imposed;

9. The filming location will substantially interfere with construction or maintenance work previously scheduled to take place on or along the City street, parking facility, sidewalk or other public right-of-way to be occupied by the event;

10. The filming will occur along a route or location adjacent to a hospital or extended care facility, and the noise created by the filming would substantially disrupt the operation of the hospital or extended care facility or disturb the patients within;

11. The filming will occur at a location adjacent to a library and the noise created by the filming will substantially disrupt the library’s operation or disturb a library’s patrons;

12. The application is not timely submitted and there is insufficient time to investigate and process the application pursuant to the timelines in this Chapter;
13. The application fails to include a declaration regarding notification of residences and businesses within the impact zone as required by this chapter.

B. Change Of Date: Upon the request of the permittee, the issuing authority shall have the power, upon a showing of good cause, to change the date for which the permit has been issued, provided established limitations are complied with in respect to time and location. The administrator must consult with the city attorney before denying a filming permit.

4-11-15: ALTERNATIVE TIME, PLACE, OR MANNER:

If the administrator denies a film permit that would be acceptable by changing filming time, place, or manner, then the administrator may inform the applicant of such alternatives. Should the applicant accept the alternative time, place, or manner then the administrator will issue a permit in accordance with this Chapter.

4-11-16: ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES:

C. Rules: The city manager is hereby authorized and directed to promulgate rules, administrative policies, and regulations, procedures governing the form, time, and location within the city of any activity set forth in section 4-11-1 of this chapter. The licensing authority shall provide for the issuance of permits and shall collect the permit and application fees and the license fee required by section 4-2-33 of this title to implement this chapter. The rules and regulations shall can be based upon the following criteria:

A. Traffic congestion at particular locations within the city;

B. The written consent of all affected property owners or occupants in possession of property within the impact zone, as determined by the licensing authority administrator and in accordance with this chapter;

C. The safety and convenience of all persons;

D. The disruption of normal activities of all persons at particular locations within the city;

E. The safety of property within the city; and

4-11-17: MAXIMUM NUMBER OF FILMING DAYS ALLOWED:

The maximum number of filming days allowed at the same filming site is twenty (20) days within the immediately preceding twelve (12) month period.
of the date(s) for which a film permit is sought, regardless of the number of applicants seeking a film permit for the filming site. The administrator may increase the maximum filming days allowed for a filming site up to a maximum of twenty-four (24) days during the immediately preceding twelve (12) month period upon obtaining 100% neighbor consent.

4-11-18: INDEMNIFICATION AGREEMENT:

6. The submission of evidence that the applicant has adequate comprehensive general liability insurance to protect the city and its officers and employees and the permittee. The insurance shall be permitted to enter into a hold harmless agreement with the City which, in part, indemnifies the City, its officers, employees, and agents, from any liability arising from permittees’ filming in a form approved by the city attorney and in an amount and with a carrier approved by the city manager.

4-11-19: GENERAL PERMIT CONDITIONS – LIABILITY INSURANCE:

A. Insurance Requirements. Permittee must obtain public liability insurance from an insurance company licensed to do business in the state of California and having a financial rating in Best’s Insurance Guide of not less than “A VII.” Such insurance must provide “occurrence” coverage against liabilities for death, personal injury, or property damage arising out of or in any way connected with filming. Such insurance shall be based upon the size and nature of filming, the risks foreseeably involved, and must be in the amount of at least one million dollars ($1,000,000), combined single limit, and name the City and the City’s officers, employees, agents, and volunteers as additional insureds under the coverage afforded. The city’s risk manager may increase this minimum limit depending on the risk involved with the proposed filming. In addition, such insurance must be primary and noncontributing with respect to any other insurance available to the City and include a severability of interest (cross-liability) clause. If alcoholic beverages are sold or served during filming, the policy must also include an endorsement for liquor liability in an amount not less than one million dollars ($1,000,000).

B. Certificates of Insurance. A copy of the policy or a certificate of insurance along with all necessary endorsements, in a form approved by the City’s risk manager, must be filed with the administrator not less than five (5) business days, except as otherwise provided in this Chapter, before filming unless the administrator for good cause waives the filing deadline.

C. Bonds. A bond/cash deposit may be required for purposes of repairing any damage and restoring City facilities to original condition. The amount will be determined by the administrator. In the event of such damage, City
will provide written notice to the permittee specifying the damage to be repaired and/or City facilities to be restored. If, after providing permittee with such written notice, the requested repairs and/or restoration of City facilities have not been commenced and/or completed within seven (7) days, City may draw upon the bond/cash deposit to effect said repairs and/or restoration of City facilities. In the event of damage requiring emergency repairs and/or restoration of City facilities by the City, the permittee is required to reimburse the City in full for all costs incurred within thirty (30) days receipt of invoice from City.

4-11-20: NOTICE TO RESIDENCES AND BUSINESSES – GENERALLY:

Before the administrator issues a filming permit, an applicant must notify neighbors within an impact zone as follows:

A. The applicant must make every reasonable effort to notify neighbors within the impact zones, by any reasonable means specified by the administrator, regarding the filming’s nature, date, and time.

B. Notifications must include applicant’s name, address, telephone number, date(s), and time(s) of filming.

C. The applicant must submit a declaration, signed under penalty of perjury, with a permit application stating that reasonable notice was provided to every neighbor within the impact zone.

D. The administrator may, at the applicant’s cost, prepare documentation showing the neighbors within an impact zone.

4-11-21: IMPACT ZONE PROTESTS:

A. The neighbors within the impact zone are entitled to one protest per address. All protests must be received by the administrator at least two (2) business days before the filming date.

B. The administrator cannot issue a filming permit if:

1. More than fifty percent (50%) of neighbors within the impact zone submit protests against Low Impact Filming. The administrator may, but is not required to, require a lower percentage of protests based upon the time, place, or manner of the proposed filming and its consequent impact on surrounding businesses or residences;
2. If the administrator receives at least one (1) protest from a neighbor within the impact zone for filming that requires street closures; or

3. More than ten percent (10%) of neighbors within the impact zone for all other filming sites submit protests.

C. A rebuttable presumption of one hundred percent (100%) approval from neighbors within an impact zone is established if the administrator does not receive any protests from within an impact zone.

D. Neighbors may submit protests for all filming located within 300- feet of their property with the administrator. The administrator will keep a record of such protests until the end of each calendar year and apply such protests when determining the protest percentages established by this section. Protests must be resubmitted at the beginning of each calendar year to be effective.

4-11-22: GENERAL PERMIT CONDITIONS – SPECIAL EFFECTS: FIRE PERMIT:

An applicant must obtain a permit from the City fire department for filming that includes pyrotechnics, fires, or explosives. During filming the permittee must, at its own expense, use City fire personnel deemed necessary by the City fire department. All City fire permits must be obtained at least seventy-two (72) hours before filming.

4-11-23: GENERAL PERMIT CONDITIONS – ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS:

A. Filming cannot commence before 7:00 a.m. unless it is no impact filming allowed by a valid permit.

B. The permit, in its entirety, must be in the possession of the permittee at all times while filming.

C. A permittee must conduct operations in an orderly fashion. The area used must be cleaned of trash and debris upon completion and before leaving the filming site(s). A deposit to assure that a permittee removes all trash and debris from the filming site(s) may be required. This requirement and the amount may be determined by the administrator.

D. Vehicle parking for all filming related activities must be in accordance with the administrator’s directions.

E. All camera cars must have a police escort. The administrator may determine how many police officers will be required to escort camera cars.
F. All filming and ancillary activities must cease not later than 10:00 p.m., unless it is no impact filming allowed by a valid permit. Such ancillary activities include, without limitation, striking sets, loading equipment, and vehicle traffic.

G. Permittees must protect any neighbors within an impact zone from glare caused by lighting used for filming after sunset.

H. Production companies cannot place equipment or vehicles on private property without the private property resident’s written consent.

4-11-24: SUBSEQUENT CONDITIONS:

A. Grounds for Subsequent Conditions. The administrator may condition previously issued permits upon learning or discovering facts not previously disclosed or reasonably discoverable.

B. Notice of Subsequent Conditions. Should subsequent conditions be required, the administrator will serve written notice on the permittee of this decision. When acting upon information obtained twenty-four (24) hours before filming, the administrator may orally inform the permittee, and City personnel overseeing filming, of the new conditions.

4-11-25: EMERGENCY SUSPENSION OF FILMING:

The city manager, administrator, and/or any sworn public safety officer may temporarily suspend filming whenever there is an emergency that requires such action to protect public safety. Should this occur, the permittee and filming participants must immediately comply with the suspending officer’s instructions. The administrator will immediately attempt to notify the applicant orally and notify the applicant in writing, within twenty-four (24) hours after the suspension, citing with particularity the facts and the reasons for the suspension.

4-11-26: LAND USE AND PARKING REGULATIONS INAPPLICABLE:

Except as otherwise provided by this Chapter or the terms and conditions of a permit issued under this Chapter, those provisions of this Code regulating land use and parking do not apply to a permittee. All other provisions of this Code are applicable to the permittee’s conduct except as specifically provided in the permit.

4-11-27: CORDONING OFF THE ROUTE OR FILMING SITE:
The administrator, or designee, is authorized and directed to establish traffic and/or crowd control devices on or within the City's streets, parking facilities, sidewalks, or other public rights-of-way, and to undertake other actions necessary to cordon off the filming site. In addition, the administrator can, when appropriate, cause the filming site to be posted as a no-parking zone for the duration of filming and sufficiently in advance thereof as may be necessary to prevent vehicles from parking along the route or at the filming location.

4-11-28: PUBLIC CONDUCT DURING FILMING:

A. Interference with Filming. It is unlawful for any person to physically obstruct, impede, hamper or otherwise interfere with any filming authorized by a permit or with any person, animal or vehicle participating or used in filming.

B. Driving Through the Filming Site. It is unlawful for any person to drive a vehicle between vehicles or persons authorized by a film permit when such vehicles or persons are in motion.

C. Prohibited Parking. It is unlawful for any person to park along or within any portion of the route or filming site, when the filming site is designated as a no-parking zone by the administrator in the manner authorized by this Chapter.

4-11-29: 4-11-10: PROHIBITIONS:

It is unlawful for any person shall to engage in any motion-picture, radio, or television-production or still-photography activity which filming that would constitute a hazard to public safety or interfere with or endanger the public peace or rights of residents and other occupants of property to the quiet, peaceful, unmolested enjoyment of their property.

4-11-30: 4-11-11: MISREPRESENTATION:

It is unlawful for any person shall to knowingly or intentionally misrepresent to any officer or employee of the city any material fact in procuring the permit provided for in this chapter.

4-11-12: GROUNDS FOR REVOCATION OR SUSPENSION OF PERMIT:

Any permit granted or issued pursuant to the provisions of this chapter may be revoked or suspended at any time for the following reasons:

4-11-31: PERMIT MODIFICATION:
A. A material false statement contained in the application. If, due to inclement weather or other, similar, unforeseen circumstances, it is necessary to change the filming date and/or time, the administrator may, upon permittee's request, issue a film permit addendum authorizing filming at the same location for new times and dates. Permittee must comply with all applicable provisions of this Chapter, including notification, and pay any reasonable administrative fee that permit reissuance may cost.

B. Failure to comply with any regulatory provision contained in the statutes of the state or in the laws of the city regulating such business. If there is any substantial change in the filming from that described in the permit application, an applicant must pay the permit application fee and obtain an amended permit before the filming date.

C. Failure to operate such business in an orderly and businesslike manner, in obedience to such orders, rules, and regulations as may be applicable thereto under the provisions of this code or statutes of this state; or

D. The conduct of such business in an illegal, improper, or disorderly manner or in a manner which endangers the public welfare.

4-11-32: 4-11-13: PROCEDURE FOR REVOCATION OR SUSPENSION OF PERMIT:

A. Authority Of Licensing Authority: The administrator can revoke a film permit upon learning or discovering facts requiring permit denial not previously disclosed or reasonably discoverable.

B. The administrator may revoke a film permit when the permittee and/or filming violates the permit's terms and conditions, or when filming participants violate applicable laws or regulations; provided, however, that this subsection does not authorize revoking a permit because of the need to protect participants from the conduct of others; and, provided further, that the administrator cannot revoke a permit without warning the permittee and allowing him/her to correct the violation(s) within a reasonable time.

C. If the administrator revokes a permit before the filming date, the administrator must immediately serve written notice of revocation on the permittee and provide copies of the notice to all City personnel charged with carrying out any responsibility under this Chapter. If the administrator revokes a permit on the day of filming after learning of facts justifying revocation less than twenty-four (24) hours before the filming commenced, the administrator must announce such action to the filming participants, City officers and employees monitoring or controlling traffic during the
filming, and the person in charge of the filming, if such person can be located at the filming location. Written notice must be delivered after such action to the permittee.

D. An applicant is entitled to an administrative hearing before a hearing officer designated by the city manager provided

1. The licensing authority shall give the permittee at least five (5) days', and not more than ten (10) days', prior notice in writing of the grounds for the revocation or suspension of his permit and the time and place of a hearing and shall require him to show cause why his permit shall not be revoked. The service of such grounds and notice of the hearing shall be done by depositing the same in the United States mail, addressed to the applicant at his address given in the application. At any such hearing, the permittee shall be given an opportunity to be heard and defend himself, and he may call witnesses on his behalf. After conducting such hearing, the licensing authority may revoke or suspend any permit held by such permittee. The licensing authority shall notify the permittee thereof in writing within three (3) days after the decision. Applicant appeals the administrator's decision within twenty-four (24) hours of receiving notice of such conditions:

2. If the violation which forms the grounds for the proposed revocation or suspension continues after the original notification of such violation to the permittee, the licensing authority may suspend the permit until the time of the hearing. Such suspension shall be effective immediately upon giving written notice thereof to the applicant or the person in charge at the business activity. During such suspension, no person shall conduct any business activity of a type covered by this chapter. Filming is scheduled at least forty-eight (48) hours after the hearing time;

3. The hearing will be at the administrator's office at 4:00 P.M. the day after the hearing is requested, unless otherwise agreed upon. The hearing officer will issue a decision orally at the conclusion of the hearing and also notify the applicant, the administrator in writing of the hearing officer's decision;

4. Any notification of action, whether oral or written, must describe with particularity the facts and the reasons for the decision:
E. The administrator must consult with the city attorney before revoking a filming permit.

F. Appeals To Council: Any person aggrieved by the decision of the licensing authority administrator may appeal therefrom to the council in the manner provided in section 4-11-13 of this chapter.

G. Failure To Appeal: In the event no appeal is taken by the permittee, the decision of the licensing authority administrator revoking or suspending such permit shall become final and conclusive on the expiration of the time fixed for the appeal as set forth in section 4-11-13 of this chapter.

4-11-33: **4-11-14: APPEALS TO THE CITY COUNCIL:**

A. Procedures: Any person aggrieved by any decision of the licensing authority administrator or of any other officer of the city made pursuant to the provisions of this chapter may appeal therefrom to the council within fifteen (15) days after notice thereof by filing with the city clerk a written notice of appeal, briefly stating in such notice the grounds relied upon for appeal. If such appeal is made within the time prescribed, the city clerk shall cause the matter to be set for a hearing before the council within thirty (30) days after the date of the receipt of such notice of appeal, giving the appellant not less than ten (10) days' notice in writing of the time and place of the hearing. The findings and determinations of the council at such hearing shall be final and conclusive and within three (3) days after such findings and determinations are made, the city clerk shall give notice thereof to the appellant.

B. Council Determination: For appeals relating to the suspension or revocation of permits issued pursuant to this chapter, the council's determination shall become effective on the second day after the city clerk gives notice thereof to the appellant, unless otherwise stipulated provided by the council.

4-11-34: **EXPEDITED REVIEW:**

Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1094.8(c), and any successor statute or regulation, "the permits under this chapter are designated for expedited judicial review pursuant to the procedure set forth in California Code of Civil Procedure § 1094.8, or any successor statute or regulation."

SECTION 1: This ordinance is exempt from review under the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code §§ 21000, et seq., "CEQA") and CEQA regulations (14 California Code of Regulations §§ 15000, et
because it establishes rules and procedures to permit operation of existing facilities; minor temporary use of land; ensure maintenance, restoration and protection of the environment; and regulate normal operations of facilities for public gatherings. This Ordinance, therefore, is categorically exempt from further CEQA review under Cal. Code Regs. Title 14, §§ 15301, 15304(e), 15308, and 15323.

SECTION 2: 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 3: 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 4: 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 fifteen (15) days after the passage and adoption of this Ordinance, cause it to be published or posted in accordance with California law.

SECTION 5: This Ordinance will become effective on the thirty-first (31st) day following its passage and adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this ____ day of ________, 2008.

________________________
Kelly McDowell, Mayor

ATTEST:

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

I, Cindy Mortesen, 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 ________________, 2008, 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 __________________, 2008, and the same was so passed and adopted by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

____________________________________
Cindy Mortesen, City Clerk

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

By: ____________________________
   Karl H. Berger, Assistant City Attorney
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action to receive and file the Annual Report of the Capital Improvement Program Advisory Committee (CIPAC). Oral presentation will be made by CIPAC Chairman Mr. Jason Aro. (Fiscal Impact: none).

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

(1) Receive and file the Annual Report of CIPAC; (2) Receive the oral presentation; and (3) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:

CIPAC is a 5-member committee appointed by City Council to evaluate and recommend projects to be funded under the City's FY 2008/09 Capital Improvement Program. Over the last three months, CIPAC reviewed 20 proposed projects totaling $8,193,000, solicited input and completed project evaluations. The attached annual report presents the final recommendations of the Committee to fully or partially fund 15 projects based on the assumption that roughly $3,227,000 will be available from various funding sources. Partial funding for several projects has been recommended due to limited funding availability and/or multi-phased projects that can be funded over several years.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

CIPAC Recommendations for FY 2008-2009 (Annual Report)

FISCAL IMPACT:

| Operating Budget: | NA |
| Capital Improvement Program: | NA |
| Amount Requested: | NA |
| Account Number: | NA |
| Project Phase: | NA |
| Appropriation Required: | NA |

ORIGINATED BY: Dan Garcia, Assistant City Engineer
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The City of El Segundo is a charming, 5.46 square mile beach community with a dynamic mix of residential and business districts. With a daytime population exceeding 70,000 and a nighttime residential population of approximately 17,000, the City is committed to maintaining the vital infrastructure needed to support this world-class community.

In order to maintain and grow economic development in our region as well as to continue to provide outstanding public services, it is critical that we continue to invest in our streets, sewers, street lighting, and emergency services. Such investment also directly benefits the quality of life of our residents through beautiful parks, youth and senior community activities, downtown revitalization and high property values. In order to continue providing exceptional services, it is projected that nearly $87 million will be needed over the next decade to adequately maintain current facilities, provide new infrastructure where needed, implement new technologies for the health and welfare of our citizens, and prepare for a major disaster. Annually, these goals will be achieved through administration of the capital projects identified/recommended by staff and the Capital Improvement Program Advisory Committee (CIPAC)¹ and approved by City Council.

¹ CIPAC is a five-member committee whose representatives are appointed by City Council. The committee meets annually each spring over a series of weeks in order to fully evaluate all of the capital and community projects proposed for funding. CIPAC bases its evaluations on the most critical needs of the City and its residents, from maintaining the core infrastructure to considering innovative solutions to the many issues impacting the City.
2008/09 CIPAC

Twenty (20) projects, worth a total of $8,193,000, were submitted to CIPAC for funding consideration and evaluation for the upcoming 2008/09 fiscal year. However, it is estimated that only $3,227,000 will be available from various funding sources for these programs, representing less than 40% of the total amount requested. For this reason, CIPAC had to evaluate each project individually using well-developed criteria and consider a myriad of complex issues to determine which projects should be recommended for funding this season. CIPAC ultimately discussed, scored and made funding recommendations for 20 projects introduced this year. Of these, 15 are being recommended for partial or full funding in FY 2008-2009 based on the ranking and funding sources summarized in Appendix I. In summary, CIPAC recommends that six (6) projects be fully funded, nine (9) projects receive partial funding, and five (5) projects not be funded.

Lastly, CIPAC discussed the importance of including not only the tangible benefits of improving our infrastructure, but also how we could incorporate aesthetics and other external factors into decision making. For example, cultural, artistic and social benefits to the community should be considered when evaluating projects for funding. It was also suggested that CIPAC include a discussion on “project context” and consider the 10-Year Plan for further policy discussion regarding how to manage and finance our aging infrastructure.

FUNDING SOURCES

Funding levels for the FY 2008-2009 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) include funds derived from the General Fund, Gas Tax, Water Fund, Sewer Fund and Proposition C. Combined, they are expected to total $3,227,000. This is less than the funding level of last year’s FY2007-2008 CIP season due to a decrease in the allotted Water Fund amount. The Sewer Fund level is the same as last year. There were scheduled increases for both the Water and Sewer Fund allotments based on rate increases, but they were not factored into this year’s allocation. The General Fund, Gas Tax Funds and Proposition C Funds were anticipated to remain constant. A breakdown of the estimated funding available for the FY2008-2009 CIP is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Tax</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Fund</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Fund</td>
<td>$1,477,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition C</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,227,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Funds
The availability of General Fund dollars is pertinent to a majority of projects submitted. By spreading this resource over 9 of the 20 projects, CIPAC believes that the recommended projects truly represent the most significant community, residential, business and municipal capital improvement needs of El Segundo.
Water and Sewer Fund

Water and Sewer rates are scheduled to increase again on October 1, 2008. The rate increases are consistent with the 2004 recommendations of the Water and Wastewater Rate Study Task Force as verified through a Proposition 218 protest ballot process conducted in December 2006.

Proposition C

Proposition C Funds can be spent only on transit related improvements for roadways carrying fixed transit routes.

Actual CIP funding levels will depend on final budget allocations adopted by the City Council for FY 2008-2009.

PROJECT EVALUATIONS and SCORING CRITERIA

CIPAC met on nine occasions in 2008 to discuss and evaluate projects. Regular meetings were held on March 13, March 27, April 17, May 1, May 22, June 11, June 18 and July 9. Additionally, a Public Workshop was conducted on May 28, 2008. Staff from five City Departments (Fire, Public Works, Library, Information Services and Recreation and Parks) presented 19 projects for consideration and evaluation, while one was introduced by a member of the public during the Public Workshop. There was also a presentation made by representatives from Northrop Grumman during the review of one project put forward by staff.

Given the total $8,193,000 in project requests and the anticipated amount of $3,227,000 available, it was clear that not all projects could be funded this year. Thus, projects were evaluated and scored based on the following criteria:

➢ Mandate (0-5 points): Degree to which the City required to implement the project by law.

➢ Contractual Obligation (0-3 points): The extent to which the City is contractually obligated required to implement the project.

➢ Health and Safety (0-5 points): Extent to which the project will mitigate hazards.

➢ Funding Status (0-2 points): Extent to which funds have been previously committed to the project.

➢ Project Readiness (0-2 points): Timeliness of initiation and completion of the project.

➢ Productivity Improvements/Costs Savings (0-5 points): Duration of project cost payback.

➢ Property, Facilities and Equipment Maintenance/Improvement (0-3 points): Degree to which the project replaces repairs or extends the life of a facility.
Community Interest (0-3 points): Degree to which the public desires the project to be completed.

10-YEAR PLAN PURPOSE

The extent of current infrastructure needs indicated in the CIPAC 2007/2008 10-year plan and the escalating cost of sewage treatment is cause for the City to consider non-traditional methods in an effort to reduce costs. Additionally, and perhaps most importantly, environmental impacts of the City's infrastructure should be considered as we make decisions regarding our future infrastructure and municipal operations. As the City's infrastructure ages, operational costs will increase as efforts are diverted to repairing system failures. Significant additional capital investment in our infrastructure is needed to maintain the system in serviceable condition and to avoid system breakdown. It is in the public's best interest that we do this.

The FY 2007/2008 CIPAC Committee recommended and the City Council adopted a 10-Year Infrastructure and Maintenance Program. This guide was useful in benchmarking the infrastructure needs of El Segundo and was used as an initial framework for the FY 2008/2009 CIPAC selection process. Noting that approximately $87 million is needed over the next ten years just to maintain existing infrastructure, long term financial planning is critical if we are to meet that objective. Methods such as bond issues, user fees, direct borrowing, pay as you go, etc. can be considered.

Management of our infrastructure can be improved by setting policies and incorporating private sector and non-profit organizations. An example of a Public-Private partnership experienced this season was the proposed 118th and 120th Street Improvement Project, where Northrop-Grumman and BNSF Railways are now working together with the City towards improving the badly needed street repairs.

The 10-Year Plan is a first step in managing El Segundo’s infrastructure needs. Even if funds are not available currently to meet the demands of our aging infrastructure, the 10-Year Plan can indicate quantitatively how much we should be spending annually to keep up with replacement and maintenance of our streets, sewers, storm drains, signals, water and building facilities.

PUBLIC INPUT

In an effort to solicit public input, CIPAC conducted a Public Workshop on May 28, 2008 in the City Council Chambers. During the Workshop, CIPAC presented a summary of the project submittals, a brief explanation of the scoring process, on-going projects previously submitted in FY 2007-08 that are now being executed, and then evaluated a project to demonstrate the evaluation process. Three persons attended the workshop and requested that CIPAC consider one additional project for funding this season, and that was to revitalize the 2005 Aquatic Master Plan and move forward with conducting a feasibility study for the construction a new aquatics facility at Hilltop Park or other location. The project was ultimately reviewed and received a score of 22, the highest ranking project score for the entire FY 2008/2009 season. However, at the July 15th City
Council meeting, staff requested and Council approved funding to conduct the feasibility study immediately rather than waiting for FY 2008/09 CIPAC funding.

As mentioned above, representatives of Northrop Grumman Corporation provided community input for the 118th and 120th Street Rehabilitation Project at the May 22 Regular CIPAC Meeting. This project represents a partnership between Northrop Grumman, BNSF Railway and the City to improve the two streets to better accommodate public safety and eliminate pedestrian hazards. This project scored 13 and partial funding is recommended to move the project forward.

Recreation and Parks introduced two projects and supported two projects introduced by the Information Services Division. The two projects introduced were additional upgrades to Sycamore Park Playground and the Retrofit of the Softball and Brett Field Lighting. The Sycamore Park Playground received the second highest score overall and is recommended for full funding. The Lighting Retrofit project on the other hand, due to limited general funds received a score of 13 and ranked number 7 of the 20 projects. CIPAC recommends fully funding the softball field lighting and deferring the Brett Field Lighting to a future CIPAC session to accommodate other projects this year.

PROJECT RECOMMENDATIONS

CIPAC recommends the following:

1. Aquatics Concept Report
   There is strong community interest in this project. There is also a need to both upgrade the aging Urho Saari Swim Stadium and possibly provide a new El Segundo swimming facility. This is according to the August 2005 Aquatic Master Plan of which this concept report project is based. Recommended for full funding but withdrawn from CIPAC’s list after it was fully funded by City Council on July 15, 2008.

2. Sycamore Park Playground
   This project is a continuation of the playground apparatus funding that was installed in FY 2007/2008 at Recreation Park. We have been using RZH 2000 and 2002 grant funds and the amount requested is the required local match. This project will also include handicap accessibility to the playground. Recommended for full funding.

3. Dry Weather Diversion for Pump Station 17
   This project provides for mandated storm water mitigation during low-flow periods to prevent pollution from reaching the ocean via local storm drains. Recommended for full funding.
4. Pump Station No. 1 Upgrades and Force Main Station No. 7 Abandonment (Design):
The 2008-09 proposed allocation will provide for the both design and construction for the abandonment of Pump Station No. 7 and the enhancement of Pump Station No. 1 to accept the additional flows via gravity. The projected $636,000 shortfall will be considered next fiscal year once the design further establishes a more real construction cost figure.

5. Water Main Replacements
This project will address the replacement of cast and/or ductile iron pipes and is in line with the proposed 10-Year Infrastructure Replacement and Maintenance Program.

6. Curb and Sidewalk Replacement Citywide
This project will address the displacement of curbs and sidewalks caused by the roots of City and private trees and is in line with the proposed 10-Year Infrastructure Replacement and Maintenance Program.

7. Retrofit Field Lights for Softball and Brett Fields
This project will rewire existing light poles with new underground feeds replace lighting lamps and ballasts with energy efficient alternatives. CIPAC recommends fully funding the Softball Field lighting upgrades and considering funding for Brett Field in the 2009-2010 CIPAC session.

8. 118th and 120th Street Improvements
This project will repair degraded pavement and improve street lighting and pedestrian access at 118th and 120th Streets west of Aviation Blvd. Partially funding this project provides match dollars to Northrop-Grumman's contribution and allows the design to proceed. After coordination with BNSF, further appropriations can be considered in the FY 2009/2010 CIPAC session for construction once this amount is known.

9. Fiber Installation Phase 3
This project will extend fiber optic connectivity to the new Fire Station 2 and Athletic Fields. This project was withdrawn by the Interim Public Works Director after consultation with the Fire and IS Departments. This project will be re-proposed during the FY 2009-10 CIPAC season.
10. Fiber Installation Phase 2
   This project will provide fiber optic connectivity between City Hall, the Public Works Maintenance Yard and the Water Department. Funds may be considered in the FY 2009/2010 CIPAC session. This project has an override consideration due to being a prior Council approved project.

11. Local Streets Rehabilitation Program
   In order to match the recommended funding for our local streets as outlined in the 10-year Infrastructure Replacement and Maintenance Plan, $400,000 would need to be appropriated to this effort every year. No funding was appropriated in FY 2007/2008. CIPAC recommends that in future years, more emphasis be placed on addressing the rehabilitation of our local streets.

12. Surveillance Cameras for El Segundo Athletic Fields
   This project will allow law enforcement personnel to be better equipped when responding to situations at the Athletic Fields as well as have the ability to monitor activities.

13. Arterial Streets Rehabilitation Program
   The funds recommended for this project will provide the pavement overlay of Aviation Blvd from 124th Street to El Segundo Blvd. to increase pavement condition to a standard pavement rating of 65. The requested amount for this project is much less than the $800,000 recommended in the proposed 10-Year Infrastructure Replacement and Maintenance Program to address the deteriorating condition of the City's 25 miles of arterial and collector streets.

14. 3.1 MG Reservoir Roof
   This project will repair and paint the aging roof currently on the 3.1 million gallon reservoir. There will be a shortfall of $150,000 that will be necessary to secure prior to implementing this project, and CIPAC recommends allocating any remaining available from the FY 2008-09 water funds to cover the shortfall.

15. Maple @ Nash Storm Drain and Street Improvements
   CIPAC recommends fully funding the grind and overlay portion of this street improvement in FY 2008-09 and omitting the Storm Drain Improvement portion due to limited general funds.

16. Traffic Signal Rehabilitation
   This project will rehabilitate one traffic signal every two years. Additional funds may be considered in the FY 2009/2010 CIPAC session.
17. Elevated Reservoir Painting
This project will provide for recoating and maintenance of the City's elevated reservoir to extend its useful life. CIPAC does not recommend funding this project due to its low score and limited general fund and water budget.

18. City Hall Signage
This project will customize signage for City Hall departments and service, and bring signs into compliance with ADA requirements. CIPAC does not recommend funding this project due to its low score and limited general fund budget.

19. Archway on Main @ Imperial
This project will provide a gateway architectural feature at El Segundo's Main/Imperial entrance. CIPAC does not recommend funding this project due to its low score and limited general fund budget. The override score denotes not only a prior Council approval on this project but the C denotes that a Council policy decision may be required.

20. Library Homework Center
This project will construct a new homework center and adjoining Children’s Reading Room at the City Library. CIPAC does not recommend funding this project due to its low score and limited general fund budget.

CONCLUSION

CIPAC has completed its evaluation of capital improvement projects and respectfully submits its list of recommended for projects to be included in the FY 2008-2009 Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

It is recommended that City Council adopt the FY 2008-2009 CIP including the projects identified in this report to be funded with General Fund, Gas Tax, Proposition C and enterprise funds. It is further recommended that projects using General Funds be included in the CIP as funding permits according to the priorities established in this report.

The following tables provide CIPAC's recommendations for FY 2008-2009.
APPENDIX I

Project Summary Sheets
1. By Rank
2. By Fund
## CIPAC Recommendations for FY 2008-09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Requested Amount</th>
<th>CIPAC Score</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Gas Tax</th>
<th>Sewer Fund</th>
<th>Water Fund</th>
<th>Prop C</th>
<th>Funds Allocated to Date</th>
<th>Amount Recommended</th>
<th>Shortfall for FY 08/09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIPAC Strategy</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics Concept Report</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$93,741.00</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sycamore Park Playground</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Weather Diversion for Pump Station 17</td>
<td>$2,113,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$717,000.00</td>
<td>$1,477,000</td>
<td>$636,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Station No. 1 Upgrades and Force Main and Station No. 7 Abandonment (Design)</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Main Replacements</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb and Sidewalk Replacement Citywide</td>
<td>$285,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$160,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrofit Field Lights for Softball and Breit Fields</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$310,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118th and 120th Street Improvements</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>13B</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$(300,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiber Installation Phase 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Aquatics Concept Report**: CIPAC recommends this project for full funding. There is strong community interest in this project and there is also a need to both upgrade the aging Lino Saari Swim Stadium and possibly provide a new El Segundo swimming facility. This is according to the August 2005 Aquatic Master Plan of which this concept report project is based. Note: On July 15, 2008 City Council approved this item be funded in the 2007/2008 FY. Therefore, the funding is not shown for FY 2008/2009.

- **Sycamore Park Playground**: CIPAC recommends this project for full funding. This project is a continuation of the playground apparatus funding that was installed in FY 2007/2008 at Recreation Park. We have been using RZH 2000 and 2002 grant funds and the amount requested is the required local match. This project will also include handicap accessibility to the playground.

- **Dry Weather Diversion for Pump Station 17**: CIPAC recommends this project for full funding to provide for mandated storm water mitigation during low-flow periods to prevent pollution to the ocean from local storm drains. The recent 20 cities Notice of Violation was a consideration in the high score this project received.

- **Pump Station No. 1 Upgrades and Force Main and Station No. 7 Abandonment (Design)**: CIPAC recommends this project for the maximum 2008/2009 funding according to the adopted 10-Year Infrastructure Replacement and Maintenance Program to address capacity deficiency and physical deterioration as determined in the 2002 Sewer Master Plan. There will still be a deficit of $536,000 according to the estimation but this will be reconsidered next fiscal year once the design further establishes a more realistic construction cost figure. The 2008-09 proposed allocation of funding will provide for both design and construction for the abandonment of Pump Station No. 7 and the enhancement of Pump Station No. 1 to accept the additional flows via gravity.

- **Water Main Replacements**: CIPAC recommends this project for full funding in line with the proposed 10-Year Infrastructure Replacement and Maintenance Program to address the replacement of cast and/or ductile iron pipes.

- **Curb and Sidewalk Replacement Citywide**: CIPAC recommends fully funding this project to be in line with the proposed 10-Year Infrastructure Replacement and Maintenance Program. This project will address the displacement of curbs and sidewalks caused by the roots of City and private trees.

- **Retrofit Field Lights for Softball and Breit Fields**: CIPAC recommends full funding for the Softball Field only due to the available general funds for this year's CIPAC. Additional funding for Breit Field can be considered at the 2009/2010 CIPAC session.

- **118th and 120th Street Improvements**: CIPAC recommends this project for partial FY 2008/2009 funding to allow for design and to match the contribution from Northrop-Grumman. After coordination with BNSF, further appropriations can be considered for construction once this amount is known. It may be in the FY 2009/2010 CIPAC session.

- **Fiber Installation Phase 3**: CIPAC withdrew funding for this project in FY 2008-09 on advice of the Interim Public Works Director.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIPAC Priority &amp; Page No.</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Requested Amount</th>
<th>CIPAC Score</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Gas Tax</th>
<th>Sewer Fund</th>
<th>Water Fund</th>
<th>Prop C</th>
<th>Funds Allocated to Date</th>
<th>Amount Recommended</th>
<th>Shortfall for FY 08/09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fiber Installation Phase 2</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>13B</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>($150,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Local Streets Rehabilitation Program</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>($650,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Surveillance Cameras for the El Segundo Athletic Fields</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Arterial Streets Rehabilitation Program</td>
<td>$582,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>($467,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.1 MG Reservoir Roof</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>($150,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Maple @ Nash SD and Street Improvement</td>
<td>$352,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>($312,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
<td>($146,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Elevated Reservoir Painting</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>7</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>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($100,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>City Hall Signage Program</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>7</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>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($75,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Archway on Main @ Imperial</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>7BC</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>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($360,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Library Homework Center</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td>7</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>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($1,150,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Requests</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,193,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$3,197,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>($4,996,000)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available Funding by Source of Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,200,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$1,477,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$3,227,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>($4,968,000)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance of available funding</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$30,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CIPAC Recommendations for FY 2008-09 By Fund Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIPAC Priority No.</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Requested Amount</th>
<th>CIPAC Score</th>
<th>Amount Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sewer Enterprise Funds</td>
<td>$2,113,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$1,477,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pump Station No. 1 Upgrades and Force Main and Station No. 7 Abandonment (Design)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIFAC recommends this project for the maximum 2008/2009 funding according to the adopted 10-Year Infrastructure Replacement and Maintenance Program to address capacity deficiency and physical deterioration as determined in the 2002 Sewer Master Plan. There will still be a deficit of $635,000 according to the estimation but this will be reconsidered next fiscal year once the design further establishes a more real construction cost figure. The 2008-09 proposed allocation of funding will provide for both design and construction for the abandonment of Pump Station No. 7 and the enhancement of Pump Station No. 1 to accept the additional flows via gravity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Water Enterprise Funds</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water Main Replacements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIFAC recommends this project for full funding in line with the proposed 10-Year Infrastructure Replacement and Maintenance Program to address the replacement of cast and/or ductile iron pipes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.1 MG Reservoir Roof</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIFAC recommends this project for funding with the remaining available funds for water in FY 2008-09. There will be a shortfall of $150,000 that will be necessary to secure prior to implementing this project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Elevated Reservoir Painting</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIFAC does not recommend funding this project due to low score and limited general fund and water budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gas Tax Funds</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curb and Sidewalk Replacement Citywide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIFAC recommends fully funding this project to be in line with the proposed 10-Year Infrastructure Replacement and Maintenance Program. This project will address the displacement of curbs and sidewalks caused by the roots of City and private trees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Arterial Streets Rehabilitation Program</td>
<td>$542,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIFAC recommends partial funding this project due to a shortfall in available funds. Funding is recommended for this project using Proposition C and Gas Tax funding. The requested amount for this project is much less than the recommended $800,000 from the proposed 10-Year Infrastructure Replacement and Maintenance Program to address the deteriorating condition of the City's 25 miles of arterial and collector streets. The money allotted for this project will provide the pavement overlay of Aviation Blvd from 124th Street to El Segundo Blvd. to increase pavement condition to a standard pavement rating of 65.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Proposition C Funds</td>
<td>$582,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arterial Streets Rehabilitation Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIFAC recommends partial funding this project due to a shortfall in available funds. Funding is recommended for this project using Proposition C and Gas Tax funding. The requested amount for this project is much less than the recommended $800,000 from the proposed 10-Year Infrastructure Replacement and Maintenance Program to address the deteriorating condition of the City's 25 miles of arterial and collector streets. The money allotted for this project will provide the pavement overlay of Aviation Blvd from 124th Street to El Segundo Blvd. to increase pavement condition to a standard pavement rating of 65.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General Funds</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aquatics Concept Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIFAC recommends this project for full funding. There is strong community interest in this project and there is also a need to both upgrade the aging Urcho Saari Swim Stadium and possibly provide a new El Segundo swimming facility. This is according to the August 2005 Aquatic Master Plan of which this concept report project is based. Note: On July 15, 2008 City Council approved this item be funded in the 2007/2008 FY. Therefore, the funding is not shown for FY 2008/2009.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sycamore Park Playground</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Weather Diversion for Pump Station 17</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrofit Field Lights for Softball and Brett Fields</td>
<td>$285,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118th and 120th Street Improvements</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiber Installation Phase 3</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiber Installation Phase 2</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Streets Rehabilitation Program</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance Cameras for the El Segundo Athletic Fields</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple @ Nash SD and Street Improvement</td>
<td>$352,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signal Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$209,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Hall Signage Program</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archway on Main @ Imperial</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>7/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Homework Center</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost of Total Projects Recommended for Funding in FY 2008-09: $3,197,000
APPENDIX II

Project Detail Sheets
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 2008/2009

PROJECT TITLE  Aquatic Concept Report

REQUESTING DEPARTMENT  N/A – Public from Public Workshop 10/28/08

DESCRIPTION
This project will provide a consultant to evaluate and make recommendations for the implementation of the August 2005 Aquatic Master Plan.

JUSTIFICATION
The Aquatic Master Plan from August 2005 summarized recommendations as follows:
1. Support identified aquatic programming needs by providing appropriate aquatic facilities.
2. Renovate and repair existing aquatic facilities.
3. Develop new aquatic facilities to meet future and existing community aquatic needs.

The Public Works Department will be providing an update report to City Council on June 17, 2008, regarding costs to replace the filtration system, gutters, and related components to the existing Urho Saari Swim Stadium (The Plunge). The estimated costs of these improvements are $676,000.

The Aquatic Master Plan identified four options for a new aquatic complex. These options included different pool sizes and amenities that ranged from $6 million to $9.8 million. A possible location identified for this aquatic complex was Hilltop Park.

This proposed project consultant will look at the existing Aquatic Master Plan, the Urho Saari Swim Stadium and proposal for a new aquatic facility, compare feasible locations and alternatives that serve the El Segundo community and present these alternatives to City Council.

GENERAL PLAN REFERENCE
LU1, LU6

URHO SAARI SWIM STADIUM

CIPAC COMMENTS
CIPAC recommends this project for full funding. There is strong community interest in this project and there is also a need to both upgrade the aging Urho Saari Swim Stadium and possibly provide a new El Segundo swimming facility. This is according to the August 2005 Aquatic Master Plan of which this concept report project is based. Note: On July 15, 2008 City Council approved this item be funded in the 2007/2008 FY. Therefore, the funding is not shown for FY 2008/2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
<th>FUNDS ALLOCATED TO DATE</th>
<th>EXPENSES TO 9/30/08</th>
<th>FY 2008/09</th>
<th>FY 2009/10</th>
<th>FY 2010/11</th>
<th>FY 2011/12</th>
<th>FY 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CIPAC SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PFE</th>
<th>CN</th>
<th>TOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUNDING SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>General/Capital Improvement Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.</td>
<td>Water Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT.</td>
<td>Gasoline Tax Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Developer Contributions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>C.D.B.G.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Asset Forfeiture Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR.</td>
<td>Grant/Other Agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR.</td>
<td>Infrastructure Replacement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>CONCEPT DESIGN</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>MANAGEMENT/INSPECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>CONTINGENCIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>OTHER (LIST)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|               | TOTAL                 | $30,000        |

All costs shown in current dollars

CIPAC FORM 2008 – 2009

1

66
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 2008/2009

PROJECT TITLE | Sycamore Park Playground

REQUESTING DEPARTMENT | Recreation and Parks

DESCRIPTION
The installation of a new swing set apparatus, pour-in-place ground cover, and design and installation of a handicap ramp from the sidewalk into the Sycamore Park playground area.

JUSTIFICATION
Sycamore Park’s original swing set was removed for safety reasons. Residents requested they be replaced. Through the Roberti-Z’Berg-Harris (RZH) Bond Act of 2000, replacing the swing set and a pour-in-place ground material was approved by the State in April 2003. This grant requires a matching fund of $21,026 from the City and was approved by City Council Resolution 4302 in March 2003. Grant expenditure and reimbursement approval is contingent upon handicap accessibility to the playground, therefore the design and installation of an ADA accessible ramp from the sidewalk into the park is necessary. Use of an additional a Roberti-Z’ Berg-Harris Grant in 2002 for $49,061 which had already been approved but has been awaiting project designation will be used toward this project.

Utilization of both the RZH 2000 and RZH 2002 grants, combined with the City’s required matching funds of $21,026 will provide sufficient funding for all elements for this project as well as additional park amenities (i.e. benches, etc.).

Secured Grant Funds for this project under RZH 2000 grant | $49,061
Required Local Match that is being requested from City (for RZH 2000) | $21,026
Secured Grant Funds to be designated under RZH 2002 grant | $44,680
ESTIMATED PROJECT TOTAL | $114,767

GENERAL PLAN REFERENCE
LU 6

CIPAC COMMENTS: CIPAC recommends this project for full funding. This project is a continuation of the playground apparatus funding that was installed in FY 2007/2008 at Recreation Park. We have been using RZH 2000 and 2002 grant funds and the amount requested is the required local match. This project will also include handicap accessibility to the playground.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
<th>FUNDS ALLOCATED TO DATE</th>
<th>EXPENSES TO 9/30/08</th>
<th>FY 2008/09</th>
<th>FY 2009/10</th>
<th>FY 2010/11</th>
<th>FY 2011/12</th>
<th>FY 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$114,767</td>
<td>$93,741</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$21,026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CIPAC SCORE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PFE</th>
<th>CN</th>
<th>TOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUNDING SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. DESIGN</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>$84,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MANAGEMENT/INSPECTION</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. OTHER (LIST):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All costs shown in current dollars

CIPAC FORM 2008 – 2009
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 2008/2009

PROJECT TITLE  Dry Weather Diversion – Pump Station No. 17

REQUESTING DEPARTMENT  Public Works – Wastewater Division

DESCRIPTION

Provide a design and construct a dry weather diversion plan for the northeast residential area to pump station no. 17.

JUSTIFICATION

Runoff from the northeast residential area typically drains into pump station no. 17 storm drain. This project would divert the flow to the sewer line in Imperial Avenue during the dry weather months between April 15 and October 15. A plan and construction needs to be initiated to achieve overall better water quality in Santa Monica Bay.

GENERAL PLAN REFERENCE

LU7

CIPAC COMMENTS

CIPAC recommends this project for full funding to provide for mandated storm water mitigation during low-flow periods to prevent pollution to the ocean from local storm drains. The recent 20 cities Notice of Violation was a consideration in the high score this project received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND ALLOCATED TO DATE</th>
<th>EXPENSES TO 9/30/08</th>
<th>FY 2008/09</th>
<th>FY 2009/10</th>
<th>FY 2010/11</th>
<th>FY 2011/12</th>
<th>FY 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CIPAC SCORE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PFE</th>
<th>CN</th>
<th>TOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUNDING SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COST - BREAKDOWN</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Asset Forfeiture Fund</td>
<td>1. DESIGN</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. C.D.B.G.</td>
<td>2. CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT. Gasoline Tax Fund</td>
<td>3. MANAGEMENT/INSPECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Developer Contributions</td>
<td>4. CONTINGENCIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. General/Capital Improvement Fund</td>
<td>5. OTHER (LIST) Soils Engineer Rep. Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Water Fund</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All costs shown in current dollars

CIPAC FORM 2008 – 2009
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 2008/2009

PROJECT TITLE  Pump Station No. 1 Upgrades and Force Main and Station No. 7 Abandonment

REQUESTING DEPARTMENT  Public Works Department – Wastewater Division

DESCRIPTION
Upgrade Pump Station No. 1 and replace the Force Main and abandon Pump Station No. 7.

JUSTIFICATION
In FY2007-08, CIPAC recommended to fund $542k of the $2,830,000 project to 1) upgrade station no. 1, 2) replace the force main and 3) abandon pump station no. 7. The 10-year plan calls for $2,530,000 be allotted to this effort this fiscal year. The sewer program has suspended replacements to focus funds on this needed project. The Sewer Master Plan Study identifies this project as Priority No. 1. Abandonment of Pump Station 7 was not a part of the master plan study. If the allotted amount of $1,477,000 is obtained in sewer funds, $636,000 in general funds would be required this FY.

GENERAL PLAN REFERENCE  LU7

CIPAC COMMENTS:
CIPAC recommends this project for the maximum 2008/2009 funding according to the adopted 10-Year Infrastructure Replacement and Maintenance Program to address capacity deficiency and physical deterioration as determined in the 2002 Sewer Master Plan. There will still be a deficit of $636,000 according to the estimation but this will be reconsidered next fiscal year once the design further establishes a more real construction cost figure. The 2008-09 proposed allocation of funding will provide for the both design and construction for the abandonment of Pump Station No. 7 and the enhancement of Pump Station No. 1 to accept the additional flows via gravity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
<th>FUNDS ALLOCATED TO DATE</th>
<th>EXPENSES TO 9/30/08</th>
<th>FY 2008/09</th>
<th>FY 2009/10</th>
<th>FY 2010/11</th>
<th>FY 2011/12</th>
<th>FY 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,830,000</td>
<td>$717,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$2,113,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CIPAC scored the project as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PFE</th>
<th>CN</th>
<th>TOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUNDING SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COST - BREAKDOWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. DESIGN</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>2,480,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MANAGEMENT/INSPECTION</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CONTINGENCIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. OTHER (LIST)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,830,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All costs shown in current dollars

CIPAC FORM 2008–2009
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 2008/2009

PROJECT TITLE | Water Main Replacements

REQUESTING DEPARTMENT | Public Works – Water Division

DESCRIPTION
Replace deteriorating mains ($600k). The following location of mains are proposed to be replaced in this FY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Length (LF)</th>
<th>Pipe Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Street</td>
<td>Mariposa to Maple</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariposa Avenue</td>
<td>Hillcrest to Loma Vista</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>10&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Avenue</td>
<td>Valley to Hillcrest</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>8&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Avenue</td>
<td>Hillcrest to West End</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>8&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JUSTIFICATION
The water system is composed of water mains, booster pumps and reservoirs. The City Maintains approximately 57 miles of primarily cast or ductile iron pipes. The pipes listed were built in the 1930s. These pipes typically have a 50-year life requiring that roughly 1 mile of main should be replaced annually. In addition, the water master plan completed in 2005 identified a 10-year capital improvement program. The plan shown in Attachment E mirrors the master plan with a few adjustments. The plan consists of $900,000 in water main replacement annually and varying investments for pump station, reservoir and high tower maintenance. This level of capital improvement cannot be accommodated by the current rate structure. Expenses have escalated at a rate beyond what was anticipated in the rate studies. Assuming no General Fund subsidy to the water operation, there is currently about $200,000 available for water capital improvements. An additional investment in the amount $400,000 would be required in FY 2008-09 to accomplish the replacements listed assuming all of the available water CIP money was used in conjunction with this project. Additional investment will be required in future years depending on water purchase costs and billing revenues. Attachment E indicates the available funding and additional required investment expected considering scheduled rate adjustments and expected water purchase cost increases.

GENERAL PLAN REFERENCE | LU7
CIPAC COMMENTS
CIPAC recommends this project for full funding in line with the proposed 10-Year Infrastructure Replacement and Maintenance Program to address the replacement of cast and/or ductile iron pipes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EST. COST</th>
<th>FUNDS ALLOCATED TO DATE</th>
<th>EXPENSES TO 9/30/08</th>
<th>FY 2008/09</th>
<th>FY 2009/10</th>
<th>FY 2010/11</th>
<th>FY 2011/12</th>
<th>FY 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$600K</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$1,492,000</td>
<td>$1,116,000</td>
<td>$1,116,000</td>
<td>$1,116,000</td>
<td>$1,116,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CIPAC SCORE | Score M CO HS FS PR PI PFE CN TOT 14
2 3 |

FUNDING SOURCES | COST - BREAKDOWN
G. General/Capital Improvement Fund | DESCRIPTION | ESTIMATED COST
1. DESIGN | $60,000
2. CONSTRUCTION | $510,000
3. MANAGEMENT/INSPECTION | $20,000
4. CONTINGENCIES | $10,000
5. OTHER (LIST) Soils Engineer Rep. Survey | TOTAL $600,000

All costs shown in current dollars

CIPAC FORM 2008 – 2009
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 2008/2009

PROJECT TITLE | Curb and Sidewalk Replacement Citywide

REQUESTING DEPARTMENT | Public Works

DESCRIPTION

Curb and Sidewalk Repair Citywide.

JUSTIFICATION

Curb and sidewalk are displaced by tree roots and other causes creating potential trip hazards. Locations for curb and sidewalk requiring repair are generated throughout the year by field surveys from the Street Maintenance Division and requests from residents. Each year the amount of work identified for repair exceeds the funding allocated. Additional funding would enable the Street Maintenance Division to reduce the backlog of resident's requests and City survey's. It is estimated that every 20 years 10% of a street's concrete curbs and sidewalk must be replaced. This results in approximately $185,000 of concrete work needed annually. There is $100,000 available in Gas Tax funds for this project.

GENERAL PLAN REFERENCE
LU7

CIPAC COMMENTS
CIPAC recommends fully funding for this project to be in line with the proposed 10-Year Infrastructure Replacement and Maintenance Program. This project will address the displacement of curbs and sidewalks caused by the roots of City and private trees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
<th>FUNDS ALLOCATED TO DATE</th>
<th>EXPENSES TO 9/30/08</th>
<th>FY 2008/09</th>
<th>FY 2009/10</th>
<th>FY 2010/11</th>
<th>FY 2011/12</th>
<th>FY 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CIPAC SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PFE</th>
<th>CN</th>
<th>TOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUNDING SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COST - BREAKDOWN</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td>$185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MANAGEMENT/INSPECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CONTINGENCIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. OTHER (LIST) Soils Engineer Rep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$185,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All costs shown in current dollars

CIPAC FORM 2008 – 2009
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 2008/2009

PROJECT TITLE
Retro-fit Field Lights for Softball and Brett Field- Continuation of final Phase (3)

REQUESTING DEPARTMENT
Recreation and Parks

DESCRIPTION
This final phase will rewire the existing light poles picking up from the new underground feeders installed in Phase Two (2). This project will replace the wires from the ground connections up the pole and to all of the fixtures at George Brett and the Softball Field in Recreation Park. In addition, the project will replace the current field lighting lamps and ballast with a new energy efficient Musco Light- Structure Green system. Phase (3) has been completed on Stevenson Field in January 2008, cost restraints prevented George Brett and the Softball Field from being completed at that time.

JUSTIFICATION
Recreation Park recently completed replacement of all electrical services, sub-panels and distribution systems throughout the park. This final phase will replace the old wiring in the poles that have experienced several faults and failures, as well as upgrading the inefficient ballast and fixtures with modern technology that will save energy in the order of 20 metric tons per year. It will also allow the maintenance crews to further consolidate their tasks by using this latest and the same technology used at the Campus El Segundo Athletic Fields and Stevenson Field.

GENERAL PLAN REFERENCE
LU1, LU6

CIPAC COMMENTS
CIPAC recommends full funding for the Softball Field only due to the available general funds for this year's CIPAC. Additional funding for Brett Field can be considered at the 2009/2010 CIPAC session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
<th>FUNDS ALLOCATED TO DATE</th>
<th>EXPENSES TO 9/30/08</th>
<th>FY 2008/09</th>
<th>FY 2009/10</th>
<th>FY 2010/11</th>
<th>FY 2011/12</th>
<th>FY 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$160,000 Brett Field</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$285,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125,000 Softball Field</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CIPAC SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUNDING SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>BREAKDOWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G. General/Capital Improvement Fund</td>
<td>1. DESIGN</td>
<td>$285,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Water Fund</td>
<td>2. CONSTRUCTION (G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT. Gasoline Tax Fund</td>
<td>3. MANAGEMENT/INSPECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Developer Contributions</td>
<td>4. CONTINGENCIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. C.D.B.G.</td>
<td>5. OTHER (LIST)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Asset Forfeiture Fund</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$285,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR. Grant/Other Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR. Infrastructure Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All costs shown in current dollars

CIPAC FORM 2008 – 2009
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 2008/2009

PROJECT TITLE 118th & 120th Street Improvements

REQUESTING DEPARTMENT Public Works

DESCRIPTION

Northrop Grumman Systems Corporation (NGSC) has requested street improvements on 118th and 120th Streets between the Aviation Blvd. and Hornet Way. Each day, including before dawn and during evening hours, hundreds of employees drive or walk across the MTA railroad right-of-way. NGSC is requesting 1) sidewalk construction; 2) street lighting, 3) street resurfacing, and 4) City support to obtain a memorandum of agreement with the MTA for crossing improvements and cost allocation between the parties. This project may require complete reconstruction depending on the recommendations of the soils engineer and street designer. Design will be required as part of this project.

JUSTIFICATION

The NGSC site employs approximately 4,500 personnel assigned to both classified and unclassified military programs. Employees have only two major access points to the main complex of buildings: Douglas Street to the west, and Hornet Way to the east. The MTA right-of-way immediately adjacent to Hornet Way accommodates active rail lines. This project will upgrade two short streets located west of Aviation Boulevard and east of Hornet Way and install sidewalks and street lights. These two intersections were originally designed decades ago. Pedestrians and automobile traffic are not separated on portions of the streets. The rapid deterioration of this street is possibly due to the original street being built on the existing grade without the proper sub-base per today's street construction standards.

GENERAL PLAN REFERENCE
LU4, LU7

CIPAC COMMENTS

CIPAC recommends this project for partial FY 2008/2009 funding to allow for design and to match the contribution from Northrop-Grumman. After coordination with BNSF, further appropriations can be considered for construction once this amount is known. It may be in the FY 2009/2010 CIPAC session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
<th>FUNDS ALLOCATED TO DATE</th>
<th>EXPENSES TO 9/30/08</th>
<th>FY 2008/09</th>
<th>FY 2009/10</th>
<th>FY 2010/11</th>
<th>FY 2011/12</th>
<th>FY 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CIPAC SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PFE</th>
<th>CN</th>
<th>TOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUNDING SOURCES

All costs shown in current dollars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. DESIGN</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>$250,000 (Street Lights exclude)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MANAGEMENT/INSPECTION</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CONTINGENCIES</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. OTHER (LIST) Soils Engineer Rep. Survey</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CIPAC FORM 2008 – 2009
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 2008/2009

PROJECT TITLE  Fiber Installation Phase 3

REQUESTING DEPARTMENT  Fire Department

DESCRIPTION

Phase 3 of the fiber project will continue the installation of fiber through City owned facilities to the new Fire Station 2 and the El Segundo Athletic Fields from the intersection of El Segundo Blvd. and Illinois Street. This intersection is located within the currently planned fiber project Phase 2.

JUSTIFICATION

Phase 3 of this project will continue the extension of fiber data transmission lines to the new Fire Station and El Segundo Athletic Fields from the existing fiber installed at City Hall and Recreation Park. The goal is to have the outlying City facilities that have significant data transmission needs linked to City Hall and other City facilities through a fiber optic information network. Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the City's fiber installation project have been reviewed by the CIPAC previously. Phase 1 of this project would connect the Plunge, the Library and El Segundo High School to City Hall. Phase 2 would connect City Hall to the outlying Public Works Divisions and the Parks Maintenance Divisions located at the City Maintenance Facility.

GENERAL PLAN REFERENCE

LU7

CIPAC COMMENTS

CIPAC withdrew funding for this project in FY 2008-09 on advice of the Interim Public Works Director.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
<th>FUNDS ALLOCATED TO DATE</th>
<th>EXPENSES TO 9/30/08</th>
<th>FY 2008/09</th>
<th>FY 2009/10</th>
<th>FY 2010/11</th>
<th>FY 2011/12</th>
<th>FY 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CIPAC SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PFE</th>
<th>CN</th>
<th>TOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUNDING SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G. General/Capital Improvement Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Water Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT. Gasoline Tax Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Developer Contributions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. C.D.B.G.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Asset Forfeiture Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR. Grant/Other Agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR. Infrastructure Replacement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. General/Capital Improvement Fund</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Water Fund</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT. Gasoline Tax Fund</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Developer Contributions</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. C.D.B.G.</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Asset Forfeiture Fund</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR. Grant/Other Agencies</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR. Infrastructure Replacement</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All costs shown in current dollars

CIPAC FORM 2008 – 2009
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 2008/2009

PROJECT TITLE  Fiber Installation Phase 2

REQUESTING DEPARTMENT  Administration Dept. Information Technology Division

DESCRIPTION

This project will install fiber to the Public Works Yard and connect to the Water Yard from City Hall.

JUSTIFICATION

This project will allow fiber transmission from City Hall to the outlying Public Works Divisions as well as connect the Parks Maintenance Divisions to City Hall. On Phase 1, this project connects the Plunge, the Library and El Segundo High School to City Hall.

GENERAL PLAN REFERENCE

LU6, LU7

CIPAC COMMENTS

CIPAC recommends partially funding this project with available general funds for FY 2008/2009. Additional funds may be considered in the FY 2009/2010 CIPAC session. This project has an override consideration due to being a prior Council approved project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
<th>FUNDS ALLOCATED TO DATE</th>
<th>EXPENSES TO 9/30/08</th>
<th>FY 2008/09</th>
<th>FY 2009/10</th>
<th>FY 2010/11</th>
<th>FY 2011/12</th>
<th>FY 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CIPAC SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PFE</th>
<th>CN</th>
<th>TOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUNDING SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G. General/Capital Improvement Fund</td>
<td>1. DESIGN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Water Fund</td>
<td>2. CONSTRUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT. Gasoline Tax Fund</td>
<td>3. MANAGEMENT/INSPECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Developer Contributions</td>
<td>4. CONTINGENCIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. C.D.B.G.</td>
<td>5. OTHER (LIST)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Asset Forfeiture Fund</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR. Grant/Other Agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR. Infrastructure Replacement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All costs shown in current dollars

CIPAC FORM 2008 – 2009
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 2008/2009

PROJECT TITLE
Local Streets Rehabilitation Program

REQUESTING DEPARTMENT
Public Works

DESCRIPTION
Pavement overlay of 1.2 miles of local streets per year.

JUSTIFICATION
In El Segundo, local streets are maintained through spot repair and slurry seal. As pavement ages, it get less flexible and eventually cracks. Slurry sealing helps keep water from getting into the cracks and damaging the subgrade. As environmental cracks enlarge, slurry sealing is less effective. A fresh wearing surface of conventional or rubberized asphalt is required from time to time. Throughout the industry it is generally accepted that streets can go about 30 years between overlays. Virtually all the City’s local streets are much older than 30 years and there is no record that any local street has been overlaid. Cracking and alligating are evident on most streets. The local street overlay program proposed will mill and overlay 5% of local streets or about 1.2 miles per year annually. This will provide a new wearing surface on all local streets in twenty years. After this goal is met, the program can be reduced to overlaying on a 30-year cycle. No money was allocated for this purpose from CIPAC 07/08.

GENERAL PLAN REFERENCE
LU7

CIPAC COMMENTS
CIPAC recommends partially funding this project with available general funds. In order to match the recommended funding for our local streets as outlined in the 10-year Infrastructure Replacement and Maintenance Plan, $400,000 would need to be appropriated to this effort every year. No funding was appropriated in FY 2007/2008. CIPAC recommends that in future years, more emphasis be placed on addressing the rehabilitation of our local streets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
<th>FUNDS ALLOCATED TO DATE</th>
<th>EXPENSES 9/30/08</th>
<th>FY 2008/09</th>
<th>FY 2009/10</th>
<th>FY 2010/11</th>
<th>FY 2011/12</th>
<th>FY 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CIPAC SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUNDING SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COST - BREAKDOWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G. General/Capital Improvement Fund</td>
<td>1. DESIGN</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Water Fund</td>
<td>2. CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT. Gasoline Tax Fund</td>
<td>3. MANAGEMENT/INSPECTION</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Developer Contributions</td>
<td>4. CONTINGENCIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. C.D.B.G.</td>
<td>5. OTHER (LIST) Soils Engineer Rep. Survey</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Asset Forfeiture Fund</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR. Grant/Other Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR. Infrastructure Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All costs shown in current dollars

CIPAC FORM 2008 – 2009
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 2008/2009

PROJECT TITLE
Surveillance cameras for the El Segundo Athletic Fields

REQUESTING DEPARTMENT
Recreation and Parks

DESCRIPTION
This project will install cameras to the El Segundo Athletic Fields. Conduit was installed as a change order at the end of the project in 2007. Cameras were not purchased but need to be in order to deter vandalism.

JUSTIFICATION
This project will deter vandalism at the athletic fields. By having a direct link to the Police Department, surveillance to monitor after hour activities at this public facility will protect the City’s investment in this public park facility.

GENERAL PLAN REFERENCE
LU1, LU6

CIPAC COMMENTS
CIPAC recommends fully funding this project in FY 2008/2009. This project will allow law enforcement personnel to be better equipped when responding to situations at the Athletic Fields as well as having the ability to monitor activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
<th>FUNDS ALLOCATED TO DATE</th>
<th>EXPENSES TO 9/30/08</th>
<th>FY 2008/09</th>
<th>FY 2009/10</th>
<th>FY 2010/11</th>
<th>FY 2011/12</th>
<th>FY 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CIPAC SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PFE</th>
<th>CN</th>
<th>TOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUNDING SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COST - BREAKDOWN</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G. General/Capital Improvement Fund</td>
<td>1. DESIGN</td>
<td>2. CONSTRUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Water Fund</td>
<td>3. MANAGEMENT/INSPECTION</td>
<td>4. CONTINGENCIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT. Gasoline Tax Fund</td>
<td>5. OTHER (LIST)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Developer Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. C.D.B.G.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Asset Forfeiture Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR. Grant/Other Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR. Infrastructure Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All costs shown in current dollars

CIPAC FORM 2008 – 2009
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 2008/2009

PROJECT TITLE
Arterial Streets Rehabilitation Program

REQUESTING DEPARTMENT
Public Works

DESCRIPTION
Proposed street rehabilitation projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aviation Bl. - 124th St. to Railroad R/W @</td>
<td>248000</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$496,000</td>
<td>$371,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mariposa Ave - Sepulveda to Nash @</td>
<td>205600</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$411,200</td>
<td>$411,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JUSTIFICATION
The Arterial Streets Rehabilitation Program will rehabilitate arterial and collector street citywide. On a biennial basis, Public Works inspects and rates pavements on arterials and collectors. A Pavement Condition Index (PCI, 0-100, 100 being best) is assigned to each street based on pavement condition. Agencies typically attempt to keep their average PCI above 65, which is considered a minimum standard. The City’s current average PCI rating is 56 which is “fair to good”. The goal of the program is to increase the condition of streets to a rating of 65. To do so, a minimum investment in pavement overlay projects in the amount of $800,000 per year is required. Once this PCI rating is reached, the Arterial and Collector system can be maintained through simple lower-cost measures such as slurry sealing. If this level of investment is not made, the quantity of deferred maintenance will increase and streets will no longer be candidates for lower cost rehabilitation strategies. $100,000 can be used for this project from Gas Tax.

GENERAL PLAN REFERENCE
LU7

CIPAC COMMENTS
CIPAC recommends partial funding this project due to a shortfall in available funds. Funding is recommended for this project using Proposition C and Gas Tax funding. The requested amount for this project is much less than the recommended $800,000 from the proposed 10-Year Infrastructure Replacement and Maintenance Program to address the deteriorating condition of the City’s 25 miles of arterial and collector streets. The money allotted for this project will provide the pavement overlay of Aviation Blvd from 124th Street to El Segundo Blvd. to increase pavement condition to a standard pavement rating of 65.

ESTIMATED COST FUND ALLOCATED TO DATE EXPENSES TO 9/30/08 FY 2008/09 FY 2009/10 FY 2010/11 FY 2011/12 FY 2012/13
$782,200 0 0 $782,200 $800,000 $800,000 $800,000 $800,000

CIPAC SCORE: Score M CO HS FS PR PI PFE CN TOT
0 0 3 1 2 1 2 2 11

FUNDING SOURCES COST - BREAKDOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>General/Capital Improvement Fund</td>
<td>1. DESIGN</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.</td>
<td>Water Fund</td>
<td>2. CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>$607,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT.</td>
<td>Gasoline Tax Fund</td>
<td>3. MANAGEMENT/INSPECTION</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Developer Contributions</td>
<td>4. CONTINGENCIES</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>C.D.B.G.</td>
<td>5. OTHER (LIST) Soils Engineer Rep. Survey</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Asset Forfeiture Fund</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$782,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR.</td>
<td>Grant/Other Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR.</td>
<td>Infrastructure Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All costs shown in current dollars

CIPAC FORM 2008 – 2009
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 2008/2009

PROJECT TITLE | Water 3.1 MG Reservoir Roof Repairs and Painting

REQUESTING DEPARTMENT | Public Works – Water Division

DESCRIPTION
Recat/repair/maintain 3.1 MG circular reservoir ($250k).

JUSTIFICATION
The 3.1 Million Gallon (MG) Circular reservoir was identified as priority no. 4 for recoating and maintenance in the Water Master Plan. The $250,000 will pay for the repair and painting of the 3.1 MG reservoir along with the required preparation and scaffolding to execute such a project. The inspection conducted in 2004 showed that the roofing has cracks which may allow leakage of rainwater into the reservoir. This project will repair the roofing to prevent entry of rainwater and to protect the roof framing.

GENERAL PLAN REFERENCE
LU7

CIPAC COMMENTS
CIPAC recommends this project for funding with the remaining available funds for water in FY 2008-09. There will be a shortfall of $150,000 that will be necessary to secure prior to implementing this project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
<th>FUNDS ALLOCATED TO DATE</th>
<th>EXPENSES TO 9/30/08</th>
<th>FY 2008/09</th>
<th>FY 2009/10</th>
<th>FY 2010/11</th>
<th>FY 2011/12</th>
<th>FY 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CIPAC SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PFE</th>
<th>CN</th>
<th>TOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUNDING SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COST - BREAKDOWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MANAGEMENT/INSPECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CONTINGENCIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. OTHER (LIST) Soils Engineer Rep.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All costs shown in current dollars

CIPAC FORM 2008 – 2009
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 2008/2009

PROJECT TITLE | Maple @ Nash Storm Drain & Street Improvements

REQUESTING DEPARTMENT | Public Works

DESCRIPTION
The project will consist of either reconstruction or grind and overlay of the easterly 400 Lineal Feet of Maple Avenue at Nash Street and include a storm drain connecting to the existing 60 inch storm drain at Nash Street and Mariposa Avenue. The project will include a catch basin on the north side of the street and one on the south side of the street at this location. Development in the area has increased the runoff into this area and over the years, possibly as a result of settlement, this stretch of Maple Avenue has become a problem area of El Segundo.

JUSTIFICATION
In the recent past, complaints have been received regarding this area for flooding and potholes. The picture above is on the northerly side of Maple Avenue near the Nash Street intersection facing west. Patching has not accomplished a long term solution to this problem. The problem is drainage. Prior to reconstruction of this 400 LF of Maple Avenue, a storm drain needs to be installed. By addressing the drainage problem, the service life of the reconstructed street will be extended. The plan to the right shows a proposed solution.

GENERAL PLAN REFERENCE
LU7
CIPAC COMMENTS
CIPAC recommends fully funding the grind and overlay portion of this project for funding in FY 2008-09. The Storm Drain Improvement shall be omitted due to limited general funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
<th>FUNDS ALLOCATED TO DATE</th>
<th>EXPENSES TO 9/30/08</th>
<th>FY 2008/09</th>
<th>FY 2009/10</th>
<th>FY 2010/11</th>
<th>FY 2011/12</th>
<th>FY 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$352,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$352,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CIPAC SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PFE</th>
<th>CN</th>
<th>TOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUNDING SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost - Breakdown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G. General/Capital Improvement Fund</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Water Fund</td>
<td>$237,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT. Gasoline Tax Fund</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Developer Contributions</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. C.D.B.G.</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Asset Forfeiture Fund</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR. Grant/Other Agencies</td>
<td>TOTAL $352,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR. Infrastructure Replacement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All costs shown in current dollars

CIPAC FORM 2008 – 2009
# CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 2008/2009

**PROJECT TITLE** | Traffic Signal Rehabilitation Program
---|---
**REQUESTING DEPARTMENT** | Public Works – Street Division
**DESCRIPTION** | Rehabilitate 60 Traffic Signals every 2 years.

**JUSTIFICATION**
El Segundo has 100% jurisdiction over 24 signals, 8 are shared with the City of Manhattan Beach, 5 are shared with the City of Hawthorne, 1 is shared with both Manhattan Beach and Hawthorne, 3 are shared with the County of Los Angeles and 9 are shared with the City of Los Angeles and 10 are maintained entirely by Caltrans. The City contracts with the County for maintenance of the 24 traffic signal maintained 100% by El Segundo and the shared intersections with Manhattan Beach and Hawthorne. The City of Los Angeles maintains the shared intersections along Imperial Highway and Caltrans maintains all signals on Sepulveda Boulevard and the Atwood Way onramp to the 105 Freeway. There have been no stand-alone traffic signal projects undertaken by the City in recent memory. Many signals are showing their age and require upgrading. Poles and signal heads are antiquated and controller cabinets are corroded and unsightly. Most signal lamps are still incandescent bulbs with small percentage using L.E.D. technology. The plan proposed in Attachment E provides for the rehabilitation of an existing traffic signal every other year at the investment of $200,000 in alternating years. Funding of L.E.D retrofits will also be accomplished through this proposed budget and through the County maintenance contract.

**GENERAL PLAN REFERENCE** | LU7

**CIPAC COMMENTS**
CIPAC recommends partially funding this project with available general funds for FY 2008/2009. Additional funds may be considered in the FY 2009/2010 CIPAC session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
<th>FUNDS ALLOCATED TO DATE</th>
<th>EXPENSES TO 9/30/08</th>
<th>FY 2008/09</th>
<th>FY 2009/10</th>
<th>FY 2010/11</th>
<th>FY 2011/12</th>
<th>FY 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CIPAC SCORE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PFE</th>
<th>CN</th>
<th>TOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FUNDING SOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COST - BREAKDOWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G. General/Capital Improvement Fund</td>
<td>1. DESIGN</td>
<td>ESTIMATED COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Water Fund</td>
<td>2. CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT. Gasoline Tax Fund</td>
<td>3. MANAGEMENT/INSPECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Developer Contributions</td>
<td>4. CONTINGENCIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Asset Forfeiture Fund</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR. Grant/Other Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR. Infrastructure Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All costs shown in current dollars

CIPAC FORM 2008 – 2009
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 2008/2009

PROJECT TITLE
Water Elevated Reservoir Painting

REQUESTING DEPARTMENT
Public Works – Water Division

DESCRIPTION
Recoat/maintain elevated reservoir ($100k).

JUSTIFICATION
The elevated reservoir was identified as priority no. 2 for recoating and maintenance in the Water Master Plan. The $100,000 will pay for the painting of the elevated reservoir along with the required preparation and scaffolding to execute such a project. The inspection conducted in 2006 shows that it is in relatively good condition. The improvements recommended by the inspection report should be implemented and the tank should be recoated to extend its useful life.

GENERAL PLAN REFERENCE
LU7

CIPAC COMMENTS
CIPAC does not recommend funding this project due to low score and limited general fund and water budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
<th>FUNDS ALLOCATED TO DATE</th>
<th>EXPENSES TO 9/30/08</th>
<th>FY 2008/09</th>
<th>FY 2009/10</th>
<th>FY 2010/11</th>
<th>FY 2011/12</th>
<th>FY 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CIPAC SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PFE</th>
<th>CN</th>
<th>TOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUNDING SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>General/Capital Improvement Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.</td>
<td>Water Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT.</td>
<td>Gasoline Tax Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Developer Contributions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>C.D.B.G.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Asset Forfeiture Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR.</td>
<td>Grant/Other Agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR.</td>
<td>Infrastructure Replacement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DESCRIPTION
1. DESIGN
2. CONSTRUCTION
3. MANAGEMENT/INSPECTION
4. CONTINGENCIES
5. OTHER (LIST) Soils Engineer Rep. Survey

TOTAL $100,000

All costs shown in current dollars

CIPAC FORM 2008 – 2009
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 2008/2009

PROJECT TITLE | City Hall Signage Program
REQUESTING DEPARTMENT | Public Works – Engineering Division

DESCRIPTION

This project will customize signage to integrate into the entire facility.

JUSTIFICATION

Improve Signage to City Offices at City Hall to be compliant with latest OSHA, ADA and fire code.

GENERAL PLAN REFERENCE

LU7

CIPAC COMMENTS

CIPAC does not recommend funding this project due to low score and limited general fund budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED COST ALLOCATED TO DATE</th>
<th>EXPENSES TO 9/30/08</th>
<th>FY 2008/09</th>
<th>FY 2009/10</th>
<th>FY 2010/11</th>
<th>FY 2011/12</th>
<th>FY 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CIPAC SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PFE</th>
<th>CN</th>
<th>TOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUNDING SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MANAGEMENT/INSPECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CONTINGENCIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. OTHER (LIST) Soils Engineer Rep. Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL $75,000

All costs shown in current dollars

CIPAC FORM 2008 – 2009
**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 2008/2009**

**PROJECT TITLE**  
Archway on Main @ Imperial

**REQUESTING DEPARTMENT**  
Public Works

**DESCRIPTION**  
Provide an archway on Main Street at the entrance to the City near Imperial Avenue and a pylon and monument sign.

---

**JUSTIFICATION**  
On 7/17/07, the City Council approved three gateway signage locations, and on 10/17/07 approved the monument and pylon sign designs. The Council-appointed Downtown Subcommittee has since selected archway design and will recommend Council approval upon determination of a funding source. CIPAC support is requested for: an archway at Main and Imperial ($300k), a pylon sign at Grand and Vista Del Mar ($40K) and a monument at Grand and Sepulveda ($20K).

**GENERAL PLAN REFERENCE**  
LU1 & LU2

**CIPAC COMMENTS**  
CIPAC does not recommend funding this project due to low score and limited general fund budget. The override score denotes not only a prior Council approval on this project but the C denotes that a Council policy decision may be required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
<th>FUNDS ALLOCATED TO DATE</th>
<th>EXPENSES TO 9/30/08</th>
<th>FY 2008/09</th>
<th>FY 2009/10</th>
<th>FY 2010/11</th>
<th>FY 2011/12</th>
<th>FY 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CIPAC SCORE**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PFE</th>
<th>CN</th>
<th>TOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FUNDING SOURCES**

- G. General/Capital Improvement Fund
- W. Water Fund
- GT. Gasoline Tax Fund
- D. Developer Contributions
- C. C.D.B.G.
- A. Asset Forfeiture Fund
- GR. Grant/Other Agencies
- IR. Infrastructure Replacement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MANAGEMENT/INSPECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CONTINGENCIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. OTHER (LIST) Soils Engineer Rep. Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COST - BREAKDOWN**

| TOTAL | $360,000 |

All costs shown in current dollars

CIPAC FORM 2008 – 2009
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 2008/2009

PROJECT TITLE | Library Homework Center & Children’s Story-time Room

REQUESTING DEPARTMENT | Library Services Department

DESCRIPTION
This would be a new construction project for a Library Homework Center (2,000 sq. ft.) and adjoining Children’s Story-time Room (2,000 sq. ft.). The addition would be a total expansion of 4,000 sq. ft. to the Youth Services Division in the lower area of the Library. This project was first submitted last year and it still considered a worthy project by staff.

JUSTIFICATION
Homework Center
As in many communities, parents perceive the El Segundo Public Library as a safe and welcoming place for their children to visit after school. From the hours between 3 p.m. - 6 p.m., the Youth Services section of the library becomes filled with students needing to complete school assignments. Our current number of study tables and computer terminals does not accommodate this growing trend.

With the close supervision of staff and volunteers, many public libraries throughout the country are incorporating homework centers into their children and young adult service areas. The proposal is to add a separate room for students to use print and electronic resources to assist them with their homework. Additional part-time staff and volunteers would be on site to supervise, tutor and instruct them in using the library materials and computers.

GENERAL PLAN REFERENCE | LU1, LU2

CIPAC COMMENTS
CIPAC does not recommend funding this project due to low score and limited general fund budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
<th>FUNDS ALLOCATED TO DATE</th>
<th>EXPENSES TO 9/30/08</th>
<th>FY 2008/09</th>
<th>FY 2009/10</th>
<th>FY 2010/11</th>
<th>FY 2011/12</th>
<th>FY 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CIPAC SCORE

Score

M CO HS FS PR PI PFE CN TOT
0 0 0 0 1 1 2 3 7

FUNDING SOURCES

| G. General/Capital Improvement Fund |
| W. Water Fund |
| GT. Gasoline Tax Fund |
| D. Developer Contributions |
| C. C.D.B.G. |
| A. Asset Forfeiture Fund |
| GR. Grant/Other Agencies |
| IR. Infrastructure Replacement |

DESCRIPTION | COST BREAKDOWN | ESTIMATED COST

1. DESIGN
2. CONSTRUCTION
3. MANAGEMENT/INSPECTION
4. CONTINGENCIES
5. OTHER (LIST) Soils Engineer Rep.
Survey

TOTAL $2,300,000

All costs shown in current dollars

CIPAC FORM 2008 – 2009
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>750,665.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Traffic Safety Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>State Gas Tax Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Associated Recreation Activities Fund</td>
<td>1,919.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Asset Forfeiture Fund</td>
<td>2,781.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Comm. Dev. Block Grant</td>
<td>6,100.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>PROP &quot;A&quot; Transportation</td>
<td>9,028.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>PROP &quot;C&quot; Transportation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Air Quality Investment Program</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Home Sound Installation Fund</td>
<td>125,001.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Hyperion Mitigation Fund</td>
<td>19.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>TOA Article 3 - SB 21 Bikeway Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>MTA Grant</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>C.O.P.S. Fund</td>
<td>30,273.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>L.A.W.A. Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Assessment District #73</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Capital Improvement Fund</td>
<td>363,840.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Infrastructure Replacement Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>149.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>Water Utility Fund</td>
<td>61,836.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>Wastewater Fund</td>
<td>8,876.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>Golf Course Fund</td>
<td>67,887.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>Equipment Replacement</td>
<td>265,397.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>Liability Insurance</td>
<td>393,393.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>Workers Comp. Reserve\ Insurance</td>
<td>374,043.45</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>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703</td>
<td>Expendable Trust Fund - Other</td>
<td>17,308.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708</td>
<td>Outside Services Trust</td>
<td>447.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Warrants: $2,508,937.28**

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

Information on actual expenditures is available in the Director of Administrative Services 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:**

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

For Ratiocination:

- **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:**

**DATE:** 7/28/08

**CITY MANAGER:**

**DATE:**
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO  
PAYMENTS BY WIRE TRANSFER  
7/4/2008 THROUGH 7/24/2008  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Payee</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/13/2008</td>
<td>Health Comp</td>
<td>(5,711.21)</td>
<td>Correct previous memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/13/2008</td>
<td>Manufactures &amp; Traders</td>
<td>5,711.21</td>
<td>Correct previous memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/3/2008</td>
<td>Unum provident</td>
<td>(427.80)</td>
<td>LTD insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/3/2008</td>
<td>Unum provident</td>
<td>469.80</td>
<td>LTD insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/9/2008</td>
<td>Health Comp</td>
<td>4,753.27</td>
<td>Weekly claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/10/2008</td>
<td>West Basin</td>
<td>927,451.88</td>
<td>H2O payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/10/2008</td>
<td>Employment Development</td>
<td>50,969.86</td>
<td>State Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/10/2008</td>
<td>IRS</td>
<td>254,801.77</td>
<td>Federal Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/11/2008</td>
<td>Employment Development</td>
<td>3,272.56</td>
<td>State Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/11/2008</td>
<td>Manufactures &amp; Traders</td>
<td>38,018.53</td>
<td>Vantage 457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/11/2008</td>
<td>State of CA</td>
<td>1,153.24</td>
<td>Child support withholdings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/14/2008</td>
<td>Federal Reserve</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>Employee I Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/14/2008</td>
<td>Nationwide Retirement</td>
<td>32,700.23</td>
<td>457 contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/17/2008</td>
<td>Lane Donovan Golf</td>
<td>17,616.49</td>
<td>Payroll Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/18/2008</td>
<td>Cal Pers</td>
<td>284,692.16</td>
<td>Retirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/18/2008</td>
<td>Health Comp</td>
<td>1,197.59</td>
<td>Weekly claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/21/2008</td>
<td>La Salle</td>
<td>43,725.00</td>
<td>ABAG Payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/24/2008</td>
<td>Health Comp</td>
<td>657.91</td>
<td>Weekly claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/24/2008</td>
<td>Manufactures &amp; Traders</td>
<td>34,733.31</td>
<td>Vantage 457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/24/2008</td>
<td>Employment Development</td>
<td>3,139.11</td>
<td>State 457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/24/2008</td>
<td>Employment Development</td>
<td>43,392.10</td>
<td>State Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/24/2008</td>
<td>IRS</td>
<td>227,019.52</td>
<td>Federal Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/4-7/24/08</td>
<td>Workers Comp Activity</td>
<td>17,589.19</td>
<td>SCRMA checks issued</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1,987,225.72  

DATE OF RATIFICATION: 8/5/08  
TOTAL PAYMENTS BY WIRE: 1,987,225.72  

Certified as to the accuracy of the wire transfers by:  

[Signatures and dates]  

Information on actual expenditures is available in the City Treasurer’s Office of the City of El Segundo.
REGULAR MEETING OF THE EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
TUESDAY, JULY 15, 2008 - 5:00 P.M.

5:00 P.M. SESSION

CALL TO ORDER – Mayor McDowell at 5:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Mayor McDowell - Present
Mayor Pro Tem Busch - Present
Council Member Brann - Present
Council Member Fisher - Present
Council Member Jacobson - Present

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

SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS:

None

The City Attorney stated that Council would be meeting in closed session pursuant to items identified on the agenda and Government Code §54956.9(b) items were the Henry Radio Claim No. 07-48 and a threat of exposure to litigation known to the public generally.

CLOSED SESSION:
The City Council moved 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(a) – -1- matter

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

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION
Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to Government Code §54956.9(b): -2- matters
CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION
Initiation of litigation pursuant to Government Code §54956.9(c): -1- matter

1. Potential intervention in Los Angeles Airport noise variance proceeding with California Department of Transportation.

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

CONFERENCE WITH CITY’S LABOR NEGOTIATOR (Gov't Code §54957.6): - 4- matters
City Negotiators: Interim City Manager Jack Wayt; Human Resources Director Bob Hyland; Finance Director Deborah Cullen; Richard Kreisler. Employee Organizations: (1) Unrepresented management/confidential employees (City employees who are not members of bargaining units); (2) the El Segundo Police Officers' Association; (3) El Segundo Firefighter's Association; and (4) the El Segundo Police Manager's Association.

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

SPECIAL MATTERS: - 0- matter

Council recessed at 6:50 p.m.
REGULAR MEETING OF THE EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
TUESDAY, JULY 15, 2008 - 7:00 P.M.

7:00 P.M. SESSION

CALL TO ORDER – Mayor McDowell at 7:00 p.m.

INVOCATION – Mark Stepp, Oceanside Christian Fellowship

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – Council Member Carl Jacobson

PRESENTATIONS

ROLL CALL

Mayor McDowell - Present
Mayor Pro Tem Busch - Present
Council Member Brann - Present
Council Member Fisher - Present
Council Member Jacobson - Present

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS – (Related to City Business Only – 5 minute limit per person, 30 minute limit total) Individuals who have received value of $50 or more to communicate to the City Council on behalf of another, and employees speaking on behalf of their employer, must so identify themselves prior to addressing the City Council. Failure to do so shall be a misdemeanor and punishable by a fine of $250. While all comments are welcome, the Brown Act does not allow Council to take action on any item not on the agenda. The Council will respond to comments after Public Communications is closed.

City Attorney Mark Hensley, announced 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.

Liz Garnholz, resident, spoke regarding the aquatic facilities and the repair of the Urho Saari swim stadium.

Marilyn Henchford, resident, spoke regarding the aquatics facilities and the repair of the Urho Saari swim stadium.

Jack Kenton, resident, spoke regarding RV parking problems.

Emma Duncan, resident, spoke regarding the aquatics facilities and the repair of the Urho Saari swim stadium.
Steve Shevlin, Athletic Director of the El Segundo High School and resident, commended the City on the joint use agreement currently between the City and the School District. He also spoke regarding the Urho Saari Plunge and its usefulness. He stated that unfortunately the plunge may not be able to be upgraded and may not be used for School functions due to the age of the facilities.

Lee Davis, resident, spoke regarding the Urho Saari Swim Stadium and the need for a new facility.

Carol Watkins, resident, spoke regarding the Urho Saari Swim Stadium and the need for a new facility.

Ray Ondrejch, resident, spoke regarding proposed MEPS project and the negative statements being made.

Tom Lindsey, resident, spoke favorably about a new aquatic facility.

Tad Langlow, resident, spoke favorably about a new aquatic facility.

Barbara Briney, resident, spoke favorably about a new aquatic facility, either by upgrading the Urho Saari Stadium or the construction of a new facility.

Henry Stuart, resident, spoke favorably about a new aquatic facility, either by upgrading the Urho Saari Stadium or the construction of a new facility.

Ron Swanson, resident, spoke favorably about a new aquatic facility and stated that the community needs two pools, and can the city afford to operate two pools. Staff needs to assess whether or not the Swim Stadium can be upgraded or a new pool should be built.

Susanne Fuentes, resident, encouraged the preservation of the swim stadium.

Cindie Topar, resident and Recreation and Parks Commission, encouraged the preservation of the swim stadium and the upgrade of the pool.

A. PROCEDURAL MOTIONS

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

MOTION by Council Member Jacobson, SECONDED by Council Member Brunn 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)

1. Consideration and possible action to open a public hearing and receive testimony regarding: 1) an Environmental Assessment for a proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration; 2) a Zone Change from Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone to activate the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Zone; 3) A Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Amendment to limit the permitted uses to General Office and Medical-Dental Office uses only; and 4) A Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review to allow a 32,980 square-foot, two-story, commercial general office and medical-dental office building located at 1700 E. Grand Avenue. Applicant: Mar Canyon Grand, LLC. The proposed use of the project site is for a Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS) (Fiscal Impact: None)

Mayor McDowell stated this is the time and place hereto fixed for a public hearing regarding: 1) an Environmental Assessment for a proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration; 2) a Zone Change from Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone to activate the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Zone; 3) A Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Amendment to limit the permitted uses to General Office and Medical-Dental Office uses only; and 4) A Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review to allow a 32,980 square-foot, two-story, commercial general office and medical-dental office building located at 1700 E. Grand Avenue. Applicant: Mar Canyon Grand, LLC. The proposed use of the project site is for a Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS). Clerk Mortesen stated that proper notice was completed and ten additional written communications were received by City Clerk’s Office.

Interim City Manager Jack Wayt not participating due to a conflict regarding his property ownership.

Kim Christensen, Planning Manager, gave a report.

Lieutenant Colonel David Phillips gave a brief presentation of what the MEPS center does and how it functions.

Allan MacKinzie, Mar Canyon Grand, LLC, gave a brief presentation.

1. Jennifer Rosen, resident, against the MEPS project.
2. David Rosen, resident, against the MEPS project, prefers a Small Business facility in that area.
3. Arlene Noay, non-resident, against the MEPS project.
4. Karl Jacobs, resident, supports the MEPS project.
5. Liz (West) Odabashian, resident, supports the MEPS project.
6. Jim Hart, President of the El Segundo Chamber of Commerce, announced the Chamber unanimously supports the MEPS project.
7. Lawrence Martin, resident, supports the MEPS project, but disagrees with the location.
8. Julius Wilson, resident, read a correspondence from resident Willard Krick. Supports the MEPS project, but disagrees with the location.
9. Stacy Palmer, resident, continued to read a correspondence from resident Willard Krick.
10. Robert Kerner, resident, supports the MEPS project.
11. Sally Martin, resident, supports the MEPS project, but disagrees with the location.
12. Jack Kenton, resident, supports the MEPS project.
13. Joan Parker, resident, supports the MEPS project.
14. Dave Johnston, resident, supports the MEPS project.
15. Sedan Williams, resident, against the MEPS project.
16. Steve Kykendahl, representing the developer, supports the MEPS project.
17. Floyd Carr, resident, supports the MEPS project.
18. Bill Watkins, resident, commented on the recruiting process and supports the MEPS project.
19. Ron Swanson, resident, supports the MEPS project.
20. Don McIlroy, resident, supports the MEPS project.
21. Anthony, resident, supports the MEPS project.
22. Liz Garnholz, resident, stated project does not allow the development to maximum financial potential. Does not support the MEPS project.
23. Susanne Weston, resident, against the MEPS project.

MOTION by Mayor ProTem Busch, SECONDED by Council Member Jacobson to close the public hearing. MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE. 5/0

Mark Hensley, City Attorney, read by title only:

RESOLUTION NO. 4559

A RESOLUTION APPROVING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. EA-769, ZONE CHANGE NO. 07-01, SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 08-02, AND SMOKY HOLLOW SITE PLAN REVIEW NO. 07-04 AT 1700 EAST GRAND AVENUE.

MOTION by Mayor ProTem Busch, SECONDED by Council Member Fisher to adopt Resolution No. 4559 approving a Mitigated Negative Declaration for Environmental Assessment No. EA-769, Zone Change No. 07-01, Specific Plan Amendment No. 08-02, and Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review No. 07-04 at 1700 East Grand Avenue. MOTION PASSED BY THE FOLLOWING VOICE VOTE: AYES: BUSCH, BRANN, FISHER; NOES: JACOBSON; ABSTAIN: MCDOWELL. 3/1/1

Mark Hensley, City Attorney, read by title only:

ORDINANCE NO. 1419

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE SMOKY HOLLOW SPECIFIC PLAN BY PROVIDING FOR LIMITED ACTIVATION OF LAND USES, ACTIVATING LIMITED COMMERCIAL USES, AND MAKING TECHNICAL CHANGES TO CONFORM WITH CALIFORNIA LAW.

Mayor ProTem Busch introduced Ordinance No. 1419

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

2. Consideration and possible action to approve funding for an additional Tyler Technologies’ Eden water billing software module to perform customer electronic billing for water service. (Fiscal Impact: $22,200.00)
Stephanie Katsouleas, Interim Public Works Director, gave a report.

Staff to agendize a study for feasibility and implementation for the ability of electronic payment for most city billing.

MOTION by Mayor ProTem Busch, SECONDED by Council Member Fisher to approve funding for an additional Eden water billing software module to perform electronic billing. MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE. 5/0

3. Consideration and possible action regarding the approval of funds for needed filter/circulation repairs to the Urho Saari Swim Stadium Pool (The Plunge) at 219 W. Mariposa Avenue and proceed with a feasibility study for the construction of a new aquatic facility at Hilltop or another location. (Fiscal Impact: $706,000)

Stephanie Katsouleas, Interim Public Works Director, gave a report.

MOTION by Council Member Jacobson, SECONDED by Council Member Fisher to move forward with the designs for permanent improvements at Urho Saari Swim Stadium, place a temporary “fix” on the current problems, and proceed with the feasibility of constructing a new aquatic facility at Hilltop per the aquatics master plan. MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE. 5/0

Staff to report at the Strategic Planning Session a contingency operations for providing facilities for the needed programs during the possible down time for the Swim Stadium.

D. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS AND BOARDS

4. Consideration and possible action to adopt a resolution establishing the Environmental Committee and appointing Committee members.

City Attorney Mark Hensley, stated that a resolution would not be adopted at this time and that the Environmental Committee and appointment of Committee members would be by minute action.

He also announced that Council agreed to the formation of an Environmental Committee to meet quarterly, with five members, 2 representing the residential community, 2 representing the business community and one representing the school district. He announced the following appointments to the Environmental Committee and the expiration of the terms:

Chris Scruton, Business Representative, to a one year term, expiring 6/30/09; Eric Alegria, Residential Representative, to a two year term, expiring 6/30/10; and Donna Kahl, Business Representative, to a three year term, expiring 6/30/11; Jill Moeller, Residential Representative to a four year expiring 6/30/12. An El Segundo School District Representative to be recommended by the District annually in June and approved by Council.
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.

5. Approved Warrant Numbers 2566340 to 2566584 on Register No. 18 in the total amount of $1,095,628.01 and Wire Transfers from 6/6/2008 through 6/19/2008 in the total amount of $1,594,848.63 and Warrant Numbers 2566585 to 2566837 on Register No. 19 in the total amount of $1,213,130.11 and Wire Transfers from 6/20/2008 through 7/03/2008 in the total amount of $1,184,717.05. Authorized staff to release. Ratified: Payroll and Employee Benefit checks; checks released early due to contracts or agreement; emergency disbursements and/or adjustments; and wire transfers.

6. Approved Regular and Special City Council Meeting Minutes of June 17, 2008.

7. Authorized the Interim City Manager to execute Lease No. 3834 with The Aerospace Corporation (the “Lessee”) to construct a private pedestrian bridge (the “bridge”) over El Segundo Boulevard near the intersection of Douglas Street, in a form approved by the City Attorney.

8. Awarded Standard Public Works Contract No. 3835, in a form approved by the City Attorney, to Kalban, Inc. for the 2007-2008 annual contract for curb, gutter, handicap access ramps, sidewalk and other minor improvements at various locations citywide. Approved Capital Improvement Project. Project No. PW 08-05. CDBG Project No. 601066-07. (Fiscal Impact: $231,477.40 ($210,434.00 contract amount plus 10% contingencies))

9. Pursuant to El Segundo Municipal Code § 1-7-10 waived the formal bidding process and approved Contract No. 3836 with Gary V. Bufkin Computer Consulting (GVBCC) for the development of a centralized permit module for permitting activities in the Engineering Division of Public Works. (Fiscal Impact: $16,250.00) Authorized the City Manager to execute a contract in a form approved by the City Attorney.

10. PULLED FOR DISCUSSION BY MAYOR PROTEM BUSCH

11. Accepted all work as complete for the Replacement of Water Mains, located at the 600-700 block of Lomita and Sierra Streets, 800 block of Bungalow Drive, 800 block of Maryland Street and 900-1000 block of Walnut Avenue. Approved Capital Improvement Project - Project No.: PW 07-10 (Fiscal Impact: $742,744.21) Authorized the City Clerk to file a Notice of Completion in the County Recorder's Office.
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12. Authorized the City Manager to execute License Agreement No. 3837 with Space Between Productions, LLC, in a form approved by the City Attorney, to allow the use of the City of El Segundo logo, El Segundo Fire Department vehicle graphics, El Segundo Fire Department uniforms, and El Segundo Fire Station #2 in a cable television production of Trading Spaces. (Fiscal Impact: None) Authorized the City Manager to execute a Location and Liability Release No. 3837A, in a form approved by the City Attorney, to use Fire Station #2 in a cable television production of Trading Spaces.

13. Pursuant to El Segundo Municipal Code § 1-7-10, waived the bidding and authorized the Fire Department to purchase twenty-five (25) self-contained breathing apparatus units under the competitive bid executed by the Southern California Area Personal Protective Equipment Consortium (County of Los Angeles contract number MA-IS-43634-1). The City will be reimbursed for these expenditures through the Urban Area Security Initiative Fiscal Year 2006 grant funding. (Fiscal Impact: Not to exceed $140,725)

14. Approved of the examination plans for the Personnel Merit System job classifications of Water Maintenance Worker I and Senior Building Inspector. (Fiscal Impact: None)

15. Received and filed report regarding the establishment of a Public Agency Retirement System (PARS) Supplemental Retirement Plan and the determination of future annual costs of providing the plan benefits for eligible members of the El Segundo Supervisory and Professional Employees Bargaining Unit.

16. Approved the Agreement and Election to Prefund Other Post Employment Benefits with California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS) through participation in the California Employer's Retiree Benefit Trust Program (CERBT) and Resolution No. 4560 to approve the Delegating of Authority to Request Disbursements from the trust.

17. PULLED FOR DISCUSSION BY COUNCIL MEMBER BRANN

18. Approved the purchase of three "AutoCITE" hand-held parking ticket writers currently utilized by parking enforcement, Contract No. 3838. (Fiscal impact not to exceed $18,500.00 from equipment replacement funds/unallocated funds.)

19. Awarded Contract No. 3839 from RFP 08-07 to the lowest responsive bidder, 10-8 Retrofit, to provide and install emergency equipment onto 10 new marked patrol vehicles. (Fiscal Impact: $87,000)

20. Approved Professional Services Agreement No. 3840 between the City of El Segundo and The Omega Group to upgrade the current Geographic Information System (GIS) based crime analysis system. (Fiscal Impact: $18,995). Authorized the City Manager to execute the agreement in a form approved by the City Attorney.
21. Awarded Contract No. 3841 in an amount not to exceed $95,000 to Data 911 to provide Mobile Data Computers (MDCs) for all patrol cars, the command post vehicle, the animal control truck, and one back-up system. This contract includes all related equipment to support the systems with the exception of modems. (Fiscal impact: $95,000 – paid from equipment replacement and COPS Grant funds.) Authorized the City Manager to execute the contract.

22. Accepted the work as complete for construction related to the City’s Residential Sound Insulation Program Group 17 (27 Homes). Project No. RSI 06-17. (Final contract total: $1,227,648.88) Authorized the City Clerk to file the City Planning and Building Safety Director’s Notices of Completion in the County Recorder’s Office.

MOTION by Council Member Fisher, SECONDED by Mayor ProTem Busch to approve Consent Agenda Items 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22. MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE. 5/0

CALL ITEMS FROM CONSENT AGENDA

10. Consideration and possible action to award a Standard Public Works Contract to Armand Gonzales Inc. dba Gonzales Construction for construction of a Fire Station at 2261 East Mariposa Avenue. Approved Capital Improvement Program. Project No.: PW 08-06 (Fiscal Impact: $7,206,298.00)

MOTION by Mayor McDowell, SECONDED by Mayor ProTem Busch to bring this item back at the next meeting with a cost benefit analysis of using solar panels vs. photovoltaic collector panels. MOTION PASSED BY THE FOLLOWING VOICE VOTE: MCDOWELL, BUSCH, BRANN AND FISHER; COUNCIL MEMBER JACOBSON ABSTAINING. 4/0

17. Consideration and possible action to increase the amount that the City Manager is authorized to approve Professional Service Agreements for developer reimbursed environmental review services, not to exceed $125,000 for the existing pre-approved list of consultants that provide environmental review services pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act guidelines (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations to assist the City in the processing of entitlement projects. (Fiscal Impact: None)

Council Member Brann requested an explanation of the process.

MOTION by Mayor ProTem Busch, SECONDED by Council Member Brann to increase the amount that the City Manager is authorized to approve Professional Service Agreements for developer reimbursed environmental review services, not to exceed $125,000 for the existing pre-approved list of consultants that provide environmental review services pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act guidelines (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations to assist the City in the processing of entitlement projects. MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE. 5/0
F. NEW BUSINESS

G. REPORTS – CITY MANAGER - NONE

H. REPORTS – CITY ATTORNEY - NONE

I. REPORTS – CITY CLERK - NONE

J. REPORTS – CITY TREASURER - NONE

K. REPORTS – CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

Council Member Brann – Commented on July 4th celebration, and the delegation from Guaymas, and the Beach clean up.

Council Member Fisher – Commented on July 4th celebration.

Council Member Jacobson – None

Mayor Pro Tem Busch – Commented on the July 4th celebration and the visit from our Sister City Guaymas.

Mayor McDowell – Reported on the Independent Cities Association meeting.

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.

Liz Garnholtz, resident, spoke regarding the El Segundo power plant.

MEMORIALS – NONE

CLOSED SESSION - NONE

ADJOURNMENT at 10:53 p.m.

______________________________
Cindy Mortesen, City Clerk
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
TUESDAY, JULY 15, 2008 – 4:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER – Mayor McDowell at 4:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Mayor McDowell - Present
Mayor Pro Tem Busch - Present
Council Member Brann - Present
Council Member Fisher - Present
Council Member Jacobson - Present

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

SPECIAL MATTERS: -1- matter

1. Interview of candidates and potential appointments to the Environmental Committee. [Note: the interviews will commence at approximately 4:00 p.m. and take place in the West Conference Room in City Hall]

Council announced the following appointments to the Environmental Committee:

Chris Scruton, Business Representative, to a one year term, expiring 6/30/09; Eric Alegria, Residential Representative, to a two year term, expiring 6/30/10; and Donna Kahl, Business Representative, to a three year term, expiring 6/30/11; Jill Moeller, Residential Representative to a four year expiring 6/30/12. An El Segundo School District Representative to be recommended by the District annually in June and approved by Council.

ADJOURNMENT at 5:07 p.m.

________________________
Cathy Domann, Deputy City Clerk
EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL

AGENDA ITEM STATEMENT  AGENDA HEADING: Consent Agenda

AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action to retain Bob Murray & Associates to conduct an Executive Search for the position of City Manager. Fiscal Impact: Not to Exceed $25,000.

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1) Authorize the City Manager to execute a Professional Services Agreement, in a form approved by the City Attorney, with Bob Murray & Associates in an amount not to exceed $25,000;
2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:

Following the May 1, 2008 resignation of City Manager, Jeff Stewart, and the appointment of retired Police Chief, Jack Wayt, as Interim City Manager, a Council Sub-Committee consisting of Carl Jacobson and Don Brann was tasked with identifying an Executive Search Firm to conduct a recruitment for the position of City Manager.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

Proposal from Bob Murray & Associates

FISCAL IMPACT: $25,000

Operating Budget:
Amount Requested:
Account Number: 001-400-2506-6214
Project Phase:
Appropriation Required: ___ Yes ___ NO

ORIGINATED BY: DATE: July 24, 2008

Bob Hyland, Director of Human Resources

REVIEWED BY: DATE: July 24, 2008

Jack Wayt, Interim City Manager
BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:

Proposals from seven Executive Search consulting firms were reviewed by the Sub-Committee and the following four firms were invited to selection interviews:

1.) Bob Murray & Associates
2.) Alliance Resource Consulting
3.) Teri Black & Company
4.) Peckham & McKinney

In terms of the proposal cost of each of the four firms, the proposals were very competitive, with a difference of only $3,000 between the four.

The recommendation of the Council Sub-Committee is to retain the firm of Bob Murray & Associates to conduct the recruitment for our next City Manager, for a cost not to exceed $25,000. The cost includes a consulting fee of $17,500 and expenses not to exceed $7,500 (reimbursable expenses to include such items as the cost of travel, clerical support, placement of ads, credit, criminal and civil checks, education verification and newspaper and internet searches).

Bob Murray & Associates 1) are currently conducting the City Manager recruitments for the California cities of Concord, Dixon, Dublin, Martinez, Merced, Palo Alto, Pasadena and Salinas; 2) have placed over 200 City Managers; 3) have extensive experience conducting recruitments in Los Angeles County and the surrounding region; and 4) have previously conducted Department Head level recruitments for the City of El Segundo.

Bob Murray has over 25 years experience as a recruiter and will serve as the lead consultant on this project.

The consultant anticipates that their recommendations regarding finalists for City Manager will be made within 75 to 90 days from the start of the search.
A PROPOSAL TO CONDUCT AN EXECUTIVE RECRUITMENT FOR A

City Manager

ON BEHALF OF THE

City of El Segundo
May 16, 2008

Mayor Kelly McDowell, Members of the City Council, and Mr. Robert Hyland, Director of Human Resources
City of El Segundo
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

Dear Mayor McDowell, Members of the Council and Mr. Hyland:

Thank you for inviting Bob Murray & Associates to submit a proposal to conduct the City Manager recruitment for the City of El Segundo. The following proposal details our qualifications and describes our process of identifying, recruiting and screening outstanding candidates on your behalf. It also includes a proposed budget, timeline, guarantee and sample recruitment brochure.

At Bob Murray and Associates, we pride ourselves on providing quality search to local governments. Through many years of experience, we have created an ideal recruitment process combining our ability to help you determine the direction of the search and the types of candidates you seek with our experience recruiting outstanding candidates. Working with professionalism, integrity and personal attention, our team-oriented search process, in addition to our proven expertise, ensures that the candidates we present for your consideration will match the criteria you have established and will be outstanding in their field.

A significant portion of our process focuses on conducting a thorough outreach effort. We have candid discussions with our contacts in the field to determine who might be a good fit for your organization. We then call those individuals to discuss how their career goals might be a match with the position in your organization. In addition, we draw from our extensive database as well as several professional registries and contact those candidates who are current City Managers or in a similar position with organizations that most closely match yours in size and scope of services. We personally contact 100 or more potential candidates and market the position to them. Our goal is to reach candidates who are not necessarily looking for a new opportunity. These candidates are often times the best in the field.

To learn first hand of the quality of our service and our recruitment successes, we invite you to contact the references listed on page 11 of the attached proposal.

We look forward to your favorable consideration of our qualifications. Please do not hesitate to contact us at (916) 784-9080 should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Bob Murray and Associates
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OUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE CITY

The City of El Segundo is a dynamic organization with tremendous opportunities for the next City Manager. Bob Murray & Associates will be able to attract many high caliber candidates who are looking to work in a community like yours with a city population count of approximately 17,000 residents and a daytime population that exceeds 80,000. A small coastline community, El Segundo is renowned for its small town intimacy as well as a thriving business environment that caters to some of the region's most prestigious corporations.

El Segundo prides itself on its excellent schools, quality recreation programs, safe neighborhoods and unparalleled city services. It is also a haven for business, with 13 Fortune 500 companies and a diverse mix of aerospace firms, high-tech businesses, professional service outfits, fine restaurants and retailers. Your ideal location between the Los Angeles and the South Bay beach communities will make the City Manager opportunity extremely attractive to prospective candidates.

We understand that the City of El Segundo is a General Law City with a Council/Manager form of government. The City has a five member City Council who establishes policy for the City, while the City Manager and staff are then responsible for implementing the policy.

The City delivers a comprehensive range of municipal services through eight departments that include: Office of the City Manager, Finance, Fire, Library, Planning & Building Safety, Police, Public Works, and Recreation & Parks.

Serving at the pleasure of the City Council, the City Manager is the Chief Executive of the City. In addition to preparing the annual budget and keeping the Council advised on matters pertaining to City business, the City Manager acts as the Personnel Officer, Purchasing Agent, and Civil Defense Director. The City Manager's Office is also responsible for directing projects that are especially sensitive to the City Council and the community.
PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

With respect to the City Manager recruitment, Bob Murray and Associates offers the following expertise:

- Bob Murray & Associates has an unmatched record of success in recruiting local government and special district professionals. In our 25 plus years of experience, we have placed over 200 City Managers, in addition to numerous professionals throughout the western United States. Currently, we are conducting the City Manager recruitments for the California cities of Concord, Dixon, Dublin, Martinez, Merced, Palo Alto, Pasadena, and Salinas. In the past three years, we have placed City Managers in the California cities of Apple Valley (Town Manager), Arcata, Chula Vista, Claremont, Goleta, Grover Beach, Ione, Imperial, Irwindale, Lakeport, Lathrop, Manteca, Menlo Park, Mill Valley, Needles, Oakdale, Oakley, Oceanside, Ojai, Orinda, Pacifica, Pico Rivera, Poway, Rancho Santa Margarita, Red Bluff, Rio Vista, Sonoma, Truckee, Turlock, Woodland, and Yuba City, in addition to the Cities of Airway Heights, WA; Coos Bay, OR; and Springfield, OR. Our previous experience includes conducting searches for Albany (City Administrator), Antioch, Benicia, Campbell, Capitola, Carmel-by-the-Sea (City Administrator), Corcoran, Corona, Corte Madera (Town Manager), Elk Grove, Fortuna, Fremont, Half Moon Bay, Hollister, La Mesa, La Palma, Lancaster, Lemon Grove, Los Alamitos, Monrovia, Novato, Pismo Beach, Pittsburg, Pleasanton, Rancho Cordova, Roseville, San Clemente, San Ramon, South Lake Tahoe, Stanton, Stockton, Thousand Oaks, Tracy, Ventura, Walnut Creek, and Westminster, in addition to the Cities of Albany, OR, Castle Rock, CO, Damascus, OR, Eugene, OR, Milwaukee, OR Newberg, OR, Newcastle, WA, Salem, OR, San Antonio, TX, and Shoreline, WA. Our extensive contacts and knowledge of outstanding candidates will ensure you have a quality group of finalists from which to select the City of El Segundo’s next City Manager.

- Bob Murray & Associates is familiar with the City of El Segundo and the community it serves as we recently completed your Director of Planning & Building Safety recruitment, resulting in the selection of Mr. Gary Chicots. In addition, we have previously conducted your Parks & Recreation Director recruitment. Our knowledge of the community and the opportunities it faces will be an asset when conducting the City Manager recruitment.

- We are also familiar with Los Angeles County and the surrounding region. Our knowledge of the region, its issues and its outstanding quality of life will be an asset in presenting this opportunity to prospective candidates. We have conducted recruitments on behalf of the cities of Baldwin Park (Finance Director & Police Chief), Beverly Hills (City Planner, Deputy City Manager – Public Affairs and Director of Community Development), Claremont (City Manager), Culver City (Police Chief), Glendale (Police Chief), Inglewood (Accounting Manager and Public Works Director), Irwindale (City Manager and Police Chief), Lancaster (City Manager, Assistant
City Manager & Finance Director), Long Beach (Manager of Community Recreation Services), Los Angeles (Police Chief), Lynwood (Director of Recreation & Community Services and Assistant Director), Monrovia (City Manager, Fire Chief, Police Chief, & Public Works Director), Pasadena (Assistant City Manager, City Manager, Police Chief, and others), Pico Rivera (City Manager & Public Works Director/City Engineer), Pomona (Assistant City Manager, Community Services Director, Deputy Public Works Director, Human Resources Director and Public Works Director), San Fernando (Police Chief), Santa Clarita (Director of Parks, Recreation & Community Services, Recreation Superintendent, and Transit Manager), Santa Monica (Director of Finance), South Pasadena (Public Works Director/City Engineer and Project Manager – Public Works), Walnut (City Manager), Whittier (Police Chief & Director of Parks), as well as on behalf of the Los Angeles World Airports (Airport Police Chief, Director of Airport Safety Services, Assistant Police Chief and Assistant to the Police Chief), the Port of Los Angeles (Director of Economic Development), the Port of Long Beach (Director of Security & Managing Director of Finance and Administration), the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (Executive Director, Human Resources Director, Section 8 Director, and Chief Financial Officer), the Los Angeles Convention Center (General Manager), Palmdale Water District (Finance and Services Manager and Human Resources Director), Walnut Valley Water District (General Manager), and the West Basin Municipal Water District (Communications Manager).

Bob Murray and Associates’ experience designing and conducting successful recruitment processes on behalf of cities, counties and special districts is unmatched in the field. Our process is specifically designed to meet your needs. We have developed and carried out numerous recruitment processes involving a wide variety of interests both inside and outside the organization. Should the City so desire, we can develop a process that provides a forum for the participation of members of the City Council, Department Heads, staff and representatives of the community, as appropriate, in both the development of the candidate profile, as well as the selection process. Our expertise includes designing interview strategies that involve these groups in the process, while ensuring that the City Council is able to make the final selection. In addition, we can facilitate the discussion among these groups that leads to a consensus concerning the ideal candidate. Our knowledge of how to develop an effective process that is suited specifically to the needs of the City is unsurpassed.
KEY PERSONNEL

Mr. Robert Murray will serve as the lead on this recruitment, with Ms. Amanda Sanders assisting him and the City throughout the process. We work as a team on our recruitments. Therefore, when Mr. Murray or Ms. Sanders are not available, there is always an individual in the office who is familiar with the process and available to answer any questions the City or candidates may have.

BOB MURRAY, PRESIDENT

Mr. Murray brings over 25 years experience as a recruiter. Mr. Murray is recognized as one of the nation’s leading recruiters. He has conducted hundreds of searches for cities, counties, and special districts. He has been called on to conduct searches for some of the largest most complex organizations in the country and some of the smallest. Mr. Murray has conducted searches for chief executives, department heads, professional and technical positions. Mr. Murray has taken the lead on the firm’s most difficult assignments with great success. His clients have retained him again and again given the quality of his work and success in finding candidates for difficult to fill positions.

Prior to creating Bob Murray & Associates, Mr. Murray directed the search practice for the largest search practice serving local government in the country. Mr. Murray has worked in local government and benefits from the knowledge of having led an organization. Prior to his career in executive search he served as the City Manager for the City of Olympia, Washington. He has also served as an Assistant City Manager and held positions in law enforcement.

Mr. Murray received his Bachelor’s degree in Criminology from the University of California at Berkeley with graduate studies in Public Administration at California State University at Hayward.

AMANDA SANDERS, SENIOR CONSULTANT

As a consultant with Bob Murray & Associates, Ms. Sanders is responsible for research, candidate recruitment and screening, as well as reference checks and background verifications. She focuses on client communication and works closely with clients to coordinate candidate outreach and ensure a successful search.

Ms. Sanders brings several years of industry experience as she worked for one of the nation’s largest recruitment firms. Her insight into the recruitment process is a valuable asset to Bob Murray & Associates.

Ms. Sanders received her Bachelor’s of Arts degree in Communications from the University of Wyoming.
THE RECRUITMENT PROCESS

Bob Murray and Associates’ unique client driven approach to executive search will ensure that the City of El Segundo has quality candidates from which to select the new City Manager. Outlined below are the key steps in our recruitment process.

STEP 1 DEVELOPING THE CANDIDATE PROFILE

Our understanding of the City of El Segundo’s needs will be key to a successful search. We will work with the City Council to learn as much as possible about the organization’s expectations for a new City Manager. We want to learn the values and culture of the organization, as well as understand the current issues, challenges and opportunities that face the City of El Segundo. We also want to know the City Council’s expectations regarding the knowledge, skills and abilities sought in the ideal candidate and will work with the City to identify expectations regarding education and experience. Additionally, we want to discuss expectations regarding compensation and other items necessary to complete the successful appointment of the ideal candidate. The profile we develop together at this stage will drive subsequent recruitment efforts.

STEP 2 ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN AND RECRUITMENT BROCHURE

After gaining an understanding of the City of El Segundo’s needs, we will design an effective advertising campaign appropriate for the City Manager recruitment. We will focus on professional journals that are specifically suited to the City Manager search. For the City Manager search, we would specifically recommend placing advertisements with the International City/County Management Association (ICMA), the League of California Cities Western Cities Magazine, and the Jobs Available Bulletin.

We will also develop a professional recruitment brochure on the City Council’s behalf that will discuss the community, organization, position and compensation in detail. Once completed, we will mail the profile to an extensive audience, making them aware of the exciting opportunity with the City of El Segundo.

STEP 3 RECRUITING CANDIDATES

After cross-referencing the profile of the ideal candidate with our database of over 1,000 candidates nationwide and contacts in the field, we will conduct an aggressive outreach effort, including making personal calls to prospective applicants, designed to identify and recruit outstanding candidates. We recognize that the best candidate is often not looking for a new job and this is the person we actively seek to convince to become a candidate. Aggressively marketing the City Manager position to prospective candidates will be essential to the success of the search.
STEP 4 SCREENING CANDIDATES

Following the closing date for the recruitment, we will screen the resumes we have received. We will use the criteria established in our initial meetings as a basis upon which to narrow the field of candidates.

STEP 5 PERSONAL INTERVIEWS

We will conduct personal interviews with the top 10 to 12 candidates with the goal of determining which candidates have the greatest potential to succeed in your organization. During the interviews, we will explore each candidate’s background and experience as it relates to the City Manager position. In addition, we will discuss the candidate’s motivation for applying for the position and make an assessment of his/her knowledge, skills and abilities. We will devote specific attention to establishing the likelihood of the candidate’s acceptance of the position if an offer of employment is made.

STEP 6 PUBLIC RECORD SEARCH

Following the interviews, we will conduct a review of published articles for each candidate. Various sources will be consulted including Lexis-Nexis™, a newspaper/magazine search engine, Google, and local papers for the community’s in which the candidates have worked. This alerts us to any further detailed inquiries we may need to make at this time.

STEP 7 RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information gathered through meetings with your organization and personal interviews with candidates, we will recommend a limited number of candidates for your further consideration. We will prepare a detailed written report on each candidate that focuses on the results of our interviews and public record searches. We will make specific recommendations, but the final determination of those to be considered will be up to you.

STEP 8 FINAL INTERVIEWS

Our years of experience will be invaluable as we help you develop an interview process that objectively assesses the qualifications of each candidate. We will adopt an approach that fits your needs, whether it is a traditional interview, multiple interview panel or assessment center process. We will provide you with suggested interview questions and rating forms and will be present at the interview/assessment center to facilitate the process. Our expertise lies in facilitating the discussion that can bring about a consensus regarding the final candidates.

We will work closely with your staff to coordinate and schedule interviews and candidate travel. Our goal is to ensure that each candidate has a very positive experience, as the manner in which the entire process is conducted will have an effect on the candidates’ perception of your organization.
STEP 9 BACKGROUND CHECKS / DETAILED REFERENCE CHECKS

Based on final interviews we will conduct credit, criminal, civil litigation and motor vehicle record checks for the top one to three candidates. In addition, those candidates will be the subjects of detailed, confidential reference checks. In order to gain an accurate and honest appraisal of the candidates’ strengths and weaknesses, we will talk candidly with people who have direct knowledge of their work and management style. We will ask candidates to forward the names of their supervisors, subordinates and peers for the past several years. Additionally, we make a point of speaking confidentially to individuals who we know have insight into a candidate’s abilities, but who may not be on his/her preferred list of contacts. At this stage in the recruitment we will also verify candidates’ degrees.

STEP 10 NEGOTIATIONS

We recognize the critical importance of successful negotiations and can serve as your representative during this process. We know what other organizations have done to put deals together with great candidates and will be available to advise you regarding current approaches to difficult issues such as housing and relocation. We will represent your interests and advise you regarding salary, benefits and employment agreements with the goal of putting together a deal that results in the appointment of your chosen candidate. Most often we can turn a very difficult aspect of the recruitment into one that is viewed positively by both you and the candidate.

STEP 11 COMPLETE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANCE

Throughout the recruitment, we will provide the City Council with updates on the status of the search. We will also take care of all administrative details on your behalf. Candidates will receive personal letters advising them of their status at each critical point in the recruitment. In addition, we will respond to inquiries about the status of their candidacy within twenty-four hours. Every administrative detail will receive our attention. Often, candidates judge our clients based on how well these details are handled.
BUDGET AND TIMING

PROFESSIONAL FEE AND EXPENSES

The consulting fee for conducting the City Manager recruitment on behalf of the City of El Segundo is $17,500 plus expenses. Services provided for the fee consist of all steps outlined in this proposal including three (3) days of meetings on site. The City of El Segundo will be responsible for reimbursing expenses Bob Murray and Associates incurs on your behalf. We estimate expenses for this project to be $6,500-$7,500. Actual expense costs are related to a regional recruitment versus a nationwide recruitment. Reimbursable expenses include such items as the cost of travel, clerical support, placement of ads, credit, criminal and civil checks, education verification, as well as newspaper searches. In addition, postage, photocopying, and telephone charges will be allocated.

TIMING

We are prepared to start work on this assignment immediately and anticipate that we will be prepared to make our recommendation regarding finalists within seventy five to ninety days from the start of the search.

GUARANTEE

We guarantee that should the selected candidate be terminated for cause within the first year of employment we will conduct the search again at no cost (with the exception of expenses) to the City of El Segundo. We are confident in our ability to recruit outstanding candidates and do not expect the City of El Segundo to find it necessary to exercise this provision of our proposal.
VALUE ADDED SERVICES

Bob Murray and Associates’ experience designing and conducting successful recruitment processes on behalf of cities, counties and special districts is unmatched in the field. Our process is specifically designed to meet your needs. In addition to the services offered in the above recruitment process, Bob Murray & Associates provides many value added services in an effort to streamline the recruitment process for both the client and candidate. These services are offered for an additional fee which varies based on the specific service or menu of services selected.

Bob Murray and Associates will personally assist our clients with executive compensation studies, assessment center processes, and interim placements. In addition, Bob Murray and Associates offers comprehensive onsite background checks, management/leadership assessments, and psychological assessments through strategic partnerships with several highly qualified firms whom we have worked with extensively and provide the caliber of service our clients can trust.
REFERENCES

Clients and candidates are the best testament to our ability to conduct quality searches. Clients for whom Bob Murray and Associates has recently conducted searches are listed below.

CLIENT: City of Claremont  
POSITION: City Manager  
REFERENCE: Mr. Corey Calayclay, Councilmember, (909) 399-5444

CLIENT: City of Woodland  
POSITION: City Manager, Assistant City Manager & Public Works Director  
REFERENCE: Mr. David Flory, Mayor, (530) 661-5806

CLIENT: City of Monrovia  
POSITION: City Manager, Fire Chief, Police Chief, and Public Works Director  
REFERENCE: Mayor Rob Hammond, (626) 932-5550, Mr. Scott Ochoa, City Manager, (626) 932-5501, or Ms. Theresa St. Peter, Human Resources Director, (626) 932-5512

CLIENT: City of Pasadena  
POSITION: City Manager (current) & Assistant City Manager  
REFERENCE: Mr. Bill Bogaard, Mayor, (626) 744-431 or Mr. Phil Hawkey, former City Manager, now Executive Vice President, Administration, University of La Verne, (909) 593-3511, ext. 4555

CLIENT: City of Pacifica  
POSITION: City Manager  
REFERENCE: Mr. Peter DeJarnatt, Councilmember, (650) 355-5777 or Ms. Ann Ritzma Human Resources Director, (650) 738-7402

CLIENT: City of Rancho Santa Margarita  
POSITION: City Manager  
REFERENCE: Mr. Jerry Holloway, Councilmember, (949) 635-1840
CITY MANAGER
Airway Heights, WA
Albany, CA (City Administrator)
Albany, OR
Antioch, CA
Apple Valley, CA (Town Manager)
Arcata, CA
Barstow, CA
Benicia, CA
Campbell, CA
Capitol, CA
Carmel, CA
Castle Rock, CO (Town Manager)
Chico, CA
Chula Vista, CA
Claremont, CA
Concord, CA
Coos Bay, OR
Corcoran, CA
Corona, CA
Corte Madera, CA (Town Manager)
Damascus, OR
Dixon, CA
Dublin, CA
Elk Grove, CA
Eugene, OR
Fairfield, CA
Fortuna, CA
Fremont, CA
Goleta, CA
Grover Beach, CA
Half Moon Bay, CA
Hollister, CA
Imperial, CA
Ione, CA
Irwindale, CA
La Mesa, CA
La Palma, CA
Lakeport, CA
Lancaster, CA
Lathrop, CA
Lemon Grove, CA
Los Alamitos, CA
Manteca, CA
Martinez, CA
Menlo Park, CA
Merced, CA
Mill Valley, CA
Milwaukie, OR
Monrovia, CA
Needles, CA
Newberg, OR
Newcastle, WA
Novato, CA
Oakdale, CA
Oakley, CA
Oceanside, CA
Ojai, CA
Orinda, CA
Pacifica, CA
Pasadena, CA
Palo Alto, CA
Pico Rivera, CA
Pismo Beach, CA
Pittsburg, CA
Pleasanton, CA
Poway, CA
Rancho Cordova, CA
Rancho Santa Margarita, CA
Red Bluff, CA
Rio Vista, CA
Roseville, CA
Salem, OR
Salinas, CA
San Antonio, TX
San Clemente, CA
San Ramon, CA
Shoreline, WA
Sonoma, CA
South Lake Tahoe, CA
Springfield, OR
Stanton, CA
Stockton, CA
Thousand Oaks, CA
Tracy, CA
Truckee, CA (Town Manager)
Turlock, CA
Ventura, CA
Walnut Creek, CA
Westminster, CA
Woodland, CA
Yuba City, CA
ASSISTANT/DEPUTY CITY MANAGER
Alameda, CA
Beverly Hills, CA
Carlsbad, CA
Lancaster, CA
Monterey, CA
North Las Vegas, NV
Orange, CA
Pasadena, CA
Peoria, AZ
Petaluma, CA
Pleasanton, CA
Pomona, CA
Rancho Cordova, CA
Reno, NV
Rocklin, CA
Stockton, CA
Woodland, CA
Yuba City, CA

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR
Clackamas County, OR
Clark County, NV (Assistant)
Deschutes County, OR
Marion County, OR
Tehama County, CA
Washington County, OR

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIRECTOR
Garden Grove, CA
Los Alamitos, CA
Ontario, CA
Placer County Water Agency, CA
Pleasanton, CA
Stockton, CA
Yucca Valley, CA

ANIMAL SERVICES DIRECTOR
Oakland, CA
Rancho Cucamonga, CA

AVIATION/AIRPORT
Big Bear Airport, CA
Clark County, NV
Dallas/Forth Worth, TX
San Jose, CA

BUILDING OFFICIALS/INSPECTION
Bakersfield, CA
Grants Pass, OR
Marin County, CA
Modesto, CA
Palo Alto, CA
Sacramento, CA
San Francisco, CA
Stockton, CA
Yuba City, CA

CITY CLERK
Central Contra Costa Sanitation District, CA (Secretary to the District)
Chino Hills, CA
Dublin, CA
Fremont, CA
Menlo Park, CA
Monterey County, CA (Clerk to the Board)
Napa, CA
Rio Vista, CA
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, CA (Board Secretary)

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR
Benicia, CA
Beverly Hills, CA
Capitola, CA
Chino Hills, CA
Cotati, CA
Fullerton, CA
Los Banos, CA
Maple Valley, WA
Modesto, CA
Newark, CA
Newcastle, WA
Oakland, CA
Oceanside, CA
Pleasanton, CA
Redlands, CA
Salem, OR
San Carlos, CA
Santa Cruz, CA
Stockton, CA
Vallejo, CA
Walnut Creek, CA
Yucca Valley, CA

CONVENTION AND VISITOR'S
BUREAU DIRECTOR
Los Angeles, CA
North Lake Tahoe Visitors Bureau, CA
Mammoth Lakes, CA
San Antonio, TX
Steamboat Springs, CO

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT/REDEVELOPMENT/HOUSING DIRECTOR
Chula Vista, CA
Fremont, CA
Fullerton, CA
Milpitas, CA
Oakland, CA
Port of Los Angeles, CA
Port of San Diego, CA
Sacramento, CA
Salinas, CA
Stockton, CA
Taft, CA
Tracy, CA
Upland, CA
Vancouver, WA
Vancouver Housing Authority, WA
(Executive Director & Deputy)

ENGINEERING
Bakersfield, CA
Bureau Veritas, CA
Central Contra Costa Sanitary District, CA
Chino Hills, CA
Clark County, NV – McCarran Airport
Damascus, OR
Dublin San Ramon Services District, CA
Needles, CA
Nevada County, NV
Nye County, NV
Oceanside, CA
Pomona, CA
Richmond, CA
Reno, NV
Stockton, CA
San Luis Obispo County,
Nacimiento Project, CA
South Pasadena, CA
Tracy, CA

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, CA
Arizona Municipal Water Users Association, AZ
Bay Area Air Quality Management District, CA
California Peace Officers Association, CA
California State Association of Counties, CA
Central Contra Costa Solid Waste Authority, CA
Chula Vista Redevelopment Agency, CA
Elk Grove-Rancho Cordova-El Dorado Connector JPA, CA
Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, CA
Housing Authority of the County of Butte, CA
Housing Authority of the County of Santa Cruz, CA
Kings Community Action Organization, CA
Los Angeles Convention Center, CA
March Joint Powers Authority, CA
Metro, Portland, OR
Oregon Cascades West Council of Governments, OR
Public Agency Risk Sharing Authority Commission, CA
Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency, CA
San Diego Association of Governments, CA
San Joaquin Council of Governments, CA
South Bayside Waste Management Authority, CA
Vancouver Housing Authority, WA
(Executive & Deputy)
West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management District, CA
West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee, CA

FINANCIAL
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency, CA
Aurora, CO
Baldwin Park, CA
Boulder City, NV
Calaveras County Water District, CA
Campbell, CA
Chino Hills, CA
Clark County, NV
Damascus, OR
D.C. Government, DC
Elk Grove, CA
Grants Pass, OR
Half Moon Bay, CA
Hercules, CA
Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, CA
Imperial Beach, CA
Inglewood, CA
Ione, CA
Lancaster, CA
Los Altos, CA
Menlo Park Fire Protection District, CA
Palmdale Water District, CA
Pleasanton, CA
San Diego, CA
San Francisco, CA
San Leandro, CA
San Jose, CA
Santa Monica, CA
Sparks, NV

FIRE CHIEF
Alameda, CA
Arroyo Grande (Director of Building & Fire)
Aurora, CO
Burney Fire Protection District, CA
Chula Vista, CA
Eugene, OR
Fremont, CA
Folsom, CA
Fullerton, CA
Hillsboro, OR
Grand Junction, CO
Livermore – Pleasanton Fire District, CA
Milpitas, CA
Monrovia, CA
Mountain View, CA
Newark, CA (Assistant & Chief)
Oceanside, CA
Petaluma, CA
Rancho Cucamonga, CA (Deputy and Chief)
Rancho Santa Fe Fire Protection District, CA
Salinas, CA
San Mateo, CA
San Miguel Fire Protection District, CA
Santa Cruz, CA
Sonoma Valley Fire & Rescue Authority, CA
University of California, Davis
Union City, CA
Upland, CA
Vacaville, CA

GENERAL MANAGER
Calaveras County Water District, CA
Central Contra Costa Sanitation Agency, CA
Central Marin Sanitation Agency, CA
East Bay Dischargers Authority, CA
Hilton, Farnkopf, and Hobson LLC, CA
Joshua Basin Water District, CA
Monterey Regional Waste Management District, CA
Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency, CA (Assistant GM)
Pleasant Valley Recreation & Park District, CA
Reclamation District 1000, CA (District Engineer)
Ross Valley Sanitary District, CA
Salinas Valley Solid Waste Authority, CA
Sanitary District No. 5 of Marin County, CA
Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside, CA
South Placer Municipal Utility
District, CA
Sweetwater Springs Water District,
CA
Union Sanitary District, CA
Valley of the Moon Water District,
CA
Walnut Valley Water District, CA

LEGAL COUNSEL
Aurora, CO
Hayward, CA
Lathrop, CA
Monterey, CA
Morgan Hill, CA
Newport Beach, CA
North Las Vegas, NV
Oceanside, CA
Palo Alto, CA
Salinas, CA
San Mateo, CA
Stockton, CA
Ventura, CA
Yolo County, CA (Assistant County
Counsel)

LIBRARY
Corona, CA
Folsom, CA
Norfolk, VA (Asst. Director)
Palos Verdes Library District, CA
Stockton-San Joaquin County Public
Library, CA

PARKS/RECREATION/
COMMUNITY SERVICES
Anaheim, CA
Arlington, TX
Bakersfield, CA
El Segundo, CA
Emeryville, CA
Half Moon Bay, CA
Lemoore, CA
Long Beach, CA
Lynwood, CA (Director and
Assistant Director)
Maple Valley, WA
Pleasanton, CA
Pleasant Valley Recreation and Park
District, CA

Pomona, CA
Sacramento, CA
Salinas, CA
San Jose, CA (Director and
Assistant Director)
Santa Clarita, CA
Stockton, CA
Ventura, CA
Whittier, CA

PERSONNEL/HUMAN RESOURCES
Anaheim, CA
Benicia, CA
Colusa County, CA
Corona, CA
Fresno, CA (Retirement Benefits
Manager)
Inland Empire Utilities Agency, CA
Glendale, AZ
Grants Pass, OR
Judicial Council of California, CA
Moreno Valley, CA
Newark, CA
North Las Vegas, NV
Ontario, CA
Palmdale Water District, CA
Pomona, CA
Rocklin, CA
Stockton, CA
Tehama County, CA

PLANNING
Alameda, CA
Beverly Hills, CA
Centre City Development
Corporation, CA
Damascus, OR
El Segundo, CA
Milpitas, CA
Modesto, CA
Needles, CA
Oceanside, CA
Palo Alto, CA
Pasadena, CA
Reno, NV
Riverside, CA
Roseville, CA
Sacramento, CA
Santa Cruz, CA
Stockton, CA
Tracy Unified School District, CA

**POLICE CHIEF/SAFETY**
Arroyo Grande, CA
Ashland, OR
Aurora, CO
Berkeley, CA
Capitola, CA
Carlsbad, CA
Chico, CA
Colton, CA
Concord, CA
Culver City, CA
Eugene, OR
Fairfield, CA
Glendale, AZ (Chief and Assistant Chiefs)
Glendora, CA
Grand Junction, CO
Half Moon Bay, CA
Hayward, CA
Irvine, CA
Irwindale, CA
La Mesa, CA
Littleton, CO
Los Angeles, CA
Los Angeles World Airports, CA
Los Banos, CA
Menlo Park, CA
Merced, CA
Mesa, AZ
Monrovia, CA
Monterey, CA
North Las Vegas, NV
Novato, CA
Oakdale, CA
Oceanside, CA
Orange County, CA (Sheriff- Coroner)
Petaluma, CA
Pismo Beach, CA
Placentia, CA
Pleasanton, CA
Port of Long Beach, CA
Port of San Diego, CA
Port of Seattle, WA
Reno, NV
Rio Vista, CA
Rocklin, CA
Sacramento, CA
San Bernardino, CA
San Diego State University, CA
San Fernando, CA
San Francisco, CA
San Jose State University, CA
San Rafael, CA
Seaside, CA
Sunnyvale, CA (Public Safety Director)
Tulsa, OK
Turlock, CA
University of California, Davis, CA
University of California, Santa Barbara, CA
University of Oregon, OR
Vacaville, CA
Whittier, CA

**POLICE COMMAND STAFF**
Menlo Park, CA
Pleasanton, CA
Santa Rosa, CA
Port of San Diego, CA
University of California, San Francisco, CA

**PUBLIC AFFAIRS/INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS DIRECTOR**
Beverly Hills, CA
Rancho Cordova, CA
San Diego Regional Airport Authority, CA
West Basin Municipal Water District, CA

**PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNICATIONS**
Aurora, CO
Clackamas County, OR
Heartland Communications Facility Authority, CA
San Francisco, CA
San Jose, CA
Washington County Consolidated Communications Agency, OR
Yolo Emergency Communications Agency, CA

120
PUBLIC WORKS
Belmont, CA
Chandler, AZ
Clark County, NV
Dublin San Ramon Services District, CA
Fresno, CA
Galt, CA
Grants Pass, OR
Half Moon Bay, CA
Inglewood, CA
Lathrop, CA
Los Banos, CA
Mammoth Lakes, CA
Maple Valley, WA
Modesto, CA
Monrovia, CA
Morro Bay, CA
Pico Rivera, CA
Pismo Beach, CA
Pomona, CA (Director and Deputy Director)
Roseburg, OR
San Carlos, CA
Santa Cruz, CA
South Pasadena, CA
Stockton, CA
Tehama County, CA
Tiburon, CA
Upland, CA
Woodland, CA
San Francisco, CA

TRANSPORTATION
West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee, CA
Elk Grove-Rancho Cordova-El Dorado County Connector Joint Powers Authority, CA
San Diego Association of Governments, CA
Santa Clarita, CA
Washington County, OR

WASTE WATER/SANITATION/SOLID WASTE
Central Contra Costa Sanitation District, CA
Central Contra Costa Solid Waste Authority, CA
Central Marin Sanitation Agency, CA
East Bay Dischargers Authority, CA
Monterey Regional Waste Management District, CA
Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency, CA
Ross Valley Sanitary District, CA
Salinas Valley Solid Waste Authority, CA
San Jose, CA
Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside, CA
South Bayside Waste Management Authority, CA
Stockton, CA
Union Sanitary District, CA
West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority, CA

RISK MANAGEMENT
Central Contra Costa Sanitary District, CA (Safety & Risk Management Administrator)
Central Marin Sanitation Agency, CA (Director of Safety and Training)
Riverside Transit Agency, CA (Risk Manager)

TECHNOLOGY
Clark County, NV
Fresno, CA
Hayward, CA
Hillsboro, OR
Inland Empire Utilities Agency, CA
Modesto, CA
Monterey County, CA

WATER
Arizona Municipal Water Users Association, AZ
Aurora, CO
Bakersfield, CA
Calaveras County Water District, CA
Joshua Basin Water District, CA
Phoenix, AZ
Reclamation District 1000, CA (District Engineer)
Sacramento Area Flood Control
Agency, CA
San Luis Obispo County, CA
South Placer Municipal Utility
District, CA
Stockton, CA
Sweetwater Springs Water District,
CA
Valley of the Moon Water District,
CA
Walnut Valley Water District, CA

OTHER
Bay Area Air Quality Management
District, CA (Deputy Air Pollution
Control Officer)
Bureau Veritas, CA (Vice President
– Operations)
Central Contra Costa Sanitation
Agency, CA (Purchasing & Materials
Manager)
Government Services Group, Inc.
(Municipal Services Manager)
Hilton, Farmkopf, and Hobson LLC
(Manager/Vice President)
Norfolk, VA (Assistant Director of
Human Services)
Port of Long Beach, CA (Managing
Director)
Port of San Diego, CA (Senior
Director of Real Estate)
Robson Homes (Forward Planner
and Land Acquisition Manager)
Sacramento, CA (Preservation
Director)
Sacramento, CA (Urban Design
Manager)
San Francisco, CA (Director of
Office of Citizen Complaints)
San Jose, CA (Assistant Director of
Environmental Services)
San Manuel Band of Tribal Indians
(Tribal Manager)
Superior Court of San Luis Obispo
County, CA (Assistant Court
Executive Officer)
Washoe County, NV (Director of
Senior Services)
CITY OF DUBLIN, CALIFORNIA

INVITES YOUR INTEREST IN THE POSITION OF

CITY MANAGER
THE COMMUNITY

Strategically located in the Tri-Valley region at the intersection of I-580 and I-680, the City of Dublin, CA has consistently been one of the fastest growing cities in Alameda County for the past several years. In 2007, the City reported a population of 43,630 within 14.59 square miles, and the City is in a rapid growth cycle with the population projected to exceed 62,000. The City will be served by two BART stations which provide great access from Dublin to other parts of the Bay Area. Since the City’s incorporation in 1982, the City’s population has progressively increased as both residents and businesses have found the benefit of calling Dublin “home.”

Six award-winning schools, numerous parks and recreation facilities, low crime rates, and a prime location make Dublin a wonderful place to live, work, shop and play. Growing in size and diversity, Dublin is a wonderful community that has something to offer anyone who wants to make Dublin their home.

THE CITY GOVERNMENT

The City of Dublin is a General Law City operating under a City Council-City Manager form of local government. Members of the City Council are elected “at large” to serve the entire community rather than by district. The Mayor is directly elected to a 2-year term and the four Council members are elected to 4-year staggered terms. The City Council appoints the City Manager and the City Attorney.

The City of Dublin has approximately 222 full-time City and contract employees. The City provides services with both in-house staff and a number of contract staff from private companies and other public agencies. Municipal services are delivered through the City Manager’s Office and six (6) departments: Administrative Services, Community Development, Parks & Community Services, Public Works, Police and Fire Departments. Police and Fire contract services are provided by the County of Alameda.

For Fiscal Year 2007-2008 the City has an Operating Budget of $54.9 million and a total budget of $102.7 million. The City is in sound financial condition and has established healthy reserves.

ISSUES, CHALLENGES, AND OPPORTUNITIES

The City of Dublin has experienced significant growth in the last several years, particularly in the eastern part of the City. The Eastern Dublin Specific Plan envisions continued growth. Managing continued growth in the community while preserving the quality of life and being sensitive to the concerns of residents will require the City Council and City Manager’s continued attention. Residents have expressed concerns about traffic, parking and the density of some of the more recent developments.

The City is currently updating its plans for downtown Dublin. The future Downtown Dublin Specific Plan combines the areas of the existing Downtown Core Specific Plan, Dublin Downtown Specific Plan, San Ramon Road Specific Plan, Village Parkway Specific Plan, and West Dublin BART Specific Plan into one comprehensive specific plan. The effort to date has provided for significant stakeholder involvement as well as opportunities for residents and others to be involved in the planning process.

Although Dublin is fiscally sound, like many California cities, Dublin has seen its financial position become more critical. The City’s sales tax revenue has flattened recently with the slowdown in the economy. Part of the impetus for the review of the existing specific plans for the downtown area has been the recognition of the need to broaden the City tax base. Continued development of commercial and retail properties in th
City will benefit the City’s financial position in the future.

Additionally, turnover among some of the more senior staff in the City is likely to occur in the future. Succession planning will be important to the City as will be the integration of new staff into the work force.

THE IDEAL CANDIDATE

The City Manager’s position is open as the result of the retirement of Richard C. Ambrose. Mr. Ambrose, the City’s first and only City Manager since 1982, has served in the position for 26 years. The City Council is looking for candidates with broad local government experience. The ideal City Manager will be an individual who brings a big picture perspective to the job who at the same time does not lose sight of the details. A manager who allows his/her staff broad flexibility to pursue goals while holding them accountable is being sought.

The City Council is looking for an individual that is creative, knowledgeable, responsive, and engaged. The new City Manager should be visible and be a part of the community. Candidates should have strong interpersonal skills, be an effective communicator, and possess the ability to listen effectively. The incoming Manager will work toward the future of Dublin and keep the goals of the City Council in mind. Some of the City’s more significant capital projects include: the expansion of the City’s Historic Park, the development of the Emerald Glen Park Recreation Center and Aquatics Complex, the development of the 60 acre Fallon Sports Park, the expansion of the Civic Center and the development of a new Maintenance Facility/ Emergency Operations Center.

The new City Manager will also play a key role in the development process for the US Army Camp Parks land exchange, a new Kaiser Medical Facility, continued development in the vicinity of both the East and West Dublin BART Stations, and continued development in the City’s Eastern Dublin Specific Plan Area.

Candidates should be individuals who provide the City Council with sound advice while offering options for Council consideration. An ethical and trustworthy Manager will excel in this position.

The City Council in Dublin has enjoyed a very positive relationship with staff and is looking for a City Manager who will continue that tradition. The City Council is looking for a City Manager who will earn the respect of staff and the community.

A Bachelor’s Degree in public administration, business, or a related field is required. A Master’s Degree in one of these fields is preferred.

COMPENSATION

The salary for the City Manager position is open and is dependent upon qualifications. The City also offers a generous benefits package including:

- **Retirement** – California Public Employee Retirement System (CalPERS) 2.7% @ 55 with single highest year an Employer Paid Member Contribution (EPMC) with 7% employer paid contribution.

- **Benefits** – The City offers a choice of numerous medical plans through CalPERS with City contribution of up to $1,072.97 per month (proposed to adjust annually). A fully paid dental insurance plan is provided for employees and eligible dependents as well.

- **Trust Fund** – The City offers $90 per fiscal year for excess medical, dental and vision care costs.

- **Life Insurance** – Negotiable (City St receive City-paid term life insurance policy in the amount of $50,000).
Holidays – The City offers 12 paid holidays annually; (City Staff receive one additional floating holiday).

General Leave – Negotiable (Management Staff receive 24 days of general leave given annually in lieu of the traditional sick and vacation leave; increasing with longevity).

Administrative Time Off – Negotiable (Management Staff receive 64 hours of administrative leave annually with an option of an annual payout of up to ½ of that amount with prior approval).

Long-Term Disability Insurance – Employer paid.

Tuition Reimbursement – The City offers to reimburse up to 75% of tuition costs incurred with a $1,400 maximum eligible payout.

Employee Assistance Program – City paid premiums and the benefits include work/life balance employee assistance program and worldwide emergency travel assistance services.

In addition to the above benefits, the City offers voluntary participation in the following programs: short-term disability, deferred compensation, supplemental life insurance, dependent care assistance, and credit union.

The City does not participate in the Social Security system except for a mandatory Medicare contribution.

TO APPLY

To apply for this opportunity please visit our website at www.bobmurrayassoc.com. You will be prompted to create an online profile. If you have any questions, please contact our offices at (916) 784-9080.

Filing Deadline:
May 9, 2008

Following the closing date, resumes will be screened according to the qualifications outlined above. The most qualified candidates will be invited to personal interviews with Bob Murray and Associates. A select group of candidates will be asked to provide references once it is anticipated that they may be recommended as finalists. References will be contacted only following candidate approval. Finalist interviews will be held with the Mayor and City Council. A complete background check will be conducted by Bob Murray and Associates on the selected candidate. Candidates will be advised of the status of the recruitment following selection of the City Manager. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call Mr. Bob Murray at:

(916) 784-9080.
CITY OF PASADENA, CALIFORNIA

INVITES YOUR INTEREST IN THE POSITION OF

CITY MANAGER
THE COMMUNITY

The City of Pasadena, located about 20 minutes northeast of downtown Los Angeles, is a progressive and dynamic community. It is a cultural, scientific, corporate, entertainment, and education center for a region that approaches one million people. Pasadena was the childhood home of baseball great Jackie Robinson and his Olympic star brother Mack, and the birthplace of Julia Child.

The City’s ethnic and economic diversity, combined with its heritage of historic architecture, provide a community character that is unique and exciting. People around the world know Pasadena!

The City offers a high quality of life based on elegant residential neighborhoods and many parks, a diverse economy employing over 100,000 persons, first class cultural institutions, several charmingly distinct retail centers, and colleges and universities of world renown. Its principal retail centers include Old Pasadena, the Playhouse District, South Lake Avenue, the Paseo Colorado, and East Pasadena. During the entire current decade, the local economy has outperformed regional and state economic trends.

Pasadena is one of few California cities with its own electric and water utility and health department.

The area features world class cultural and educational institutions, including the Tournament of Roses, the Rose Bowl, the Pacific Asia Museum, Art Center College of Design, Huntington Library Art Collections and Botanical Gardens, the Norton Simon Museum, the Pasadena Playhouse and Ambassador Auditorium, the California Institute of Technology, and Jet Propulsion Laboratory.

Recognized throughout the world, Pasadena’s Rose Bowl is famous for championship events including five Super Bowl football games, the 1994 Olympic Games and the 1999 Women’s World Cup Soccer Championship, in addition to each year’s Rose Bowl Game. The Rose Bowl is also home to the UCLA Bruins football team.

The Huntington Library Art Collections and Botanical Gardens offer an extensive collection of literary classics, 17th and 18th century British and French art, and 150 acres of lush gardens.

The Norton Simon Museum offers seven centuries of European art from the Renaissance to the 20th century, including masterpieces by Van Gogh, Degas, Rembrandt, and Picasso. The Pacific Asia Museum is dedicated to the promotion and understanding of the arts and culture of Asia and the Pacific, while the Pasadena Museum of California Art features California art, architecture and design from 1850 to the present. The Gamble House, built in 1908, is an architectural masterpiece of the American Arts and Crafts era.

Pasadena is home to more than 500 restaurants, including some of southern California’s finest. Exciting nightlife ranges from jazz clubs and comedy to live theatre and symphony performances.

With its convenient location and a population of 145,000, Pasadena offers visitors a traditional and friendly enclave. The City’s mild climate also makes for ideal sightseeing conditions. The year-round temperature averages in the low 70’s.

Pasadena offers easy access to all area airports, freeways and southern California attractions, including Universal Studios, Disneyland, Dodger Stadium, the Staples Center, and beaches. To make sightseeing even easier, visitors can hop aboard the Gold Line light rail system Part of the Los Angeles County Metrolink transit network, the 13.7-mile Gold Line with six stations in Pasadena transport passengers from Pasadena to downtown Los Angeles and points in between.

ISSUES, CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

With all of the City’s progress during the current decade, the Council current
sees a need to look 10 or 15 years into the future. The challenge for the new City Manager will be to participate in this next phase of the City’s history, actively assisting the Council and the community, as they work to create a greater City.

The Council’s vision for the future of the City is to retain its ethnic and economic diversity; to celebrate its active life of arts and culture; and to achieve equitable participation of all residents in the life of the City.

Pasadena faces many issues in its effort to maintain and strengthen the quality of life. They include fiscal management in uncertain economic times; promotion of a strong local economy; preservation and production of affordable housing; in collaboration with the Pasadena Unified School District, strengthening of the public schools and other programs supporting positive youth development; extension of transit systems and traffic management; and the pursuit of a City that is “pedestrian friendly”.

In 2006, the City joined the U.S. Conference of Mayors’ Climate Control Agreement and the United Nations Global Environmental Accords. Pasadena seeks to be a leader in pursuing environmental responsibility, “green building” standards and sustainability. Progress in this effort is an important priority.

During the last 10 years, the City has invested $500 million in infrastructure, including the seismic retrofit of City Hall. The Council’s commitment is ongoing with a major expansion of the conference center approaching completion and improvements being planned for the Rose Bowl. These efforts represent still another priority.

Planning and development issues are critical to the residents of Pasadena. The City’s planning goals during the next 24 months include open space, housing, mobility and land use, as well as continued extension of local and regional transit facilities. As the City undertakes to update its General Plan, challenges include encouraging and directing development to continue to support a balanced, vibrant economy while mitigating development impacts, protecting historic neighborhoods and preserving a high quality of life.

The new City Manager will be expected to assist the Council in meeting these expectations.

**THE IDEAL CITY MANAGER CANDIDATE**

The City Council seeks a strong administrator who possesses the ability to anticipate issues and work collaboratively to develop solutions. The new City Manager should embrace a big picture perspective while maintaining a good grasp of the details. The person selected must be energetic, focused and flexible.

The ideal candidate will be an accomplished manager with the ability to provide clear direction to staff. While exercising skilled leadership and judgment, the selected individual will delegate authority and encourage staff to develop their full potential. He/she should be an excellent team and consensus builder.

The new City Manager should embrace a big picture perspective while maintaining a good grasp of the details.

The new City Manager should possess strong communication skills. Most importantly, these skills should be based on a strong commitment to effective, “no surprises” communication with the City Council. The selected candidate will work with the Council on City priorities, acting in an advisory capacity while the Council performs its policy-making responsibilities. In addition, he/she must focus on the long-term fiscal health of the City and propose innovative solutions to City issues.
Individually who are talented at building partnerships with neighborhood associations and the business sector and enjoy interacting with all members of the community will be highly valued. The City Manager should be approachable and visible in the community. He/she should promote citizen involvement and an honest, well-grounded dialogue with the citizens of Pasadena.

Candidates should possess a broad range of experience in local government with strong skills on finance and budget. A Bachelor’s degree in Public Administration, Business Administration or a related field is required. A Master’s degree is highly desired.

COM 衝割 HATION AND TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT

The salary for the City Manager is open and is dependent upon qualifications. The City operates on a “9/80 schedule”, closing on alternate Fridays, and it offers an attractive benefits package, including:

PERS Retirement – 2.5% at 55. The City pays 4.4% of the employee’s contribution.

Annual Leave – 12 holidays, 120 hours vacation, 80 hours sick leave, and up to 80 hours paid management leave.

Life Insurance – City-paid benefit of $200,000. (Additional and/or dependent coverage available at employee’s expense.)

Health Insurance – City contributes $886 per month for medical premiums, vision and/or deferred comp. PERS medical plans are offered.

Dental Insurance – City contributes 100% of employee premium and up to $40 per month for dependent premiums.

Personal Development Allowance – $1,000 annually for professional or personal development.

Car Allowance – $550 per month.

Medical Exam – City pays annually for a comprehensive medical exam for executives.

APPLICATIONS

To apply for this opportunity, please visit our website at www.bobmurrayassoc.com. You will be prompted to create an online profile. If you have any questions, please contact our offices at (916) 784-9080. A detailed brochure is available.

Filing Deadline:
May 16, 2008

Following the closing date, resumes will be screened according to the qualifications outlined above. The most qualified candidates will be invited to personal interviews with Bob Murray & Associates. A select group of candidates will be asked to provide references once it is anticipated that they may be recommended as finalists. References will be contacted only following candidate approval. Finalist interviews will be held in Pasadena. All candidates will be advised following selection of the City Manager. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call Mr. Bob Murray at:

(916) 784-9080.
Consideration and possible action regarding adoption of a Resolution authorizing the establishment of a Public Agency Retirement System (PARS) Supplemental Retirement Plan for eligible members of the El Segundo Supervisory and Professional Employees Bargaining Unit, to be administered by Phase II Systems, PARS Trust Administrator.

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1) Adopt the Resolution.
2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related this item.

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:

At the July 15, 2008 Council Meeting this item was introduced for information only. As required by Section 7507 of the California Government Code, future annual costs as determined by an enrolled actuary must be made public at a public meeting at least two weeks prior to the adoption of any increases in Public Retirement Benefits.

(Insert attached)

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

Resolution

FISCAL IMPACT:

Operating Budget:
Amount Requested: 
Account Number: Various
Project Phase:
Appropriation Required: ___ Yes  X  No

ORIGINATED BY:  
Bob Hyland, Director of Human Resources

DATE: July 22, 2008

REVIEWED BY:  
Jack Wayt, Interim City Manager

DATE: 7-30-08
BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:

The current three year Memorandum of Understanding between the City and the El Segundo Supervisory and Professional Employees Bargaining Unit provides that effective October 1, 2008, the City will contract with the Public Retirement System (PARS) to provide the PARS .5 @ 55 Retirement Enhancement Formula as a supplement to the City’s 2% @ 55 Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) Formula for non-safety employees.

Eligible members of the El Segundo Supervisory and Professional Employees Bargaining Unit are those who:

1. Are 55 years of age or older;
2. Have completed 15 years of continuous service with the City of El Segundo; and
3. Service or disability retirement from the City of El Segundo.

As required by Section 7507 of the California Government Code, City staff secured the services of an enrolled actuary (John E. Bartel, Bartel Associates, LLC) to determine the future annual costs of providing the plan benefits and made the results of that study available for public review. A copy of the actuarial report has been on file with the City Clerk’s office since July 15, 2008.

The cost of the PARS Supplemental Retirement Benefit will be shared between the City, as the employer, and the covered employees. The cost to the covered employees, effective October 1, 2008, will be 1% of their total annual pay, ($30,000) via payroll deduction. The projected annual actuarial cost of the Supplemental Retirement Benefit to the City is $71,000.
RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF
A PUBLIC AGENCY RETIREMENT SYSTEM (PARS)
SUPPLEMENTAL RETIREMENT PLAN FOR ELIGIBLE
MEMBERS OF THE EL SEGUNDO SUPERVISORY AND
PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES BARGAINING UNIT,
TO BE ADMINISTERED BY PHASE II SYSTEMS, PARS
TRUST ADMINISTRATOR.

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

Section 1: The City Council finds and declares as follows:

A. It is determined to be in the best interest of the City and its
 employees to provide a Retirement Enhancement Program to
 eligible employees;

B. The City is eligible to be a member of the Public Agency Retirement
 System (PARS) Trust, which has made available a Retirement
 Enhancement Plan supplementing CalPERS and qualifying under
 the relevant sections of the Internal Revenue Code and the
 California Government Code.

Section 2: The City Council hereby adopts the PARS Trust, including the
PARS Retirement Enhancement Plan, as part of the City Retirement Program,
effective October 1, 2008; and

Section 3: The City Council hereby appoints the Director of Finance, or his/her
successor or his/her designee as the City's Plan Administrator for the Public
Agency Retirement System; and

Section 4: The City PARS Plan Administrator is hereby authorized to execute
the PARS legal and administrative service documents on behalf of the City to
implement a PARS supplemental plan to CalPERS. In addition, if the City's
PARS Plan Administrator finds that the PARS supplemental plan benefit must be
limited under Section 415 of Internal Revenue Code, then the Plan Administrator
will implement replacement benefit programs at no additional cost to the City.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 5th day of August, 2008.

ATTEST:

__________________________
Kelly McDowell, Mayor

__________________________
Cindy Mortesen, City Clerk
APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Mark D. Hensley, City Attorney

By: __________________________
    Karl H. Berger,
    Assistant City Attorney

ATTEST:

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

I, Cindy Mortesen, 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 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 ___________ 2008, and the same was so passed and adopted by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

____________________________
Cindy Mortesen, City Clerk
Consideration and possible action regarding the approval of the examination plan for the Personel Merit System job classification of Street Maintenance Supervisor. (Fiscal Impact: None)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1) Approve the examination plan.
2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:

Section 1-6-9 of the El Segundo Municipal Code, entitled “Examinations”, provides that the Personel Officer shall review and recommend to the City Manager, who in turn shall recommend to the City Council, an appropriate examination plan and weights for each portion of the examination for Personel Merit System job classifications.

Approval of examination plans for Merit System job classifications in all City Departments has been required since the passage of initiative Ordinance No. 586 in April 1962.

(continued on next page)
BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:

For departments other than the Police and Fire Departments, the plan may consist of any one or combination of the following techniques:

1. Written;
2. Oral;
3. Demonstration;
4. Any evaluation of education, experience, or skills or physical fitness, which fairly evaluated the relative capacities of the applicants.

Police and Fire Departments:

The examination plan, for entrance or promotional, for the Police and Fire Departments, shall consist of a written examination and one or more of the following:

1. Oral;
2. Demonstration;
3. Any evaluation of education certification, experience, or skills or any test of manual skills or physical fitness, which fairly evaluates the relative capacities of the applicant.

Street Maintenance Supervisor
Structured, Technical and Career Preparation Interview (Open-Competitive) Weighted - 100%

The need for this examination plan is a result of the upcoming retirement of the incumbent.
Consideration and possible action to waive the formal bidding process pursuant to the El Segundo Municipal Code §1-7-10 and authorize the Fire Department to purchase a replacement paramedic rescue ambulance manufactured by Emergency Vehicle Group, Inc. on a sole source basis. (Fiscal Impact: $203,455)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1) Pursuant to El Segundo Municipal Code §1-7-10, waive the bidding process and authorize the Fire Department to purchase a replacement paramedic rescue ambulance manufactured by Emergency Vehicle Group, Inc.; 2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:

The El Segundo Fire Department paramedic apparatus fleet currently consists of two (2) in-service paramedic rescue ambulances and one (1) paramedic rescue ambulance in reserve. Rescue 31 was purchased in 2003. Rescue 32 and Rescue 33 (reserve) were both purchased in January and November of 1996, respectively. Rescue 32 and Rescue 33 have both experienced issues with reliability over the last few years. Staff is recommending that Rescue 32 be replaced with a new ambulance that is manufactured by Emergency Vehicle Group, Inc. Rescue 32 would then replace Rescue 33 as our reserve ambulance and current Rescue 33 would be retired from the fleet.

(Continued next page)

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

None

FISCAL IMPACT: $203,455

Operating Budget: $209,888 Fire Suppression/Paramedics Equipment Replacement Funds
Amount Requested: $203,455
Account Number: 601-400-3203-8105: Unit 3305 - $127,975
601-400-3202: Fire Suppression Purchase Savings/Unallocated - $55,480
601-400-3203: Fire Paramedics Purchase Savings/Unallocated - $20,000
Project Phase: N/A
Appropriation Required: __Yes __X No

ORIGINATED BY:  
Kevin C. Smith, Fire Chief  
July 23, 2008

REVIEWED BY:  
Jack Wayt, Interim City Manager  
7-30-08

DATE:
The new paramedic rescue ambulance purchase will be funded through existing equipment replacement funds of $127,975 currently designated for Rescue 32 (Unit 3305); $55,480 in unallocated purchase savings within the Fire Suppression Equipment Replacement fund; and $20,000 in unallocated purchase savings within the Fire Paramedics Equipment Replacement fund. This purchase will necessitate a new expenditure charge of $27,343 annually to the equipment replacement account to fully fund the replacement of the new rescue ambulance after its ten (10) year life expectancy.

Staff is recommending the sole source purchase of the ambulance from Emergency Vehicle Group, Inc. based on their manufacturing of a vehicle that is built with features that are generally of higher quality, safer, and more durable than other ambulance manufacturers. Some of these features include enhanced structural integrity of the ambulance box through the use of larger structural components. These enhancements make the ambulance box safer for patients and staff in the event of a traffic collision and improve the overall durability of the vehicle. The customized vehicle will incorporate a smoother ride which lends to enhanced ability to provide patient care and comfort in transit as there is reduced noise, vibration, and bouncing in transit. The sealing of compartment doors on this vehicle is also superior in that it creates a dust free environment within compartments ensuring the exposure of equipment to environmental contaminants is greatly reduced.
EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA ITEM STATEMENT
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action regarding the adoption of a Conflict of Interest Code required by The Political Reform Act (Government Code Section 81000 et. seq.) rescinding Resolution No. 4448 and adopting a new resolution approving a new Conflict of Interest Code.

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
1) Adopt Resolution;
2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:
The California Government Code requires that no later than July of each even numbered year, the City Council shall direct the City Clerk to review and recommend changes to the Conflict of Interest Code to be adopted no later than October 1, 2008. Since the most recent update of the Code in December 2005 (no changes required in 2006), the City Clerk has reviewed the current Code and is recommending the following changes resulting from the addition or deletion of designated positions pursuant to Government Code 87302:

The addition of the Members of the Environmental Committee, the formation approved by Council on July 15, 2008. The addition of Senior Plan Check Engineer, class specification approved by Council on April 1, 2008 by Resolution 4545. The addition of Director of Finance, Director of Human Resources, Fiscal Services Manager, Building Safety Manager, Principal Planner and Purchasing Agent, class specifications approved by Council on September 18, 2007 by Resolution 4522. The addition of Assistant City Engineer and Librarian II, class specifications approved by Council on September 19, 2006 by Resolution 4483.

The Risk Manager/Purchasing Agent and City Engineer positions should be deleted because the class specifications have been eliminated and the Senior Plan Check Engineer and Plans Examiner deleted because the positions have been reclassified.

The Streets Supervisor position should be added as it was inadvertently left out of the last Conflict of Interest Code.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
Draft Resolution

FISCAL IMPACT: NONE
Operating Budget:
Amount Requested:
Account Number:
Project Phase:
 Appropriation Required:

ORIGINATED BY:         DATE: 7-29-08
Cindy Mortensen, City Clerk

REVIEWED BY:           DATE: 7-30-08
Jack Wayt, Interim City Manager
RESOLUTION NO.

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE 2008 CONFLICT OF INTEREST CODE FOR THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO IN ACCORD WITH THE POLITICAL REFORM ACT.

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

SECTION 1: The City Council finds and declares as follows:


B. Section 18730 of the FPPC Regs. sets forth a standard conflict of interest code that may be adopted by local agencies.

C. On or about July 2006 City Clerk’s Office conducted a review of the City’s conflict of interest code in accord with Government Code § 87306.5 and determined no changes to the code, amended by Resolution 4448 on December 20, 2005, were needed at that time.

D. To fulfill its obligations under the PRA and FPPC Regs., the City Council will repeal Resolution 4448 and adopt a new conflict of interest code as set forth below.

SECTION 2: Pursuant to FPPC Regs. § 18730, the City of El Segundo adopts a Conflict of Interest Code to read as follows:

"CONFLICT OF INTEREST CODE FOR THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO

A. Incorporation of Standard Code.

Under the terms of the Political Reform Act (Gov’t Code §§ 81000 et seq.) and regulations promulgated by the Fair Political Practices Commission (2 Cal. Code of Regs. §§ 18700, et seq.), the City is required to adopt a conflict of interest code. The City of El Segundo incorporates by reference 2 Cal. Code of Regs. § 18730, and its amendments, into this Conflict of Interest Code including, without limitation, the designation of officials and employees and the disclosure categories set forth below (collectively, “the Conflict of Interest Code”).

B. Filing of Statements

Designated officials, officers and employees must file Statements of Economic Interest (Form 700) with the City Clerk or Deputy City Clerk. After receiving Statements of Economic Interests from City Council members, the City Treasurer, Planning Commission members, City Attorney, and City Manager, the City Clerk or Deputy City
Clerk, must forward the original to the Fair Political Practices Commission and retain a copy for the City’s files.

Under Government Code § 82011(c), the City Council is the code reviewing body with respect to the Conflict of Interest Code.

C. Review Procedure

Under Government Code § 87306.5, not later than July 1 of each even numbered year, the City Council must direct the City Clerk, or Deputy City Clerk, to review the Conflict of Interest Code. The City Clerk or Deputy City Clerk must submit an amended Conflict of Interest Code to the City Council if a change in the Conflict of Interest Code is necessitated by changed circumstance. If changes are not required, the City Clerk or Deputy City Clerk must submit a written statement to that effect to the City Council not later than October 1 of the same year.

D. Designated Positions

The following positions entail the making or participation in the making of decisions that may have a foreseeable material effect on the officials or officer’s financial interests.

COUNCIL, COMMISSIONS, COMMITTEES, & BOARDS

* Members of the City Council
* Members of the Planning Commission
Members of the Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Committee
Members of the Capital Improvement Program Advisory
Members of the Community Cable Advisory Committee
Members of the Economic Development Advisory Council
* Members of the Environmental Committee (New Committee)
Members of the Investment Advisory Committee
Members of the Library Board of Trustees
Members of the Recreation & Parks Commission
Members of the Senior Housing Board

OFFICE OF THE CITY MANAGER:

* City Manager
  Assistant City Manager

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY:

* City Attorney
  Assistant City Attorney
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK:

City Clerk
Deputy City Clerk

OFFICE OF THE CITY TREASURER:

* City Treasurer
  Deputy City Treasurer

FINANCE DEPARTMENT: (DEPARTMENT NAME CHANGE)

Director of Finance (New Class Specification)
Fiscal Services Manager (New Class Specification)
Accounting Manager
Business Services Manager
Risk Manager/Purchasing Agent (Class Specification Eliminated)
Purchasing Agent (New Class Specification)

FIRE DEPARTMENT

Fire Chief
Battalion Chief(s)

HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT (DEPARTMENT ADDED)

Director of Human Resources (New Class Specification)
Human Resources Manager

LIBRARY DEPARTMENT:

Director of Library Services
Librarian II (New Class Specification)
Senior Librarian(s)

PLANNING & BUILDING SAFETY DEPARTMENT:

Director of Planning & Building Safety
Planning Manager
Building Safety Manager (New Class Specification)
Residential Sound Insulation Manager
Assistant Planner
Associate Planner
Building Inspector(s)
Construction Coordinator(s)
Plan Check Engineer
Planning Technician
Plans Examiner
Principal Planner (New Class Specification)
Property Owner Coordinator
Senior Building Inspector(s)
Senior Plan Check Engineer (New Class Specification)
Senior Planner(s)

POLICE DEPARTMENT

Police Chief
Police Captain(s)

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Director of Public Works
City Engineer (Class Specification Eliminated)
Assistant City Engineer (New Class Specification)
General Services Manager
Streets Supervisor (Added)
Water Supervisor
Wastewater Supervisor

RECREATION AND PARKS DEPARTMENT

Director of Recreation and Parks
Parks Superintendent
Recreation Superintendent

* Listed in the code for information purposes only. These positions file under Government Code Section 87200 with the Fair Political Practices Commission.

CONSULTANTS:

All consultants except those included by the City Manager in accordance with the following procedure:

The City Manager may determine in writing that a particular consultant, although a "designated position," is hired to perform a range of duties that requires the consultant to fully comply with the disclosure requirements described in this section. Such written determination must include a description of the consultant's duties and, based upon that description, a statement of the extent of disclosure requirements. The City Manager determination is a public record and must be retained for public inspection in the same manner and location as this conflict of interest code.
E. Disclosure Requirements

Designated employees must disclose all interests as required by the Political Reform Act and regulations promulgated thereto. When a new position classification is created by the Human Resources Department for City Council approval, the Human Resources Department will recommend that the City Council decide whether the new position will be required to file a Statement of Economic Interest and be included as a designated position in the Conflict of Interest Code.

When the City Council establishes a Commission, Committee, or Board, the City Council will decide whether the members of the Commission, Committee or Boards be included as a designated position in the Conflict of Interest Code and the members of the Commission, Committee or Board so designated by the City Council, will be required to file a Statement of Economic Interest.”

SECTION 3: Resolution No. 4448 (adopted December 20, 2005) and any other resolution or policy purporting to establish a conflict of interest code, are superseded by this Resolution and thus repealed in their entirety.

SECTION 4: Repeal of any provision of any resolution or policy herein will not affect any penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred before, or preclude prosecution and imposition of penalties for any violation occurring before, this Resolution’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 Resolution.

SECTION 5: The City Clerk will certify to the passage and adoption of this Resolution and enter it into the book of original resolutions.

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

PASSED AND ADOPTED this ___ day of __________, 2008.

__________________________
Kelly McDowell, Mayor

ATTEST:

__________________________
Cindy Mortesen, City Clerk

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

By: _________________________
Karl H. Berger, Assistant City Attorney
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action regarding a new Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) license for on-site sale and on-site consumption of alcohol (Type 47 - On-Sale Beer, Wine and Distilled Spirits) at a new restaurant located at 2361 Rosecrans Avenue, EA No. 792 and AUP No. 08-02. Applicant: Continental Development Corporation – Alex J. Rose (Fiscal Impact: None).

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
1. Receive and file a determination that the City Council does not object to issuance of a new Type 47 ABC license at 2361 Rosecrans Avenue; and/or,
2. Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:
At its April 4, 1995 meeting, the City Council directed staff to bring all future ABC licenses to it for review. ABC regulations require a 30-day review and comment period, for alcohol sales at restaurants, after notification of the local police and planning departments. The grounds of a protest should relate to public health, safety or welfare concerns. Restaurants with Type 47 licenses are specifically excluded from the ABC regulations, which require the City to make findings of public convenience of necessity in areas of "undue concentration" for off-site sale licenses. Based upon previous Council direction, staff is providing background information regarding this application.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
1. Crime and Arrest Statistics by Reporting Districts (RD)
2. Police Reporting Districts Map
5. Police Memorandum dated June 30, 2008

FISCAL IMPACT: None
Operating Budget: N/A
Amount Requested: N/A
Account Number: N/A
Project Phase: N/A
Appropriation Required: Yes x No

ORIGINATED BY: Gary Chicots, Director of Planning and Building Safety
DATE: 7-24-08

REVIEWED BY: Jack Wayt, Interim City Manager
DATE: 7-30-08
BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION: (cont.)

According to the most recent Crime and Arrest statistics report (July 2007 – December 2007, Exhibit 1) prepared by the Police Department, the proposed restaurant is located in Reporting District (RD) 319. Based on 2007 reported data prepared by the Police Department, the district had a total of 56 Part I crimes (criminal homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft and arson) and 17 felony and misdemeanor arrests. The Police Department and the Department of Planning and Building Safety have no concerns regarding the issuance of a new ABC license for the proposed new restaurant.

The approval of this license request would be for the convenience of serving alcoholic beverages to the customers to complement the food service at a proposed new restaurant. A request for a new license is required, since the applicant does not currently hold a Type 47 license, and there was no previous license issued for this address location. The applicant’s proposed hours of alcohol sale are expected to be during the hours the restaurant is open. The restaurant’s hours of operation will be limited to: 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 a.m. seven days a week. The outdoor patio would be open the same hours as the restaurant and there are no residential uses adjacent to the subject property.

On July 3, 2008, the Director of Planning and Building Safety Department approved an Administrative Use Permit application (EA No. 792, AUP No. 08-02) for 2361 Rosecrans Avenue. The Director’s decision was forwarded to the Planning Commission on July 10, 2008. On July 10, 2008, the Planning Commission chose to Receive and File the item with the conditions of approval.

The ABC license review is a separate application from the City’s AUP process, which requires mandatory findings that are regulated by the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control. The Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) in addition to reviewing the City’s AUP approval is responsible for running a complete background check on all alcohol license applicants, as well as conducting site inspections, before the issuance of any type of license.

P:\Planning & Building Safety\PROJECTS\776-800\EA-792\2008 8 5 EA-792 ccreport.doc
## RECORDED PERIOD: JULY – DECEMBER 2007
### PART I CRIMES AND ARRESTS STATISTICS BY REPORTING DISTRICT (RD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RD</th>
<th>PART I CRIMES (ONLY)</th>
<th>FELONY/MISD ARRESTS PART I (ONLY)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>AVERAGE BY RD PERCENTAGE +/-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+170%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>+80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>+80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>+10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>+80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>+80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>+40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>+40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>+560%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>+630%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**: 400 113 513

Number of Reporting Districts = 52
Average # of Part I Crimes per Reporting District = 8
Average # of Felony/Misdemeanor Part I Crime Arrests per Reporting District = 2
Average # of Crimes and Arrests per Reporting District = 10

(Results from 07/01/2007 through 12/31/2007)

**FORMULA**: Add (Part I crimes + Felony/Misd Arrest) then subtract from the Average # of Crimes and Arrest per Rd, divided by the Average # of Crimes and Arrests per RD and multiply by 100.

*Sample: 10+3=13, 13-10=3, 3/10=.3, .3x100=30%*
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO

PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

PUBLIC HEARING: July 10, 2008

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment No. EA-792, Conditional Use Permit No. 08-05 and Administrative Use Permit No. 08-02

APPLICANT: Alex J. Rose, Vice President c/o Continental Development Corporation

PROPERTY OWNER: Continental 2361/2381, LLC.
Richard Lundquist

REQUEST: A Request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a 735 square-foot outdoor dining area and an Administrative Use Permit to allow the sale and consumption of alcohol (Type 47 Alcoholic Beverage Control License for beer, wine and distilled spirits) at a new restaurant

PROPERTY INVOLVED: 2361 Rosecrans Avenue

I. Introduction

The proposed project is a request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a 735 square-foot outdoor dining area and an Administrative Use Permit to allow the on-site sale and consumption of alcohol at a new restaurant within an existing four-story office building located at 2361-2381 Rosecrans Avenue in the Urban Mixed-Use South (MU-S) Zone. The applicant is requesting a Type 47 license from the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control for the on-site sale and consumption of beer, wine and distilled spirits in the restaurant and in a new outdoor dining area. The Director made the necessary findings to grant an Administrative Use Permit for the on-site sale and consumption of alcohol and approved the Administrative Use Permit on July 3, 2008 (see Exhibit E).
II. **Recommendation**

Planning staff recommends that the Planning Commission 1) review the facts and findings as contained within this report, and adopt Resolution No. 2641 approving Environmental Assessment No. EA-792 and Conditional Use Permit No. 08-05, with conditions, and 2) Receive and File Administrative Use Permit No. 08-02.

III. **Background**

**Project Description**

The subject site is a 4.29-acre lot that is developed with an existing 186,909 square-foot office building and a 5-level parking structure with 641 parking spaces. The applicant proposes to convert an existing 6,952 square-foot office suite located at the southwest corner of the first floor of the building fronting on Rosecrans Avenue and Continental Circle to a new restaurant. Additionally, the applicant proposes to use 161 square feet of an existing utility/loading area as storage space for the restaurant. The applicant proposes a 136 square-foot addition adjacent to the main entrance and a 420 square-foot mechanical equipment enclosure on the south side of the restaurant. The addition will serve as the reception vestibule for the new restaurant. The proposed hours of operation are 11 a.m. to 1 a.m. daily.

The outdoor patio is proposed along the south side of the building. The patio will be approximately 735 square feet in size and will be decorated with fireplace accent features. The patio area will be surrounded by a combination of a low concrete wall and glass screen and steel columns at regular intervals. The wall extends west beyond the patio area along the restaurant frontage to the sidewalk along Continental Circle. The exterior façade of the restaurant and the patio area have a distinct contemporary architectural design intended to create its identity while remaining compatible with the office building architecture.

The interior of the restaurant includes a main dining area, a bar area and private dining area. The restaurant will contain 120 seats in the general dining area, 44 seats at the bar, and 24 seats in the private dining area(s) for a total of 188 seats inside the restaurant. The outdoor dining area will contain 44 seats. The restaurant will contain a combined total of 232 seats. The following chart summarizes the proposed dining and seating areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PROPOSED RESTAURANT</strong></th>
<th><strong>PROPOSED SQUARE FOOTAGE</strong></th>
<th><strong>NUMBER OF SEATS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Dining and Bar</td>
<td>3,428 SF</td>
<td>188 seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED RESTAURANT</td>
<td>PROPOSED SQUARE FOOTAGE</td>
<td>NUMBER OF SEATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Patio</td>
<td>735 SF</td>
<td>44 seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,163 SF</td>
<td>232 seats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Description and Surrounding Land Uses

The subject site is surrounded by other commercial/office uses. The surrounding land uses are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North: Parking Structure, Hotel and Green Line</td>
<td>MU-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South: Shopping Center</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East: Green Line and Self-Storage</td>
<td>Aviation Specific Plan (ASP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West: Parking structure and offices</td>
<td>MU-S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Analysis

Pursuant to El Segundo Municipal Code §15-23-4, the Planning Commission is authorized to grant a conditional use permit if it makes the three required findings listed in ESMC §15-23-6. The purpose of a conditional use permit is to a) assure the compatibility of the particular use on the particular site in relationship to other existing and potential uses within the general area in which the use is proposed to be located; b) assure the proposed use is consistent and compatible with the purpose of the zone in which the site is located; and c) recognize and compensate for potential impacts that could be generated by the proposed use, such as noise, smoke, dust, fumes, vibration, odors, traffic and hazards.

1) Compatibility

Restaurants are a permitted use in the Urban Mixed-Use South (MU-S) Zone. Outdoor dining areas that exceed 200 square feet or 20% of the indoor area, whichever is less, require a CUP. The subject outdoor dining area is 735 square feet, and therefore requires a Conditional Use Permit. The Administrative Use
Permit for on-site sale and consumption of alcohol at the new restaurant and outdoor dining area is required since there is no previous business with a license at this location in accordance with ESMC § 15-5F-2(l). Restaurants, such as the subject full service restaurant (the term includes coffee shops and cafes) typically have outdoor dining areas that provide a choice of indoor or outdoor dining for restaurant patrons. The proposed outdoor dining area will be compatible with the existing office uses on the site and the surrounding area. These uses are customarily located in complexes that serve the dining needs of office employees.

2) Zoning Consistency

The proposed restaurant, the outdoor dining area and their operations will be consistent with the ESMC requirements in the MU-S Zone, including but not limited to parking, floor area ratio (F.A.R.), setbacks, screening and outdoor dining. The following table compares the proposed project to the relevant MU-S Zone development standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>MU-S Zone Standards</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Outdoor dining exceeding 200 square feet in area or 20% of the indoor dining area whichever is less subject to a conditional use permit. ESMC § 15-5F-5(H)</td>
<td>735 square-foot outdoor dining area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>179,935 net square feet of office requires 481 spaces. 7,687 net square feet of restaurant including the outdoor dining area requires 103 spaces. Total required parking = 584 ESMC § 15-15-3(B)</td>
<td>641 spaces Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>The total net floor area of all buildings shall not exceed the total net square footage of the property multiplied by 1.0 or an FAR of 1:1. ESMC § 15-5F-8(F)</td>
<td>187,045 SF:187,045 SF, or 1:1 Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>MU-S Zone Standards</td>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>A minimum lot area of 10,000 square feet ESMC § 15-5F-8(B)</td>
<td>187,045 square feet (existing lot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Buildings and structures shall not exceed a height of 175' ESMC § 15-5F-8(C)</td>
<td>19 feet (Addition) Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>Thirty (30') feet minimum ESMC § 15-5F-8(D)(1)</td>
<td>At least 30 feet Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setback</td>
<td>Twenty five (25) feet minimum; or thirty (30) feet minimum if the side yard adjoins a dedicated street; or if the side yard abuts property with a different classification, the side yard setback shall be the average of the two (2) side yard setbacks, but not less than ten (10) feet. ESMC § 15-5F-8(D)(2)</td>
<td>25 feet on the west side 33 feet on the east side Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>Five (5) feet minimum, unless the rear yard adjoins an alley, dedicated street, or public right-of-way, of if the primary access is through the rear yard, in these cases, a minimum of thirty (30) feet shall be provided. ESMC § 15-5F-8(D)(3)</td>
<td>33 feet Complies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parking

The total restaurant area, including indoor and outdoor dining, kitchen and other usable areas is 7,687 square feet. The total parking requirement for the restaurant is 103 parking spaces. The rest of the office building area is 179,935 square feet, which requires 481 parking spaces. Thus, total parking requirement for the entire building is 584 parking spaces. This requirement will be satisfied by the existing 641-space parking structure onsite.
Floor Area Ratio (FAR)

The required FAR for the subject site is 1:1. This ratio was set when the existing office building development was approved by the City Council on March 1, 1988. The City Council at the time adopted Ordinance No. 1107 approving Subdivision 87-7/Tentative Parcel Map 17158 and Precise Plan for the subject development. The development currently meets the required F.A.R., in that the existing office building is 186,909 square feet and the subject lot is 187,045 square feet. The current application includes the addition of a 136 square-foot entry area and a 420 square-foot mechanical equipment room to the new restaurant, which will bring the total floor area of the building to 187,045 square feet and the FAR to exactly 1:1. Thus, the proposed project will meet the FAR requirements set by the City Council for this site.

Setbacks

ESMC § 15-5F-8(D) requires a 30-foot building setback along the Rosecrans Avenue frontage (south property line). The proposed patio will maintain a minimum setback of 30 feet, and the proposed addition to the building (vestibule) will be setback approximately 45 feet from the south property line. No further additions are proposed to the building that would affect the existing setbacks along other property lines. Therefore, the proposal meets the setback requirements of the MU-S Zone.

Equipment Screening

The project includes a 14' by 30' equipment room along the building frontage to house mechanical equipment (air filters) associated with the restaurant. The room will be approximately 16'4'' tall and will be painted match the office building exterior. A three-foot concrete landscape wall will surround the equipment room. A kitchen exhaust hood, which will project above the equipment room, will be screened on three sides by a metal louver screen painted to match the building windows. The louver screen will match the height of the exhaust hood (approximately four feet), which will completely hide the hood from the adjacent public right-of-way. Therefore, the proposed equipment room and screening will be consistent with the screening requirements of ESMC § 15-2-8.

Outdoor Dining Area

The proposed hours of operation for the patio are the same as the restaurant's and would be limited to 11 a.m. to 1 a.m. Sunday through Saturday as requested by the applicant. No live entertainment is proposed. The applicant proposes to have pre-recorded background music played inside the restaurant and in the outdoor patio. The walkway leading from the sidewalk to the outdoor patio will range in width from six feet to ten (the minimum is four feet). The floor plan shows that no tables, chairs, or umbrellas will be placed within four feet of required entrances to and exits.
from the patio area. In addition, the elevation drawings indicate that the proposed umbrellas will maintain the required minimum eight-foot vertical clearance. Finally, the proposed outdoor dining area, as conditioned, will meet all the maintenance and operation standards of ESMC § 15-2-16. Any change to the operation or maintenance of the outdoor dining area will be subject to review and approval by the Director of Planning and Building Safety.

An Administrative Use Permit is required for the on-site sale and consumption of alcohol, and is being processed concurrently with the subject Conditional Use Permit application. The Director made the necessary findings to grant an Administrative Use Permit for the project (Exhibit E).

3) Impacts

Additional trips that may be generated as a result of the outdoor dining area are not anticipated to be significant. The majority of additional vehicle trips will result from the new restaurant. Adding the outdoor dining area would not significantly increase traffic. Indeed, the overall traffic may decrease since office workers will use the on-site restaurant instead of driving elsewhere.

Noise is a potential impact that can be associated with outdoor dining. However, the subject dining area is located in commercial area, along a major arterial street, which is a significant distance from the nearest residential area. As a result, no significant noise impacts are anticipated.

General Plan Consistency

The El Segundo General Plan land use designation for the property is Urban Mixed-Use South. This designation permits a mixture of office, research and development, retail, restaurant and hotel uses. Outdoor dining areas in conjunction with a restaurant that exceed 200 square feet or 20% of the indoor area, whichever is less, are allowed subject to the granting of a Conditional Use Permit. The proposed use is consistent with Land Use Element Goal LU4 in that it provides a stable tax base for the City through development of new commercial uses, primarily within a mixed-use environment, without adversely affecting the viability of Downtown. The proposed use is also consistent with Land Use Element Objective LU4-4 in that it adds to the mixture of uses, which has the potential to maximize economic benefit, reduce traffic impacts, and encourage a pedestrian environment.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT – PURPOSE, FINDINGS, AND ANALYSIS

As stated above, pursuant to El Segundo Municipal Code §15-23-4, the Planning Commission is authorized to grant a conditional use permit if it finds in the affirmative the three required findings listed below (the findings appear in bold, followed by staff’s analysis):
1. The proposed location of the conditional use is in accord with the objectives of this Title and the purposes of the zone in which the site is located.

The zoning designation for the subject site is Urban Mixed-Use South (MU-S). This zone allows outdoor dining areas which exceed 200 square feet or 20% of the indoor dining area, whichever is less, subject to the granting of a conditional use permit pursuant to ESMC § 15-5F-5(H). The size of the outdoor dining area is appropriate to its location as it will be incidental to the proposed restaurant. Restaurants are a permitted use in the zone pursuant to ESMC § 15-5F-2(I). The principal uses in the zone are restricted to a mixture of commercial, office, research and development, retail, restaurant and hotel uses. The subject site consists of a commercial building containing office uses on all the floors above the ground floor restaurant level. It is the intent of the MU-S Zone to have several types of uses occupy a single building. Businesses located within this Zone are encouraged to provide street level uses which allow for, and facilitate, pedestrian activity for area workers and visitors. The restaurant with the accompanying outdoor dining area is in accord with the principal objectives of the zone.

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

The proposed location of the conditional use is adjacent to the south side of an existing 4-story office building and it is bounded by Rosecrans Boulevard on the south, Continental Circle to the west, the Green Line to the north, and the Santa Fe Railroad and Aviation Boulevard to the east. No particular use is adjacent or near the proposed outdoor dining area that could be impacted by the operation of the outdoor dining area which faces Rosecrans Boulevard. Outdoor dining activities are not anticipated to be detrimental to adjacent businesses. No residential uses are located in the vicinity. As such, the proposed location of the conditional use and the conditions under which it would be operated or maintained will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare, or materially injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity.

3. That the proposed conditional use will comply with each of the applicable provisions of this Chapter.

The proposed conditional use complies with the applicable provisions of ESMC Chapter 15-23 and 15-27 since proper notice was provided and
proper hearing is scheduled for July 10, 2008. In addition, proper hearing
decision and records will be complied with, and the required findings will be
considered. The proposed project meets all of the current ESMC
requirements.

As analyzed above, there is adequate evidence to support the three required
Conditional Use Permit findings subject to the listed conditions of approval in the
attached resolution. The Planning Commission may consider and impose additional
conditions which it deems necessary, if it demonstrates a reasonable relationship
between the condition it desires to impose and the project's impact.

V. **Inter-Departmental Comments**

The project applications and plans were circulated to all the relevant City
Departments and are attached to this report. Only the Fire Department and the
Building Safety Division submitted comments which have been incorporated in the
conditions of approval.

VI. **Environmental Review**

The proposed project is categorically exempt from the requirements of the California
Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Categorical Exemption 15301 (Class
1 – Existing Facilities). The project is categorically exempt from the requirements of
the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Categorical Exemption
15301 (Class 1 – Existing Facilities). The project consists of the conversion of an
existing 6,952 square-foot vacant office suite into a restaurant use, a 136 square-
foot addition for an entry area, a 420 square-foot addition for a mechanical
equipment room, conversion of 161 square feet of the existing loading dock area to
storage, and a 735 square-foot outdoor dining patio. The property is in an
urbanized development area where it has adequate access and all public services
and facilities are available. The site is currently developed with an office building
and parking structure and it is in an area that is not environmentally sensitive.
Therefore, the project is not anticipated to have any significant impacts with regard
to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.

VII. **Conclusion**

Planning staff recommends that the Planning Commission: 1) adopt Resolution No.
2641, approving Environmental Assessment No. EA-792 and Conditional Use
Permit No. 08-05, with conditions based upon the findings as contained in this
report; and 2) Receive and File Administrative Use Permit No. 08-02.
VIII. Exhibits

A. Draft Resolution No. 2641
B. Inter-Departmental Comments
C. Site Photos
D. Applications
E. Administrative Use Permit No. 08-02 Approval Letter, dated July 3, 2008.
F. Plans

Prepared by: Paul Samaras, Principal Planner

Kimberly Christensen, AICP, Planning Manager
Department of Planning & Building Safety

Gary Chicots, Director
Department of Planning & Building Safety
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RESOLUTION NO. 2641

A RESOLUTION APPROVING ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. EA-792 AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 08-05 TO ALLOW A 735 SQUARE-FOOT OUTDOOR DINING AREA IN CONJUNCTION WITH A NEW RESTAURANT IN THE URBAN MIXED-USE SOUTH (MU-S) ZONE AT 2361 ROSECRANS AVENUE.

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

SECTION 1: The Commission finds and declares that:

A. On March 31, 2008, Alex J. Rose on behalf of Continental Development Corporation filed an application for Environmental Assessment No. EA-792 and Conditional Use Permit No. 08-05 to allow the construction and use of a 735 square foot outdoor dining area in conjunction with a proposed restaurant at 2361 Rosecrans Avenue;

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

D. The Planning and Building Safety Department completed its review and scheduled a public hearing regarding the application before this Commission for July 10, 2008;

E. On July 10, 2008, the Commission held a public hearing to receive public testimony and other evidence regarding the application including, without limitation, information provided to the Commission by Continental Development Corporation and its representatives; and

F. The Commission considered the information provided by City staff, public testimony, and the representative for Continental Development Corporation. This Resolution, and its findings, are made, in part, based upon the evidence presented to the Commission at its July 10, 2008 public hearing including, without limitation, the staff report submitted by the Planning and Building Safety Department.

SECTION 2: Factual Findings. The Commission finds that the following facts exist:
A. The subject site is located in the Urban Mixed-Use South (MU-S) Zone at 2361 Rosecrans Avenue.

B. The subject site is located on the north side of Rosecrans Avenue.

C. The subject site is currently developed with a 186,909 square-foot, four-story office building and a five-story parking structure on a 187,045 square-foot (4.29-acre) parcel on the block bounded by Rosecrans Boulevard to the south, the Green Line to the north, Santa Fe Railroad and Aviation Boulevard to the east, and Continental Circle to the west.

D. The proposed new restaurant will include the conversion of an existing 6,952 square-foot office suite, a 136 square-foot addition for an entry area, a 420 square-foot addition for a mechanical equipment room, conversion of 161 square feet of the existing loading dock area to storage, and a 735 square-foot outdoor dining patio.

E. The subject site has 641 parking spaces and 584 spaces are required for the proposed restaurant, the outdoor dining area and the existing offices in the existing building. Therefore, the site will provide 57 parking spaces in excess of the minimum required for all the uses on the entire project site.

F. A Conditional Use Permit is required for outdoor dining areas which exceed 200 square feet or 20% of the indoor dining area, whichever is less, pursuant to El Segundo Municipal Code §15-5F-5(H).

G. The proposed outdoor dining area is approximately 735 square feet in area.

SECTION 3: Environmental Assessment. The project is categorically exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Categorical Exemption 15301 (Class 1 – Existing Facilities). The project consists of the conversion of an existing 6,952 square-foot office suite into a restaurant use, a 136 square-foot addition for an entry area, a 420 square-foot addition for a mechanical equipment room, conversion of 161 square feet of the existing loading dock area to storage, and a 735 square-foot outdoor dining patio. The property is in an urbanized development area where it has adequate access and all public services and facilities are available. The site is currently developed with an office building and parking structure and it is in an area that is not environmentally sensitive. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to have any significant impacts with regard to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.

SECTION 4: General Plan Findings. The proposed project conforms to the City’s General Plan as follows:

A. The El Segundo General Plan land use designation for the property is Urban Mixed-Use South. This designation permits a mixture of office, research and development, retail, restaurants and hotel uses. The proposed restaurant use is a permitted use in the Urban Mixed-Use South (MU-S) Zone. Outdoor dining areas in conjunction with a restaurant that exceed 200 square feet or
20% of the indoor dining area, whichever is less, are permitted with approval of a Conditional Use Permit.

B. The proposed use is consistent with Land Use Element Goal LU4 in that it provides a stable tax base for the City through development of new commercial uses, primarily within a mixed-use environment, without adversely affecting the viability of Downtown.

C. The proposed use is consistent with Land Use Element Objective LU4-4 in that it adds to the mixture of uses, which has the potential to maximize economic benefit, reduce traffic impacts, and encourage pedestrian environment.

SECTION 5: Conditional Use Permit Findings. After considering the above facts, the Commission finds as follows:

A. The proposed location of the conditional use is in accord with the objectives of this Title and the purposes of the zone in which the site is located.

The zoning designation for the subject site is Urban Mixed-Use South (MU-S). This zone allows outdoor dining areas which exceed 200 square feet or 20% of the indoor dining area, whichever is less, subject to the granting of a conditional use permit pursuant to ESMC § 15-5F-5(H). The size of the outdoor dining area is appropriate to its location as it will be incidental to the proposed restaurant. Restaurants are a permitted use in the zone pursuant to ESMC § 15-5F-2(l). The principal uses in the zone are restricted to a mixture of commercial, office, research and development, retail, restaurant and hotel uses. The subject site consists of a commercial building containing office uses on all the floors above the ground floor restaurant level. It is the intent of the MU-S Zone to have several types of uses occupy a single building. Businesses located within this Zone are encouraged to provide street level uses which allow for, and facilitate, pedestrian activity for area workers and visitors. The restaurant with the accompanying outdoor dining area is in accord with the principal objectives of the zone.

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

The proposed location of the conditional use is adjacent to the south side of an existing 4-story office building and it is bounded by Rosecrans Boulevard on the south, Continental Circle to the west, the Green Line to the north, and the Santa Fe Railroad and Aviation Boulevard to the east. No particular use is adjacent or near the proposed outdoor dining area that could be impacted by the operation of the outdoor dining area which faces Rosecrans Boulevard. Outdoor dining activities are not anticipated to be detrimental to adjacent businesses. No residential uses are located in the vicinity. As such, the
proposed location of the conditional use and the conditions under which it
would be operated or maintained will not be detrimental to the public health,
safety or welfare, or materially injurious to properties or improvements in the
vicinity.

C. That the proposed conditional use will comply with each of the applicable
provisions of this Chapter.

The proposed conditional use complies with the applicable provisions of
ESMC Chapter 15-23 and 15-27 since proper notice was provided and proper
hearing is scheduled for July 10, 2008. In addition, proper hearing decision
and records will be complied with, and the required findings will be
considered. The proposed project meets all of the current ESMC
requirements.

SECTION 6: Approval. Subject to the conditions listed on the attached Exhibit “A,” which
are incorporated into this Resolution by reference, the Planning Commission approves
Environmental Assessment No. EA-792 and Conditional Use Permit No. 08-05.

SECTION 7: This Resolution will remain effective unless superseded by a subsequent
resolution.

SECTION 8: The Commission Secretary is directed to mail a copy of this Resolution to Alex
J. Rose of Continental Development Corporation and to any other person requesting a
copy.

SECTION 9: This Resolution may be appealed within ten (10) 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 10: Except as provided in Section 9, this Resolution is the Commission's final decision and will become effective immediately upon adoption.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 10th day of July 2008.

David Wagner, Vice Chairperson
City of El Segundo Planning Commission

ATTEST:

Gary D. Chicots, Secretary

Wagner  -
Rotolo  -
Fellhauer  -
Fuentes  -
Baldino  -

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

By: Karl H. Berger, Assistant City Attorney
PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 2641

Exhibit A

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

In addition to all applicable provisions of the El Segundo Municipal Code ("ESMC"), Continental Development Corporation agrees to comply with the following provisions as conditions for the City of El Segundo’s approval of Environmental Assessment No. EA-792 and Conditional Use Permit No. 08-05 ("Project Conditions"):

Zoning Conditions

1. This approval is for the project as shown on the plans reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission and on file. Before the City issues a building permit, the applicant must submit plans, showing that the project substantially complies with the plans and conditions of approval on file with the Planning and Building Safety Department. Any subsequent modification must be referred to the Director of the Planning and Building Safety Department for a determination regarding the need for Planning Commission review and approval of the proposed modification.

2. The outdoor dining area must comply with all requirements of ESMC § 15-2-16.

3. The hours of operation for the outdoor dining area are limited to 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 a.m. daily.

4. No live entertainment is permitted. Only pre-recorded background music may be provided, and must meet the noise and vibration requirements of ESMC § 7-2-1.

5. Before the City issues building permits, the applicant/property owner must submit landscaping and irrigation plans for any new or modified landscaping areas to the Planning and Building Safety and Recreation and Parks Departments for review.

Building Safety Conditions

6. The applicant must comply with the California Building Code 2007 Edition as amended by the City of El Segundo.

7. The applicant must provide plumbing fixtures in restrooms per the California Plumbing Code 2007 Edition Table 4-1.

8. Before the City issues building permits, the applicant must obtain Los Angeles County Health Department approval.
Fire Department Conditions

9. The applicant must comply with applicable California Fire Code requirements and El Segundo Fire Department regulations.

Miscellaneous Conditions

10. Continental Development Corporation agrees to indemnify and hold the City harmless from and against any claim, action, damages, costs (including, without limitation, attorney’s fees), injuries, or liability, arising from the City’s approval of Environmental Assessment No. EA-792 and Conditional Use Permit No. 08-05. Should the City be named in any suit, or should any claim be brought against it by suit or otherwise, whether the same be groundless or not, arising out of the City approval of Environmental Assessment No. EA-792 and Conditional Use Permit No. 08-05, the Applicant agrees to defend the City (at the City’s request and with counsel satisfactory to the City) and will indemnify the City for any judgment rendered against it or any sums paid out in settlement or otherwise. For purposes of this section “the City” includes the City of El Segundo’s elected officials, appointed officials, officers, and employees.

By signing this document, Continental Development Corporation, certifies that they read, understood, and agree to the Project Conditions listed in this document.

Alex J. Rose
Continental Development Corporation

{If Corporation or similar entity, needs two officer signatures or evidence that one signature binds the company}
City of El Segundo
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

Circulation Date: June 24, 2008

TO: Jack Wayt, Interim City Manager
Karl Berger, Assistant City Attorney
Debra Brighton, Library and Cable Services Director
Richard Brunette, Recreation and Parks Director
Deborah Cullen, Finance Director
David Cummings, Police Chief
Stefanie Katsouleas, Public Works Director
Sam Lee, Building Safety Manager/Building Official
Kevin Smith, Fire Chief

FROM: Gary Chicots, Director
       Kimberly Christensen, AICP, Planning Manager

STAFF PLANNER: Paul Samaras, Principal Planner

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment No. 792, Conditional Use Permit No. 08-05 and Administrative Use Permit No. 08-02 to allow a 735-square foot outdoor dining area at a new restaurant and a liquor license for on-site consumption of beer, wine and distilled spirits (Type 47 ABC License).

Location: 2361 Rosecrans Avenue
Applicant: Continental Development Corporation – Alex J. Rose, Vice President
Property Owner(s): Continental 2361/2381, LLC.

The proposed project involves the conversion of an existing 6,952 square-foot office suite on the first floor of a multi-story office building into a new full service restaurant at 2361 Rosecrans Avenue. The project also includes a 136 square-foot addition and a new, 735 square-foot outdoor dining patio. The applicant’s request is for an Environmental Assessment for the project, a Conditional Use Permit to allow the outdoor dining, and an Administrative Use Permit to sell beer, wine and distilled spirits for on-site consumption (Type 47 Alcoholic Beverage Control license). A total of 104 required parking spaces will be provided in the existing parking structure on-site. The project site is located in the Urban Mixed Use South (MU-S) Zone within the block bordered by the Green Line to the north, Rosecrans Avenue to the south, Douglas Street to the west and Aviation Boulevard to the east.
The ESMC requires restaurants, including outdoor dining areas larger than 200 square feet, to provide one parking space per 75 square feet of net floor area. The proposed restaurant (7,823 square feet) is required to provide 104 parking spaces. The total required number of parking spaces for the restaurant and the office building combined is 584 spaces. The restaurant will meet the minimum parking requirements since the existing parking structure on the property has 641 parking spaces. The ESMC requires a 30-foot street facing building setback in the Urban Mixed Use North (MU-N) Zone. The existing building meets this setback requirement, the addition, outdoor patio and a mechanical equipment enclosure will maintain at least a 30-foot setback along the Rosecrans Avenue property frontage.

The project is categorically exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act per Section 15301, Class 1 – Existing Facilities. Please return this form, the plans and any comments you may have by 4:00 pm on Tuesday, July 1, 2008. Should you have any questions, please contact Paul Samaras, Principal Planner, at extension 2312.

COMMENTS:

Reviewed By:  
[Signature and Title]  
[Signature and Title]

Encl.: Application, and plans
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City of El Segundo
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

Circulation Date: June 24, 2008

TO: Jack Wayt, Interim City Manager
    Karl Berger, Assistant City Attorney
    Debra Brighton, Library and Cable Services Director
    Richard Brunette, Recreation and Parks Director
    Deborah Cullen, Finance Director
    David Cummings, Police Chief
    Stefanie Katsouleas, Public Works Director
    Sam Lee, Building Safety Manager/Building Official
    Kevin Smith, Fire Chief

FROM: Gary Chicots, Director
      Kimberly Christensen, AICP, Planning Manager

STAFF PLANNER: Paul Samaras, Principal Planner

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment No. 792, Conditional Use Permit No. 08-05 and Administrative Use Permit No. 08-02 to allow a 735-square foot outdoor dining area at a new restaurant and a liquor license for on-site consumption of beer, wine and distilled spirits (Type 47 ABC License).

Location: 2361 Rosecrans Avenue
Applicant: Continental Development Corporation – Alex J. Rose, Vice President
Property Owner(s): Continental 2361/2381, LLC.

The proposed project involves the conversion of an existing 6,952 square-foot office suite on the first floor of a multi-story office building into a new full service restaurant at 2361 Rosecrans Avenue. The project also includes a 136 square-foot addition and a new, 735 square-foot outdoor dining patio. The applicant's request is for an Environmental Assessment for the project, a Conditional Use Permit to allow the outdoor dining, and an Administrative Use Permit to sell beer, wine and distilled spirits for on-site consumption (Type 47 Alcoholic Beverage Control license). A total of 104 required parking spaces will be provided in the existing parking structure on-site. The project site is located in the Urban Mixed Use South (MU-S) Zone within the block bordered by the Green Line to the north, Rosecrans Avenue to the south, Douglas Street to the west and Aviation Boulevard to the east.
The ESMC requires restaurants, including outdoor dining areas larger than 200 square feet, to provide one parking space per 75 square feet of net floor area. The proposed restaurant (7,823 square feet) is required to provide 104 parking spaces. The total required number of parking spaces for the restaurant and the office building combined is 584 spaces. The restaurant will meet the minimum parking requirements since the existing parking structure on the property has 641 parking spaces. The ESMC requires a 30-foot street facing building setback in the Urban Mixed Use North (MU-N) Zone. The existing building meets this setback requirement, the addition, outdoor patio and a mechanical equipment enclosure will maintain at least a 30-foot setback along the Rosecrans Avenue property frontage.

The project is categorically exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act per Section 15301, Class 1 – Existing Facilities. Please return this form, the plans and any comments you may have by 4:00 pm on Tuesday, July 1, 2008. Should you have any questions, please contact Paul Samaras, Principal Planner, at extension 2312.

COMMENTS:

None @ this time.

Reviewed By:  

Signature and Title:  

Encl.: Application, and plans
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TO: Jack Wayt, Interim City Manager
Karl Berger, Assistant City Attorney
Debra Brighton, Library and Cable Services Director
Richard Brunette, Recreation and Parks Director
Deborah Cullen, Finance Director
David Cummings, Police Chief
Stefanie Katsouleas, Public Works Director
Sam Lee, Building Safety Manager/Building Official
Kevin Smith, Fire Chief

FROM: Gary Chicots, Director
Kimberly Christensen, AICP, Planning Manager

STAFF PLANNER: Paul Samaras, Principal Planner

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment No. 792, Conditional Use Permit No. 08-05 and Administrative Use Permit No. 08-02 to allow a 735-square foot outdoor dining area at a new restaurant and a liquor license for on-site consumption of beer, wine and distilled spirits (Type 47 ABC License).

Location: 2361 Rosecrans Avenue
Applicant: Continental Development Corporation – Alex J. Rose, Vice President
Property Owner(s): Continental 2361/2381, LLC.

The proposed project involves the conversion of an existing 6,952 square-foot office suite on the first floor of a multi-story office building into a new full service restaurant at 2361 Rosecrans Avenue. The project also includes a 136 square-foot addition and a new, 735 square-foot outdoor dining patio. The applicant’s request is for an Environmental Assessment for the project, a Conditional Use Permit to allow the outdoor dining, and an Administrative Use Permit to sell beer, wine and distilled spirits for on-site consumption (Type 47 Alcoholic Beverage Control license). A total of 104 required parking spaces will be provided in the existing parking structure on-site. The project site is located in the Urban Mixed Use South (MU-S) Zone within the block bordered by the Green Line to the north, Rosecrans Avenue to the south, Douglas Street to the west and Aviation Boulevard to the east.
The ESMC requires restaurants, including outdoor dining areas larger than 200 square feet, to provide one parking space per 75 square feet of net floor area. The proposed restaurant (7,823 square feet) is required to provide 104 parking spaces. The total required number of parking spaces for the restaurant and the office building combined is 584 spaces. The restaurant will meet the minimum parking requirements since the existing parking structure on the property has 641 parking spaces. The ESMC requires a 30-foot street facing building setback in the Urban Mixed Use North (MU-N) Zone. The existing building meets this setback requirement, the addition, outdoor patio and a mechanical equipment enclosure will maintain at least a 30-foot setback along the Rosecrans Avenue property frontage.

The project is categorically exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act per Section 15301, Class 1 – Existing Facilities. Please return this form, the plans and any comments you may have by 4:00 pm on Tuesday, July 1, 2008. Should you have any questions, please contact Paul Samaras, Principal Planner, at extension 2312.

COMMENTS:

Reviewed By:

[Signature]

Signature and Title

6/24/08

Date

Encl.: Application, and plans
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TO:        Jack Wayt, Interim City Manager
            Karl Berger, Assistant City Attorney
            Debra Brighton, Library and Cable Services Director
            Richard Brunette, Recreation and Parks Director
            Deborah Cullen, Finance Director
            David Cummings, Police Chief
            Stefanie Katsouleas, Public Works Director
            Sam Lee, Building Safety Manager/Building Official
            Kevin Smith, Fire Chief

FROM:      Gary Chicots, Director
            Kimberly Christensen, AICP, Planning Manager

STAFF PLANNER: Paul Samaras, Principal Planner

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment No. 792, Conditional Use Permit No. 08-05 and Administrative Use Permit No. 08-02 to allow a 735-square foot outdoor dining area at a new restaurant and a liquor license for on-site consumption of beer, wine and distilled spirits (Type 47 ABC License).

Location:  2361 Rosecrans Avenue
Applicant: Continental Development Corporation – Alex J. Rose, Vice President
Property Owner(s): Continental 2361/2381, LLC.

The proposed project involves the conversion of an existing 6,952 square-foot office suite on the first floor of a multi-story office building into a new full service restaurant at 2361 Rosecrans Avenue. The project also includes a 136 square-foot addition and a new, 735 square-foot outdoor dining patio. The applicant’s request is for an Environmental Assessment for the project, a Conditional Use Permit to allow the outdoor dining, and an Administrative Use Permit to sell beer, wine and distilled spirits for on-site consumption (Type 47 Alcoholic Beverage Control license). A total of 104 required parking spaces will be provided in the existing parking structure on-site. The project site is located in the Urban Mixed Use South (MU-S) Zone within the block bounded by the Green Line to the north, Rosecrans Avenue to the south, Douglas Street to the west and Aviation Boulevard to the east.
The ESMC requires restaurants, including outdoor dining areas larger than 200 square feet, to provide one parking space per 75 square feet of net floor area. The proposed restaurant (7,823 square feet) is required to provide 104 parking spaces. The total required number of parking spaces for the restaurant and the office building combined is 584 spaces. The restaurant will meet the minimum parking requirements since the existing parking structure on the property has 641 parking spaces. The ESMC requires a 30-foot street facing building setback in the Urban Mixed Use North (MU-N) Zone. The existing building meets this setback requirement, the addition, outdoor patio and a mechanical equipment enclosure will maintain at least a 30-foot setback along the Rosecrans Avenue property frontage.

The project is categorically exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act per Section 15301, Class 1 – Existing Facilities. Please return this form, the plans and any comments you may have by 4:00 pm on Tuesday, July 1, 2008. Should you have any questions, please contact Paul Samaras, Principal Planner, at extension 2312.

COMMENTS:
No comments

Reviewed By:  
Signature and Title

Encl.: Application and plans
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City of El Segundo
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

Circulation Date: June 24, 2008

Jack Wayt, Interim City Manager
Karl Berger, Assistant City Attorney
Debra Brighton, Library and Cable Services Director
Richard Brunette, Recreation and Parks Director
Deborah Cullen, Finance Director
David Cummings, Police Chief
Stefanie Katsouleas, Public Works Director
Sam Lee, Building Safety Manager/Building Official
Kevin Smith, Fire Chief

FROM: Gary Chicots, Director
Kimberly Christensen, AICP, Planning Manager

STAFF PLANNER: Paul Samaras, Principal Planner

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment No. 792, Conditional Use Permit
No. 08-05 and Administrative Use Permit No. 08-02 to allow a
735-square foot outdoor dining area at a new restaurant and a
liquor license for on-site consumption of beer, wine and
distilled spirits (Type 47 ABC License).

Location: 2361 Rosecrans Avenue
Applicant: Continental Development Corporation – Alex J.
Rose, Vice President
Property Owner(s): Continental 2361/2381, LLC.

The proposed project involves the conversion of an existing 6,952 square-foot
office suite on the first floor of a multi-story office building into a new full service
restaurant at 2361 Rosecrans Avenue. The project also includes a 136 square-
foot addition and a new, 735 square-foot outdoor dining patio. The applicant’s
request is for an Environmental Assessment for the project, a Conditional Use
Permit to allow the outdoor dining, and an Administrative Use Permit to sell beer,
wine and distilled spirits for on-site consumption (Type 47 Alcoholic Beverage
Control license). A total of 104 required parking spaces will be provided in the
existing parking structure on-site. The project site is located in the Urban Mixed
Use South (MU-S) Zone within the block bordered by the Green Line to the north,
Rosecrans Avenue to the south, Douglas Street to the west and Aviation
Boulevard to the east.
The ESMC requires restaurants, including outdoor dining areas larger than 200 square feet, to provide one parking space per 75 square feet of net floor area. The proposed restaurant (7,823 square feet) is required to provide 104 parking spaces. The total required number of parking spaces for the restaurant and the office building combined is 584 spaces. The restaurant will meet the minimum parking requirements since the existing parking structure on the property has 641 parking spaces. The ESMC requires a 30-foot street facing building setback in the Urban Mixed Use North (MU-N) Zone. The existing building meets this setback requirement, the addition, outdoor patio and a mechanical equipment enclosure will maintain at least a 30-foot setback along the Rosecrans Avenue property frontage.

The project is categorically exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act per Section 15301, Class 1 – Existing Facilities. Please return this form, the plans and any comments you may have by 4:00 pm on Tuesday, July 1, 2008. Should you have any questions, please contact Paul Samaras, Principal Planner, at extension 2312.

COMMENTS:

Reviewed By:

Signature and Title

Date

Encl.: Application, and plans
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City of El Segundo
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

Circulation Date: June 24, 2008

TO: Jack Wayt, Interim City Manager
    Karl Berger, Assistant City Attorney
    Debra Brighton, Library and Cable Services Director
    Richard Brunette, Recreation and Parks Director
    Deborah Cullen, Finance Director
    David Cummings, Police Chief
    Stefanie Katsouleas, Public Works Director
    Sam Lee, Building Safety Manager/Building Official
    Kevin Smith, Fire Chief

FROM: Gary Chicots, Director
      Kimberly Christensen, AICP, Planning Manager

STAFF PLANNER: Paul Samaras, Principal Planner

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment No. 792, Conditional Use Permit No. 08-05 and Administrative Use Permit No. 08-02 to allow a 735-square foot outdoor dining area at a new restaurant and a liquor license for on-site consumption of beer, wine and distilled spirits (Type 47 ABC License).

Location: 2361 Rosecrans Avenue
Applicant: Continental Development Corporation – Alex J. Rose, Vice President
Property Owner(s): Continental 2361/2381, LLC.

The proposed project involves the conversion of an existing 6,952 square-foot office suite on the first floor of a multi-story office building into a new full service restaurant at 2361 Rosecrans Avenue. The project also includes a 136 square-foot addition and a new, 735 square-foot outdoor dining patio. The applicant's request is for an Environmental Assessment for the project, a Conditional Use Permit to allow the outdoor dining, and an Administrative Use Permit to sell beer, wine and distilled spirits for on-site consumption (Type 47 Alcoholic Beverage Control license). A total of 104 required parking spaces will be provided in the existing parking structure on-site. The project site is located in the Urban Mixed Use South (MU-S) Zone within the block bordered by the Green Line to the north, Rosecrans Avenue to the south, Douglas Street to the west and Aviation Boulevard to the east.
The ESMC requires restaurants, including outdoor dining areas larger than 200 square feet, to provide one parking space per 75 square feet of net floor area. The proposed restaurant (7,823 square feet) is required to provide 104 parking spaces. The total required number of parking spaces for the restaurant and the office building combined is 584 spaces. The restaurant will meet the minimum parking requirements since the existing parking structure on the property has 641 parking spaces. The ESMC requires a 30-foot street facing building setback in the Urban Mixed Use North (MU-N) Zone. The existing building meets this setback requirement, the addition, outdoor patio and a mechanical equipment enclosure will maintain at least a 30-foot setback along the Rosecrans Avenue property frontage.

The project is categorically exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act per Section 15301, Class 1 – Existing Facilities. Please return this form, the plans and any comments you may have by 4:00 pm on Tuesday, July 1, 2008. Should you have any questions, please contact Paul Samaras, Principal Planner, at extension 2312.

**COMMENTS:**

- Applicable building code will be California Building Code 2007 edition as amended by City of El Segundo.

- Provide plumbing fixtures in restrooms per California Plumbing Code 2007 edition Table 4-1.

- Los Angeles County Health department approval will be required prior to issuance of building permit.

Reviewed By:

[Signature]

Plan Check Engineer

Date: 6/30/08

Encl.: Application, and plans
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City of El Segundo
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

Circulation Date: June 24, 2008

TO: Jack Wayt, Interim City Manager
    Karl Berger, Assistant City Attorney
    Debra Brighton, Library and Cable Services Director
    Richard Brunette, Recreation and Parks Director
    Deborah Cullen, Finance Director
    David Cummings, Police Chief
    Stefanie Katsouleas, Public Works Director
    Sam Lee, Building Safety Manager/Building Official
    Kevin Smith, Fire Chief

FROM: Gary Chicots, Director
       Kimberly Christensen, AICP, Planning Manager

STAFF PLANNER: Paul Samaras, Principal Planner

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment No. 792, Conditional Use Permit
          No. 08-05 and Administrative Use Permit No. 08-02 to allow
          a 735-square foot outdoor dining area at a new restaurant and a
          liquor license for on-site consumption of beer, wine and
          distilled spirits (Type 47 ABC License).

Location: 2361 Rosecrans Avenue
Applicant: Continental Development Corporation – Alex J.
           Rose, Vice President
Property Owner(s): Continental 2361/2381, LLC.

The proposed project involves the conversion of an existing 6,952 square-foot
office suite on the first floor of a multi-story office building into a new full service
restaurant at 2361 Rosecrans Avenue. The project also includes a 136 square-
foot addition and a new, 735 square-foot outdoor dining patio. The applicant’s
request is for an Environmental Assessment for the project, a Conditional Use
Permit to allow the outdoor dining, and an Administrative Use Permit to sell beer,
wine and distilled spirits for on-site consumption (Type 47 Alcoholic Beverage
Control license). A total of 104 required parking spaces will be provided in the
existing parking structure on-site. The project site is located in the Urban Mixed
Use South (MU-S) Zone within the block bordered by the Green Line to the north,
Rosecrans Avenue to the south, Douglas Street to the west and Aviation
Boulevard to the east.
The ESMC requires restaurants, including outdoor dining areas larger than 200 square feet, to provide one parking space per 75 square feet of net floor area. The proposed restaurant (7,823 square feet) is required to provide 104 parking spaces. The total required number of parking spaces for the restaurant and the office building combined is 584 spaces. The restaurant will meet the minimum parking requirements since the existing parking structure on the property has 641 parking spaces. The ESMC requires a 30-foot street facing building setback in the Urban Mixed Use North (MU-N) Zone. The existing building meets this setback requirement, the addition, outdoor patio and a mechanical equipment enclosure will maintain at least a 30-foot setback along the Rosecrans Avenue property frontage.

The project is categorically exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act per Section 15301, Class 1 – Existing Facilities. Please return this form, the plans and any comments you may have by 4:00 pm on Tuesday, July 1, 2008. Should you have any questions, please contact Paul Samaras, Principal Planner, at extension 2312.

**COMMENTS:** Applicant must comply with applicable California Building Code, California Fire Code requirements and El Segundo Fire Department Regulations

Reviewed By: [Signature]
James R. Garver, Fire Marshal

Date: 6/25/08

Encl.: Application, and plans
1. Site: Continental Park Terrace south elevation. View of proposed restaurant location.
2. Site: Continental Park Terrace south elevation.

3. Site: Continental Park Terrace south elevation - proposed restaurant location.

5. Site: Continental Park Terrace west elevation.

7. View north from site.
8. View south from site.

9. View east from site.
10. View west from site.
APPLICATION FOR AN ADMINISTRATIVE USE PERMIT

Environmental Assessment No: 792  AUP No: 08-02

Date: May 27, 2008

Applicant:
Alex J. Rose Vice President c/o
Continental Development Corporation
Name (print or type)
2041 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 200
Address
El Segundo, CA 90245
City/St/Zip

Check One: Owner □ Lessee □ Agent X

Property Owner:
Continental 2361/2381, LLC.
Name (print or type)
2041 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 200
Address
El Segundo, CA 90245
City/St/Zip

Representative of applicant: (i.e., attorney, expediter, etc.)
Fancher Development Services, Inc. c/o
Nina Raey
Name (print or type)
1342 Bell Ave., Suite 3K
Address
Tustin, CA 92780
City/St/Zip

Phone (310) 640-1520 (310) 524-0859
Fax
Email arose@continentaldevelopment.com
Signature

(714) 258-1808 (714) 258-2401
Fax
Email nina@fancherdevelopment.com
Signature

Richard C. Fancher
Architect/Engineer:
Nelson Henrich Interiors, Inc. c/o Janet Henrich
Name (print or type)
15210 N. Scottsdale Road, Suite 300
Address
Scottsdale, AZ 85254
City/St/Zip

Phone (480) 949-6800
Fax (480) 949-6801
Email jheenrich@hiinteriors.com

Property situated at: See attachment for legal description. APN #4138-011-038
(Exact legal description. Provide attachment, if necessary).

General location: 2361 Rosecrans Ave., Suite 180 between Douglas Street & Aviation Blvd.
Address (Street/Avenue)

Zoning: MUS - Mixed Use South
General Plan Land Use Designation: MUS - Mixed Use South

El Segundo Municipal Code Sections Relating to Request: 15-5F-4

Request: Under the provisions of Section 15-22-3 of the El Segundo Municipal Code, application for
consideration of an Administration Use Permit for the above described property.

1. Describe in detail the entire proposed project (type of construction, materials to be used, uses involved, i.e.,
   bank, general office, industrial, restaurant, etc.) buildings, and other equipment necessary to the project.
   Tenant improvement of existing ground floor space into Paul Martin's American Bistro a fine dining
   establishment. The AUP is being requested in conjunction with the obtaining of an alcohol license
to serve beer, wine, and liquor with meal service. The size of the space will be 7,113 square feet
   with a 735 square foot patio.

2. Describe the existing development on the site (include square footages and uses of each building).
   APN #4138-011-038: The Continental Park Terrace (2361-2381 Rosecrans Ave.) contains 186,909 square
   feet of office space in two four-story, Class "A" building wings. Parking is provided in an adjacent
   641 space parking structure. Please see Attachment "A" for a project parking calculation
   summary.

Received
MAY 29 2008
PLANNING DIVISION

EA:792; AUP 08-02; CUP 08-05
3. Explain in detail why this particular site is especially suited for the proposed development and how it is compatible with the purpose of the zone.

The proposed Paul Martin's American Bistro is compatible with the purpose of the MU-S Zone. The proposed restaurant provides a street level use in an existing office building which allows for and facilitates pedestrian activity for area workers (MC Section 15-5F-1). Paul Martin's American Bistro will be located within walking distance of many nearby business establishments. The location of the proposed restaurant with outdoor dining area is also compatible with the stated intent of the MU-S zone to have several types of uses occupy a single building (MC Section 15-5F-1).

4. Describe how the proposed project relates to the development of adjacent properties and the immediate area and will not have detrimental effects to the adjacent properties or neighborhood.

Paul Martin's American Bistro is a well run establishment that ties to the American agricultural legacy. Please see the website http://www.paulmartinsamericanbistro.com/index.php for reviews by the press of existing locations and for a further explanation of the style and culture of Paul Martin's American Bistro. This restaurant fits in with the existing mixed use dining locations that can be further reviewed on the attached amenities plan for the Continental Park development.

5. Describe the requested hours of operation of the proposed use/uses. Please list hours for each use if there are multiple uses on the site. If the application is for an alcohol permit, please also clarify if any entertainment is proposed and what are the requested hours of entertainment.

Hours of operation will be 11:00am till 1:00am 7 days a week.

No live entertainment is proposed.

6. If the application is for an alcohol permit, please list the type of alcohol license you are requesting (i.e., Type 41, On-site Sale and Consumption of beer and wine).

Type 47 on site sale and consumption of beer, wine, and liquor.
NOTE: Separate Affidavits must be submitted if there are multiple owners.

OWNER'S AFFIDAVIT

I, We Continental 2361/2381 LLC. being duly sworn depose and say that I/we
the OWNER of the property involved in this application and that I/we have familiarized myself (ourselves)
with the rules and regulation of the City of El Segundo with respect to preparing and filing this application
and that the foregoing statements herein contained and the information documents and all plans attached
hereunto are in all respects true and correct to the best of my/our knowledge and belief.

Richard C. Lundquist
Signature
5-27-08
Date

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
County of Los Angeles.

On his 27th day of May, 2008, before me, the undersigned Notary Public
in and for said County and State, personally appeared Richard C. Lundquist
known to me to be the person whose name is subscribe to the within
instrument, and acknowledged to me that he/she executed the same.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Ester M. Fungladda
Notary Public in and for said County and State

ESTER M. FUNGLADDA
Commission # 1678678
Notary Public - California
Los Angeles County
My Comm. Expires June 22, 2010
OWNER'S AUTHORIZATION

Nina Raey & Christopher Wadleigh of Fancher Development Services, Inc.

I hereby authorize _________________________ to act for me in all matters relevant to this application. I understand that this person will be the primary contact on the project and will be sent all information and correspondence.

Richard C. Landquist
Owner's Signature

5-27-08
Date

APPLICANT AFFIDAVIT

I, We Continental Development Corporation _________________________ am (are) the APPLICANT(S) of the property involved in this application; I (we) have familiarized myself (ourselves) with the rules and regulation of the City of El Segundo with respect to preparing and filing this application; and the information documents and all plans is true and correct to the best of my (our) knowledge and belief.

Applicant's Signature

5-27-08
Date
CALIFORNIA ALL-PURPOSE ACKNOWLEDGMENT

State of California
County of Los Angeles

On May 27, 2008 before me, ESTER M. FUNGLADDA, here inserted Name and Title of the Officer
personally appeared Richard E. Lundquist

and Alex J. Rose

who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature Ester M. Fungledda
Signature of Notary Public

OPTIONAL

Though the information below is not required by law, it may prove valuable to persons relying on the document and could prevent fraudulent removal and reattachment of this form to another document.

Description of Attached Document

Title or Type of Document: ____________________________________________________________

Document Date: _______________ Number of Pages: _______

Signer(s) Other Than Named Above: ___________________________________________________

Capacity(ies) Claimed by Signer(s)

Signer's Name: ________________________________________________________________

☐ Individual
☐ Corporate Officer — Title(s):
☐ Partner — ☐ Limited ☐ General
☐ Attorney in Fact
☐ Trustee
☐ Guardian or Conservator
☐ Other: ____________________________

Signer Is Representing: ____________________________________________________________

Signer's Name: ________________________________________________________________

☐ Individual
☐ Corporate Officer — Title(s):
☐ Partner — ☐ Limited ☐ General
☐ Attorney in Fact
☐ Trustee
☐ Guardian or Conservator
☐ Other: ____________________________

Signer Is Representing: ____________________________________________________________
LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF LAND

PARCEL 1 IN THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS SHOWN ON PARCEL MAP NO. 17158, FILED IN BOOK 208, PAGES 60 AND 61 OF PARCEL MAPS IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, COMMONLY KNOWN AS 2361/2361 ROSECRANS AVENUE, EL SEGUNDO, CALIFORNIA 90245.
Amenity Directory

Master List of Buildings

Major Tenant List

Amenity Directory

Amenities

Space Available

SkyPark Office & Medical Center

Plaza El Segundo

San Francisco Properties

News

About Continental

Contact Us

DINING
1. P.F. Chang's China Bistro
2. Taiko Japanese Cuisine
3. Quino's Subs
4. McCormick & Schmick's Seafood Restaurant
5. The Daily Grill
6. Trimana
7. Cozymel's
8. Boston Market / Starbucks' Coffee / Noah's Bagels
9. Houston's
10. Lido's
11. Bristol Farms
12. Il Fornaio
13. Fleming's Prime Steakhouse & Wine Bar
14. Romano's Macaroni Grill

RETAIL SERVICES
16. Golfsmith
17. Auto Art Precision Detail
18. Murad 365 Total Body Salon & Spa
19. Office Depot
20. Long's Drugs
21. Manhattan Gateway (Old Navy, Pier One Imports, Trader Joe's, REI, and Barnes & Noble)

HOTELS
22. Summerfield Suites (122 apartment style suites with living rooms, fully equipped kitchens, and meeting accommodations)
23. Manhattan Beach Marriott Hotel (380-room hotel/resort with a fitness center and a 9-hole executive golf course)
24. Marriott Spring Hill Suites (165 apartment style suites)
25. Marriott TownePlace (158 Rooms)

FITNESS & RECREATION
26. The Spectrum Club
27. Marriott Golf Course (Executive)
28. 24-Hour Fitness (Gym)
29. Manhattan Country Club

OTHER SERVICES
30. Unocal Credit Union, a division of Wescom Credit Union (Open to Park tenants)
31. Western Federal Credit Union (Open to Park tenants)

TRANSPORTATION
32. Metro Rail Green Line Station

WITHIN WALKING DISTANCE
33. Manhattan Village Mall with 50 specialty retailers and restaurants anchored by two Macy's stores
34. Manhattan Beach Studios
Attachment "A"

Application for an Administrative Use Permit
2361 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 180, El Segundo, CA 90245
Paul Martin's American Bistro Restaurant
Parking Calculation Summary
Dated May 27, 2008

Proposed Restaurant Area: 7,113 SF
Proposed Outdoor Dining Area: 735 SF
Total Area: 7,848 SF

Parking Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Net Floor Area</th>
<th>Parking Ratio</th>
<th>Parking Stalls Required</th>
<th>Parking Structure Stalls Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>25,000 SF</td>
<td>1 space /300 SF</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>25,000 SF</td>
<td>1 space /350 SF</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>129,935 SF</td>
<td>1 space /400 SF</td>
<td>325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub Total 481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>6,952 SF</td>
<td>1 space /75 SF</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>735 SF</td>
<td>1 space /75 SF</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Dining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub Total 103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant Storage</td>
<td>161 SF</td>
<td>1 space per 1,000 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 584</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>187,783 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 641</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment “B”

Application for Administrative Use Permit
2361 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 180, El Segundo, CA 90245
Paul Martin’s American Bistro Restaurant
Dated May 27, 2008

FINDINGS AND FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS:

Presented below is the applicant’s written description of how the proposed Administrative Use Permit (AUP) for on-site sale and on-site consumption of beer, wine, and liquor at the proposed restaurant meets the required Findings as set forth in 15-22-5 of the El Segundo Municipal Code.

AUP Finding A1

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

Facts in Support of Finding A1

1. The General Plan Land Use designation for the site is Urban Mixed-Use South.
2. The zoning for the site is Mixed-Use South (MU-S). Restaurants are a permitted use in this zone in accordance with Section 15-5F-2 of the El Segundo Municipal Code.
3. The applicant’s Lessee proposes to provide on-site sale of beer, wine, and liquor with meal service at a new fine dining restaurant, Paul Martin’s American Bistro.
4. The restaurant must obtain the State of California Alcohol and Beverage Control (ABC) license for on-site sale and consumption of alcohol (Type 47). The proposed use (on-site sale and consumption of beer, wine, and liquor at a restaurant) requires and Administrative Use Permit in accordance with El Segundo Municipal Code Section 15-5F-4(C).
5. The purpose of the Urban Mixed-Use South zone is to provide areas where a mixture of compatible commercial, office, research and development, retail, and hotel uses can locate and occupy a single building. It is also the intent of this zone that businesses are encouraged to provide street level uses which allow for, and facilitate, pedestrian activity for area workers and visitors. The proposed restaurant use is consistent with this stated purpose because the restaurant use will be converted from office use in an existing office building which will result in a mix of compatible uses occupying a single building. In addition, the proposed restaurant is a street level use which will promote pedestrian activity for area workers and visitors.
option to walk to a fine dining establishment instead of driving to another dining establishment of similar quality and style.

6. The surrounding land uses include: office, commercial retail, and restaurants. The proposed restaurant will be compatible with the surrounding uses including other restaurants that sell and serve alcohol.

AUP Finding A2

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

Facts in Support of CUP Finding No. A2

1. The General Plan Land Use designation for the site is Urban Mixed-Use South.
2. The zoning for the site is Mixed-Use South (MU-S). Restaurants are a permitted use in this zone in accordance with Section 15-5F-2 of the El Segundo Municipal Code.
3. The purpose of the Urban Mixed-Use South zone is to provide areas where a mixture of compatible commercial, office, research and development, retail, and hotel uses can locate and occupy a single building. It is also the intent of this zone that businesses are encouraged to provide street level uses which allow for, and facilitate, pedestrian activity for area workers and visitors. The proposed restaurant use is consistent with this stated purpose because the restaurant use will be converted from office use in an existing building which will result in a mix of compatible uses occupying a single building.
4. The proposed use is consistent with General Plan Land Use Element Goal LU4 in that it provides a stable tax base for the City through development of new commercial uses within a mixed use environment, without adversely affecting the viability of Downtown.
5. The proposed use is consistent with Land Use Element Objective LU4-1 in that it promotes the development of high quality retail facilities in proximity to major employment centers.
6. The proposed use is consistent with General Plan Policy LU4-3.1 in that it encourages retail uses, where appropriate on the ground floor of Urban Mixed-Use and corporate offices with other uses above.
7. The surrounding uses include: office, retail and restaurants. The proposed restaurant will be compatible with the surrounding uses.

AUP Finding A3

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

Facts in Support of AUP Finding A3

1. The new restaurant will be located in an existing building and will be constructed in accordance with all applicable codes and regulations. Parking will be provided in an on-site parking structure. A new valet drop off area will be constructed along Continental
Circle adjacent to the restaurant to offer customers the option of both valet parking and self parking. The site is within the Continental Park development, which is patrolled by a contract security guard service 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

2. The restaurant proposed dining hours of operation are: 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 a.m. seven days a week. No live entertainment is proposed.

3. The surrounding uses include: office, retail and restaurants. The proposed restaurant is compatible with the surrounding uses.

**AUP Finding A4**

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

**Facts in Support of AUP Finding A4**

1. The sale of alcohol will not create any new impacts that would not be normally associated with the operation of a restaurant with and indoor dining area and an outdoor dining area.

2. The location of the proposed restaurant in a commercial area which is located in the MU-S zone will help minimize impacts on surrounding uses.

3. The restaurant dining hours of operation are 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 a.m. seven days a week. Parking is provided in an on-site parking structure. No residential uses are adjacent to the proposed restaurant so there are no identifiable impacts on residential uses in the City.

4. The conversion of office space in an existing office building for the proposed restaurant use results in a street level use which allows for and facilitates pedestrian access that may reduce mid-day vehicle trips for employment center workers and visitors.

5. The restaurant will be located in an existing building and will be constructed in accordance with all applicable codes and regulations. The restaurant is subject to regulations of the State of California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control and the County Health Department regulations that address and monitor impacts related to fumes and odors.

**AUP Finding B**

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

**Facts in Support of AUP Finding B**

1. The applicant’s lessee, Paul Martin’s American Bistro, must obtain a license from the State of California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (Type 47).
APPLICATION FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT:

Environmental Assessment No: 792  Conditional Use Permit No: 08-05

Date: May 27, 2008

Applicant:
Alex J. Rose, Vice President,
Development
Continental Development Corporation
Name (print or type)
2041 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 200
Address
El Segundo, CA 90245
City/ST/Zip

Check One: Owner ☐ Lessee ☐

Property Owner:
Continental 2361 / 2381 LLC
Name (print or type)
2041 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 200
Address
El Segundo, CA 90245
City/ST/Zip

Representative of applicant: (i.e., attorney, expeditor, etc.)
Alex J. Rose, Vice President Development
Name (print or type)
Same as applicant
Address
City/ST/Zip

Phone 310-640-1520  310-414-9279
Fax
Email arose@continentaldevelopment.com
Signature

Phone 310-640-1520  310-414-9279
Fax
Email rlundquist@continentaldevelopment.com
Signature

Phone 310-640-1520
Fax
Email arose@continentaldevelopment.com
Signature

EA-792; AUP 08-02; CIP 08-03
Architect/Engineer: Go Janet Henrich

Name (print or type) Nelsen Henrich Interiors

Phone (480) 949. 6800 Fax (480) 949. 6801

Address 15210 N Scottsdale Rd Ste 300

Email henrich@nhiinteriors.com

City/St/Zip Scottsdale, AZ 85254

Property Situated at: 2381/2381 Rosecrans Avenue, El Segundo, California 90245

Parcel 1 in the City of El Segundo, County of Los Angeles, State of California, as

Shown on Parcel Map No. 17158, filed in book 208, pages 60 and 61 of Parcel

Maps in the office of the County Recorder of said County.

(Exact legal description. Provide attachment, if necessary).

General Location:

2381 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 180

between Douglas Street and Aviation Blvd.

El Segundo Municipal Code Section(s) Relating to Request: 15-5F-4 Uses Subject to CUP

Request: Under the provisions of Title 15, Chapter 23-4 of the Municipal Code, application for

consideration of a Conditional Use Permit for the above described property.

1. Describe in detail the entire proposed project. Uses involved (i.e. bank, general office, industrial,

   restaurant, etc.), number of buildings and size, (including square footage and number of stories);
   design of buildings (style, materials, colors), and related equipment necessary to the project
   (mechanical, telephone and electrical equipment, transformers, generators, trash enclosures,
   loading docks, etc.). Add additional sheets to answer questions as needed.

   The project consists of tenant improvement of existing ground floor office space for Paul Martin's
   American Bistro, a fine dining establishment. The proposed restaurant area is 7,113 SF with a 736 SF
   outdoor dining patio. A CUP is required for the restaurant's outdoor dining area. Included in the
   restaurant area is a 136 SF addition to the existing building for a restaurant entry vestibule. A new
   restaurant valet drop off area is proposed on the west side of the building with access via
   Continental Circle. The restaurant exterior is a contemporary design with rustic accents. The
   restaurant will have its own dedicated HVAC and kitchen hood exhaust systems. In addition,
   the Landlord has applied for a dedicated sewer lateral connection to serve the restaurant. A
   dedicated restaurant wet and dry trash enclosure area will be provided within the existing
   loading dock footprint. Please see Attachment "A" for a project Parking Calculation Summary
   which demonstrates that there is adequate on site parking for the new restaurant use.

2. Describe the existing development on the site. Include square footages, and uses of each building.

   APN #4138-011-038. The existing development consists of 186,909 square feet of office
   space in two four-story, Class "A" building wings located at 2361-2381 Rosecrans Avenue. The
   building is named Continental Park Terrace. Parking for the development is provided in an
   adjacent gated, 5-level concrete parking structure that contains 641 parking spaces.
3. Explain in detail why this particular site is especially suited for the proposed development on the site and how it is compatible with the purpose of the zone.

The proposed Paul Martin's American Bistro is compatible with the purpose of the MU-S zone. The proposed restaurant provides a street level use in an existing office building which allows for an facilitates pedestrian activity for area workers (MC Section 15-5F-1). Paul Martin's American Bistro will be located within walking distance of many nearby business establishments. The location of the proposed restaurant with outdoor dining area is also compatible with the stated intent of the MU-S zone to have several types of uses occupy a single building (MC Section 15-5F-1).

4. Describe how the proposed project related to the development of adjacent properties and the immediate surrounding area and will not have detrimental effects to the adjacent properties or neighborhood.

Surrounding uses are: – north: office and parking structure; south: retail and restaurant; east: office; west: office and restaurant. The proposed restaurant is compatible with adjacent properties and will provide an outdoor dining opportunity at a fine dining establishment for the daytime business population and the local community. The proposed use creates a favorable environment for abutting uses that facilitates pedestrian trips to the site. The proposed use will not result in significant additional vehicle trips, noise, or have detrimental effects on the adjacent properties or neighborhood.

5. Describe hours of operation for the proposed use/uses.

Anticipated hours of operation are 11:00 a.m. till 1:00 a.m. 7 days a week. No live entertainment is proposed.
NOTE: Separate Affidavits must be submitted if there are multiple owners.

OWNER'S AFFIDAVIT

I, We Continental 2361 / 2381 LLC being duly sworn depose and say that I/we am the OWNER of the property involved in this application and that I/we have familiarized myself (ourselves) with the rules and regulation of the City of El Segundo with respect to preparing and filing this application and that the foregoing statements herein contained and the information documents and all plans attached hereto are in all respects true and correct to the best of my/our knowledge and belief.

Richard C. Lundquist  5-27-2008
Signature Date

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, )
County of Los Angeles )ss.

On this 27th day of May 2008, before me, the undersigned Notary Public in and for said County and State, personally appeared Richard C. Lundquist known to me to be the person whose name to subscribe to the within instrument, and acknowledged to me that he/she executed the same.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

ESTER M. FUNGLADDA
Commission # 1670678
Notary Public - California
Los Angeles County
My Comm. Expires Jun 23, 2010

Notary Public in and for said County and State

RECEIVED
MAY 29 2008
PLANNING DIVISION
199
AGENT AUTHORIZATION

I hereby authorize Alex J. Rose and Toni Reina to act for me/us in all matters relevant to this application. I understand that this person will be the exclusive contact on the project and will be sent all information and correspondence.

Richard E. Jungwerk  
Owner's Signature  5-27-2008

AGENT AFFIDAVIT

I, We Alex J. Rose and Toni Reina being duly sworn deposite and say that I/we am the AGENT of the property involved in this application and that I/we have familiarized myself (ourselves) with the rules and regulation of the City of El Segundo with respect to preparing and filing this application and that the foregoing statements herein contained and the information documents and all plans attached hereto are in all respects true and correct to the best of my/our knowledge and belief.

Signature  5-27 2008

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, )
County of Los Angeles )ss.
On this 27th day of May 2008, before me, the undersigned Notary Public in and for said County and State, personally appeared Alex J Rose known to me to be the person whose name is subscribe to the within instrument, and acknowledged to me that he/she executed the same.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

ESTER M. FUNGADDA  
Commission # 1670678  
Notary Public - California  
Los Angeles County  
My Comm. Expires Jun 25, 2010

Ester M. Fungadda  
Notary Public in and for said County and State

PLANNING DIVISION  #00

MAY 29 2008

EA-792; AUP 08-02; CUP 08-05  
2361 Rosecrans Ave.
CALIFORNIA ALL-PURPOSE ACKNOWLEDGMENT

State of California
County of Los Angeles

On May 27, 2008 before me, ESTER M. FUGLADDA, Notary Public

personally appeared Richard C. Lundquist
and Alex J. Rose

who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature __________________________

Place Notary Seal Above

OPTIONAL

Though the information below is not required by law, it may prove valuable to persons relying on the document and could prevent fraudulent removal and reattachment of this form to another document.

Description of Attached Document

Title or Type of Document:________________________________________

Document Date:________________________________________ Number of Pages:_____

Signer(s) Other Than Named Above:________________________________________

Capacity(ies) Claimed by Signer(s)

Signer’s Name:________________________________________

☐ Individual
☐ Corporate Officer — Title(s): __________________________
☐ Partner — ☐ Limited ☐ General
☐ Attorney in Fact
☐ Trustee
☐ Guardian or Conservator
☐ Other:________________________________________

Signer Is Representing:________________________________________

________________________

Signer’s Name:________________________________________

☐ Individual
☐ Corporate Officer — Title(s): __________________________
☐ Partner — ☐ Limited ☐ General
☐ Attorney in Fact
☐ Trustee
☐ Guardian or Conservator
☐ Other:________________________________________

Signer Is Representing:________________________________________
Attachment “A”

Application for a Conditional Use Permit
2361 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 180, El Segundo, CA 90245
Paul Martin’s American Bistro Restaurant
Project Parking Calculation Summary
Dated May 27, 2008

Proposed Restaurant Area: 7,113 SF
Proposed Outdoor Dining Area: 735 SF
Total Area: 7,848 SF

Parking Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Net Floor Area</th>
<th>Parking Ratio</th>
<th>Parking Stalls Required</th>
<th>Parking Structure Stalls Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>25,000 SF</td>
<td>1 space /300 SF</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>25,000 SF</td>
<td>1 space /350 SF</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>129,935 SF</td>
<td>1 space /400 SF</td>
<td>325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>6,952 SF</td>
<td>1 space /75 SF</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>735 SF</td>
<td>1 space /75 SF</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Dining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>161 SF</td>
<td>1 space per 1,000 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>187,783 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 584</td>
<td>Total 641</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment “B”

Application for a Conditional Use Permit
2361 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 180, El Segundo, CA 90245
Paul Martin’s American Bistro Restaurant
Dated May 27, 2008

Findings

Presented below is the applicant’s written description of how the proposed Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for an outdoor dining area at a new restaurant meets the required Findings as set forth in 15-23-6 of the El Segundo Municipal Code.

CUP Finding 1

The proposed location of the conditional use is in accord with the objectives of this Title and the purposes of the zone in which the site is located.

Facts in Support of CUP Finding 1

1. The General Plan Land Use designation for the site is Urban Mixed-Use South.
2. The zoning for the site is Mixed-Use South (MU-S). Restaurants are a permitted use in this zone in accordance with Section 15-5F-2 of the El Segundo Municipal Code.
3. The proposed outdoor dining area requires a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) in accordance with Section 15-5F-5 of the El Segundo Municipal Code.
4. The purpose of the Urban Mixed-Use South zone is to provide areas where a mixture of compatible commercial, office, research and development, retail, and hotel uses can locate and occupy a single building. It is also the intent of this zone that businesses are encouraged to provide street level uses which allow for, and facilitate, pedestrian activity for area workers and visitors. The proposed outdoor dining area is consistent with this stated purpose because the restaurant use will be converted from office use in an existing office building which will result in a mix of compatible uses occupying a single building. In addition, the proposed outdoor dining area is a street level use which will promote pedestrian activity for area workers and visitors. Workers and visitors in the existing office building and surrounding office buildings will have the option to walk to a fine dining establishment with outdoor dining instead of driving to another dining establishment of similar quality and style.
5. The proposed use is consistent with General Plan Land Use Element Goal LU4 in that it provides a stable tax base for the City through development of new commercial uses within a mixed use environment, without adversely affecting the viability of Downtown.

MAY 29 2008
PLANNING DIVISION
EA-792; AUP 08-02; CUP 08-05
6. The proposed use is consistent with Land Use Element Objective LU4-1 in that it promotes the development of high quality retail facilities in proximity to major employment centers.

7. The proposed use is consistent with General Plan Policy LU4-3.1 in that it encourages retail uses where appropriate on the ground floor of Urban Mixed-Use and corporate offices with other uses above.

8. The surrounding land uses include: office, retail, and restaurants. The proposed outdoor dining area in a new restaurant will be compatible with the surrounding uses. Other restaurants in the same district have outdoor dining areas.

CUP Finding 2

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

Facts in Support of CUP Finding 2

1. The new restaurant with outdoor dining area will be located in an existing office building and will be constructed in accordance with all applicable codes and regulations. The outdoor dining area is proposed immediately south of the building (Rosecrans Avenue frontage) with direct access from the interior or the restaurant. A new valet drop off area will be constructed along Continental Circle just west of the restaurant to offer customers the option of both valet parking and self parking. The outdoor dining area will be enclosed within a glass screen wall. The site is within the Continental Park development, which is patrolled by a contract security guard service 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

2. The proposed restaurant hours of operation are: 11:00 a.m. – 1:00 a.m. seven days a week. It is anticipated the outdoor dining area will be open during the same hours as the restaurant. No live entertainment is proposed.

3. The surrounding uses include: office, retail and restaurants. The proposed outdoor dining area in a new restaurant is compatible with the surrounding uses. Other restaurants in the MU-S district have outdoor dining areas.

CUP Finding 3

The proposed conditional use will comply with each of the applicable provisions of this Chapter.

Facts in Support of CUP Finding 3

1. The proposed outdoor dining area in a new restaurant will comply with each of the applicable provisions of Chapter 23, Variances and Conditional Use Permits, of the El Segundo Municipal Code.
July 3, 2008

Alex J. Rose, Vice President
Continental Development Corporation
2041 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 200
El Segundo, CA 90245

RE: Environmental Assessment No. EA-792 and
Administrative Use Permit (AUP) No. 08-02
On-Site Sale and Consumption of Beer and Wine in
Conjunction with the Operation of a New Restaurant (Paul
Martin’s American Bistro) for a (Type 47 State of California
Alcoholic Beverage Control License)
Address: 2361 Rosecrans Avenue

Dear Mr. Rose:

I am pleased to inform you that, in accordance with El Segundo Municipal Code ("ESMC") Chapter 15-22, the Planning Division reviewed your application for the above-referenced project and the Director of Planning and Building Safety Department APPROVED Environmental Assessment No. EA-792 and Administrative Use Permit No. 08-02 for the on-site sale and on-site consumption of beer and wine at 2361 Rosecrans Avenue. The following are the findings and facts in support of each finding for this decision:


350 Main Street, El Segundo, California 90245-3813
Phone (310) 524-2380    FAX (310) 322-4167
FINDINGS AND FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS:

Environmental Assessment No. EA-792

Finding 1

- The proposed project is exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Categorical Exemption Section 15301, Class 1 – Existing Facilities.

Facts in Support of Finding 1

1. The applicant proposes to convert an existing 6,952 square-foot office suite into a new restaurant use that includes the addition of 136 square feet of building area, the conversion of 161 square feet of loading dock area to storage, the addition of a 420 square-foot mechanical room, the addition of a 735 square-foot outdoor dining patio, and the on-site sale and consumption of beer, wine, and distilled spirits. The property is in an urbanized development area where it has adequate access and all public services and facilities are available. The site is currently developed with an office building and parking structure and it is in an area that is not environmentally sensitive. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to have any significant impacts with regard to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.

Administrative Use Permit 08-02

Finding 1

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

Facts in Support of Finding 1

1. The applicant proposes to provide on-site sale and consumption of beer, wine and distilled spirits in a new restaurant. The restaurant will be located within an existing office building at 2361 Rosecrans Avenue. The restaurant will be approximately 7,687 square feet in area and will contain 120 seats in the general dining area, 24 seats in the private dining area and 44 seats at the bar for a total of 188 seats inside the restaurant. The 735 square-foot outdoor patio will contain 44 seats for dining. The outdoor dining area is proposed on the south side of the building with direct access from the front of the restaurant. The restaurant will contain a combined total of 232 seats.
2. The minimum number of required parking spaces for the restaurant and patio (based upon the proposed uses) is 103 parking stalls which will be provided on-site.

3. The General Plan Land Use designation for the site is Urban Mixed-Use South. The zoning for the site is Urban Mixed-Use South (MU-S). Restaurants are permitted in the Urban Mixed-Use South (MU-S) Zone and on-site sale and consumption of alcohol is permitted with the approval of an Administrative Use Permit.

4. The Urban Mixed-Use South (MU-S) Zone permits, and the surrounding land uses include: commercial retail, restaurant, office, hotel, theater and light industrial uses. The proposed restaurant will be similar and compatible with the surrounding uses.

5. The restaurant must obtain a State of California Alcohol and Beverage Control (ABC) license for on-site sale and consumption of alcohol (Type 47).

6. On July 10, 2008, the El Segundo Planning Commission is scheduled to Receive and File the Administrative Use Permit request.

Finding 2

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

Facts in Support of Finding 2

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

2. The zoning for the site is Urban Mixed-Use South (MU-S). Restaurants are a permitted use in this Zoning District. The proposed use (on-site, sale, and consumption of beer, wine and distilled spirits at a new restaurant) requires an Administrative Use Permit in accordance with ESMC § 15-5F-4(C).

3. The purpose of the Urban Mixed-Use South (MU-S) Zone is to provide areas where a mixture of compatible commercial, office, research and development, retail and hotel uses can locate and develop in a mutually beneficial manner. It is the intent of the Urban Mixed-Use South (MU-S) Zone to have several types of uses occupy a single building. Businesses located within this Zone are encouraged to provide street level uses which allow for, and facilitate, pedestrian activity for area workers and visitors.

4. The proposed restaurant is consistent with the purpose and intent of the MU-S Zone in that: a) restaurant uses are compatible with the existing mixture of uses
in the immediate area, b) the proposed restaurant will be a new use within an existing office building, c) the restaurant is located on and accessible from the street level and facilitates pedestrian activity, and d) the restaurant will be open for lunch and dinner, which caters to the area workers and visitors.

5. The proposed use is consistent with Land Use Element Goal LU4 in that it provides a stable tax base for the City through development of new commercial uses, primarily within a mixed-use environment, without adversely affecting the viability of Downtown.

6. The proposed use is consistent with Land Use Element Objective LU4-4 in that it adds to the mixture of uses, which has the potential to maximize economic benefit, reduce traffic impacts and encourage a pedestrian environment.

7. The surrounding land uses include: commercial retail, restaurant, office hotel, theater and light industrial uses. The proposed restaurant will be compatible with the surrounding land uses.

Finding 3

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

Facts in Support of Finding 3

1. The restaurant will be located inside an existing commercial office building and will be constructed in accordance with all applicable codes and regulations. Sufficient parking will be provided on-site in a 641-space parking structure in compliance with ESMC Chapter 15-15. In addition, the applicant has indicated that the restaurant will be located within the Continental Park development, which is patrolled by contract security guard service 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

2. The surrounding land uses include commercial retail and office uses, and light industrial uses. The proposed restaurant includes a 735 square-foot outdoor patio.

3. The restaurant dining hours of operation are limited to 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 a.m. seven days a week. The outdoor dining patio would be open the same hours as the restaurant. No live entertainment is proposed. Only pre-recorded background music will be provided, and the restaurant will be required to meet the noise and vibration requirements of ESMC § 7-2-1.
Finding 4

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

Facts in Support of Finding 4

1. The sale of alcohol will not create any new impacts that would not be normally associated with the operation of a restaurant with an indoor dining area and outdoor patio area.

2. The proposed hours of operation and alcohol sales are limited from 11:00 am to 1:00 am, seven days a week. These hours also apply to the outdoor patio. The proposed restaurant is located in a predominantly commercial area that is not adjacent to any residential uses, which will help to minimize noise impacts on sensitive uses.

3. The proposed restaurant will provide adequate parking on-site, including valet parking. In addition, the restaurant is located on the street level within an existing office and commercial area, which will make it accessible by pedestrians and will limit the vehicular traffic to and from the site.

4. In addition to complying with the requirements of the City of El Segundo and the State of California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control the restaurant is subject to County Health Department regulations that address and monitor impacts of fumes and odors.

Finding 5

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

Facts in Support of Finding 5

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

DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND BUILDING SAFETY DEPARTMENT ACTION

Based on these findings and facts in support of these findings, the Director of Planning and Building Safety Department APPROVES the proposed project, subject to the following conditions:
1. The restaurant dining hours of operation are limited to 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 a.m. daily. The outdoor patio would be open the same hours as the restaurant. Food service must be available in the indoor dining area and the outdoor patio during the dining hours. Any change to the hours of operation or the hours that alcohol may be served is subject to review and approval by the Director of Planning and Building Safety.

2. The seating within the restaurant must be limited to 188 indoor dining seats, including a maximum of 44 bar seats, and the outdoor patio must not exceed 44 seats. The restaurant will contain a combined total of 232 seats.

3. Any subsequent modification to the project as approved must be referred to the Director of Planning and Building Safety for approval and a determination regarding the need for Planning Commission review of the proposed modification.

4. Any subsequent changes to the floor plan and areas where alcohol will be served must be reviewed and approved to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Building Safety Department.

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

6. The restaurant operations must comply with ESMC §§ 7-2-1, et seq. regulating noise and vibration.

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

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

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

10. The applicant must, at all times, display a Designated Driver sign of at least ten inches by ten inches (10" X 10") in the bar and restaurant dining areas at eye
level. The sign must be worded in a way that reminds patrons who are consuming alcohol to designate a non-drinking driver.

11. There must be no exterior advertising of any kind or type, including advertising directed to the exterior from within, promoting or indicating the availability of alcoholic beverages. Interior displays of alcoholic beverages which are clearly visible to the exterior must constitute a violation of this condition.

12. All employees serving alcoholic beverages to patrons must enroll in and complete a certified training program approved by the State Department of Alcoholic Beverages Control (ABC) for the responsible sales of alcohol. The training must be offered to new employees on not less than a quarterly basis.

13. Any and all employees hired to sell alcoholic beverages must provide evidence that they have either:

a. Completed training from the State of California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC), Inglewood District Office administered Leadership and Education in Alcohol and Drugs (LEAD) Program in the form of an ABC-issued certificate; or,

b. Completed an accepted equivalent by the ABC, Inglewood District Office to ensure proper distribution of beer, wine and distilled spirits to adults of legal age. If any prospective employee designated to sell alcoholic beverages does not currently have such training, then;

c. The ABC-licensed proprietors must have confirmed with the Planning and Building Safety Department within fifteen (15) days of the Director's decision, or by final project approval, that a date certain has been scheduled within the local ABC Office to complete the LEAD course.

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

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

15. If complaints are received regarding excessive noise, parking availability, lighting, building access, and the like associated with the restaurant and the outdoor patio area, the city may, in its discretion, take action to review the Administrative Use Permit, including without limitation, adding conditions or revoking the permit.
16. The outdoor dining/seating area must comply with ESMC § 15-2-16.

17. The building must not be occupied by more persons than allowed by the California Building Code, as adopted by the ESMC.

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

19. The Applicant agrees to indemnify and hold the City harmless from and against any claim, action, damages, costs (including, without limitation, attorney's fees), injuries, or liability, arising from the City's approval of Environmental Assessment No. 792 and Administrative Use Permit No. 08-02. Should the City be named in any suit, or should any claim be brought against it by suit or otherwise, whether the same be groundless or not, arising out of the City approval of EA-792 or AUP 08-02, the Applicant agrees to defend the City (at the City's request and with counsel satisfactory to the City) and will indemnify the City for any judgment rendered against it or any sums paid out in settlement or otherwise. For purposes of this section "the City" includes the City of El Segundo's elected officials, appointed officials, officers, and employees.

PLANNING COMMISSION

This determination was received and filed by the Planning Commission at its July 10, 2008 meeting. Please be advised that this does not conclude the review process. The City Council will determine whether or not to protest the issuance of the ABC License (Type 47) at its meeting on July 10, 2008.

Should you have any questions, please contact Paul Samaras, Principal Planner, at (310) 524-2312.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Gary Chicola, Director
Department of Planning and Building Safety
Samaras, Paul

From: Phipps, Max (Captain)
Sent: Monday, June 30, 2008 4:22 PM
To: Samaras, Paul
Subject: RE: Alcohol License for new restaurant with outdoor dining at 2361 Rosecrans Avenue

The police department has no objection to the issuance of a Type 47 (On-Sale General for Public Eating Place) ABC license for Paul Martin's American Bistro restaurant, 2361 Rosecrans Ave.

From: Samaras, Paul
Sent: Monday, June 30, 2008 1:40 PM
To: Phipps, Max (Captain)
Subject: Alcohol License for new restaurant with outdoor dining at 2361 Rosecrans Avenue

Captain Phipps,

The Planning Commission will be considering an application for an alcohol license in conjunction with a new restaurant (ABC License Type 47) at 2361 Rosecrans Avenue (Continental Development). We typically request a statement confirming that the Police Department will not protest the issuance of the license. Can you respond to this email to confirm this? Feel free to call me if you have any questions on this application.

Thanks,

Paul Samaras
Principal Planner
City of El Segundo
Planning and Building Safety Department
(310) 524-2312
EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL

AGENDA ITEM STATEMENT

AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action for second reading and adoption of an Ordinance for: (1) the rezoning of approximately 4.25 acres of property at 1700 E. Grand Avenue from Medium Manufacturing (MM) Zone to the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Zone; (2) an amendment to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan to further limit permitted uses with the Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Zone for the property at 1700 E. Grand Avenue, to general Office and Medical-Dental Office uses only, and; (3) technical changes to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan (SHSP) relating to the environmental review requirements to make the SHSP consistent with the law (CEQA). Applicant: Mar Canyon Grand, LLC. (Fiscal Impact: None)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1) Waive second reading and adopt Ordinance No. 1419 for Zone Change No. 07-01 and Specific Plan Amendment No. 08-02 for the “MEPS” Project site rezoning to Grand Avenue Commercial (GAC) Zone with limited uses pursuant to the SHSP; and/or
2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:

On August 5, 2008, the Council held a public hearing and adopted Resolution No. 4559 approving Environmental Assessment No. 769 for Zone Change No. 07-01, Specific Plan Amendment No. 08-02, and Smoky Hollow Site Plan Review No. 07-04. The Council also introduced an ordinance to adopt the Zone Change and Specific Plan Amendment for the Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS) project at 1700 East Grand Avenue and to make technical changes to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan (SHSP) relating to the environmental review requirements to make the SHSP consistent with the law (CEQA).

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

A. Ordinance No. 1419 (Underline/strike-out version)
B. Ordinance No. 1419

FISCAL IMPACT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Budget:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount Requested:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Number:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Phase:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appropriation Required:  X  No

ORIGINATED BY: Gary Chicots, Director of Planning and Building Safety

DATE: 7-29-08

REVIEWED BY: Jack Wayt, Interim City Manager

DATE: 7-30-08
ORDINANCE NO. 1419

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE SMOKY HOLLOW SPECIFIC PLAN BY PROVIDING FOR LIMITED ACTIVATION OF LAND USES, ACTIVATING LIMITED COMMERCIAL USES, AND MAKING TECHNICAL CHANGES TO CONFORM WITH CALIFORNIA LAW.

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

SECTION 1: Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Findings. The City Council finds and declares that the amendments to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan set forth in this ordinance are consistent with the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan as follows:

A. The Smoky Hollow Specific Plan specifically recognizes that individual property owners and market forces should determine what growth should occur in the area. (ESMC § 15-11-2).

B. Both the procedural amendments to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan and the activation of a portion of the Grand Avenue Commercial Zone to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan set forth in this Ordinance are consistent with the goals and objectives of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan including, without limitation:

1. Objective 1.3 – providing maximum possible responsiveness to market opportunities within the desire development intensification; and

2. Objective 5.1 – Providing for maximum possible capture of market opportunities by property owners.

C. Since the Property is covered by the Grand Avenue Commercial overlay district which allows general office and medical-dental office uses, activation of only those uses for the Property is consistent with the purpose of the Grand Avenue Commercial overlay district.

D. Since the project site is regulated by the Grand Avenue Commercial overlay district which allows general and medical-dental office uses, activation of only these uses for the project site is consistent with the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan.
E. The amendments to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan set forth in this Ordinance are consistent with the City's General Plan as the Land Use Map designates the property as Smoky Hollow Mixed Use, which specifically provides for office uses and commercial uses under the Grand Avenue Commercial Zone.

SECTION 2: Additional Findings. The City Council also finds and declares as follows:

A. The findings set forth in Resolution No. 4559, adopted on July 15, 2008, are incorporated as if fully set forth.

B. Based upon the entirety of the administrative record including, without limitation, Resolution No. 4559, the public hearings before the Planning Commission and City Council, and additional information in the record, in accordance with ESMC §§ 15-7B-13 and 15-11-2(E)(1)(c)(2), the City Council finds that because only the office uses set forth in ESMC § 15-7B-2(B) are being activated on the project site, the proposed uses will not erode the commercial market for downtown businesses.

SECTION 3: ESMC § 15-11-2(E)(1)(c)(2) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) A commercial district is provided along the south edge of Grand Avenue for limited commercial development if it can be demonstrated that erosion of downtown commercial potential will not thereby occur. Subject to the discretionary approval of the City Council an application may be filed with the City requesting that only some of the permitted uses set forth in the Grand Avenue Commercial Zone be activated."

Section 4: ESMC § 15-11-3 (D)(2) is amended to read as follows:

"2. Procedure: The City Council, after receiving recommendations from the Planning Commission, giving written notice to adjacent property owners and holding a public hearing may activate either of these floating zones. The Council or the Commission may initiate such change by petition of the property owner(s). If petitioned for by the property owner only limited uses in the Grand Avenue Commercial Zone may be activated, in which case the property shall receive a designation of "GAC –[limited/allowed uses]." Before such petition can be considered, the owner(s) must submit a focused supplemental EIR addressing land use, traffic, utilities, noise and air quality. The City shall ultimately determine which supplemental potential impacts must be addressed. Fees for such a procedure shall be established by the City Council. "
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SECTION 5: Zoning Map. The City Council amends ESMC § 15-11-3(D) by revising Exhibit III-2 to show the limited activation of the Grand Avenue Commercial Zone for General and Medical/Dental Office Uses (GAC Limited/General and Medical/Dental Office) as specified in ESMC § 15-7B-2(B) for the property located at 1700 East Grand Avenue and more specifically identified on attached Exhibit "A," which is incorporated by reference.

SECTION 6: ESMC § 15-11-3(H)(2)(b) is amended to read as follows:

"b. Applicability: Approval of a site plan shall be required prior to or concurrent with a tentative tract or parcel map for all proposed projects within the specific plan area. Where no tentative tract or parcel map is required, approval of a site plan shall not occur prior to issuance of the permits. Authority for approval of a site plan shall rest with the Planning and Building Safety Director of Community, Economic and Development Services for projects under fifteen thousand (15,000) square feet in floor area (appealable to the Planning Commission) and with the Planning Commission for projects fifteen thousand (15,000) square feet or larger in floor area. If a site plan is being considered in conjunction with the activation of an overlay zone, the Director or Planning Commission must make a recommendation and the authority for approval rests with the City Council."

SECTION 7: ESMC § 15-11-3 H(2)(d)(3) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) For projects which are fifteen thousand (15,000) square feet or larger in floor area, upon determination that the site plan complies with the provisions of the Specific Plan and the review factors described in the design guidelines, the staff shall prepare a staff report with recommendations which shall be submitted along with the site plan to the Planning Commission at the earliest possible regular meeting. The Planning Commission shall approve, deny or conditionally approve the site plan. If a site plan is being considered in conjunction with the activation of an overlay zone, the Planning Commission must make a recommendation and the City Council must approve, deny or conditionally approve the site plan."

SECTION 8: ESMC § 15-11-3(H)(2)(e) is amended to read as follows:

“e. Environmental Determination: The site plan review process is discretionary, not ministerial, and is therefore subject to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). However, in light of the Master EIR established as part of this Specific Plan, only a focused EIR or mitigated negative declaration will be required for uses permitted in the base districts and then only where it is demonstrated that public facilities are inadequate and improvements beyond the project site may be
required. A full supplemental EIR will be required for activation of any portion of the floating zones."

SECTION 9: Environmental Assessment. Resolution No. 4559 adopted an MND for this Project which, among other things, properly assesses the environmental impact of this Ordinance, and the Project, in accordance with CEQA. This Ordinance incorporates by reference the findings and analysis set forth in Resolution No. 4559.

SECTION 10: Repeal or amendment of any provision of the ESMC will 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 11: 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 fifteen (15) days after the passage and adoption of this Ordinance, cause it to be published or posted in accordance with California law.

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: Effective Date. This Ordinance will become effective on the thirty-first (31st) day following its passage and adoption.
PASSED AND ADOPTED this 5th day of August 2008.

________________________
Kelly McDowell, Mayor

ATTEST:

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

I, Cindy Mortesen, 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. 1419 was duly introduced by said City Council at a regular meeting held on the 15th day of July 2008, 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 5th day of August, 2008, and the same was so passed and adopted by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

________________________
Cindy Mortesen, City Clerk

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

By: _______________________
Karl H. Berger, Assistant City Attorney
ORDINANCE NO. 1419

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE SMOKY HOLLOW SPECIFIC PLAN BY PROVIDING FOR LIMITED ACTIVATION OF LAND USES, ACTIVATING LIMITED COMMERCIAL USES, AND MAKING TECHNICAL CHANGES TO CONFORM WITH CALIFORNIA LAW.

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

SECTION 1: Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Findings. The City Council finds and declares that the amendments to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan set forth in this ordinance are consistent with the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan as follows:

A. The Smoky Hollow Specific Plan specifically recognizes that individual property owners and market forces should determine what growth should occur in the area. (ESMC § 15-11-2).

B. Both the procedural amendments to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan and the activation of a portion of the Grand Avenue Commercial Zone to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan set forth in this Ordinance are consistent with the goals and objectives of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan including, without limitation:

1. Objective 1.3 – providing maximum possible responsiveness to market opportunities within the desire development intensification; and

2. Objective 5.1 – Providing for maximum possible capture of market opportunities by property owners.

C. Since the Property is covered by the Grand Avenue Commercial overlay district which allows general office and medical-dental office uses, activation of only these uses for the Property is consistent with the purpose of the Grand Avenue Commercial overlay district.

D. Since the project site is regulated by the Grand Avenue Commercial overlay district which allows general and medical-dental office uses, activation of only these uses for the project site is consistent with the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan.
E. The amendments to the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan set forth in this Ordinance are consistent with the City’s General Plan as the Land Use Map designates the property as Smoky Hollow Mixed Use, which specifically provides for office uses and commercial uses under the Grand Avenue Commercial Zone.

SECTION 2: Additional Findings. The City Council also finds and declares as follows:

A. The findings set forth in Resolution No. 4559, adopted on July 15, 2008, are incorporated as if fully set forth.

B. Based upon the entirety of the administrative record including, without limitation, Resolution No. 4559, the public hearings before the Planning Commission and City Council, and additional information in the record, in accordance with ESMC §§ 15-7B-13 and 15-11-2(E)(1)(c)(2), the City Council finds that because only the office uses set forth in ESMC § 15-7B-2(B) are being activated on the project site, the proposed uses will not erode the commercial market for downtown businesses.

SECTION 3: ESMC § 15-11-2(E)(1)(c)(2) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) A commercial district is provided along the south edge of Grand Avenue for limited commercial development if it can be demonstrated that erosion of downtown commercial potential will not thereby occur. Subject to the discretionary approval of the City Council an application may be filed with the City requesting that only some of the permitted uses set forth in the Grand Avenue Commercial Zone be activated.”

Section 4: ESMC § 15-11-3 (D)(2) is amended to read as follows:

“2. Procedure: The City Council, after receiving recommendations from the Planning Commission, giving written notice to adjacent property owners and holding a public hearing may activate either of these floating zones. The Council or the Commission may initiate such change by petition of the property owner(s). If petitioned for by the property owner only limited uses in the Grand Avenue Commercial Zone may be activated, in which case the property shall receive a designation of “GAC –[limited/allowed uses].” Fees for such a procedure shall be established by the City Council. “

SECTION 5: Zoning Map. The City Council amends ESMC § 15-11-3(D) by revising Exhibit III-2 to show the limited activation of the Grand Avenue Commercial Zone for General and Medical/Dental Office Uses (GAC Limited/General and Medical/Dental Office) as specified in ESMC § 15-7B-2(B)
for the property located at 1700 East Grand Avenue and more specifically identified on attached Exhibit “A,” which is incorporated by reference.

SECTION 6: ESMC § 15-11-3(H)(2)(b) is amended to read as follows:

“b. Applicability: Approval of a site plan is required before or concurrent with a tentative tract or parcel map for all proposed projects within the specific plan area. Where no tentative tract or parcel map is required, approval of a site plan must occur before building permits are issued. Authority for approval of a site plan rests with the Planning and Building Safety for projects under fifteen thousand (15,000) square feet in floor area (appealable to the Planning Commission) and with the Planning Commission for projects fifteen thousand (15,000) square feet or larger in floor area. If a site plan is being considered in conjunction with the activation of an overlay zone, the Director or Planning Commission must make a recommendation and the authority for approval rests with the City Council.”

SECTION 7: ESMC § 15-11-3 H(2)(d)(3) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) For projects which are fifteen thousand (15,000) square feet or larger in floor area, upon determination that the site plan complies with the provisions of the Specific Plan and the review factors described in the design guidelines, the Director must prepare a report with recommendations which must be submitted along with the site plan to the Planning Commission at the earliest possible regular meeting. The Planning Commission must approve, deny or conditionally approve the site plan. If a site plan is being considered in conjunction with the activation of an overlay zone, the Planning Commission must make a recommendation and the City Council must approve, deny or conditionally approve the site plan.”

SECTION 8: ESMC § 15-11-3(H)(2)(e) is amended to read as follows:

“e. Environmental Determination: The site plan review process is discretionary, not ministerial, and is therefore subject to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).”

SECTION 9: Environmental Assessment. Resolution No. 4559 adopted an MND for this Project which, among other things, properly assesses the environmental impact of this Ordinance, and the Project, in accordance with CEQA. This Ordinance incorporates by reference the findings and analysis set forth in Resolution No. 4559.

SECTION 10: Repeal or amendment of any provision of the ESMC will 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 11: 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 fifteen (15) days after the passage and adoption of this Ordinance, cause it to be published or posted in accordance with California law.

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: Effective Date. This Ordinance will become effective on the thirty-first (31st) day following its passage and adoption.
PASSED AND ADOPTED this 5th day of August 2008.

__________________________
Kelly McDowell, Mayor

ATTEST:

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

I, Cindy Mortesen, 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. 1419 was duly introduced by said City Council at a regular meeting held on the 15th day of July 2008, 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 5th day of August, 2008, and the same was so passed and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: ______________________

NOES: ______________________

ABSENT: ____________________

ABSTAIN: ___________________

__________________________
Cindy Mortesen, City Clerk

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

By: __________________________
Karl H. Berger, Assistant City Attorney
EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA ITEM STATEMENT
MEETING DATE: August 5, 2008
AGENDA HEADING: Consent Agenda

AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action to approve a purchase order to Oldcastle Precast for utility pull boxes that will serve as access junction points for the City's fiber optic cable installation project. (Fiscal Impact: $15,285.00).

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1) Authorize the Purchasing Agent to issue a purchase order to Oldcastle Precast for the amount of $15,285.00; 2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:

In the FY 2006/07 budget Council approved funds for the El Segundo Institutional Fiber Network (I-Net) capital project, which will provide fiber optic connectivity between City facilities (e.g., City Hall, Public Works yard, Water Department), the high school and the library. While most of the conduit pathways are already in place, they are not currently accessible for cabling. To both provide access to the existing conduit and meet the fiber's distance limitations, 19 pull boxes will need to be installed approximately every 1000 feet along the routes and at other junction points such as intersections/corners in Phase I of this project (areas west of Sepulveda Blvd.).

(Background and Discussion continued on the next page)

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

Quotation from Oldcastle Utility Vault and Jensen Precast
Diagram of Pull Box
Map of Pull Box Locations

FISCAL IMPACT: $15,285.00

Operating Budget: none
Amount Requested: $15,285
Account Number: 301-400-8201-8497
Project Phase: N/A
Appropriation Required: No

ORIGINATED BY: Stephanie Katsouleas, Director of Public Works
DATE: 7/30/08

REVIEWED BY: Jack Wayt, City Manager
DATE: 7-30-08
BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION (continued)

The minimum size pull box required to meet fiber access and pulling/splices needs is 17" x 30" x 36" deep, and the boxes must be traffic rated for safety because they will be placed in the roadway. The attached map shows the anticipated locations where the pull boxes will be installed by Public Works staff.

Due to the weight of concrete castings, high delivery costs preclude using out-of-area vendors. There are three suppliers of precast concrete in the greater Los Angeles area, which include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Price, Tax &amp; Delivery</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jensen Precast</td>
<td>Fontana</td>
<td>$16,201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Concrete Precast</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Cannot provide Bottoms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldcastle Precast</td>
<td>Fontana</td>
<td>$15,285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concrete bottoms are required to meet heavy duty, structural, traffic requirements and avoid sinking. US Concrete Precast suggested pouring our own concrete on-site for the bottoms. However, this would require significant extra labor, time and resources, and was thus not considered a viable or financially competitive alternative. Therefore, staff recommends purchasing the pull boxes from Oldcastle Utility Vault.
# Contract & Proposal

**Quote No.** S094060-2

**P.O. Box 310039**  
Fontana, CA 92337  
Telephone: (909)-428-3700  
Fax: (909)-428-3737

**Quote To** Bidders  
**Ship To** EL SEGUNDO - YARD DROP  
El Segundo, CA 90245

**Reference:** CITY OF EL SEGUNDO-NORM THORN  
**Contact:** Phone:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order No</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Customer No</th>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Cash discount</th>
<th>F.O.B.</th>
<th>Quote is Valid for:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S094060</td>
<td>7/23/2008</td>
<td>002003</td>
<td>Cash on Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td>FOB Job Site</td>
<td>30 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Group: A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Unit price</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>Ea</td>
<td>0000001</td>
<td>720.00</td>
<td>13,680.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| EL SEGUNDO 17"X30"X36" CONC HANDHOLE W/ TRFC COVER GALV  
INCLUDES BASE AND PENTA HEAD BOLTS |
| 19.00 | Ea | 4100270| 17"X30"X12" 6T - CONCRETE TOP SECTION W/ FRAME |
| 38.00 | Ea | 4100270| 17"X30"X12" 6T - CONCRETE EXTENSION |
| 19.00 | Ea | 4100270| 17"X30" - 6T - TRAFFIC STEEL D.P. COVER GALV |
| 19.00 | Ea | 4100270| 17"X30"X6" CONCRETE BASE |

## Group: B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Unit price</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Ea</td>
<td>0000001</td>
<td>720.00</td>
<td>13,680.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PRICE INCLUDES DELIVERY TO YARD IN 1 TRUCK LOAD.  
**"QUOTE GOOD FOR 30 DAYS"** |

**QUOTATION TOTAL US** 13,680.00

**IMPORTANT:** This proposal is based on standard terms and conditions. Items and quantities shown are the basis for the quotation, and we are not responsible for any discrepancies between this list and actual items or quantities.

(Accepted by)  
(Sales Person: Tracy Pitts)

(Position)  
(Date)
6T Electrical Series
18½" x 31" I.D.
H20 Loading

6T DP
1/2" Diamond Plate
H20 Traffic Cover
Bolt Down
105 lbs.

6T PB
Pull Box
320 lbs.

6T EXT
Extension
272 lbs.

6T B
Base
115 lbs.

Meets #6T
Caltrans State Spec.
TO: CITY OF EL SEGUNDO REV.1
ATTN: NORMAN THORN
F # NTHORN@ELSEGUNDO.ORG
P # 310-524-2330
EL SEGUNDO, CA
FIBER

QUOTATION
Quote #: RR071608D
Customer ID: 07-02-08

Quoted By: G. STEIN
Ship Via: OUR TRUCK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>PART</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PRICE EACH</th>
<th>EXTENDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>17&quot;X30&quot;X36&quot; CALTRANS #8 H20</td>
<td>$767.00</td>
<td>$14,573.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ABOVE PRICE INCLUDES:
- M-20 TRAFFIC LOADING
- GALV COVER BEAD WELD
- "CITY OF EL SEGUNDO"
- W/ PENTA HEAD BOLTS

ABOVE PRICE IS FOB FONTANA
CUSTOMER TO WILL CALL.

IF DELIVERY, REQUIRED ADD $425.00 TOTAL

REVISION TO ADD PRICE FOR PENTA HEAD BOLTS.

NOTE: NOTE: Jensen Precast - TERMS AND CONDITIONS ATTACHED

QUOTE BASED ON VERBAL INFORMATION.
SPCS/DRAWINGS NOT REVIEWED.
ADDITIONAL CHARGES FOR ANY EXTRA TRIPS AND DELAYS.
2 DELIVERY TRIPS

NOTE: IF OFF LOADED ONLY TAX WILL BE APPLIED TO PRODUCT

NOTE: SPECS CAN BE FOUND ON LINE @jensencast.com

>>>>> THANK YOU, GWEN <<<<<
> gstein@jensencast.com
>>>> 909-492-3150 <<<<

QUOTE TOTAL: $14,573.00

ALL ORDERS ARE SUBJECT TO CREDIT APPROVAL AND ACCEPTANCE BY SELLER.

IF JENSEN PRECAST DOES NOT SET PRODUCT AT TIME OF DELIVERY, SALES TAX WILL BE CHARGED.

DELIVERY TRIPS, SETTING TIME, OR MATERIALS NOT NOTED ABOVE WILL BE BILLED ACCORDINGLY.

OFFER TO SELL SUBJECT TO JENSEN PRECAST’S COMPANY POLICIES, TERMS AND CONDITIONS.
PLEASE REFER TO WWW.JENSENPRECAST.COM/SOUTHERN/CA/FORMS/ORDER/TERMS.TERM FOR COMPLETE TERMS AND CONDITIONS

WHICH ARE HEREBY INCORPORATED INTO THIS DOCUMENT BY REFERENCE AND ALSO ATTACHED HERETO FOR YOUR CONVENIENCE.

QUOTATION IS VALID FOR 30 DAYS. THANK YOU FOR CHOOSING JENSEN PRECAST!

BY CUSTOMER

BY JENSEN PRECAST

CUSTOMER PO
No. 6-T PB STEEL TRAFFIC COVER
BOLT DOWN
WT. 104 lbs.

No. 6-T PB - BODY
WT. 276 lbs.

33 1/4" 20 1/4" 1/2"
LIFT HOLE
BOLT-DOWN HOLES

3/8" INSERT AND
CLEAN-OUTS
FOR BOLT DOWNS
(2 REQ'D.)

No. 6-T PB - EXTENSION
WT. 273 lbs.

5" x 5 3/4" K.O. x 1 1/2" DEEP

No. 6-T PB - BASE
WT. 207 lbs.

17" x 30"
TRAFFIC PULL BOX
(STATE SPEC. 6-T)

36" 24"
REINFORCING
STEEL

12" 12"

22"

6-T PB

240
EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA ITEM STATEMENT

MEETING DATE: August 5, 2008
AGENDA HEADING: Consent Agenda

AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action regarding adoption of plans and specifications for the slurry sealing of the streets in the area bounded by Sheldon Street, Mariposa and Imperial Avenues and the west City Limits. Project No.: PW 08-09. (Fiscal Impact: $169,905)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

(1) Adopt plans and specifications; (2) Authorize staff to advertise the project for receipt of construction bids; (3) Alternatively discuss and take other action related to this item.

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:

The Public Works Department administers a slurry sealing program as a preventive measure to extend the life of pavement Citywide. The slurry sealing process consists of the application of a thin asphalt slurry layer on existing asphalt pavement to prevent water intrusion.

(Background and discussion continued on the next page.........)

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

Map

FISCAL IMPACT: $169,905.00

| Operating Budget:          | $169,905.00 |
| Capital Improvement Program: | N/A         |
| Amount Requested:          | $169,905.00 |
| Account Number:            | 001-400-4202-6206 |
| Project Phase:             | Adopt plans and specifications |
| Appropriation Required:    | No          |

ORIGINATED BY:  
Stephanie Katsouleas, Public Works Director

DATE: 07/30/08

REVIEWED BY:  
Jack Wayt, Interim City Manager

DATE: 7/30/08
The City is divided into five (5) areas for slurry; four quadrants west of Sepulveda Boulevard and one area east of Sepulveda (see attached map). Conventional pavement management practice indicates that asphalt pavements should be slurry sealed at least every eight years. The City’s five-year cycle exceeds this standard. The southwest quadrant west of Sepulveda Boulevard was treated under the last contract completed in 2007.

Staff has prepared plans and specifications for the Fiscal Year 2007/08 Slurry Seal Program, which includes streets within the area bounded by Mariposa Avenue, Sheldon Street, Imperial Avenue and the west City limit as shown on the attached map. This area was last slurry sealed in FY 2000/01.

Funding for slurry sealing is available through the Public Works operating budget in the amount of $169,905. However, slurry sealing costs have escalated due to the oil market condition, and we anticipate that the actual cost for completing the scope will exceed available funding. Once bids are received, we will determine whether an additional appropriation is needed and address the funding shortfall at that time.
Consideration and possible action regarding acceptance of the project for the Replacement of the windows at the Urho Saari Swim Stadium (plunge), located at 219 W. Mariposa Avenue. Approved Capital Improvement Project - Project No.: PW 08-03 (Fiscal Impact: $68,680.00)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

(1) Accept all work under this contract as complete; (2) Authorize the City Clerk to file a Notice of Completion in the County Recorder's Office; (3) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:

On April 1, 2008, the City Council awarded a contract for $68,680 to Ardalan Construction Company, Inc. to replace the existing sliding widows at the plunge that could not be opened and closed. All work associated with Project No. PW 08-03 has now been completed to the satisfaction of the City and staff recommends acceptance of the complete project.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

Notice of Completion

FISCAL IMPACT: $68,680.00

Capital Improvement Program: $70,000.00
Amount Requested: $68,680.00
Account Number: 301-400-8202-8989
Project Phase: Accept the work as complete
 Appropriation Required: No

ORIGINATED BY:
Stephanie Katsouleas, Public Works Director

REVIEWED BY:
Jack Wayt, Interim City Manager
NOTICE OF COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECT

Project Name: Urho Saari Swim Stadium Window Replacement

Project No.: PW 08-03

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

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

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

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

4. The nature of the interest of the owner is: Public Swim Stadium

5. A work of improvement on the property hereinafter described was field reviewed by the City Engineer on July 29, 2008. The work done was: Replacement of the windows at the Urho Saari Stadium.

6. On August 5, 2008, City Council of the City of El Segundo accepted the work of this contract as being complete and directed the recording of this Notice of Completion in the Office of the County Recorder.

7. The name of the Contractor for such work of improvement was: Ardalan Construction Company, Inc.

8. The property on which said work of improvement was completed is in the City of El Segundo, County of Los Angeles, State of California, and is described as follows: Public Swim Stadium.

9. The street address of said property is: 219 W. Mariposa Avenue.

Dated: ____________________

Stephanie Katsouleas
Public Works Director

VERIFICATION

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

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

Executed on ________________, 2008 at El Segundo, California.

Stephanie Katsouleas
Public Works Director
EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA ITEM STATEMENT

MEETING DATE: August 5, 2008
AGENDA HEADING: Consent Agenda

AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action to authorize staff to solicit bids for the installation of risers on the Stevenson Field Bleachers in El Segundo's Recreation Park at 339 Sheldon Street. Approved Capital Improvement Program Project No. PW 08-07. (Fiscal Impact: $26,000 General Fund)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

(1) Authorize staff to solicit bids for the installation of risers on the Stevenson Field Bleachers; and (2) Alternatively discuss and take other action related to this item.

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:

Installation of risers on the Stevenson Field Bleachers was identified on the CIPAC 2007/08 list of approved projects. The bleachers, which have been in place for many years, do not have risers between the floor boards and bench seats to prevent trash and debris from falling beneath the bleachers. Retrieving dropped articles from under the bleachers is unsafe for patrons and removing trash is cumbersome for park maintenance crews. This project will retrofit the existing bleachers by providing risers between the floor boards and bench seats of each row, thereby preventing the risk of personal articles (keys, purse, wallets, etc.) and trash/debris from falling beneath the bleachers.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

None

FISCAL IMPACT: $26,000

Capital Improvement Program: $26,000
Amount Requested: $26,000
Account Number: 301-400-8202-899
Project Phase: Bid
Appropriation Required: $26,000 from General Fund

ORIGINATED BY: Stephanie Katsouleas, Public Works Director
DATE: 7/30/08

REVIEWED BY: Jack Wayt, City Manager
DATE: 7-30-08
Consideration and possible action regarding approval as per municipal code §1-7-12 for emergency purchases for the leasing of two passenger buses from Nations Bus Corporation to be used for City shuttle service programs until City-owned shuttle buses can be repaired. (Fiscal Impact: $11,158)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1) As per municipal code § 1-7-12 regarding emergency purchases, approve use of Nations Bus Corporation and the funds needed to lease shuttle buses to be used for current City shuttle service programs until existing City-owned vehicles are repaired; 2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:

This past June, as the City’s shuttle service programs entered the busy summer season, Public Works Equipment Maintenance staff made Parks and Recreation Department staff aware that one of the City’s shuttle bus vehicles was going to have to be pulled from service due to a propane fuel system valve failure. It would take several months for the required parts to come in, as they are on back order. Therefore this shuttle vehicle would be out of service for several months.

During the summer months, current City shuttle service programs require six operational buses to provide the transportation services these programs provide. This includes three, 10 to 16 passenger buses that are used Monday through Friday for the Lunchtime Shuttle; two buses used seven days a week for the Beach Shuttle; and one bus used six days a week for Dial-A-Ride. The loss of one shuttle vehicle severely impacts the number of participants that can be transported for each of these programs. To continue providing shuttle transportation

(Continued on next page...)

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

FISCAL IMPACT:

Operating Budget: Funded through Proposition A
Account Number: 112-400-5293-6216
Amount Requested: $11,158 for first two months, potentially more if necessary
Project Phase: 
Appropriation Required: X Yes  __ No

ORIGINATED:  DATE:
Richard Brunette, Recreation and Parks Director 7/28/08

REVIEWED BY:  DATE:
Jack Wayt, Interim City Manager 7/30/08
BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION: Continued from previous page…

services at current existing levels, particularly for the Lunchtime Shuttle since participants have fixed daily timeframes in which to use the service, it was critical to secure a replacement vehicle as soon as possible.

City Public Works Equipment Maintenance staff, Purchasing, and Parks and Recreation Department staff investigated options and compared rental prices from vehicle rental companies. Staff chose Nations Bus Corporation as the best option and pricing for a bus vehicle lease at $5,579 for the two month lease for the bus and $2,250 per month thereafter if needed. The City Attorneys office approved the lease contract. The expected threshold for the lease was below the $10,000 cap for pricing requiring City Council approval and the City Manager approved the contract. Funding for these shuttle transportation programs comes from Proposition A funds.

Unfortunately, in mid-July, the same propane fuel system valve failure occurred in the second of the City's two propane-fueled shuttle buses. In order to continue with existing shuttle service levels, another contract was entered into on an emergency basis with Nations Bus Rental as per municipal code § 1-7-12 for emergency purchases. The combined total for this and the previous contract with Nations Bus Corporation now exceeds the $10,000 cap. Staff is requesting City Council approve the expenditures and continued use of Nations Bus Corporation. It is anticipated the two contracts will be necessary for at least two months, totaling $11,158 combined for these first two months.
Consideration and possible action regarding the purchase of a computerized bar code evidence management system and desktop computer for tracking evidence and property in the police department’s property room. (Net Fiscal Impact to City $17,500.00 from Police Department’s Asset Forfeiture Account).

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

(1) Approve the purchase of a computerized bar code evidence management system for use in the police department’s property room.
(2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:

The police department requests to purchase a computerized bar code evidence management system which will allow us to more easily maintain the proper tracking and documentation of evidence in the property room. The department currently utilizes a predominantly paper intensive system to track the location and disposition of property / evidence. Thousands of items are processed annually and the requirements governing the storage and disposition of property / evidence will be more easily and efficiently managed by an automated system.

Utilizing the proposed computerized bar code evidence management system will improve the efficiency of operating the property room while simultaneously reducing duplicative work efforts by officers and crime scene investigators.

Continued next page

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

Quotation from EvidenceOnQ

FISCAL IMPACT:

Operating Budget: None
Amount Requested: $17,500.00
Account Number: 109-400-3105-8108 (asset forfeiture)
Project Phase: N/A
Appropriation Required: ___ Yes ___ No

ORIGINATED:  
David Cummings, Chief of Police

REVIEWED BY:  
Jack Wayt, Interim City Manager
BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION (continued):

The system offers additional benefits including streamlining evidence management, creating a more easily traceable “chain of custody” for criminal proceedings and simplifying audit reports and property status inquiries. This computerized system will allow easier identification of property which is no longer needed, resulting in quicker disposal and freeing up overcrowded storage space. The system is also virtually paperless which may be considered better for the environment.

Staff obtained quotations from three companies that offer bar code evidence management systems. They are:

1. EvidenceOnQ  $15,323.00
2. Porter Lee Corporation  $16,332.60
3. QueTel  $27,285.00

(Note: Prices do not include the cost of a new desktop computer estimated at $1,800.00)

EvidenceOnQ was the lowest bidder and their system meets staff’s requirements.

The software, hardware and professional services specifications for implementation of this system were reviewed and approved by the City’s Executive Technology Review Committee.

Staff requests Council approve the expenditure of up to $15,323.00 to EvidenceOnQ for the purchase of the computerized bar code evidence management system and an additional $1,800.00 for the purchase of a new desktop computer system, utilizing asset forfeiture funds.

The computerized bar code evidence management system and desktop computer system should be added to the equipment replacement schedule with a four-year service life.
The following are the proposed software, hardware and professional services that will be provided to meet your Department’s implementation requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY.</th>
<th>Software Licenses and Seats Description</th>
<th>Extended Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EvidenceOnQ 5.1 Application Software License: Single Database/Application for up to 100,000 Records/Items, Utilizing SQL Server Database (provided by customer)</td>
<td>$4,995.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Concurrent Desktop Client Seat Licenses Included</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Retention Module</td>
<td>$895.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Container/Box Content Management Tracking Module</td>
<td>$370.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Signature Capture Module</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Equipment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Symbol LS2208 attached scanner</td>
<td>$1,192.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Zebra TLP 2844 Barcode Label Printer</td>
<td>$650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rolls of Zebra Thermal Transfer Labels, 1,100 - 4&quot;X 2&quot; Labels per Roll</td>
<td>$194.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rolls of Zebra 4.3&quot; Thermal Transfer Printer Ribbons</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Topaz T-LBK755 Signature Pad with 4X3 LCD</td>
<td>$1,190.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Videx laser lite portable scanner with docking station</td>
<td>$1,595.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Professional Services:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EvidenceOnQ Tailored Application Configuration</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Days On Site Installation &amp; Training, travel and per diem; Installation Includes EvidenceOnQ Application Server, 3 Desktops, and hardware.</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Custom Tailored Reports: Property Report, Notification Letter, Chain of Custody, Checkout Receipt &amp; PropertyRoom.com Manifest (included for those using PropertyRoom.com)</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Initial Data Import Assistance (Data Conversion and Clean Up Not Included)</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Annual Maintenance and Support for Twelve Months Following Installation (guaranteed to never increase during the life of the system)</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Investment Plan:

This investment plan requires a 50% down payment with the order and the remainder upon completion of installation. Your investment includes the purchase of the software licenses, equipment, installation, maintenance, support and training itemized on the previous pages, for a complete system.

Investment: $15,323.00
Consideration and possible action to pay $250,000.00 to Radio Communications Association in accordance with a fee sharing arrangement relating to the sale of City radio frequency rights. (Net Fiscal Impact to City - $250,000 from Police Department's Asset Forfeiture account.)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

(1) Approve paying $250,000 to Radio Communications Association; (2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:

On December 16, 2003, the City Council approved a Communications Products Agreement ("CPA") with Motorola, Inc., for purchasing two radio frequencies (471/474.3375 and 472/475.5375 MHz) using asset forfeiture funds. These frequencies have multiple transmitter sites providing a footprint covering the vast majority of Los Angeles County and a portion of Riverside County.

The CPA included a Construction and Revenue Sharing Agreement amendment with Radio Communications Association ("RCA"). This revenue sharing agreement gave RCA the authority to locate potential buyers for remarketing radio frequencies at sites not contiguous to El Segundo. The agreement provides RCA receive fifty percent (50%) of the gross amount of any sale price upon closing of the transaction.

On September 19, 2006, the Council authorized the City Manager to initiate and conclude contract negotiations with the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority for it to purchase the rights to two City radio frequencies at $250,000 each.

Continued next page

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

Invoice #4148 from Radio Commutations Association

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FISCAL IMPACT:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Budget:</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount Requested:</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Number:</td>
<td>109-300-0000-3901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Phase:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation Required:</td>
<td>Yes X No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORIGINATED BY: David Cummings, Chief of Police

REVIEWED BY: Jack Wayt, Interim City Manager

DATE: 7-24-08

DATE: 7-30-08
BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION: (Continued)

On June 5, 2007, Council approved a Purchase Agreement for $500,000 between the City of El Segundo and the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority for the sale of the rights to the referenced City radio frequencies. The sales transaction of these radio frequency rights formally closed February 7, 2008. The funds derived from the sale of radio frequency rights were returned to the police department's asset forfeiture account.

Radio Communications Association met the terms of the Construction and Revenue Sharing Agreement and the sale of the radio frequency rights has formally closed. Per the terms of the Construction and Revenue Sharing Agreement, Staff recommends Council approval the disbursement to RCA of $250,000 from the Police Department's asset forfeiture.
Radio Communications Association
6700 E. Pacific Coast Hwy., Suite 100
Long Beach, CA  90803
(562) 431-3458
(562) 431-3476 (Fax)

BILL TO
Lieutenant Max Phipps
El Segundo Police Department
348 Main Street
El Segundo, CA  90245

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As per the Construction &amp; Revenue Sharing Agreement dated April 26, 2004 for services rendered, Radio Communications Association is due 50% of the revenue and legal expenses regarding the sale of frequency 471.3375 and 472.5375 to the Burbank, Glendale &amp; Pasadena Airport AGREEMENT Total Purchase Price</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please Remit to the Above Address.

Total $250,000.00
Consideration and possible action regarding final acceptance of construction related to the City's Residential Sound Insulation Program Group 20 (21 Homes). Project No. RSI 07-02. (Final contract total = $1,288,700).

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

Recommendation – (1) Accept the work as complete; (2) Authorize the City Clerk to file the City Planning and Building Safety Director's Notices of Completion in the County Recorder's Office; and (3) Alternatively discuss and take other action related to this item.

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION:

The project is a part of the City’s Residential Sound Insulation (RSI) Program financed by federal grants from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the settlement agreement with Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA). The RSI Program offers modifications to owners of qualifying residential property in the City of El Segundo that reduce interior sound levels of noise generated by air traffic from neighboring Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). At its meeting on June 5, 2007 the City Council awarded a construction contract to Professional Building Contractors, Inc. for construction related to Group 20. The work has now been completed. The final contract amount based on measured quantities is $1,288,700. Staff recommends acceptance of this project.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
List of homes in Group 20

FISCAL IMPACT:

Amount approved by City Council: $1,372,446.00
Amount Requested: $1,288,700.00
Account Number: 116-400-0000-8960
Project Phase: Group 20 - Acceptance of the work
Appropriation Required: No

ORIGINATED BY:   DATE: July 24, 2008

James S. O'Neill, Program Manager

REVIEWED BY:  DATE: 7-30-08

Jack Wayt, Interim City Manager
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RSI Number</th>
<th>Project Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.01</td>
<td>929 Dune St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.02</td>
<td>839 Dune St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.03</td>
<td>741 W. Sycamore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.04</td>
<td>935 Hillcrest St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.05</td>
<td>913 Hillcrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.06</td>
<td>855 Hillcrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.07</td>
<td>656 W. Acacia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.08-20.09</td>
<td>646 &amp; 646 1/2 W. Acacia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.10</td>
<td>631 W. Acacia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.11</td>
<td>627 W. Acacia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.12</td>
<td>628 W. Acacia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.13</td>
<td>649 W. Walnut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.15</td>
<td>855 Loma Vista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.16</td>
<td>512 W. Walnut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.17</td>
<td>942 Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.18</td>
<td>316 W. Acacia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.19</td>
<td>224 W. Acacia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.20</td>
<td>1112 E. Acacia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.21-20.22</td>
<td>418 E. Imperial Ave.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>