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, OCTOBER 21, 2008 - 5:00 P.M.

Next Resolution # 4573
Next Ordinance # 1425

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) – -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): -0- 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): - 0- matter

CONFERENCE WITH CITY’S LABOR NEGOTIATOR (Gov’t Code §54957.6): - 4- matters
City Negotiators: 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) El Segundo Police Officers’ Association; (3) El Segundo Firefighter’s Association; (4) the El Segundo Police Management Association.

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, OCTOBER 21, 2008 - 7:00 P.M.

Next Resolution # 4573
Next Ordinance # 1425

7:00 P.M. SESSION

CALL TO ORDER

INVOCATION – Pastor John Svendsen, First Baptist Church

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – Council Member Don Brann
PRESENTATIONS

a. Proclamation announcing the Halloween Frolic on Main Street El Segundo, October 31, 2008, from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

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 (Public Hearing) regarding the City commissioned Cost Allocation and Fee Study for City services rendered to the public that was performed by Revenue and Cost Specialist, LLC. (Fiscal Impact: $1,014,875)
Recommendation – (1) Receive public testimony regarding new schedule for service rates, fees, and charges; (2) Adoption of draft Cost Study Resolution approving proposed new fee schedule effective January 1, 2009; (3) Approval to increase cost allocation fee schedule rates on an annual basis of each fiscal year based on the average percentage over the previous calendar year to the City's cost for administering the services under the City's proposed fee schedule; (4) Approval of annual cost allocation plan maintenance updates by Revenue & Cost Specialist LLC; (5) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
D. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS AND BOARDS

2. Consideration and possible action regarding recommendations from the Downtown Committee to approve the design and specifications for the Downtown El Segundo way finding signage plan.  (Fiscal Impact: $110,000.00)

Recommendation – (1) Approve the design and specifications for the Downtown El Segundo way finding signage plan; (2) Adopt plans and specifications for the Downtown El Segundo way finding signage plan; (3) Authorize staff to advertise the plan for competitive bids; (4) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

3. Consideration and possible action regarding the El Segundo Senior Housing Board’s request to initiate the process for Park Vista Senior Housing facility to become smoke free by January 1, 2010 and for all common areas to be smoke free immediately.  (Fiscal Impact: None)

Recommendation – (1) Consider the item and provide direction to staff; (2) 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.

4. Warrant Numbers 2568133 to 2568330 on Register No. 1 in the total amount of $1,097,579.56.

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.

5. Regular City Council Meeting Minutes of October 7, 2008 and Special City Council Meeting Minutes of October 13, 2008.

Recommendation – Approval.

6. Consideration and possible action regarding the award of a Standard Public Works Contract to FS Construction for the installation of risers for the Stevenson Field bleachers at 339 Sheldon St. – Project No. PW 08-07  (Fiscal Impact: $30,000)

Recommendation – (1) Approve a transfer of $4,000.00 from the Recreation Park Softball Field Retaining Wall Project (Project Account No. 301-400-8282-8996); (2) Authorize the City Manager to execute a Standard Public Works Contract in a form approved by the City Attorney with FS Construction in the amount of $30,000.00; (3) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.
7. Consideration and possible action authorizing the City Manager to execute a Professional Services Agreement with DCA Civil Engineering Group for the Softball Retaining Wall Design at 339 Sheldon Street – RFP No. 08-13. (Fiscal Impact: $28,881)

Recommendation – (1) Authorize the City Manager to execute a Professional Services Agreement with DCA Civil Engineering Group in a form approved by the City Attorney in the amount of $28,881; (2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

8. Consideration and possible action regarding the adoption of Plans and Specifications and authorization to advertise for bid the renovation of the Human Resources Office at 350 Main Street – Project No. PW 02-21 (Fiscal Impact: $130,000)

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.

9. Consideration and possible action regarding approval of ongoing service agreements and blanket purchase orders for FY 2008-2009 in excess of $25,000 and possible action to waive the formal bidding process and authorize the continued purchase of gasoline and diesel fuel for City vehicles and equipment through the use of spot market purchasing for the Public Works Department. (Fiscal Impact: $397,000)

Recommendation – (1) Authorize staff to continue to purchase gasoline and diesel fuel for City vehicles and equipment through the use of spot market purchasing in an amount not to exceed $347,000; (2) Authorize the issuance of blanket purchase order to Metron Farnier & Actaris in an amount not to exceed $50,000 for the purchase of single jet water meters for the City's water system; (3) Alternatively discuss and take other action related to this item.

10. Consideration and possible action regarding the Proposal from Beach Cities Transit to participate in funding operation for the 109 Line for two years in conjunction with the Cities of Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach and Manhattan Beach. (Fiscal Impact: $64,598 for FY 2008-09 and $72,412 for FY 2009-10. Two year fiscal impact: $137,010)

Recommendation – (1) City Council authorize the City Manager to enter into an agreement with Beach Cities Transit to continue funding Bus Line 109 for the next two years; (2) Alternatively discuss and take other action related to this item.
11. Consideration and possible action regarding award of City's professional services contract for auditing services with Mayer Hoffman McCann P.C. for three years through 2008-2010, plus optional two year extension. (Fiscal Impact: $265,300; 2008-2012)

Recommendation: (1) Authorize approval of three year professional services contract for auditing services with Mayer Hoffman McCann P.C. through years 2008-2010 for $155,140 and optional two year extension for years 2011 and 2012 for $110,160; (2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

12. Consideration and possible action to extend the City's agreement with Cassidy & Associates through September 30, 2009 for the provision of legislative advocacy services in Washington, D.C., and to approve federal advocacy work program elements. (Fiscal Impact: ($160,000 for FY 2008-2009)

Recommendation – (1) Authorize the Mayor to execute the attached agreement with Cassidy & Associates; (2) Approve the federal advocacy work plan as outlined in Cassidy & Associates Memorandum of September 18, 2008 and City’s Homeland Security Needs Assessment; (3) Instruct the City Manager, affected departments, and our Washington, D.C. advocate to work with the Congressional staff and local government associations to pursue the City’s federal funding and program objectives; (4) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

13. Consideration and possible action regarding a request from Northrop Grumman to install two 1,334 square-foot permanent wall signs located at 101 Continental Boulevard. (Fiscal Impact: None)

Recommendation – (1) Approve Northrop Grumman’s request to install two proposed 1,334 square-foot permanent wall signs and adopt a Resolution approving Environmental Assessment No. 802 and Sign Permit 08-01; (2) Alternatively, discuss and take other possible 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 receive value of $50 or more to communicate to the City Council on behalf of another, and employees speaking on behalf of their employer, must so identify themselves prior to addressing the City Council. Failure to do so shall be a misdemeanor and punishable by a fine of $250. While all comments are welcome, the Brown Act does not allow Council to take action on any item not on the agenda. The Council will respond to comments after Public Communications is closed.

MEMORIALS –

CLOSED SESSION

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

REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN IN CLOSED SESSION (if required)

ADJOURNMENT
POSTED:

DATE: 10/15/08
TIME: 3:25 pm
NAME: M. Jennings
Proclamation

City of El Segundo, California

WHEREAS, On Friday, October 31st, on the 300 and 400 block of Main Street, The City of El Segundo Recreation and Parks Department presents El Segundo’s ghosties, scarecrows, and jack-o-lanterns, an annual traditional event that dates back more than 32 years – our annual Halloween Frolic; and

WHEREAS, Festivities begin at 4:00 p.m. and last through the dark-of-night till 7:00 p.m.; little monsters will scream with glee as they play ghoulish games and climb on inflatable rides; excited participants of all ages can enter the El Segundo Kiwanis sponsored fun filled costume contest; the creative creatures can bring their decorated and carved pumpkins for a ribbon winning critique by the El Segundo Women’s Club; fans of the mystical arts will learn their fate at the fortune telling booth; and everyone can munch on a multitude of magical morsels while enjoying live music by the Mark Dayton Borders Band which is guaranteed to lift their spirits; and

WHEREAS, El Segundo Fire Department will display their engines; El Segundo Police Department will display their vehicles and both will have staff on hand to meet, greet, and provide information and giveaways to the little storm-troopers visiting their areas, as many other city departments are involved in the evening events.

WHEREAS, The annual Halloween Frolic provides residents of El Segundo the opportunity to experience wholesome, family fun, in a safe environment, while enjoying downtown Main Street.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Mayor and Members of the City Council of El Segundo, California hereby proclaim Friday, October 31, 2008, from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., as the Halloween Frolic on Main Street El Segundo and invite parents, children, and the entire community to participate in this traditional annual event.

Mayor Kelly McDowell
Council Member Eric K. Brown
Council Member Bill Fisher
Council Member Carl Jackson
Council Member Don Brown
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action (Public Hearing) regarding the City commissioned Cost Allocation and Fee Study for City services rendered to the public that was performed by Revenue and Cost Specialist, LLC. (Fiscal Impact: $1,014,875)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1) Receive public testimony regarding new schedule for service rates, fees, and charges.
2) Adoption of draft Cost Study Resolution approving proposed new fee schedule effective January 1, 2009.
3) Approval to increase cost allocation fee schedule rates on an annual basis of each fiscal year based on the average percentage over the previous calendar year to the City's cost for administering the services under the City's proposed fee schedule.
4) Approval of annual cost allocation plan maintenance updates by Revenue & Cost Specialist LLC.
5) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

1) Cost Allocation and Fee Study Summary
2) Draft Cost Study Resolution adopting a new fee schedule for recovering costs incurred from providing personal choice services.

FISCAL IMPACT: Included in Adopted Budget

Amount Budgeted: $1,014,875
Additional Appropriation: N/A
Account Number(s):

ORIGINATED BY: Rolf Schleicher, Fiscal Services Manager
REVIEWED BY: Deborah Cullen, Director of Finance
APPROVED BY: Jack Wayt, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

The City had not initiated a comprehensive analysis or increase to fees since 1989. Staff prepared and circulated a Request for Proposal (RFP) to qualified consulting firms experienced in the preparation of cost allocation studies and user fee pricing. The purpose of this study was to identify the actual cost for services and identify the tax subsidy to cover the cost of providing the services related to planning, building, fire and engineering functions.
Based on the technical expertise of submitted proposals, familiarity with the City, knowledge of rules and regulations, experience with comparable local agencies, costs, and presentation, Revenue & Costs Specialist, LLC, was awarded the bid.

The results of the RCS study identified $2,227,564 in tax subsidies and recommended an increase in fees of $1,934,875. City Council requested that staff review all the proposed fee increases and ensure that all fees are reasonable and appropriate. Staff reviewed all proposed fees, and based upon that review, modified various fee categories. The modifications proposed by staff resulted in fee reductions totaling $282,000. Staff further recommended reducing the revenue projection by an additional 20% or $254,000 based on the economic conditions relating to the downturn in housing and commercial development.

Staff recommended implementing the new fee structure beginning January 1, 2009, which reduced the revenue projections by an additional 25% or $423,000. These reductions total $959,000; therefore, the total revenue projection for FY 2008-2009 is $1,014,875. Implementing fees on January 1, 2009, allows time for communication to residents and the development community; provides staff needed time to make changes to the software programs within the City, and meets the minimum 60-day legal requirement to enact new fees.

Council is requested to consider adoption of the Cost Study Resolution which approves the new fee schedule. Staff is also recommending annual increases in the fee schedule based on the BLS CPI-U index. Additionally, Staff requests approval of RCS’s annual maintenance service plan to update administrative cost allocations within the fee schedule.
RESOLUTION NO.

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING A NEW FEE SCHEDULE FOR RECOVERING COSTS INCURRED FROM PROVIDING VARIOUS PUBLIC SERVICES.

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

SECTION 1: The City Council finds as follows:

A. The City Council may establish fees for services under various provisions of California law including, without limitation, Business & Professions Code § 16000; Government Code §§ 36936.1, 43000, 54344, 65104, 65456, 65574, 65909.5, 65943, 66013, 66014, 66451.2; and Health & Safety Code §§ 510, 17951, 17980.1, 19852.

B. Pursuant to Government Code § 66016, the City made data available regarding the cost, or estimated cost, of providing services for various fees ten (10) days before the public hearing held on October 21, 2008.

C. On October 21, 2008, City Council heard public testimony and considered evidence in a public hearing held and noticed in accordance with Government Code § 66016.

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

SECTION 2: The Fees, attached as Exhibit “A” and incorporated into this Resolution as if fully set forth, are approved and adopted.

SECTION 3: Unless otherwise revised, the fees established by this Resolution will be automatically adjusted on an annual basis at the beginning of each fiscal year based on the average percentage change over the previous calendar year to the City's costs for administering the services set forth in Exhibit “A.” The first fee adjustment cannot be made before a minimum of ten (10) months after the effective date of this Resolution.

SECTION 4: This Resolution is exempt from review under the California Environmental Quality Act (Cal. Pub. Res. Code §§ 21000, et seq.; “CEQA”) and CEQA regulations (Cal. Code Regs. tit. 14, §§ 15000, et seq.) because it establishes, modifies, structures, restructures, and approves rates and charges for meeting operating expenses; purchasing supplies, equipment, and materials; meeting financial requirements; and obtaining funds for capital projects needed to maintain service within existing service
areas. This Resolution, therefore, is categorically exempt from further CEQA review under Cal. Code Regs. tit. 14, § 15273.

SECTION 5: Pursuant to Government Code § 66017, all fees related to the Planning and Building Safety Department set forth in this Resolution will become effective on January 1, 2009 and will remain effective unless repealed or superseded.

SECTION 6: For all other fees, this Resolution will become effective on January 1, 2009 and will remain effective unless repealed or superseded.

SECTION 7: The City Clerk will certify to the passage and adoption of this Resolution; will enter the same in the book of original Resolutions of said City; and will make a minute of the passage and adoption thereof in the record of proceedings of the City Council of said City, in the minutes of the meeting at which the same is passed and adopted.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 16th day of September 2008.

_________________________________
Kelly McDowell,
Mayor

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

I, Cindy Mortesen, City Clerk of the City of El Segundo, California, hereby certify that the whole number of members of the City Council of the City is five; that the foregoing Resolution No. _________ was duly passed and adopted by said City Council, approved and signed by the Mayor of said City, and attested to by the City Clerk of said City, all at a regular meeting of said Council held on the ____ day of September 2008, and the same was so passed and adopted by the following roll call vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:
ATTEST:

Cindy Mortesen,
City Clerk

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

By:

Karl H. Berger
Assistant City Attorney
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFERENCE #</th>
<th>CITY/ SERVICE</th>
<th>FEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-001</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE USE PERMIT</td>
<td>$3,345 per application/$1,670 per application (50% fee) for properties in the Downtown Specific Plan Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-002</td>
<td>MINOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT</td>
<td>$3,345 per application/$1,670 per application (50% fee) for properties in the Downtown Specific Plan Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-003</td>
<td>MAJOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT</td>
<td>$6,855 per application/$3,425 per application (50% fee) for properties in the Downtown Specific Plan Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-004</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURAL/DESIGN REVIEW</td>
<td>$450 per application/$225 per application (50% fee) for properties in the Downtown Specific Plan Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-005</td>
<td>VARIANCE REVIEW</td>
<td>$8,855 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-006</td>
<td>ADJUSTMENT REVIEW</td>
<td>$2,570 per application/$1,285 per application (50% fee) for fence height adjustment on properties in the R-1, R-2 and R-3 Zones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-007</td>
<td>ZONE TEXT AMENDMENT/ZONE CHANGE</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-008</td>
<td>PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW</td>
<td>$3,410 per application. This fee gets the applicant two meetings with staff. Half of this fee will be credited towards any future fees for this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-009</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STUDY REVIEW</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-010</td>
<td>OFF-SITE PARKING COVENANT</td>
<td>$300 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-011</td>
<td>PARKING DEMAND/SHARED PARKING STUDY</td>
<td>$3,285 per study plus actual costs for Traffic Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-012</td>
<td>GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT REVIEW</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-013</td>
<td>SPECIFIC PLAN REVIEW</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-014</td>
<td>SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT REVIEW</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-015</td>
<td>SPHERE OF INFLUENCE AMENDMENT</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-016</td>
<td>ANNEXATION REQUEST REVIEW</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-017</td>
<td>CFD ANNEXATION REQUEST REVIEW</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-018</td>
<td>DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT REVIEW</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-019</td>
<td>COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT</td>
<td>$770 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-020</td>
<td>PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT REV</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCE #</td>
<td>CITY SERVICE</td>
<td>CITY/PROPOSED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-Use Industrial - $1,500 Two-Use Mixed - $2,000 Three Use Mixed - $2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amendment: Single-Use Project - $250 Two-Use Project - Three Use -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-022</td>
<td>SMOKY HOLLOW FLOATING ZONE PROC.</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-023</td>
<td>SMOKY HOLLOW SITE PLAN</td>
<td>$2,060 per application - &lt; 15,000 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,180 per application - &gt;= 15,000 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-024</td>
<td>DENSITY BONUS AGREEMENT REVIEW</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-025</td>
<td>ENVIRON. CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION</td>
<td>$130 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-026</td>
<td>ENVIRON INITIAL STUDY/NEG DEC/RECIR</td>
<td>$3,545 per application if prepared only by City staff/Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-027</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT REVIEW</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-028</td>
<td>MITIGATION MONITORING</td>
<td>Minor - $465 per project Major - Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-029</td>
<td>PRECISE PLAN MODIFICATION REVIEW</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-030</td>
<td>TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP REVIEW</td>
<td>$4,475 per map (Any County processing fees are paid directly to the County by the applicant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-031</td>
<td>TENTATIVE TRACT MAP REVIEW</td>
<td>$4,845 per map plus $370 per lot for every lot over 5 (Any County processing fees are paid directly to the County by the applicant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-032</td>
<td>VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP REVIEW</td>
<td>$4,845 per map plus $370 per lot for every lot over 5 (Any County processing fees are paid directly to the County by the applicant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-033</td>
<td>RESUBMITTED MAP REVIEW</td>
<td>$1,135 per map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-034</td>
<td>LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>$1,365 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-035</td>
<td>LOT MERGER</td>
<td>$1,385 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-036</td>
<td>REVERSION TO ACREAGE</td>
<td>$5,245 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-037</td>
<td>CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE REVIEW</td>
<td>$1,510 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-038</td>
<td>RECIPROCAL ACCESS EASEMENT</td>
<td>$1,345 per application plus actual costs for City Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-039</td>
<td>CC&amp;R REVIEW</td>
<td>$1,350 per application plus actual costs for City Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCE #</td>
<td>CITY SERVICE</td>
<td>CITY PROPOSED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-040</td>
<td>HISTORIC RESOURCE NOMINATION REVIEW</td>
<td>$7,195 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-041</td>
<td>ADMIN DETERMINATION - DIR DECISION</td>
<td>$1,110 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-042</td>
<td>ADMIN DETERMINATION - PC DECISION</td>
<td>$1,650 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-043</td>
<td>SIGN PLAN REVIEW</td>
<td>$110 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-044</td>
<td>MASTER SIGN PROGRAM</td>
<td>Minor - $580 per application Major - Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-045</td>
<td>LARGE FAMILY DAY CARE PERMIT</td>
<td>$220 per application plus $100 if a public hearing is requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-046</td>
<td>MOVED BUILDING SITE PLAN REVIEW</td>
<td>$1,030 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-047</td>
<td>ZONING CONFORMANCE LETTER/REVIEW</td>
<td>$745 per letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-048</td>
<td>MODIF. TO DISCRETIONARY APPROVAL</td>
<td>$3,250 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-049</td>
<td>TIME EXTENSION REVIEW</td>
<td>$1,255 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-050</td>
<td>APPEAL TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION</td>
<td>Resident - $1,100 per appeal for 50% cost recovery Non-Resident - $2,200 per appeal for 100% cost recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-051</td>
<td>APPEAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL</td>
<td>Resident - $1,550 per appeal for 50% cost recovery Non-Resident - $3,100 per appeal for 100% cost recovery Inside the Coastal Appeal Zone - No Charge per State law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-052</td>
<td>STREET ADDRESS CHANGE</td>
<td>$545 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-053</td>
<td>GENERAL PLAN MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>10% of all Building &amp; Safety permit fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-054</td>
<td>TEMPORARY USE PERMIT</td>
<td>$745 per application/No fee for special events (including block parties) on properties in the R-1, R-2, and R-3 Zones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-055</td>
<td>ENTERTAINMENT PERMIT</td>
<td>$670 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-056</td>
<td>ADULT USE PLANNING PERMIT</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-057</td>
<td>AMPLIFIED SOUND PERMIT</td>
<td>$110 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-058</td>
<td>ANIMAL PERMIT</td>
<td>$340 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-059</td>
<td>ANIMAL PERMIT RENEWAL</td>
<td>$170 per renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-060</td>
<td>ANIMAL PERMIT APPEAL</td>
<td>Resident - $805 per appeal for 50% cost recovery Non-Resident - $1,610 per appeal for 100% cost recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-061</td>
<td>BUSINESS ZONING CLEARANCE</td>
<td>Home Occupation - $110 per application Other Businesses - $55 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-062</td>
<td>PUBLIC NOTICING</td>
<td>$120 per notice or deposit with actual costs, at the discretion of City staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>City Service</td>
<td>Engineering Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-063</td>
<td>ENCROACHMENT PERMIT</td>
<td>House Sewer Lateral Connection to Existing Sewer Main - $225 House Sewer Connection to Existing Sewer Lateral - $145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-064</td>
<td>EXCAVATION PERMIT</td>
<td>Permit Issuance - $30 Inspection - $2.85 per linear foot of excavation or trench with a minimum of $140 Plan Check - $300 plus performance bond at a level determined by City staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-065</td>
<td>UTILITY STREET CUT PERMIT</td>
<td>Permit Issuance - $30 Inspection - $2.85 per linear foot of excavation or trench with a minimum of $140 Plan Check - $300 plus performance bond at a level determined by City staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-066</td>
<td>ENCROACHMENT LICENSE AGREEMENT</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-067</td>
<td>STREET CLOSURE REVIEW</td>
<td>$215 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-068</td>
<td>NEWSRACK PERMIT</td>
<td>New - $105 per newsrack Annual Renewal - $50 per newsrack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-069</td>
<td>NEWSRACK IMPOUNDMENT</td>
<td>$90 per newsrack + $5 per day for storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-070</td>
<td>FINAL PARCEL MAP CHECK</td>
<td>$665 per map (Any County processing fees are paid directly to the County by the applicant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-071</td>
<td>FINAL TRACT MAP PLAN CHECK</td>
<td>$1,565 or Actuals on 10 or greater lots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-072</td>
<td>FINAL MAP AMENDMENT</td>
<td>$155 per application (Any County processing fees are paid directly to the County by the applicant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-073</td>
<td>PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT PLAN CHECK</td>
<td>Percent of Construction Valuation: $0-$100,000 - 3% $100,001-$500,000 - 2% of the construction value over $100,000 $500,001+ - 1% of the construction value over $500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-074</td>
<td>PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT INSPECTION</td>
<td>Percent of Construction Valuation: $0-$100,000 - 1.5% $100,001-$500,000 - 1% of the construction value over $100,000 $500,001+ - 0.5% of the construction value over $500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-075</td>
<td>CERTIFICATE OF CORRECTION ISSUANCE</td>
<td>$1,505 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-076</td>
<td>RECORD OF SURVEY PLAN CHECK</td>
<td>$382.50 per plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-077</td>
<td>EASEMENT PROCESSING</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-078</td>
<td>QUITCLAIM REVIEW</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-079</td>
<td>SURETY &amp; SUBORDINATION REVIEW</td>
<td>$382 per plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-080</td>
<td>LIEN REMOVAL</td>
<td>$155 per lien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-081</td>
<td>DRAINAGE STUDY REVIEW</td>
<td>Minor - $460 Major - Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-082</td>
<td>STOCKPILE/BORROW SITE PLAN CHECK</td>
<td>$340 per plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-083</td>
<td>MINOR PLAN CHECK REVISION</td>
<td>$305 per sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-084</td>
<td>STREET NAME CHANGE</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCE #</td>
<td>CITY SERVICE</td>
<td>CITY PROPOSED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-085</td>
<td>ALLEY/STREET VACATION REVIEW</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-086</td>
<td>ASSESS. DISTRICT FORMATION RESEARCH</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-087</td>
<td>CITY PROPERTY ACQUISITION PROC.</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-088</td>
<td>WIDE &amp; OVERLOAD PERMIT</td>
<td>Daily - $16 per permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual - $90 per permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fees are set by State Law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-089</td>
<td>BLUEPRINT COPY SERVICE</td>
<td>In House - $2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outside - Actual Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCE#</td>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td>COM/PROPOSED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-090</td>
<td>BUILDING PLAN CHECK SERVICES</td>
<td>See Schedules B-1 and B-2, Attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-091</td>
<td>BUILDING INSPECTION SERVICES</td>
<td>See Schedules B-1 and B-2, Attached</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| S-092     | MAP/PLAN/FILE SCANNING SERVICES  | $1.20 per sheet - 8 1/2" x 11"  
<p>|           |                                  | $1.80 per sheet - larger          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFERENCE #</th>
<th>CITY/SERVICE</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSED FEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-093</td>
<td>ANNUAL BUSINESS FIRE INSPECTION</td>
<td>100,000 - 499,999 square feet - $650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000 - 5,000,000 square feet - $1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-094</td>
<td>ANNUAL BUSINESS FIRE REINSPECTION</td>
<td>100,000 - 499,999 square feet - $200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000 + square feet - $400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-095</td>
<td>ANNUAL FIRE PERMIT</td>
<td>$95 per permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-096</td>
<td>TEMPORARY FIRE PERMIT</td>
<td>$505 per permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-097</td>
<td>FIRE HIGH RISE INSPECTION</td>
<td>$1.02 per 100 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-098</td>
<td>FIRE SPRINKLER PLAN CHECK/INSPECT.</td>
<td>Valuation based on Tables in Appendix B of this Report. These revenues should be in separate revenue accounts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-099</td>
<td>FIRE ALARM PLAN CHECK/INSPECTION</td>
<td>Valuation based on Tables in Appendix B of this Report. These revenues should be in separate revenue accounts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-100</td>
<td>FIRE EXTINGUISHING SYSTEM PC/INSPECTION</td>
<td>Valuation based on Tables in Appendix B of this Report. These revenues should be in separate revenue accounts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-101</td>
<td>FIRE PROTECTION TESTING</td>
<td>$465 per system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-102</td>
<td>STATE MANDATED FIRE INSPECTION</td>
<td>$125 per inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-103</td>
<td>SPECIAL FIRE EQUIP INSPE/APPRAVAL</td>
<td>$775 per request plus any outside costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-104</td>
<td>HAZARDOUS MATERIALS INSPE. PROGRAM</td>
<td>Range I - $382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Range II - $428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Range III - $564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-105</td>
<td>CHEMICAL ACCIDENT RELEASE PREV PROG</td>
<td>100-1,000 Pounds: 1 chemical - $1,370 2 chemicals - $1,825 3+ chemicals - $2,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000-10,000 Pounds: 1 chemical - $1,480 2 chemicals - $2,055 3+ chemicals - $2,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-106</td>
<td>HAZARDOUS WASTE GENERATOR PERMIT</td>
<td>Small (6-19 employees) - $800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate (20-100 employees) - $1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced (101-500 employees) - $1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Permit By Rule - $1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conditional Authorization - $1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conditionally Exempt - $125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large Quantity Generator - $125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-107</td>
<td>NEW INDUSTRIAL WASTE PERMIT/INSPECT</td>
<td>New Permit Application: Sewer - $480 Off-Site - $480 On-Site - $935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Sewer Plan: 1/2 - $570 3/4 - $800 5/6 - $1,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New On-Site Plan: 1/2 - $725 3/4 - $1,010 5/6 - $1,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Off-Site Plan: 1/2 - $625 3/4 - $875 5/6 - $1,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Closure Inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-108</td>
<td>REVISED INDUSTRIAL WASTE PERMIT/INS</td>
<td>Revise Permit Application - $230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revise Sewer Plan: 1/2 - $440 3/4 - $610 5/6 - $950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revise On-Site Plan: 1/2 - $550 3/4 - $780 5/6 - $1,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revise Off-Site Plan: 1/2 - $440 3/4 - $610 5/6 - $950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-109</td>
<td>INDUSTRIAL WASTE ANNUAL INSPECTION</td>
<td>Class 1 - $244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class 2 - $448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class 3 - $732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class 4 - $976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class 5 - $1,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class 6 - $2,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-110</td>
<td>UNDERGROUND TANK PERMIT</td>
<td>Annual Permit Maintenance - $770 plus $140 for each add’l tank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Fee Study Summary
### Schedule - Exhibit A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference #</th>
<th>City Service</th>
<th>City Proposed Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| S-111       | Above Ground Liquid Tank Inspection       | 0-10,000 gallon - $62.50  
10,001-100,000 gallon - $125  
100,001-1,000,000 gallons - $250  
1,000,001 + 10,000,000 gallons - $1,000  
10,000,001-100,000,000 gallon - $5,000  
100,000,001+ gallon - $18,750 |
| S-112       | Review of Risk Management Plan            | Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs. |
| S-113       | Fire Stormwater Inspection                | Restaurant - $165  
Automotive - $165  
1 Acre - $200  
2-5 Acres - $235  
More than 5 Acres - $330 |
| S-114       | Hazardous Materials Response              | Charge the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs. |
| S-115       | New Constr. Fire Re-inspection           | Charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs. |
| S-116       | After-Hours Fire Inspection               | Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs. |
## Fee Study Summary
### Schedule - Exhibit A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFERENCE #</th>
<th>CITY SERVICE</th>
<th>ONY PROPOSED FEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-117</td>
<td>NEW BUSINESS LICENSE PROCESSING</td>
<td>$40 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-118</td>
<td>BUSINESS LICENSE RENEWAL PROCESSING</td>
<td>$40 per renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-119</td>
<td>FILM PERMIT PROCESSING</td>
<td>Permit Application Fee - $640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revision/Rider - $175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Right-of-Way Usage - $750 per day per location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Police Personnel - Actual Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fire Personnel - Actual Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Works Personnel - Actual Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-120</td>
<td>COPY SERVICE</td>
<td>First 5 copies - No Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Each additional copy - $0.20 per copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-121</td>
<td>DOCUMENT CERTIFICATION</td>
<td>$3 per document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-122</td>
<td>VIDEO/AUDIO COPYING</td>
<td>$10 per tape/disk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-123</td>
<td>INITIATIVE PROCESSING</td>
<td>$200 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fee is limited by State Law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
### BUILDING & SAFETY FEE SCHEDULE
### BUILDING PERMIT FEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>CURRENT FEE</th>
<th>PROPOSED FEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESIDENTIAL BUILDING PERMITS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit Under $500 Valuation</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit $501-$2,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$15 + $2 for each $100 over $500</td>
<td>$18 + $2.40 for each $100 over $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit $2,001-$25,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$45 + $9 for each $1,000 over $2,000</td>
<td>$54 + $10.80 for each $1,000 over $2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit $25,001-$50,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$252 + $6.50 for each $1,000 over $25,000</td>
<td>$302.40 + $7.80 for each $1,000 over $25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit $50,001-$100,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$414.50 + $4.50 for each $1,000 over $50,000</td>
<td>$481.80 + $5.40 for each $1,000 over $50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit $100,001-$500,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$639.50 + $3.50 for each $1,000 over $100,000</td>
<td>$751.80 + $4.20 for each $1,000 over $100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit $500,001-$1,000,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$2,039.50 + $3 for each $1,000 over $500,000</td>
<td>$2,431.80 + $3.60 for each $1,000 over $500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit Over $1,000,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$3,539.50 + $2.50 for each $1,000 over $1,000,000</td>
<td>$4,231.80 + $3 for each $1,000 over $1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **RESIDENTIAL BUILDING PLAN CHECK** | | |
| Building Plan Check Under $500 Valuation | $7.50 | $9.00 |
| Building Plan Check $501-$2,000 Valuation | $7.50 + $1 for each $100 over $500 | $9 + $1.20 for each $100 over $500 |
| Building Plan Check $2,001-$25,000 Valuation | $22.50 + $4.50 for each $1,000 over $2,000 | $27 + $5.40 for each $1,000 over $2,000 |
| Building Plan Check $25,001-$50,000 Valuation | $128 + $3.25 for each $1,000 over $25,000 | $151.20 + $3.90 for each $1,000 over $25,000 |
| Building Plan Check $50,001-$100,000 Valuation | $207.25 + $2.25 for each $1,000 over $50,000 | $248.70 + $2.70 for each $1,000 over $50,000 |
| Building Plan Check $100,001-$500,000 Valuation | $319.75 + $1.75 for each $1,000 over $100,000 | $383.70 + $2.10 for each $1,000 over $100,000 |
| Building Plan Check $500,001-$1,000,000 Valuation | $1,019.75 + $1.50 for each $1,000 over $500,000 | $1,223.70 + $1.80 for each $1,000 over $500,000 |
| Building Plan Check Over $1,000,000 Valuation | $1,769.75 + $1.25 for each $1,000 over $1,000,000 | $2,123.70 + $1.50 for each $1,000 over $1,000,000 |
## CITY OF EL SEGUNDO

**BUILDING & SAFETY FEE SCHEDULE**

**BUILDING PERMIT FEES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>CURRENT FEE</th>
<th>PROPOSED FEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NON-RESIDENTIAL BUILDING PERMITS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit Under $500 Valuation</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit $501-$2,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$20 + $3 for each $100 over $500</td>
<td>$24 + $3.60 for each $100 over $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit $2,001-$25,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$65 + $12 for each $1,000 over $2,000</td>
<td>$78 + $14.40 for each $1,000 over $2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit $25,001-$50,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$341 + $9 for each $1,000 over $25,000</td>
<td>$409.20 + $10.80 for each $1,000 over $25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit $50,001-$100,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$566 + $6 for each $1,000 over $50,000</td>
<td>$679.20 + $7.20 for each $1,000 over $50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit $100,001-$500,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$866 + $5 for each $1,000 over $100,000</td>
<td>$1,039.20 + $6 for each $1,000 over $100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit $500,001-$1,000,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$2,866 + $4 for each $1,000 over $500,000</td>
<td>$3,439.20 + $4.80 for each $1,000 over $500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit Over $1,000,000 Valuation</td>
<td>$4,866 + $3 for each $1,000 over $1,000,000</td>
<td>$5,839.20 + $3.60 for each $1,000 over $1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| NON-RESIDENTIAL BUILDING PLAN CHECK |             |              |
| Building Plan Check Under $500 Valuation | $30.80 | $36.96 |
| Building Plan Check $501-$2,000 Valuation | $30.80 + $4.62 for each $100 over $500 | $36.96 + $5.54 for each $100 over $500 |
| Building Plan Check $2,001-$25,000 Valuation | $100.10 + $18.48 for each $1,000 over $2,000 | $120.06 + $22.18 for each $1,000 over $2,000 |
| Building Plan Check $25,001-$50,000 Valuation | $525.14 + $13.86 for each $1,000 over $25,000 | $630.20 + $16.63 for each $1,000 over $25,000 |
| Building Plan Check $50,001-$100,000 Valuation | $871.64 + $9.24 for each $1,000 over $50,000 | $1,045.95 + $11.09 for each $1,000 over $50,000 |
| Building Plan Check $100,001-$500,000 Valuation | $1,333.54 + $7.70 for each $1,000 over $100,000 | $1,600.45 + $9.24 for each $1,000 over $100,000 |
| Building Plan Check $500,001-$1,000,000 Valuation | $4,413.64 + $6.16 for each $1,000 over $500,000 | $5,296.45 + $7.39 for each $1,000 over $500,000 |
| Building Plan Check Over $1,000,000 Valuation | $7,493.64 + $4.62 for each $1,000 over $1,000,000 | $8,991.45 + $5.54 for each $1,000 over $1,000,000 |
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
BUILDING & SAFETY FEE SCHEDULE
BUILDING PERMIT FEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>CURRENT FEE</th>
<th>PROPOSED FEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMBO PERMITS (only applies to Single Family Residential):</td>
<td></td>
<td>8% of the Building Permit Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS:</td>
<td></td>
<td>8% of the Building Permit Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicate Inspection Card</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicate Certificate of Occupancy</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Certificate of Occupancy</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$333 + $10,000 deposit refunded at time of Final C of O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other inspections not specified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime Inspection (4 hour minimum)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Plan Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedited Plan Review in addition to regular Plan Review Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overtime Hourly Rate is 120% of the Regular Hourly Rate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ELECTRICAL PERMITS</strong></th>
<th><strong>Current Fee</strong></th>
<th><strong>RCS Proposed Fee</strong></th>
<th><strong>City Proposed Fee</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permit Issuance</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Permit Issuance</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$21.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Appliances, up to 1 hp</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>$14.00 (SFR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential Appliances, up to 1 hp</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Sign</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$133.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power Apparatus (Ratings in HP, KW, KVA, or KVAR)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 5</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
<td>$114.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-20</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$114.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 50</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$114.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 100</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$114.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 +</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$188.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temporary Power Pole</strong></td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$37.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services, Switchboards, Control Centers, &amp; Panels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 600 volts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 200 amps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$56.00</td>
<td>$28.00 (SFR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-SFR</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$133.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-400 amps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$56.00</td>
<td>$28.00 (SFR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-SFR</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$133.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401-1,200 amps</td>
<td>$36.00</td>
<td>$315.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 1,200 amps</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$315.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greater than 600 volts</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$342.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Switchboards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Section Standing Panel</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Sections</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL PERMITS</td>
<td>Current Fee</td>
<td>RCS Proposed Fee</td>
<td>City Proposed Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 600 Volt Section</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Sections</td>
<td>$55.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptacle, Switch, and Lighting Outlet, per fixture</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td>$3.50 (SFR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting Fixture, per fixture</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td>$3.50 (SFR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pole or Platform Mounted Fixtures, per fixture</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$19.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pool</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$111.00</td>
<td>$55.50 (SFR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meter Change</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$37.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Conduits and Conductors (per 100 linear feet)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspections not specified</td>
<td>Hourly Rate</td>
<td>Hourly Rate</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinspections</td>
<td>Hourly Rate</td>
<td>Hourly Rate</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Hours Inspection (4 hour minimum)</td>
<td>OT Hourly Rate</td>
<td>OT Hourly Rate</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overtime Hourly Rate is 120% of the Regular Hourly Rate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLUMBING PERMITS</th>
<th>Current Fee</th>
<th>RCS Proposed Fee</th>
<th>City Proposed Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permit Issuance</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Permit Issuance</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$21.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing Fixtures and Vents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-SFR</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$27.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair or Alteration of Drainage or Vent Piping</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>$14.00 (SFR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grease Interceptor</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$237.00</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential (per dwelling unit)</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$37.00</td>
<td>$18.50 (SFR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family Residential (per dwelling unit)</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$114.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repipe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential (per dwelling unit)</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$56.00</td>
<td>$28.00 (SFR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family Residential (per dwelling unit)</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$56.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn Sprinklers, Vacuum Breakers, and Backflow Protection Device</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Lawn Sprinkler System per Valve</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Vacuum Breaker or Backflow Protection Device</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backflow Protection Device greater than 6&quot;</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$167.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Each System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2&quot;</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$56.00</td>
<td>$28.00 (SFR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&quot; or more</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$133.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Each Outlet over 5</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>$5.50 (SFR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Heater</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>$14.00 (SFR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar Water Heating system</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$56.00</td>
<td>$28.00 (SFR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-25 linear feet</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>each additional 100 linear feet</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pool</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$83.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Ground Spa</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$37.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>New Fee</td>
<td>Change to Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool/Spa Heater</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$56.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspections not specified</td>
<td>Hourly Rate</td>
<td>Hourly Rate</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinspections</td>
<td>Hourly Rate</td>
<td>Hourly Rate</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Hours Inspection (4 hour minimum)</td>
<td>OT Hourly Rate</td>
<td>OT Hourly Rate</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overtime Hourly Rate is 120% of the Regular Hourly Rate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MECHANICAL PERMITS</th>
<th>Current Fee</th>
<th>RCS Proposed Fee</th>
<th>City Proposed Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permit Issuance</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Permit Issuance</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$21.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced-Air or Gravity-Type Furnace or Burner</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$23.50 (SFR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Furnace - Installation or Relocation</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$37.00</td>
<td>$18.50 (SFR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended/Recessed Wall/Floor Mounted Heater - Install/Reloc</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$37.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireplace</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$76.00</td>
<td>$38.00 (SFR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appliance Vents per each Inlet/Outlet</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>$6.50 (SFR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Handling Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$56.00</td>
<td>$28.00 (SFR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-SFR</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$133.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Register Ventilation Fan</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Venting System</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$37.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood served by Mechanical Exhaust</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$133.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boilers, Compressors, and Absorption Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3 HP or 0-100,000 Btu/h</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$114.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-15 HP or 100,001-500,000 Btu/h</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$133.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-30 HP or 500,001-1,000,000 Btu/h</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$237.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-50 HP or 1,000,001-1,750,000 Btu/h</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$342.00</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+ HP or 1,750,001+ Btu/h</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$447.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incinerator/Kiln</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$56.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alteration to Duct Work not otherwise noted</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$56.00</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspections not specified</td>
<td>Hourly Rate</td>
<td>Hourly Rate</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MECHANICAL PERMITS</td>
<td>Current Fee</td>
<td>RCS Proposed Fee</td>
<td>City Proposed Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinspections</td>
<td>Hourly Rate</td>
<td>Hourly Rate</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Hours Inspection (4 hour minimum)</td>
<td>OT Hourly Rate</td>
<td>OT Hourly Rate</td>
<td>No Change to proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime Hourly Rate is 120% of the Regular Hourly Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consideration and possible action (Public Hearing) regarding the City commissioned Cost Allocation and Fee Study for City services rendered to the public that was performed by Revenue and Cost Specialist, LLC. (Fiscal Impact: $1,014,875)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1) Receive public testimony regarding new schedule for service rates, fees, and charges.
2) Adoption of draft Cost Study Resolution approving proposed new fee schedule effective January 1, 2009.
3) Approval to increase cost allocation fee schedule rates on an annual basis of each fiscal year based on the average percentage over the previous calendar year to the City's cost for administering the services under the City's proposed fee schedule.
4) Approval of annual cost allocation plan maintenance updates by Revenue & Cost Specialist LLC.
5) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

1) Cost Allocation and Fee Study Summary
2) Draft Cost Study Resolution adopting a new fee schedule for recovering costs incurred from providing personal choice services.

FISCAL IMPACT: Included in Adopted Budget

Amount Budgeted: $1,014,875
Additional Appropriation: N/A
Account Number(s):

ORIGINATED BY: Rolf Schleicher, Fiscal Services Manager
REVIEWED BY: Deborah Cullen, Director of Finance
APPROVED BY: Jack Wayt, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

The City had not initiated a comprehensive analysis or increase to fees since 1989. Staff prepared and circulated a Request for Proposal (RFP) to qualified consulting firms experienced in the preparation of cost allocation studies and user fee pricing. The purpose of this study was to identify the actual cost for services and identify the tax subsidy to cover the cost of providing the services related to planning, building, fire and engineering functions.
Based on the technical expertise of submitted proposals, familiarity with the City, knowledge of rules and regulations, experience with comparable local agencies, costs, and presentation, Revenue & Costs Specialist, LLC, was awarded the bid.

The results of the RCS study identified $2,227,564 in tax subsidies and recommended an increase in fees of $1,934,875. City Council requested that staff review all the proposed fee increases and ensure that all fees are reasonable and appropriate. Staff reviewed all proposed fees, and based upon that review, modified various fee categories. The modifications proposed by staff resulted in fee reductions totaling $282,000. Staff further recommended reducing the revenue projection by an additional 20% or $254,000 based on the economic conditions relating to the downturn in housing and commercial development.

Staff recommended implementing the new fee structure beginning January 1, 2009, which reduced the revenue projections by an additional 25% or $423,000. These reductions total $959,000; therefore, the total revenue projection for FY 2008-2009 is $1,014,875. Implementing fees on January 1, 2009, allows time for communication to residents and the development community; provides staff needed time to make changes to the software programs within the City, and meets the minimum 60-day legal requirement to enact new fees.

Council is requested to consider adoption of the Cost Study Resolution which approves the new fee schedule. Staff is also recommending annual increases in the fee schedule based on the BLS CPI-U index. Additionally, Staff requests approval of RCS’s annual maintenance service plan to update administrative cost allocations within the fee schedule.
RESOLUTION NO.________

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING A NEW FEE SCHEDULE FOR RECOVERING COSTS INCURRED FROM PROVIDING VARIOUS PUBLIC SERVICES.

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

SECTION 1: The City Council finds as follows:

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

B. Pursuant to Government Code § 66016, the City made data available regarding the cost, or estimated cost, of providing services for various fees ten (10) days before the public hearing held on October 21, 2008.

C. On October 21, 2008, City Council heard public testimony and considered evidence in a public hearing held and noticed in accordance with Government Code § 66016.

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

SECTION 2: The Fees, attached as Exhibit “A” and incorporated into this Resolution as if fully set forth, are approved and adopted.

SECTION 3: Unless otherwise revised, the fees established by this Resolution will be automatically adjusted on an annual basis at the beginning of each fiscal year based on the average percentage change over the previous calendar year to the City’s costs for administering the services set forth in Exhibit “A.” The first fee adjustment cannot be made before a minimum of ten (10) months after the effective date of this Resolution.

SECTION 4: This Resolution is exempt from review under the California Environmental Quality Act (Cal. Pub. Res. Code §§ 21000, et seq.; “CEQA”) and CEQA regulations (Cal. Code Regs. tit. 14, §§ 15000, et seq.) because it establishes, modifies, structures, restructures, and approves rates and charges for meeting operating expenses; purchasing supplies, equipment, and materials; meeting financial requirements; and obtaining funds for capital projects needed to maintain service within existing service
areas. This Resolution, therefore, is categorically exempt from further CEQA review under Cal. Code Regs. tit. 14, § 15273.

SECTION 5: Pursuant to Government Code § 66017, all fees related to the Planning and Building Safety Department set forth in this Resolution will become effective on January 1, 2009 and will remain effective unless repealed or superseded.

SECTION 6: For all other fees, this Resolution will become effective on January 1, 2009 and will remain effective unless repealed or superseded.

SECTION 7: The City Clerk will certify to the passage and adoption of this Resolution; will enter the same in the book of original Resolutions of said City; and will make a minute of the passage and adoption thereof in the record of proceedings of the City Council of said City, in the minutes of the meeting at which the same is passed and adopted.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 16th day of September 2008.

Kelly McDowell,
Mayor

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

I, Cindy Mortesen, City Clerk of the City of El Segundo, California, hereby certify that the whole number of members of the City Council of the City is five; that the foregoing Resolution No. _________ was duly passed and adopted by said City Council, approved and signed by the Mayor of said City, and attested to by the City Clerk of said City, all at a regular meeting of said Council held on the ___ day of September 2008, and the same was so passed and adopted by the following roll call vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:
ATTEST:

Cindy Mortesen,
City Clerk

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

By:

Karl H. Berger
Assistant City Attorney
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFERENCE #</th>
<th>CITY SERVICE</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSED FEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-001</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE USE PERMIT</td>
<td>$3,345 per application/$1,670 per application (50% fee) for properties in the Downtown Specific Plan Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-002</td>
<td>MINOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT</td>
<td>$3,345 per application/$1,670 per application (50% fee) for properties in the Downtown Specific Plan Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-003</td>
<td>MAJOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT</td>
<td>$6,855 per application/$3,425 per application (50% fee) for properties in the Downtown Specific Plan Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-004</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURAL/DESIGN REVIEW</td>
<td>$450 per application/$225 per application (50% fee) for properties in the Downtown Specific Plan Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-005</td>
<td>VARIANCE REVIEW</td>
<td>$6,855 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-006</td>
<td>ADJUSTMENT REVIEW</td>
<td>$2,570 per application/$1,285 per application (50% fee) for fence height adjustment on properties in the R-1, R-2 and R-3 Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-007</td>
<td>ZONE TEXT AMENDMENT/ZONE CHANGE</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-008</td>
<td>PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW</td>
<td>$3,410 per application. This fee gets the applicant two meetings with staff. Half of this fee will be credited towards any future fees for this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-009</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STUDY REVIEW</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-010</td>
<td>OFF-SITE PARKING COVENANT</td>
<td>$300 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-011</td>
<td>PARKING DEMAND/SHARED PARKING STUDY</td>
<td>$3,285 per study plus actual costs for Traffic Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-012</td>
<td>GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT REVIEW</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-013</td>
<td>SPECIFIC PLAN REVIEW</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-014</td>
<td>SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT REVIEW</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-015</td>
<td>SPHERE OF INFLUENCE AMENDMENT</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-016</td>
<td>ANNEXATION REQUEST REVIEW</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-017</td>
<td>CFD ANNEXATION REQUEST REVIEW</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-018</td>
<td>DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT REVIEW</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-019</td>
<td>COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT</td>
<td>$770 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-020</td>
<td>PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT REV</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCE #</td>
<td>CITY SERVICE</td>
<td>CITY PROPOSED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-021</td>
<td>FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS</td>
<td>In House:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-Use Residential - $750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-Use Commercial - $1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-Use Industrial - $1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two-Use Mixed - $2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Three Use Mixed - $2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amendment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-Use Project - $250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two-Use Project - $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-022</td>
<td>SMOKY HOLLOW FLOATING ZONE PROC.</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-023</td>
<td>SMOKY HOLLOW SITE PLAN</td>
<td>$2,060 per application - &lt; 15,000 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,180 per application - &gt;= 15,000 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-024</td>
<td>DENSITY BONUS AGREEMENT REVIEW</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-025</td>
<td>ENVIRON. CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION</td>
<td>$130 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-026</td>
<td>ENVIRON INITIAL STUDY/NEG DEC/REC/R</td>
<td>$3,545 per application if prepared only by City staff/Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-027</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT REVIEW</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-028</td>
<td>MITIGATION MONITORING</td>
<td>Minor - $465 per project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Major - Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-029</td>
<td>PRECISE PLAN MODIFICATION REVIEW</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-030</td>
<td>TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP REVIEW</td>
<td>$4,475 per map (Any County processing fees are paid directly to the County by the applicant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-031</td>
<td>TENTATIVE TRACT MAP REVIEW</td>
<td>$4,845 per map plus $370 per lot for every lot over 5 (Any County processing fees are paid directly to the County by the applicant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-032</td>
<td>VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP REVIEW</td>
<td>$4,845 per map plus $370 per lot for every lot over 5 (Any County processing fees are paid directly to the County by the applicant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-033</td>
<td>RESUBMITTED MAP REVIEW</td>
<td>$1,135 per map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-034</td>
<td>LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>$1,365 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-035</td>
<td>LOT MERGER</td>
<td>$1,365 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-036</td>
<td>REVERSION TO ACREAGE</td>
<td>$5,245 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-037</td>
<td>CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE REVIEW</td>
<td>$1,510 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-038</td>
<td>RECIPROCAL ACCESS EASEMENT</td>
<td>$1,345 per application plus actual costs for City Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-039</td>
<td>CC&amp;R REVIEW</td>
<td>$1,350 per application plus actual costs for City Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCE #</td>
<td>CITY SERVICE</td>
<td>CITY PROPOSED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-040</td>
<td>HISTORIC RESOURCE NOMINATION REVIEW</td>
<td>$7,195 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-041</td>
<td>ADMIN DETERMINATION - DIR DECISION</td>
<td>$1,110 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-042</td>
<td>ADMIN DETERMINATION - PC DECISION</td>
<td>$1,650 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-043</td>
<td>SIGN PLAN REVIEW</td>
<td>$110 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-044</td>
<td>MASTER SIGN PROGRAM</td>
<td>Minor - $580 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Major - Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-045</td>
<td>LARGE FAMILY DAY CARE PERMIT</td>
<td>$220 per application plus $100 if a public hearing is requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-046</td>
<td>MOVED BUILDING SITE PLAN REVIEW</td>
<td>$1,030 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-047</td>
<td>ZONING CONFORMANCE LETTER/REVIEW</td>
<td>$745 per letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-048</td>
<td>MODIF. TO DISCRETIONARY APPROVAL</td>
<td>$3,250 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-049</td>
<td>TIME EXTENSION REVIEW</td>
<td>$1,255 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-050</td>
<td>APPEAL TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION</td>
<td>Resident - $1,100 per appeal for 50% cost recovery Non-Resident - $2,200 per appeal for 100% cost recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-051</td>
<td>APPEAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL</td>
<td>Resident - $1,550 per appeal for 50% cost recovery Non-Resident - $3,100 per appeal for 100% cost recovery Inside the Coastal Appeal Zone - No Charge per State law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-052</td>
<td>STREET ADDRESS CHANGE</td>
<td>$545 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-053</td>
<td>GENERAL PLAN MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>10% of all Building &amp; Safety permit fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-054</td>
<td>TEMPORARY USE PERMIT</td>
<td>$745 per application/No fee for special events (including block parties) on properties in the R-1, R-2, and R-3 Zones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-055</td>
<td>ENTERTAINMENT PERMIT</td>
<td>$670 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-056</td>
<td>ADULT USE PLANNING PERMIT</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-057</td>
<td>AMPLIFIED SOUND PERMIT</td>
<td>$110 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-058</td>
<td>ANIMAL PERMIT</td>
<td>$340 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-059</td>
<td>ANIMAL PERMIT RENEWAL</td>
<td>$170 per renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-060</td>
<td>ANIMAL PERMIT APPEAL</td>
<td>Resident - $805 per appeal for 50% cost recovery Non-Resident - $1,610 per appeal for 100% cost recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-061</td>
<td>BUSINESS ZONING CLEARANCE</td>
<td>Home Occupation - $110 per application Other Businesses - $55 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-062</td>
<td>PUBLIC NOTICING</td>
<td>$120 per notice or deposit with actual costs, at the discretion of City staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCE #</td>
<td>CITY SERVICE</td>
<td>CITY PROPOSED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| S-063       | ENCROACHMENT PERMIT              | House Sewer Lateral Connection to Existing Sewer Main - $225  
                      | House Sewer Connection to Existing Sewer Lateral - $145  |
| S-064       | EXCAVATION PERMIT                | Permit Issuance - $30  
                      | Inspection - $2.85 per linear foot of excavation or trench with a minimum of $140  
                      | Plan Check - $300  
                      | plus performance bond at a level determined by City staff |
| S-065       | UTILITY STREET CUT PERMIT        | Permit Issuance - $30  
                      | Inspection - $2.85 per linear foot of excavation or trench with a minimum of $140  
                      | Plan Check - $300  
                      | plus performance bond at a level determined by City staff |
| S-066       | ENCROACHMENT LICENSE AGREEMENT   | Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs. |
| S-067       | STREET CLOSURE REVIEW            | $215 per application                                                             |
| S-068       | NEWSRACK PERMIT                  | New - $105 per newsrack  
                      | Annual Renewal - $50 per newsrack                                                |
| S-069       | NEWSRACK IMPOUNDMENT             | $90 per newsrack + $5 per day for storage                                        |
| S-070       | FINAL PARCEL MAP CHECK           | $665 per map  
                      | (Any County processing fees are paid directly to the County by the applicant)    |
| S-071       | FINAL TRACT MAP PLAN CHECK       | $1,565 or Actuals on 10 or greater lots.                                          |
| S-072       | FINAL MAP AMENDMENT              | $155 per application  
                      | (Any County processing fees are paid directly to the County by the applicant)    |
| S-073       | PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT PLAN CHECK    | Percent of Construction Valuation:  
                      | $0-$100,000 - 3%  
                      | $100,001-$500,000 - 2% of the construction value over $100,000  
                      | $500,001+ - 1% of the construction value over $500,000 |
| S-074       | PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT INSPECTION    | Percent of Construction Valuation:  
                      | $0-$100,000 - 1.5%  
                      | $100,001-$500,000 - 1% of the construction value over $100,000  
                      | $500,001+ - 0.5% of the construction value over $500,000 |
| S-075       | CERTIFICATE OF CORRECTION ISSUANCE | $1,505 per application  
                      | Record of Survey Plan Check - $382.50 per plan                                     |
| S-077       | EASEMENT PROCESSING              | Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs. |
| S-078       | QUITCLAIM REVIEW                 | $382 per plan                                                                   |
| S-079       | SURETY & SUBORDINATION REVIEW    | $382 per plan                                                                   |
| S-080       | LIEN REMOVAL                     | $155 per lien                                                                   |
| S-081       | DRAINAGE STUDY REVIEW            | Minor - $480  
<pre><code>                  | Major - Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs. |
</code></pre>
<p>| S-082       | STOCKPILE/BORROW SITE PLAN CHECK  | $340 per plan                                                                   |
| S-083       | MINOR PLAN CHECK REVISION        | $305 per sheet                                                                  |
| S-084       | STREET NAME CHANGE               | Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFERENCE #</th>
<th>CITY SERVICE</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSED FEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-085</td>
<td>ALLEY/STREET VACATION REVIEW</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-086</td>
<td>ASSESS. DISTRICT FORMATION RESEARCH</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-087</td>
<td>CITY PROPERTY ACQUISITION PROC.</td>
<td>Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-088</td>
<td>WIDE &amp; OVERLOAD PERMIT</td>
<td>Daily - $16 per permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual - $90 per permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fees are set by State Law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-089</td>
<td>BLUEPRINT COPY SERVICE</td>
<td>In House - $2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outside - Actual Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCE #</td>
<td>CITY SERVICE</td>
<td>CITY PROPOSED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-090</td>
<td>BUILDING PLAN CHECK SERVICES</td>
<td>See Schedule B-2: Attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-091</td>
<td>BUILDING INSPECTION SERVICES</td>
<td>See Schedule B-2: Attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-092</td>
<td>MAP/PLAN/FILE SCANNING SERVICES</td>
<td>No Change to RCS Proposed Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCE #</td>
<td>CITY SERVICE</td>
<td>CITY PROPOSED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-093</td>
<td>ANNUAL BUSINESS FIRE INSPECTION</td>
<td>100,000 - 499,999 square feet - $650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000 - 5,000,000 square feet - $1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-094</td>
<td>ANNUAL BUSINESS FIRE REINSPECTION</td>
<td>100,000 - 499,999 square feet - $200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000 + square feet - $400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-095</td>
<td>ANNUAL FIRE PERMIT</td>
<td>$95 per permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-096</td>
<td>TEMPORARY FIRE PERMIT</td>
<td>$505 per permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-097</td>
<td>FIRE HIGH RISE INSPECTION</td>
<td>$1.02 per 100 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-098</td>
<td>FIRE SPRINKLER PLAN CHECK/INSPECT.</td>
<td>Valuation based on Tables in Appendix B of this Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>These revenues should be in separate revenue accounts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-099</td>
<td>FIRE ALARM PLAN CHECK/INSPECTION</td>
<td>Valuation based on Tables in Appendix B of this Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>These revenues should be in separate revenue accounts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-100</td>
<td>FIRE EXTINGUISHING SYSTEM PC/INSP</td>
<td>Valuation based on Tables in Appendix B of this Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>These revenues should be in separate revenue accounts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-101</td>
<td>FIRE PROTECTION TESTING</td>
<td>$465 per system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-102</td>
<td>STATE MANDATED FIRE INSPECTION</td>
<td>$125 per inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-103</td>
<td>SPECIAL FIRE EQUIP INSPECTION/APPROVAL</td>
<td>$775 per request plus any outside costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-104</td>
<td>HAZARDOUS MATERIALS INSPECTION/PROGRAM</td>
<td>Range I - $382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Range II - $428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Range III - $564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-105</td>
<td>CHEMICAL ACCIDENT RELEASE PREV PROG</td>
<td>100-1,000 Pounds:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 chemical - $1,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 chemicals - $1,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3+ chemicals - $2,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000-10,000 Pounds:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 chemical - $1,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 chemicals - $2,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3+ chemicals - $2,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-106</td>
<td>HAZARDOUS WASTE GENERATOR PERMIT</td>
<td>Small (5-19 employees) - $300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate (20-100 employees) - $1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced (101-500 employees) - $1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Permit By Rule - $1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conditional Authorization - $1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conditionally Exempt - $125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large Quantity Generator - $125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-107</td>
<td>NEW INDUSTRIAL WASTE PERMIT/INSPECT</td>
<td>New Permit Application: Sewer - $480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Off-Site - $480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On-Site - $935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-108</td>
<td>REVISED INDUSTRIAL WASTE PERMIT/INS</td>
<td>Revise Permit Application: $230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revise Sewer Plan: 1/2 - $440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/4 - $610 5/6 - $1,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revise On-Site Plan: 1/2 - $550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/4 - $760 5/6 - $1,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-109</td>
<td>INDUSTRIAL WASTE ANNUAL INSPECTION</td>
<td>Class 1 - $244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class 2 - $448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class 3 - $722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class 4 - $976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class 5 - $1,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class 6 - $2,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-110</td>
<td>UNDERGROUND TANK PERMIT</td>
<td>Annual Permit Maintenance - $770 plus $140 for each add'l tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCE #</td>
<td>CITY SERVICE</td>
<td>CITY PROPOSED FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| S-111      | ABOVE GROUND LIQUID TANK INSPECTION       | 0-10,000 gallon - $62.50  
10,001-100,000 gallon - $125  
100,001,000,000 gallons - $250  
1,000,001 + 10,000,000 gallons - $1,000  
10,000,001-100,000,000 gallon - $5,000  
100,000,001+ gallon - $18,750 |
| S-112      | REVIEW OF RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN            | Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs. |
| S-113      | FIRE STORMWATER INSPECTION                | Restaurant - $165  
Automotive - $165  
1 Acre - $200  
2-5 Acres - $235  
More than 5 Acres - $330 |
<p>| S-114      | HAZARDOUS MATERIALS RESPONSE              | Charge the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs. |
| S-115      | NEW CONST. FIRE RE-INSPECTION             | Charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs. |
| S-116      | AFTER-HOURS FIRE INSPECTION              | Deposit determined by staff with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved plus any outside or contract costs. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFERENCE #</th>
<th>CITY SERVICE</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSED FEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-117</td>
<td>NEW BUSINESS LICENSE PROCESSING</td>
<td>$40 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-118</td>
<td>BUSINESS LICENSE RENEWAL PROCESSING</td>
<td>$40 per renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-119</td>
<td>FILM PERMIT PROCESSING</td>
<td>Permit Application Fee - $640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revision/Rider - $175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Right-of-Way Usage - $750 per day per location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Police Personnel - Actual Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fire Personnel - Actual Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Works Personnel - Actual Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-120</td>
<td>COPY SERVICE</td>
<td>First 5 copies - No Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Each additional copy - $0.20 per copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-121</td>
<td>DOCUMENT CERTIFICATION</td>
<td>$3 per document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-122</td>
<td>VIDEO/AUDIO COPYING</td>
<td>$10 per tape/disk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-123</td>
<td>INITIATIVE PROCESSING</td>
<td>$200 per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fee is limited by State Law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action regarding recommendations from the Downtown Committee to approve the design and specifications for the Downtown El Segundo way finding signage plan. (Fiscal Impact: $110,000.00)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
1) Approve the design and specifications for the Downtown El Segundo way finding signage plan.
2) Adopt plans and specifications for the Downtown El Segundo way finding signage plan.
3) Authorize staff to advertise the plan for competitive bids.
4) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
Wayfinding Signage Bid and Specifications developed by Ryder Communications.

FISCAL IMPACT: Included in Adopted Budget
Amount Budgeted: $110,000.00
Additional Appropriation: No
Account Number(s): 001-400-2901-6201

ORIGINATED BY: Lauren Mahakian, Senior Administrative Analyst
REVIEWED BY: Dana Greenwood, Public Works Director
APPROVED BY: Jack Wayt, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:
In May 2008, the City Council approved the Downtown Committee’s recommendation to develop a plan for the design, fabrication and placement of Downtown El Segundo way finding signage. The intent of this plan is to create attractive signage that directs visitors from the main thoroughfares that pass through El Segundo into the downtown business area. Specific attention is focused on Sepulveda Blvd., Imperial Hwy., El Segundo Blvd., and Vista del Mar, as the principal high volume traffic corridors.

The proposed signage plan consists of 57 signs including: four (4) Welcome to Downtown El Segundo signs, 44 directional signs, and nine (9) public parking signs. Signs will mount to 4” diameter aluminum poles, except where existing light poles are available.
Welcome signs will be located at the four main entrances to Downtown El Segundo: Main Street at El Segundo Blvd., Grand Ave. at Concord, Main St. at Mariposa, and Grand Ave. at Eucalyptus. Each of these signs will be 4 feet in width and will sit 10 feet in height from the ground in a visible and prominent position.

Directional signage will run north and south along Sepulveda Blvd., Main St. and Vista del Mar. Traveling east and west, signage will be located along El Segundo Blvd., Grand Ave., Mariposa and Imperial Hwy. The signage is in two (2), three (3) and four (4) line listings that include combinations of the following: Civic Center, Public Parking, Downtown, Police / Fire, Recreation Park, and Library. Signs located along Sepulveda Blvd., Vista del Mar, and Imperial Hwy. will be 4' wide. All others will be 3' wide. To assist traffic entering from Sepulveda Blvd., additional signage will be placed along El Segundo Blvd., Grand Ave., and Imperial Hwy, within 100' to the west of Sepulveda Blvd.

Distinctive parking signs that match other way finding signs will be posted at the entrance of the four public parking lots, the parking structure located within the downtown area, and the two parking lots adjacent to the Recreation Park. The parking structure will have two (2) types of signs attached to the front entrance; halo style pin letters over the driveway and an illuminated 4’ translucent box that sits perpendicular to the face of the structure on the west column.
SIGN #
A1-01

SIGN FACES:
West

LOCATION:
On Grand center median
9' east of Concord

SIGN TYPE:
Secondary Gateway

SIGN MESSAGE:
Welcome to
Downtown El Segundo

NOTES:
• 4' wide signage

SIGN #
A1-02

SIGN FACES:
East

LOCATION:
9' west of beginning of center divider on Grand
west of Eucalyptus

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
Welcome to
Downtown El Segundo

NOTES:
• 4' wide signage
SIGN #
A1-03

SIGN FACES:
North

LOCATION:
On Main, west side (Center of curbside planted area)
39’ south of Mariposa

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
Welcome to Downtown El Segundo

NOTES:
• 4’ wide signage

SIGN #
A1-04

SIGN FACES:
South

LOCATION:
On Main, east side
54’ north of El Segundo Blvd

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
Welcome to Downtown El Segundo

NOTES:
• 4’ wide signage
SIGN #
B1-01

SIGN FACES:
East

LOCATION:
On Grand Ave., north side
6' east of first driveway
east of Main

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
→ Police
→ Fire

NOTES:
• 3" wide signage

SIGN #
B1-02

SIGN FACES:
North/South, back to back

LOCATION:
On Main, west side,
51' north of fire dept. driveway

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
→ Police
→ Fire

NOTES:
• 3" wide signage
SIGN #
B2-01

SIGN FACES:
East

LOCATION:
On El Segundo Blvd., north side
120' East of Eucalyptus

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
→ Recreation
→ Public Parking

NOTES:
• 3' wide signage

SIGN #
B2-02

SIGN FACES:
West

LOCATION:
On El Segundo Blvd., south side
18' east of Chevron Gate 2
west of Eucalyptus

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
← Recreation
← Public Parking

NOTES:
• 3' wide signage
SIGN #  
B2-03

SIGN FACES:
East

LOCATION:
On Grand, north side
36' east of Eucalyptus

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
→ Recreation
→ Public Parking

NOTES:
• Replace existing sign and pole
• 3' wide signage

SIGN #  
B2-04

SIGN FACES:
South

LOCATION:
On Eucalyptus, east side
105' south of Grand

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
↑ Recreation
↑ Public Parking

NOTES:
• 3' wide signage
SIGN #
B3-01

SIGN FACES:
South

LOCATION:
On Main, east side
114' south of Pine

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
↑ Library
→ Recreation

NOTES:
• 3' wide signage

SIGN #
B4-01

SIGN FACES:
South

LOCATION:
On Main, east side
102' south of Mariposa

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
← Library
← Public Parking

NOTES:
• 3' wide signage
SIGN #
C1-01

SIGN FACES:
North

LOCATION:
On Sepulveda, west side
198’ north of Mariposa

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
↑ Civic Center
↑ Public Parking
↑ Downtown

NOTES:
• Existing pole
• 4’ wide signage

SIGN #
C1-02

SIGN FACES:
North

LOCATION:
On Sepulveda, west side
120’ north of Grand

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
→ Civic Center
→ Public Parking
→ Downtown

NOTES:
• 4’ wide signage
SIGN #
C1-03

SIGN FACES:
East

LOCATION:
On Grand, north side
114° east of Sepulveda

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
↑ Civic Center
↑ Public Parking
↑ Downtown

NOTES:
• 4’ wide signage

SIGN #
C1-04

SIGN FACES:
South

LOCATION:
On Sepulveda, center median
2nd light pole south of Grand

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
← Civic Center
← Public Parking
← Downtown

NOTES:
• Existing pole
• 4’ wide signage
SIGN #
C1-05

SIGN FACES:
East

LOCATION:
On El Segundo Blvd., north side
66' east of Illinois

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
↑ Civic Center
↑ Public Parking
↑ Downtown

NOTES:
• 3' wide signage

SIGN #
C1-06

SIGN FACES:
East

LOCATION:
On Mariposa, north side
96' east of Center

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
↑ Civic Center
↑ Public Parking
↑ Downtown

NOTES:
• 3' wide signage
SIGN #
C1-07

SIGN FACES:
North

LOCATION:
On Sepulveda, west side
108’ north of El Segundo Blvd.

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
→ Civic Center
→ Public Parking
→ Downtown

NOTES:
• Existing pole
• 4’ wide signage

SIGN #
C1-08

SIGN FACES:
East

LOCATION:
On El Segundo Blvd., north side
30’ east of Lomita

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
↑ Civic Center
↑ Public Parking
↑ Downtown

NOTES:
• 3’ wide signage
SIGN #
C1-09

SIGN FACES:
East

LOCATION:
On Grand, center median
18' east of 1st light pole
west of Eucalyptus

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
↑ Civic Center
↑ Public Parking
↑ Downtown

NOTES:
• 3' wide signage

SIGN #
C1-10

SIGN FACES:
South East

LOCATION:
On Pine, north side
15' west of Eucalyptus

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
↑ Civic Center
↑ Public Parking
↑ Downtown

NOTES:
• Replace existing pole and sign
• 3' wide signage
SIGN #
C1-11

SIGN FACES:
West

LOCATION:
On Imperial Hwy., south side, west of Main
30' west of end of stone wall

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
→ Civic Center
→ Public Parking
→ Downtown

NOTES:
• 4' wide signage

SIGN #
C1-12

SIGN FACES:
West

LOCATION:
On El Segundo Blvd., south side
30' east of Virginia

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
↑ Civic Center
↑ Public Parking
↑ Downtown

NOTES:
• 3' wide signage
SIGN #
C1-13

SIGN FACES:
East

LOCATION:
On Mariposa, north side
57' west of 1st driveway
east of Sepulveda

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
↑ Civic Center
↑ Public Parking
↑ Downtown

NOTES:
• 4' wide signage

SIGN #
C1-14

SIGN FACES:
North

LOCATION:
On Sepulveda, west side
24' south of 909 Sepulveda parking - garage entrance
(south of Imperial)

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
↑ Civic Center
↑ Public Parking
↑ Downtown

NOTES:
• 4' wide signage
SIGN #
C1-15

SIGN FACES:
South

LOCATION:
On Sepulveda, east side, 4th light pole south of El Segundo Blvd.
160 Sepulveda

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
← Civic Center
← Public Parking
← Downtown

NOTES:
• Existing pole
• 4' wide signage

SIGN #
C1-16

SIGN FACES:
East

LOCATION:
On Imperial Hwy., center median
225' east of Main

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
← Civic Center
← Public Parking
← Downtown

NOTES:
• 4' wide signage
• Replace existing pole
**SIGN #**

**C1-17**

**SIGN FACES:**
East

**LOCATION:**
On Imperial Hwy., center median at Main

**SIGN TYPE:**
Primary Directional

**SIGN MESSAGE:**
← Civic Center
← Public Parking
← Downtown

**NOTES:**
- 4' wide signage
- Replace existing sign

---

**SIGN #**

**C1-18**

**SIGN FACES:**
West

**LOCATION:**
On Imperial Hwy., south side
Adjacent to 512 Imperial Ave.

**SIGN TYPE:**
Primary Directional

**SIGN MESSAGE:**
↑ Civic Center
↑ Public Parking
↑ Downtown

**NOTES:**
- 4' wide signage
SIGN #
C1-19

SIGN FACES:
East

LOCATION:
On El Segundo Blvd., north side
120' east of Sepulveda

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
↑ Civic Center
↑ Public Parking
↑ Downtown

NOTES:
• 4’ wide signage

SIGN #
C1-20

SIGN FACES:
West

LOCATION:
On Imperial Hwy., south side
126' east of Hyperian Gate A

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
↑ Civic Center
↑ Public Parking
↑ Downtown

NOTES:
• 4’ wide signage
SIGN #
C1-21

SIGN FACES:
East

LOCATION:
On Imperial Hwy., center median
93' east of Sepulveda

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
← Civic Center
← Public Parking
← Downtown

NOTES:
• 4' wide signage

SIGN #
C1-22

SIGN FACES:
North

LOCATION:
On Vista del Mar, west side
288' north of Grand

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
← Civic Center
← Public Parking
← Downtown

NOTES:
• Existing pole
• 4' wide signage
SIGN #
C1-23

SIGN FACES:
North

LOCATION:
On Vista del Mar, west side
75' north of Imperial Hwy

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
← Civic Center
← Public Parking
← Downtown

NOTES:
• 4' wide signage

SIGN #
C1-24

SIGN FACES:
South

LOCATION:
On Vista del Mar, east side
204' south of Grand

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
→ Civic Center
→ Public Parking
→ Downtown

NOTES:
• 4' wide signage
**SIGN # C2-01**

**SIGN FACES:**
North

**LOCATION:**
On Main, west side
150’ north of Mariposa

**SIGN TYPE:**
Primary Directional

**SIGN MESSAGE:**
↑ Police
↑ Fire
→ Library

**NOTES:**
• Existing pole
• 3’ wide signage

---

**SIGN # D1-01**

**SIGN FACES:**
North/South, back to back

**LOCATION:**
On Main, west side
60’ south of Mariposa

**SIGN TYPE:**
Primary Directional

**SIGN MESSAGE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign facing North</th>
<th>Sign facing South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>![P] Public Parking</td>
<td>![P] Public Parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
• Double-sided sign
• 3’ wide signage
SIGN #
D1-02

SIGN FACES:
East/West back to back

LOCATION:
On Pine, south side
11’ west of Guaymas

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
Sign facing East

P
← Public Parking

Sign facing West

P
→ Public Parking

NOTES:
• Double-sided sign
• 3’ wide signage

SIGN #
D1-03

SIGN FACES:
North/South, back to back

LOCATION:
On Eucalyptus, west side
28’ north of Grand

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
Sign facing North

P
→ Public Parking

Sign facing South

P
← Public Parking

NOTES:
• Replace existing sign and pole
• Double-sided sign
• 3’ wide signage
SIGN #
D1-04

SIGN FACES:
North/South, back to back

LOCATION:
On Richmond, east side
99' north of Franklin

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
Sign facing North
P
← Public Parking

Sign facing South
P
→ Public Parking

NOTES:
• Double-sided sign
• 3' wide signage

SIGN #
D1-05

SIGN FACES:
North/South, back to back

LOCATION:
On Eucalyptus, east side
81' north of Grand

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
Sign facing North
P
← Public Parking

Sign facing South
P
→ Public Parking

NOTES:
• Double-sided sign
• 3' wide signage
SIGN #
D1-06

SIGN FACES:
East/West, back to back

LOCATION:
On Grand, center median
7' east of Richmond

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
Sign facing East  Sign facing West

← Public Parking  → Public Parking

NOTES:
• Existing pole
• Remove existing sign
• Double-sided sign
• 3' wide signage

SIGN #
D1-07

SIGN FACES:
North/South, back to back

LOCATION:
On Main, north side of parking lot driveway
at 418 - 420 Main

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
Sign facing North  Sign facing South

← Public Parking  → Public Parking

NOTES:
• Double-sided sign
• 3' wide signage
SIGN #
D1-08

SIGN FACES:
South

LOCATION:
On Grand, north side
Parking structure near Richmond

SIGN TYPE:
Halo Lighted Letters

SIGN MESSAGE:
PUBLIC PARKING

NOTES:
• 1" high Pin Letters
• Replace existing sign

SIGN #
D1-09

SIGN FACES:
East/West, back to back

LOCATION:
On Grand, north side
Parking structure near Richmond

SIGN TYPE:
Illuminated Parking Sign

SIGN MESSAGE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign facing East</th>
<th>Sign facing West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>→ Public Parking</td>
<td>← Public Parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
• Attached to column
• 4" wide signage
SIGN #
E1-01

SIGN FACES:
South

LOCATION:
On Main, east side
140' south of Grand

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
↑ Police
↑ Fire
↑ Library
← Public Parking

NOTES:
• Existing pole
• Remove existing sign
• 3' wide signage

SIGN #
E2-01

SIGN FACES:
West

LOCATION:
On Grand, south side
111' west of Virginia

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
↑ Civic Center
↑ Public Parking
↑ Downtown
↑ Recreation

NOTES:
• 3' wide signage
SIGN #
E2-02

SIGN FACES:
North

LOCATION:
On Main, west side
90' north of Pine
Adjacent “Banner Pole” in planted area

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
↑ Civic Center
↑ Public Parking
↑ Downtown
← Recreation

NOTES:
• 3' wide signage

SIGN #
E3-01

SIGN FACES:
North

LOCATION:
On Main, west side (763 Main)
42' south of Maple

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
↑ Civic Center
↑ Public Parking
↑ Downtown
↑ Library

NOTES:
• 3' wide signage
SIGN #
E3-02

SIGN FACES:
East

LOCATION:
On Mariposa, north side
120’ east of Main

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
← Civic Center
← Public Parking
← Downtown
↑ Library

NOTES:
• Existing light pole
• 3’ wide signage

SIGN #
E4-01

SIGN FACES:
West

LOCATION:
On El Segundo Blvd., south side
30’ west of stop sign at Main

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
← Civic Center
← Public Parking
← Downtown
← Police / Fire

NOTES:
• 3’ wide signage
SIGN #: E4-02

SIGN FACES:
East

LOCATION:
On El Segundo Blvd., north side
57' east of Main

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
- Civic Center
- Public Parking
- Downtown
- Police / Fire

NOTES:
- Replace existing pole and sign
- 3' wide signage

SIGN #: E4-03

SIGN FACES:
West

LOCATION:
On Grand., south side
33' west of Main

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
<- Civic Center
<- Public Parking
<- Downtown
<- Police / Fire

NOTES:
- Replace existing pole and sign
- 3' wide signage
SIGN #
E4-04

SIGN FACES:
East

LOCATION:
On Grand, north side
111' west of Lomita

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
↑ Civic Center
↑ Public Parking
↑ Downtown
↑ Police / Fire

NOTES:
• 3' wide signage

SIGN #
E4-05

SIGN FACES:
East

LOCATION:
On Grand, north side
186' west of crosswalk at California

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
↑ Civic Center
↑ Public Parking
↑ Downtown
↑ Police / Fire

NOTES:
• Existing light pole
• 3' wide signage
SIGN #
E4-06

SIGN FACES:
North

LOCATION:
On Main, west side
Grass strip by curb at 935 Main

SIGN TYPE:
Primary Directional

SIGN MESSAGE:
↑ Civic Center
↑ Public Parking
↑ Downtown
↑ Police / Fire

NOTES:
• 3’ wide signage
This attachment is available in the City Clerk's Office for review in 11.5 by 17.
16. WARRANTY

16.1 Application of Warranties

The warranties provided in this section are intended to cover any defects in materials, workmanship, and performance of the Product. These warranties do not cover ordinary wear and tear, or damage caused by misuse or abuse of the Product.

16.2 Exclusions

These warranties do not apply to any defects or damage caused by factors outside the control of the Seller, including but not limited to: acts of God, unreasonable use, neglect, improper installation, or modification of the Product. The Seller shall not be liable for any incidental or consequential damages arising from the use or inability to use the Product.

17. MATERIAL HANDLING

17.1 General

Material handling procedures shall be followed as specified in the Product Manual. All materials shall be handled in accordance with applicable safety and handling procedures.

17.2 Hazardous Materials

If the Product contains hazardous materials, the installer shall comply with all applicable regulations and guidelines for handling, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials.

17.3 Contract Documents

Any contract documents or specifications shall be considered part of this specification and shall be followed to the extent necessary to meet the requirements of the Project.

18. QUALITY ASSURANCE

18.1 Project Conditions

The conditions on the site shall be considered part of this specification and shall be followed to the extent necessary to meet the requirements of the Project.

18.2 Material Testing

All materials shall be tested and approved by the Seller prior to installation. Any testing performed by the Installer shall be done in accordance with the procedures specified in the Product Manual.

18.3 Inspections

Regular inspections shall be conducted during installation to ensure compliance with all applicable codes and specifications.

18.4 Acceptance

Acceptance of the Product shall be based on compliance with all applicable specifications and the successful completion of all necessary testing and inspections.
10' INSTALLATION-
GENERAL

A. All work performed by ODC shall be at the Contractor's expense. If the Contractor's work and/or materials are not in accordance with the drawings and specifications, the Contractor shall be responsible for the errors, omissions, or defects.

B. The Contractor shall provide all labor, materials, and equipment necessary to complete the work. The Contractor shall be responsible for obtaining all necessary permits and approvals from the appropriate authorities.

C. The Contractor shall ensure that all work is performed in a safe and workmanlike manner. The Contractor shall take all necessary precautions to prevent injury to persons or damage to property.

D. The Contractor shall be responsible for the proper storage and disposal of all materials and waste.

E. The Contractor shall be responsible for all costs and expenses incurred in connection with the work.

F. The Contractor shall be responsible for the proper installation and testing of all equipment.

G. The Contractor shall be responsible for the proper operation and maintenance of all equipment.

H. The Contractor shall be responsible for the proper disposal of all waste materials.

I. The Contractor shall be responsible for the proper removal of all equipment at the end of the project.

J. The Contractor shall be responsible for the proper documentation of all work performed.

K. The Contractor shall be responsible for the proper warranty of all work performed.

L. The Contractor shall be responsible for the proper insurance coverage for all work performed.

M. The Contractor shall be responsible for the proper cleanup of the site at the completion of the project.

N. The Contractor shall be responsible for the proper coordination with all other trades.

O. The Contractor shall be responsible for the proper training of all employees.

P. The Contractor shall be responsible for the proper scheduling of all work.

Q. The Contractor shall be responsible for the proper quality control of all work performed.

R. The Contractor shall be responsible for the proper safety program for all work performed.

S. The Contractor shall be responsible for the proper project management for all work performed.

T. The Contractor shall be responsible for the proper project closeout for all work performed.

U. The Contractor shall be responsible for the proper project closeout for all work performed.

V. The Contractor shall be responsible for the proper project closeout for all work performed.

W. The Contractor shall be responsible for the proper project closeout for all work performed.

X. The Contractor shall be responsible for the proper project closeout for all work performed.

Y. The Contractor shall be responsible for the proper project closeout for all work performed.

Z. The Contractor shall be responsible for the proper project closeout for all work performed.
SIDE DETAIL

TOP DETAIL

3" WIDE 3 LINES

15 - SIGN TYPE C MOUNTING DETAILS
3. WIDE PARKING

SIDE DETAIL

1/4" GAUGE STAINLESS STEEL STRAPPING WITH CLAMP

MINIMUM 3 PER PANEL

TOP DETAIL

NOTE: PROVIDE STAINLESS STEEL SHEETING

1/2" THICK RIGID CORE ALUMINUM PANEL

STAINLESS STEEL CHANNEL

EXTENSION PAINTED TO MATCH

EXTENSION FOOT WITH WAFFLES

19 - SIGN TYPE D MOUNTING DETAILS
SIDE DETAIL

TOP DETAIL

2 1/8 THICK ALUMINUM HEAT MAST

2 1/8 THICK ALUMINUM HEAT MAST

BOLT - FLUSH ALUMINUM HEAT MAST

BOLT - FLUSH ALUMINUM HEAT MAST

STAINLESS STEEL ANGLE CLAMP

STAINLESS STEEL ANGLE CLAMP

SHEET METAL ANGLE ALUMINUM

SHEET METAL ANGLE ALUMINUM

FLANGE WITH PAINTED SURFACE ON ALL SIDES

FLANGE WITH PAINTED SURFACE ON ALL SIDES

FACE W/GANGE EXTENDED VERS. ALLOY TO TOP ALUMINUM HEAT MAST

FACE W/GANGE EXTENDED VERS. ALLOY TO TOP ALUMINUM HEAT MAST

3 - WIDE 4 LINES

23 - SIGN TYPE E MOUNTING DETAILS
24 - SIGN LAYOUT AND COLORS
EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA STATEMENT: Agenda Heading: Reports of Committees, Commissions and Boards

AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action regarding the El Segundo Senior Housing Board's request to initiate the process for Park Vista Senior Housing facility to become smoke free by January 1, 2010 and for all common areas to be smoke free immediately. (Fiscal Impact: None)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
(1) Consider the item and provide direction to staff. (2) Alternatively discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
Attachment A: Letter from Park Vista Resident, Steve Haxton

FISCAL IMPACT: None

Amount Budgeted: $0
Additional Appropriation: N/A
Account Number(s): None

ORIGINATED BY: El Segundo Senior Housing Board, Sept. 24, 2008
REVIEWED BY: Judy Andoe, Interim Recreation and Parks Director
APPROVED BY: Jack Wayt, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:
At the August 27, 2008, El Segundo Senior Housing Board meeting several residents from Park Vista spoke regarding the Non-Smoking agenda item before the Board. Many residents spoke in favor of the ban. None were recorded in favor of continuing as a smoking facility. The Senior Housing Board voted unanimously as follows: "That as soon as possible, all interior and exterior common areas in this building are to be smoke free, that immediately and thereafter all vacated units are to be smoke free and that by January 1, 2010 the entire building is to be smoke free".

Specifically, the Sr. Housing Board identified the following areas as facility common areas and recommended they become no smoking areas effective immediately: all apartment balconies, concrete apron surrounding the building, hallways, the main lobby, the laundry area and garages. The apartment balconies were recommended due to the close quarters of the balconies in relation to neighbor’s balconies and windows.

It was further recommended that new applicants to the facility be told of the new no smoking policy and that new tenants not be allowed to smoke in their apartments. All
current smokers are able to smoke in their apartments until Dec. 31, 2010. However, beginning Jan. 1, 2010, all smoking must take place outside the facility.

Should City Council approve the recommendation, the Board will notify all prospective residents of the non-smoking policy and have the house rules reflect said policy.
Attachment A

From: S Haxton [mailto:steve_lawlib@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 01, 2008 1:35 PM
To: Bill Fisher; Jacobson, Carl (Council Member); Brann, Don (Council Member); Busch, Eric (Mayor Pro Tem); McDowell, Kelly (Mayor)
Cc: Neil Cadman; Whalon, Pete; Andoe, Judy; Wayt, Jack; Bob Widen; Carol Wingate; Don McIlroy; Jerry Osnower; Paula Rotolo
Subject: Park Vista must be smoke-free

Gentlemen:

Several months ago, at a Housing Board meeting, Neil Cadman read a letter from a Park Vista resident. She wrote she was a quiet resident and never complained about anything but now she was writing about her health problems caused by smokers on a balcony beneath her unit. Neil Cadman continued a precedent he had already established when relating input from residents by not giving her name.

You likely never met this lady. She is among the majority of Park Vista residents who are shy and non-assertive. Park Vista has a greater percentage of these people than you find elsewhere, with a statistical correlation likely related to many residents here having been financially challenged for most or all of their lives.

I know this lady but I will follow Neil Cadman's precedent and not use her name. I can verify she is quiet, unassuming and well-liked. To me, the most interesting point about her situation is that she does not live directly over the offending smoker but cater-corner over him. Can you imagine how bad it must be for residents who live directly over smokers?

The lady's letter initiated discussion and resident input at a subsequent Housing Board meeting. (I did not attend that meeting and I gave no input.) Your Housing Board wisely decided to request that smoking on balconies and all common areas be banned immediately and that Park Vista become entirely smoke-free by January 1, 2010. This allows smokers a remarkable fifteen-month grace period to give up the habit and spare themselves and the rest of us health and safety issues.

You might recall automatic door-closures are mandated for Park Vista by California Building and Safety Code. In our close community of units, automatic door-closures are intended to save lives---by inhibiting an uncontrolled fire from spreading rapidly from one unit to hallways and to other units. In hot weather, some residents want increased airflow inside their unit and they defeat the purpose of their automatic door-closure by propping open their front door.

September 30 was a hot day. October 1 was a warm morning. I left my unit at 5:30 a.m. I immediately noticed a smoky smell. I walked along the hallway and around a curve to see a propped door. That resident is a smoker. How would you rate this for double duty, for increasing risks of both health and safety of one's neighbors?

Park Vista residents look forward to your vote supporting your Housing Board’s request.

Steve
REGULAR MEETING OF THE EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL  
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 7, 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 - Absent
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

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

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): -0- 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): - 0- matter

5
CONFERENCE WITH CITY’S LABOR NEGOTIATOR (Gov’t Code §54957.6): - 4- matters
City Negotiators: 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) El Segundo Police Officers’ Association; (3) El Segundo Firefighter’s Association; (4) the El Segundo Police Management 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, OCTOBER 7, 2008 - 7:00 P.M.

7:00 P.M. SESSION

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

INVOCATION – Pastor SeHee Han, United Methodist Church of El Segundo

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – Mayor Pro Tem Eric Busch

PRESENTATIONS

a. Mayor McDowell presented a Proclamation to City Employee Lauren Mahakian announcing week of October 4 through 11, 2008 as “No Drugs Down The Drain”.

ROLL CALL

Mayor McDowell - Present
Mayor Pro Tem Busch - Present
Council Member Brann - Absent
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.

Jenny Daves, El Segundo PTA, spoke on the annual PTA Drive.

Patricia Meccia, Lights of Your Life, spoke regarding custom themed prints.

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 Fisher 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 (Public Hearing) regarding the proposed revision to the City of El Segundo’s 2008-2009 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program to cancel Project D96660-08, Juvenile Diversion and reallocate CDBG funds totaling $13,039 to an alternate CDBG project. (Fiscal Impact: $13,039)

Mayor McDowell stated this is the time and place hereto fixed for a public hearing regarding the proposed revision to the City of El Segundo’s 2008-2009 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program to cancel Project D96660-08, Juvenile Diversion and reallocate CDBG funds totaling $13,039 to an alternate CDBG project. (Fiscal Impact: $13,039) Clerk Domann stated that proper notice was completed and no written communication had been received by City Clerk’s Office.

Tina Gall, CDBG Program, gave a presentation.

MOTION by Council Member Jacobson, SECONDED by Council Member Fisher to close the Public Hearing. MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE. 4/0. COUNCIL MEMBER BRANN ABSENT

MOTION by Mayor Pro Tem Busch, SECONDED by Council Member Jacobson to cancel CDBG Project D96660-08, Juvenile Diversion, and reallocate CDBG funds totaling $13,039 to an alternate CDBG Project; Authorize the City Manager to execute amendments and or contracts with the Los Angeles County Community Development Commission. MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE. 4/0. COUNCIL MEMBER BRANN ABSENT

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

D. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS AND BOARDS

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

2. Approved Warrant Numbers 2567815 to 2568132 on Register No. 24 in the total amount of $2,495,584.63 and Wire Transfers from 9/04/2008 through 9/25/2008 in the total amount of $2,553,367.90. Authorized staff to release. Ratified: Payroll and Employee Benefit checks; checks released early due to contracts or agreement; emergency disbursements and/or adjustments; and wire transfers.

3. Approved Regular City Council Meeting Minutes of September 16, 2008 and Special City Council Meeting Minutes of September 25, 2008.

4. Waived second reading and adopted Ordinance No. 1424 to amend Title 4, Chapter 11 in its entirety to regulate motion picture, radio, and television production within the City of El Segundo. (Fiscal Impact: None)
5. Adopted Plans and Specifications for trenchless rehabilitation of sanitary sewer main on Imperial Highway from east to west City limits. Project No.: PW 08-10  (Fiscal Impact: $835,000) Authorized staff to advertise the project for receipt of construction bids.

6. Adopted Resolution No. 4572 authorizing the annual destruction of identified records in accordance with the provisions of Section 34090 of the Government Code of the State of California. (Fiscal Impact: Not to exceed $1,000)

7. Received and filed a determination that the City Council does not object to a new Type 41 ABC license for on-site sale and on-site consumption of alcohol at an existing restaurant located at 409 East Grand Avenue, EA No. 793 and AUP No. 08-03. Applicant: Scot F. Nicol (Fiscal Impact: None)

8. Pursuant to ESMC § 15-18-8(H, l), approved a request from Mattel, Inc. to install two new temporary five hundred four (504) square-foot “Special Event Signs” for a period of three (3) months from October 13, 2008 and ending January 13, 2009 on the north side of the parking structure located at 333 Continental Boulevard. Applicant: Mattel, Inc. (Fiscal Impact: None)

9. Authorized the City Clerk to file the City’s Planning and Building Safety Director’s Notice of Completion in the County Recorder’s Office and authorized the City Manager to accept completion of work for 42 homes related to the City’s Residential Sound Insulation Program Group 21 (Project No. RSI 07-03). (Final Contract Amount: $889,184.03)

10. Authorized the City Clerk to file the City’s Planning and Building Safety Director’s Notice of Completion in the County Recorder’s Office and authorized the City Manager to accept completion of work for 17 homes related to the City's Residential Sound Insulation Program Group 22 (Project No. RSI 07-05). (Final Contract Amount: $870,940.07)

MOTION by Council Member Jacobson, SECONDED by Mayor Pro Tem Busch to approve Consent Agenda Items 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10. MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE. 4/0. COUNCIL MEMBER BRANN ABSENT

CALL ITEMS FROM CONSENT AGENDA

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 – ABSENT

Council Member Fisher – NONE

Council Member Jacobson – NONE

Mayor Pro Tem Busch – Spoke on the recent Richmond Street Fair. Also noted that El Segundo High School was having Homecoming this Friday, October 10th.

Mayor McDowell – Reported on Panel discussion “Creative Economy in Los Angeles County”.

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.

Tarrence LaBlu, owner of Fantastic Cleaners, spoke regarding a parking problem at his location.

MEMORIALS – NONE

CLOSED SESSION – NONE

ADJOURNMENT at 7:16 p.m.

Cathy Domann, Deputy City Clerk
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL  
Monday, October 13, 2008, 8:00 A.M.  
City Council Chambers  
350 Main Street, El Segundo, CA 90245  

CALL TO ORDER – Mayor McDowell at 8:00 a.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 prior to addressing the City Council. Failure to do so shall be a misdemeanor and punishable by a fine of $250. While all comments are welcome, the Brown Act does not allow Council to take action on any item not on the agenda. The Council will respond to comments after Public Communications is closed. - NONE  

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 Fisher 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 -  

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS  

1. Consideration and possible action to terminate the professional services agreement with Bernards who was retained by the City of El Segundo to provide construction management services on the Fire Station 2 project. Additionally, consideration and possible action to authorize the City Manager to execute a temporary professional services agreement with Tom White in the amount of $9,500 to provide construction management services for the Fire Station 2 project until a new professional services agreement is approved. (Fiscal Impact: None)  

Kevin Smith, Fire Chief, gave a report.
MOTION by Council Member Jacobson, SECONDED by Mayor Pro Tem Busch to authorize the City Manager to terminate the professional services agreement with Bernards and authorize the City Manager to execute a temporary professional services agreement in the amount of $9,500 with Tom White. MOTION PASSED BY THE FOLLOWING VOICE VOTE: AYES: MCDOWELL, BUSCH, FISHER AND JACOBSON; NOES: BRANN. 4/1

D. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES, COMMISIONS AND BOARDS

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

2. Consideration and possible action to extend the City’s agreement with Cassidy and Associates through September 30, 2009 for the provision of legislative advocacy services in Washington D.C. and to approve federal advocacy work program elements. (Fiscal Impact: $160,000 for FY 2008-2009)

Council consensus to place item on the agenda for the next regular council meeting on October 21, 2008.

E. REPORTS – CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

Council Member Brann – NONE

Council Member Fisher – NONE

Council Member Jacobson – NONE

Mayor Pro Tem Busch –

3. Consideration and possible action regarding the City commissioned Cost Allocation and Fee Study for fees charged to the public for services rendered by various City Departments that was performed by Revenue Cost Specialist, LLC.

Council consensus to direct staff to study and/or incorporate fee incentives/reductions for environmentally sensitive (“Green”) construction projects.

Council consensus to direct staff to study what other cities are doing with regard to a Public Art Program and Public Art Fund.

Mayor McDowell –

CLOSED SESSION

MOTION by Mayor McDowell, SECONDED by Mayor Pro Tem Busch to move to closed session. MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE. 5/0
The City Council moved into a closed session (8:20 A.M.) 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.

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – EXISTING LITIGATION (Gov’t Code §54956.9(a)) – 0- matter

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): -0- matter.

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

CONFERENCE WITH CITY’S LABOR NEGOTIATOR (Gov’t Code §54957.6): - 4- 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) El Segundo Police Officers’ Association; (c) El Segundo Firefighter’s Association; and (d) El Segundo Police Management Association.

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

SPECIAL MATTERS: - 0- matter

REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN IN CLOSED SESSION (if required)

ADJOURNMENT at 10:10 a.m.

Cathy Domann, Deputy City Clerk
EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA STATEMENT

AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action regarding the award of a Standard Public Works Contract to FS Construction for the installation of risers for the Stevenson Field bleachers at 339 Sheldon St. – Project No. PW 08-07 – (Fiscal Impact: $30,000.00)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
Recommendation – (1) Approve a transfer of $4,000.00 from the Recreation Park Softball Field Retaining Wall Project (Project Account No. 301-400-8282-8996); (2) Authorize the City Manager to execute a Standard Public Works Contract in a form approved by the City Attorney with FS Construction in the amount of $30,000.00; (3) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
None

FISCAL IMPACT: Included in Adopted Budget

Amount Budgeted: $26,000.00
Additional Appropriation: Yes $4,000.00
Account Number(s): 301-400-8202-8991 ($26,000), 301-400-8202-8996 ($4,000)

ORIGINATED BY: Dan Garcia, Assistant City Engineer
REVIEWED BY: Dana Greenwood, Public Works Director
APPROVED BY: Jack Wayt, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:
On August 5, 2008, City Council approved the plans and specifications and authorized staff to solicit bids for the installation of risers for the Stevenson Field bleachers. On September 30, 2008, the City Clerk’s office opened bids that were submitted by 11:00 am. FS Construction submitted the only bid at $30,000.00.

The project was a part of the 2007/08 CIPAC projects funded at $26,000.00. The project consists of installing risers on the existing bleachers at Stevenson Field bleachers to prevent items larger than four (4) inches from falling behind the bleachers. An additional $4,000.00 would be required to award this project. Staff recommends appropriating this additional amount from the Recreation Park Softball Field Retaining Wall project since this project encompasses additional improvements at the same park. There is currently $255,000.00 budgeted in the Softball Retaining Wall Project. Staff additionally recommends awarding this contract to FS Construction. FS Construction has worked for many cities in the south bay area and is a reputable firm.
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action authorizing the City Manager to execute a Professional Services Agreement with DCA Civil Engineering Group for the Softball Retaining Wall Design at 339 Sheldon Street – RFP No. 08-13 (Fiscal Impact: $28,881.00)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
Recommendation – (1) Authorize the City Manager to execute a Professional Services Agreement with DCA Civil Engineering Group in a form approved by the City Attorney in the amount of $28,881.00; (2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
DCA Civil Engineering Group Proposal

FISCAL IMPACT: Included in Adopted Budget

- **Amount Budgeted:** $255,000.00
- **Additional Appropriation:** N/A
- **Account Number(s):** 301-400-8202-8996

ORIGINATED BY: Dan Garcia, Assistant City Engineer
REVIEWED BY: Dana Greenwood, Public Works Director
APPROVED BY: Jack Wayt, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:
The FY 2007/2008 CIP budget approved $220,000.00 for this project and $40,000.00 was carried over for this project from the FY 2006/2007 CIP budget. The Teen Center Wall was originally included with this project and was subsequently repaired with in-house staff for a cost of $5,000.00, leaving a total budget of $255,000.00.

RFP No. 08-13 was released on August 20, 2008. Proposals were opened on October 2 and the only proposal received in the City Clerk’s office was from the DCA Civil Engineering Group for $28,881.00. DCA has a good reputation in the local area. Staff has reviewed the costs and determined that they are reasonable. Staff recommends approval of this professional services agreement with DCA Civil Engineering Group to design the retaining wall at the Recreation Park Softball Field.
Section II
Scope of Work

DCA Civil Engineering Group team understands that the City of El Segundo is interested in expanding the warm-up area along south side the softball field at Recreation Park (adjacent to the right field). Further, DCA Civil Engineering Group understands that in order to maximize this area, earth and trees must be removed and a retaining wall must be constructed into the existing slope between the bleachers and the back fence line. The scope includes but is not limited to the following:

a. Conduct a field survey to create a topographic record of the existing slope for calculations needed in the design of the retaining wall to be constructed.

b. Perform soils sampling and testing. Prepare a soils report based on the findings of the soil exploration to determine the characteristics and parameters of the soil for the design of the wall. For purposes of this proposal, please include the quantity and method of sampling and testing and all expected costs associated with such sampling and testing.

c. Design a retaining wall that will maximize the warm-up area between the existing bleachers and back fence line and be within the parameters of the soils report. The design shall include dimensions, footing details, structural diagrams and full plan and profile.

d. Provide 3 sets of completed design plans and specifications (deliverable) that can be used to bid the project for construction. Plans should include dimensions, footing details, structural diagrams and full plan and profile. Specifications should be able to provide sufficient product identification to be clearly understood by contractors during the bidding process.
Schedule

DCA Civil Engineering Group will adhere to the time schedule for the design of the retaining wall for this project and will ensure a timely completion. The work will commence on date specified in the Notice to Proceed to be issued by the Public Works Department and will be completed within 90 working days after the date of commence. Below is a preliminary proposed schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>Week 5</th>
<th>Week 6</th>
<th>Week 7</th>
<th>Week 8</th>
<th>Week 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Sampling and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining Wall Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PC – Plan Check
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code(s)</th>
<th>Item/Action</th>
<th>Civil Engineer</th>
<th>Soils Engineer</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Total Hours per Item/Action</th>
<th>Calculated Cost per Item/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>Project Manager, P.E.</td>
<td>Project Engineer E.I.T.</td>
<td>Technician/Designer</td>
<td>Field Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Field Survey - Topographic Base Plans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Soils Report - soil sampling and testing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Coordination and Background Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Retaining Wall Design</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Deliverables - 3 sets of completed design plan &amp; specifications</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings &amp; Project Coordination</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>28,881.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>28,881.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action regarding the Adoption of Plans and Specifications and Authorization to advertise for bid the renovation of the Human Resources Office at 350 Main Street – Project No. PW 02-21 (Fiscal Impact: $130,000.00)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
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.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
Estimate

FISCAL IMPACT: Included in Adopted Budget
Amount Budgeted: $630,000.00
Additional Appropriation: No Included in budgeted amount
Account Number(s): 301-400-8201-8475

ORIGINATED BY: Dan Garcia, Assistant City Engineer
REVIEWED BY: Dana Greenwood, Public Works Director
APPROVED BY: Jack Wayt, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:
In 2002, the City envisioned this project to include replacing the existing windows around City Hall, revamping the Council Chambers, remodeling the West Conference Room and expanding the Human Resources Department Offices. In the FY 2008/2009 adopted budget, an appropriation for $630,000.00 was included to address the City Hall Improvements. One of the components of the budgeted project was to implement the portion of the original scope of remodeling the Human Resources Office. At this time, staff is recommending that the City proceed with the expansion of the Human Resources Department Offices. Staff recommends that this $130,000 (see attached estimate) be appropriated to allow implementation of this project. Subsequent City Council actions such as amending the existing BOA design contract and approval of plans and specifications for the remaining portions of this project will be presented at a later date for City Council consideration.
# CITY HALL IMPROVEMENTS

## City Hall Improvements - Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Categories</th>
<th>Human Resources</th>
<th>Council Chambers</th>
<th>West Conference Room</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition/Construction</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment/AV/Electrical</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubicle/Ergonomics</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpet</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$130,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$315,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$105,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$55,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal: $605,000  
Contingency (10%): $60,500  
**Grand Total**: $665,500

Window Replacements for all of City Hall: $500,000 estimate
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action regarding approval of ongoing service agreements and blanket purchase orders for FY 2008-2009 in excess of $25,000 and possible action to waive the formal bidding process and authorize the continued purchase of gasoline and diesel fuel for City vehicles and equipment through the use of spot market purchasing for the Public Works Department (Fiscal Impact: $397,000)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

(1) Authorize staff to continue to purchase gasoline and diesel fuel for City vehicles and equipment through the use of spot market purchasing in an amount not to exceed $347,000.

(2) Authorize the issuance of blanket purchase order to Metron Farnier & Actaris in an amount not to exceed $50,000 for the purchase of single jet water meters for the City’s water system.

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

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

None

FISCAL IMPACT: Included in Adopted Budget

Amount Budgeted:       $397,000
Additional Appropriation:  N/A
Account Number(s):     001-102-0000-0801 ($347,000)  501-400-7102-5207 ($50,000)

ORIGINATED BY:  Ron Fajardo, General Services Manager
REVIEWED BY:    Dana Greenwood, Director of Public Works
APPROVED BY:    Jack Wayt, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

1. Fuel for City Vehicles and Equipment
   001-102-0000-0801 ($347,000)

It is estimated that City vehicles and equipment will consume 68,000 gallons of gasoline and 16,000 gallons of diesel fuel in Fiscal Year 2007-2008 at the cost of $288,000. Due to the high amount of volatility in the market, the City increased its fuel budget to $347,000 in Fiscal Year 2008-2009.

Generally, fuel is purchased either through spot market purchases or long-term contracts. Spot purchasing consists of shopping around each time fuel is needed and purchasing fuel from the
lowest priced vendor. This type of purchasing usually occurs when the fuel market is volatile as it has been for the last three years. During periods of stability, agencies enter into long-term fuel contracts. Pricing under long-term contacts is tied to a published fuel price baseline plus a markup. The recent volatility in the market has forced vendors to raise the markup under long-term contracts to as much as 5% making long-term contracts unattractive. Under the City’s last long-term contract through Los Angeles Metropolitan Public Purchasing Agents’ Cooperative (LAMPPAC), there was virtually no markup. When that contract expired in September 2005, the fuel market was quite volatile and City Council authorized staff to purchase gasoline and diesel fuel through the use of spot market purchases.

Many agencies including Cities of Manhattan Beach, Culver City and Hawthorne have opted to purchase fuel through spot purchases in lieu of entering into long-term contracts since the expiration of the LAMPAC contact. Staff continuously monitors long-term contracts available in the industry. When the terms of long-term contracts improve such that the price is a few cents over the market baseline, staff will again recommend entering into a long-term fuel contract.

Pursuant to El Segundo Municipal Code (ESMC) § 1-7-10, relating to purchases and supplies, the City Council may at any time, by a majority vote and without amending the ESMC, waive purchasing procedures or alter proceedings to fit a specific purchase, when the waiver is not in violation of State law. Spot purchasing is the sort of modified purchasing arrangement that requires such a waiver by Council. It is possible that the total of purchases from any one vendor may exceed $25,000; therefore, Council approval of spot purchasing is requested.

2. Water Meters – Metron Farnier & Actaris
501-400-7201-5207 ($50,000)

The City’s water distribution system includes approximately 250 large commercial compound water meters three to eight inches in diameter. As large meters age, they become less accurate and tend to register water usage that is below actual consumption. It is common in the water industry to replace older large meters as they are typically the greatest source of unbilled water or lost water. When meters are replaced, the Water Division installs single jet water meters rather than compound water meters. The single jet meters provide increased metering accuracy, excellent low flow registration, and less maintenance. The cost to replace each meter ranges from $2,000 to $5,000, dependent upon size.

Staff plans to continue replacing meters in FY 2008-2009 and recommends continuing to purchase meters from Metron Farnier & Actaris in an amount not to exceed $50,000.
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action regarding the Proposal from Beach Cities Transit to participate in funding operation for the 109 Line for two years in conjunction with the Cities of Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach and Manhattan Beach (Fiscal Impact: $64,598 for FY 2008-09 and $72,412 for FY 2009-10. Two year fiscal impact: $137,010)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

(1) City Council authorize the City Manager to enter into an agreement with Beach Cities Transit to continue funding Bus Line 109 for the next two years; (2) Alternatively discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

Proposal Letter from Beach Cities Transit

FISCAL IMPACT: Included in Adopted Budget

Amount Budgeted: $149,150
Additional Appropriation: N/A
Account Number(s): 114-400-5293-5206

ORIGINATED BY: Judy Angoe
REVIEWED BY:
APPROVED BY: Jack Wayt, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

Line 109 runs from Redondo Beach to downtown Los Angeles, passing through Hermosa Beach, Manhattan Beach, El Segundo and LAX. The line operates roughly between the hours of 6:00 am to 10:00 pm on weekdays and 6:00 am to 9:00 pm on weekends. For El Segundo the route runs north along Vista Del Mar, east on Grand Ave., north through downtown on Main St., continuing east on Imperial, stopping at Sepulveda, Hughes Way, Nash St. and Douglas, every 30 to 60 minutes depending on the time of the day, and makes 16 stops within the City.

In May 2006, Line 109 replaced MTA Line 439 when MTA identified as "regionally underperforming" the portion of the line between south Redondo Beach and LAX, and decided to discontinue the service. Beach Cities Transit, a community-based transit system that operates out of the City of Redondo Beach, entered into two-year equitable cost-sharing agreements with the above stated cities to operate Line 109 mirroring MTA Line 439 route and schedule. The cost for the City of El Segundo was $128,000 per year of the two year agreement. The goals were to continue providing mobility and mitigating vehicular congestion in the south bay cities. Beach Cities Transit expected that Line 109 would qualify for funding from MTA in two years, no longer requiring a subsidy from any of the beach cities from 2008 on. However, Line 109 still
has a funding shortfall. Although the financial gap has been reduced by 29% from FY 2006-07 to FY 2008-09, the anticipated Formula Allocation Box and fare box revenues have not been sufficient to compensate for the remaining nominal financial shortfall and the rise in fuel prices.

Beach Cities Transit proposes to continue supporting Line 109 with the benefiting cities sharing the cost. In June, estimates for cost sharing were significantly higher until Metro’s decision to continue lines 124 and 126. Metro’s inclusion of lines 124 and 126 reduced costs significantly. However, the original estimate was budgeted in El Segundo’s FY 08-09 budget this year. Therefore, leaving a balance of $84,412 to be forwarded to FY 09-10, should continued appropriations be considered. Other issues to be considered in evaluating this proposal include the following:

Projected Costs

The estimated net cost of operating the Line is $371,677 for two years. The portion of the cost to be paid by the City of El Segundo is $64,598 the first year, and $72,412 the second year. The following is the two year term breakdown of contributions from each city:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2 yr. term</th>
<th>Service mile percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Segundo</td>
<td>$137,010</td>
<td>36.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermosa Beach</td>
<td>$56,844</td>
<td>15.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan Beach</td>
<td>$61,217</td>
<td>16.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redondo Beach</td>
<td>$116,606</td>
<td>31.37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on service miles. El Segundo’s maintains 4.1 service miles.

Line Usage

Since the start of the operation two years ago, ridership has increased an average of 29% annually. However, actual ridership numbers are low. Mass transit indicators show that ridership of Line 109 will grow due to consumer need by way of fuel costs and congestion.

Other Beach Cities

The Cities of Hermosa Beach and Manhattan Beach are also considering Beach Cities Transit’s proposal. At a recent meeting staff from both cities indicated that they intend to recommend to their city councils that their cities continue to participate in the program. The City Council of Hermosa Beach expects to consider this proposal on October 14, 2008, and the City Council of Manhattan Beach on October 7, 2008.

CONCLUSION:

Staff feels participation in Line 109 is beneficial to El Segundo. Increased investment in the use of public transportation provides significant, direct environmental benefits and helps meet national air quality standards and the route offer/Line 109 provides a valuable service to both residents and visitors to the El Segundo area. Failure to offer public transportation alternatives would likely result in increased traffic volumes and exacerbate congestion problems.
However, in light of the low numbers of individuals riding the BCT route as it is structured today, serious review of this route and an alternative route is highly recommended during the first year of this agreement for fiscal responsibility purposes, to meet the need public demand and for continued support from the City of El Segundo. An alternative route for Line 109 which encumbers more business destinations is now being discussed for the City of El Segundo; suggesting a more traveled line be developed to alleviate the more congested areas by incorporating a route which connects Plaza El Segundo to Downtown Main St., El Segundo in lieu of traveling the standard Vista Del Mar route to downtown El Segundo.

Beach Cities Transit commitment to continue to pursue additional funding alternatives to cover the funding shortfall and to seek out additional methods to lower the costs will also be required for it’s future success.

It is recommended that the Council authorize the City Manager to enter into an agreement with Beach Cities Transit to fund the proposed El Segundo portion of Bus Line 109, subject to the following:

- Participation would be contingent on the Cities of Redondo Beach, Hermosa Beach and Manhattan Beach also participating in the agreement and that El Segundo would participate as a copartner with the other cities.
- As a part of the agreement, Beach Cities Transit agreed to invest in improved marketing.
- The City will request performance indicators on regular basis.
- The agreement would cover a period of two years with provisions to amend agreement to adjust current route to include possible alternatives which connect Plaza El Segundo to Main Street, El Segundo.
August 28, 2008

Jack Wayt
Acting City Manager
City of El Segundo
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

Subject: Line 109 City Manager Meeting Responses

Dear Mr. Wayt:

I would like to thank you for your patience and cooperation in working with the City of Redondo Beach and the Beach Cities Transit (BCT) to resolve issues relating to the contract agreement for Line 109 (the “Pacific Coaster”). Our staff has been working diligently during the past several weeks to provide your city with the most equitable cost sharing arrangement for Line 109.

Per your request in our last meeting, we are providing you with clarifications for the following inquiries:

1. Ridership Analysis per City along the Line 109 route
2. Explanation for the requested contributions
3. Existing Bus Lines along the Beach Cities Corridor (Attachment A)

Please feel free to contact Gwendolyn Parker at (310) 318-0631 ext 2246 or me at (310) 318-0631 ext 2246 for any questions and/or comments.

Sincerely,

Bill Workman
City Manager
City of Redondo Beach

cc: Gwendolyn Parker, HBT, City of Redondo Beach
    Bill Crowe, City of El Segundo
    Richard Brunette, City of El Segundo
RIDERSHIP ANALYSIS

Ridership analysis for Line 109 was performed to determine boarding and alighting activities between the Cities of El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, and Redondo Beach. Ridership counts were taken at random one hour intervals one day per month from July 2007 to June 2008. Ridership counts were evaluated based on: trip direction (northbound, southbound), month, day and hour.

The analysis concluded very active ridership numbers. Some examples of the dynamic boardings and alightings per city are described below. Commuter ridership are most obvious during peak times originating from the Green Line Station traveling southbound and conversely during afternoon peak times. There is a marked increase in ridership during the warmer months. There was also no significant difference in ridership trends between weekdays and weekends.

**Weekday Peak Mornings** from LAX Southbound have the highest ridership activities. This particular trend may indicate that commuters are utilizing Line 109 to travel from the Green Line Station and points north to travel southbound towards the Beach Cities. Reverse commute northbound from Beach Cities toward Green Line Station conversely occurs beginning mid-afternoon. (See Graph A below.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southbound- AM</th>
<th>Boardings</th>
<th>Alightings</th>
<th>Northbound- PM</th>
<th>Boardings</th>
<th>Alightings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, May 29, 2008 SOUTHBOUND</td>
<td>6:42-7:34am REDONDO BEACH HERMOSA BEACH MANHATTAN</td>
<td>0% 8% 4%</td>
<td>26 26 26</td>
<td>Wednesday, April 23, 2008 NORTHBOUND REDONDO BEACH HERMOSA BEACH MANHATTAN</td>
<td>15:41-16:38pm 37% 5% 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑ BEACH HERMOSA BEACH MANHATTAN</td>
<td>0% 23% 0%</td>
<td>21% 0% 0%</td>
<td>↓ BEACH HERMOSA BEACH MANHATTAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>15% 11% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑ EL SEGUNDO LA</td>
<td>96% 0%</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis concluded that ridership activities are generally higher during the warmer months from April to October. (See Graph B below.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warmer Months</th>
<th>Boardings</th>
<th>Alightings</th>
<th>Cooler Months</th>
<th>Boardings</th>
<th>Alightings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday, August 26, 2007 NORTHBOUND 15:10-16:07 PM REDONDO</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sunday, January 13, 2008 NORTHBOUND 10:10-11:07AM REDONDO</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\down BEACH HERMOSA</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>\down BEACH HERMOSA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\down BEACH MANHATTAN</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>\down BEACH MANHATTAN</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\down BEACH</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>\down BEACH</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\down EL SEGUNDO</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>\down EL SEGUNDO</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\down LA</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>\down LA</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph B

Although there is a general increase during weekends, it is a minimal comparative difference between weekends and weekdays ridership activities. (Graph C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekdays</th>
<th>Boardings</th>
<th>Alightings</th>
<th>Weekends</th>
<th>Boardings</th>
<th>Alightings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday, September 07, 2007 NORTHBOUND 13:30-14:27pm REDONDO</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sunday, August 26, 2007 NORTHBOUND 15:10-16:07 PM REDONDO</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\down BEACH HERMOSA</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>\down BEACH HERMOSA</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\down BEACH MANHATTAN</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>\down BEACH MANHATTAN</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\down BEACH</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>\down BEACH</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\down EL SEGUNDO</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>\down EL SEGUNDO</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\down LA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>\down LA</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph C

**EXPLANATION FOR REQUESTED CONTRIBUTIONS**

Letters were sent to the South Bay Cities requesting financial contributions for the continued operation of Line 109 between May and July 2008. Following are the explanations for the varying amounts.
May 22, 2008
Due to Metro's intention to cancel Metro Lines 124 and 126 which service the South Bay Cities, BCT planned to take over the cancelled lines in order to maintain transit connectivity. The May 22 letter incorporated the assumed costs for absorbing the discontinued lines increasing initial contributions by approximately 16%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAY 22 LETTER</th>
<th>Initial Contribution</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Segundo</td>
<td>$128,106</td>
<td>$149,127.45</td>
<td>$161,523.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermosa Beach</td>
<td>$74,984</td>
<td>$86,881.52</td>
<td>$94,103.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan Beach</td>
<td>$86,639</td>
<td>$100,385.79</td>
<td>$108,730.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

June 18, 2008
At Metro Board meeting, Metro decided against discontinuing lines.

June 24, 2008
Due to Metro's decision to maintain Metro Lines 124 & 126, cost assumptions associated with the absorption of Metro Lines 124 & 126 are not included, and required contributions were reduced accordingly. Redondo Beach assumed greater financial risk and burden of projected increase in petroleum costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUNE 24 LETTER</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Segundo</td>
<td>$40,305</td>
<td>$45,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermosa Beach</td>
<td>$25,410</td>
<td>$27,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan Beach</td>
<td>$26,286</td>
<td>$29,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redondo Beach</td>
<td>$83,239</td>
<td>$93,873</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

July 28, 2008
Final amounts accurately reflect fair contributions equally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JULY 28 LETTER</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Segundo</td>
<td>$64,598</td>
<td>$72,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermosa Beach</td>
<td>$26,801</td>
<td>$30,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan Beach</td>
<td>$28,863</td>
<td>$32,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redondo Beach</td>
<td>$54,978</td>
<td>$61,628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference between June 24 letter vs. July 28 Letters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Segundo</td>
<td>+$24,293</td>
<td>+$26,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermosa Beach</td>
<td>+$1,391</td>
<td>+$2,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan Beach</td>
<td>+$2,577</td>
<td>+$2,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redondo Beach</td>
<td>-$28,261</td>
<td>-$32,245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the financial gap has been reduced, the anticipated Formula Allocation Funds and fare-box revenues were not sufficient to compensate for the remaining nominal financial shortfall and the rise in fuel prices.

While we did not meet your expectation for a fully funded ‘Pacific Coaster’ line, we are hoping that your City continue to participate in this growing bus line through your City, and that the above two-year funding scenario to cover the funding shortfall is acceptable to your City. The BCT will continue to pursue additional funding to cover the funding shortfall and seek out additional methods to lower the costs. Several indicators have shown this Line 109 to be a very successful transit line through your City.
ATTACHMENT A
BEACH CITIES TRANSIT - BCT 109

CONNECTING REGIONAL SERVICE
LADOT – COMMUTER EXPRESS 438
METRO – 124, 125, 126, 130, 232, 625
METRO LAX SHUTTLE – 625, 626
TORRANCE – T3
EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA STATEMENT

MEETING DATE: October 21, 2008
AGENDA HEADING: Consent Agenda

AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action regarding award of City's professional services contract for auditing services with Mayer Hoffman McCann P.C. for three years through 2008-2010, plus optional two year extension. (Fiscal Impact: $265,300; 2008-2012)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:

1) Authorize approval of three year professional services contract for auditing services with Mayer Hoffman McCann P.C. through years 2008-2010 for $155,140 and optional two year extension for years 2011 and 2012 for $110,160.

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

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

FISCAL IMPACT: Included in Adopted Budget

Amount Budgeted: $51,200
Additional Appropriation: No To be included in future year budgets.
Account Number(s): 001-400-2502-6214

ORIGINATED BY: Rolf Schleicher, Fiscal Services Manager
REVIEWED BY: Deborah Cullen, Director of Finance
APPROVED BY: Jack Wayt, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

On August 2008, the Director of Finance initiated the solicitation of RFP bids from eight qualified auditing professional services firms to audit the City’s financials. The statement of work was clearly defined to include new accounting pronouncements and regulations which will increase auditing procedures, control activities, auditing hours and associated costs. The period of audit services is from years 2008-2010 with optional extension for two additional years of service pending performance and quality of work preformed.

The evaluation of selected auditing firms included the following review criteria to assist staff in making their final determination. Staff reviewed all submitted proposal materials and conducted in-depth panel interviews and rankings, which included questions related to their audit approach, specific technical capabilities, experience, administrative task management, professionalism, reporting writing abilities and research follow-up. Based on staff findings, Mayer Hoffman McCann P.C. was selected and is recommended for contract award due to their national reputation and technical expertise, experience with city and government auditing, quality and
access of assigned staff, shared resources available and listing of government audit clients.

The following is a list of candidate auditing firms that participated in the previously described evaluation process:

Mayer Hoffman McCann P.C.
2301 Dupont Dr.
Suite 200
Irvine, CA 92612

Diehl, Evans & Company, LLP
5 Corporate Park
Suite 100
Irvine, CA 92606-5165

Moss, Levy & Hartzheim, LLP
9107 Wilshire Blvd.
Suite 400
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Lance, Soll & Lunghard, LLP
203 N. Brea Blvd.
Suite 203
Brea, CA 92821-4056
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action to extend the City’s agreement with Cassidy & Associates through September 30, 2009 for the provision of legislative advocacy services in Washington, D.C., and to approve federal advocacy work program elements. (Fiscal Impact: ($160,000 for FY 2008-2009)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
1. Authorize the Mayor to execute the attached agreement with Cassidy & Associates;
2. Approve the federal advocacy work plan as outlined in Cassidy & Associates Memorandum of September 18, 2008 and City’s Homeland Security Needs Assessment;
3. Instruct the City Manager, affected departments, and our Washington, D.C. advocate to work with the Congressional staff and local government associations to pursue the City’s federal funding and program objectives.
4. Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
Cassidy & Associates memorandum outlining a proposed work plan for FY 2008-2009;
Scope of Services; City’s Homeland Security Needs Assessment; Draft Agreement

FISCAL IMPACT: Budget Adjustment Required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Budgeted:</th>
<th>$155,400</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Appropriation:</td>
<td>Yes $4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Number(s):</td>
<td>001-400-2901-6407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORIGINATED BY: Bill Crowe
REVIEWED BY: Bill Crowe
APPROVED BY: Jack Wayt, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

Over the past decade, Cassidy & Associates has been extremely successful in federal advocacy on behalf of the City. In addition to their policy work, which has ranged from aviation noise impact related advocacy to base support and retention lobbying on behalf of Los Angeles Air Force Base during the most recent Base Realignment and Closure round, Cassidy has been successful at securing federal appropriations on behalf of the City for a variety of infrastructure projects ranging from the implementation of the City’s Sewer Master Plan to the Douglas Street Gap Closure project. Federal funds of over $10 million have been secured since fiscal year 2000 for these important infrastructure projects.
For the new fiscal year, the City—with the assistance of Cassidy & Associates—has developed a federal advocacy scope of work that focuses on homeland security and hazards mitigation. Those funding strategies are outlined in the attached Homeland Security Needs and Hazards Mitigation briefing paper. Key priorities include: obtaining an additional tactical operations radio frequency, acquisition of a new public safety computer-aided dispatch and records management system (CAD/RMS), purchase of a mass notification and warning system, and establishment of an alternate emergency dispatch and operations center.

These important public safety program enhancements along with recommended communications and utility infrastructure improvements will contribute substantially to improve the City’s preparedness to deal with security threats and multiple hazard situations. Therefore, staff recommends Council (1) approve an agreement with Cassidy & Associates for federal legislative advocacy services for a monthly retainer of $13,333, or $160,000 annually; (2) approve the federal advocacy work plan as outlined in Cassidy & Associates Memorandum of September 18, 2008 and City’s Homeland Security Needs Assessment document; and (3) instruct the City Manager, affected departments, and Cassidy & Associates to work with congressional members, their staff and local government associations to pursue the City’s federal funding and program objectives.
HOMELAND SECURITY NEEDS & HAZARDS MITIGATION

Background

The City of El Segundo is located immediately south of Los Angeles International Airport. The 5.5 square mile city is home to the largest oil refinery on the West Coast; two electricity generating plants; the primary sewage treatment facility for the City of Los Angeles; 21 high-rise buildings; Los Angeles Air Force Base; over 12 major aerospace and defense firms; and many other high-tech and other Fortune 500 companies.

As a major employment center for the South Bay of Los Angeles County, the City's daytime population exceeds 85,000 people. El Segundo is also near not only the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, it is within minutes of many of the region's significant transportation corridors.

These facts mean that the City and the surrounding region are exposed to an unusually high risk of threats associated with homeland security issues and multiple hazard scenarios. A homeland security event or other disaster that significantly impacted El Segundo would have far-reaching impacts on the region, the economy of Southern California and the nation's defense as a whole.

In recent years the City of El Segundo has focused significant emphasis on being prepared for the impacts of a homeland security event or other type of disaster. Significant progress has been made, but much remains to be done to ensure the City's readiness and capability to provide services in the event of a disaster, protect its residents and workers and recover quickly.

To that end, the Fire and Police Departments recommend that the City pursue assistance to acquire the following prioritized public safety resource needs:

- Additional Radio Frequency for Tactical Operations
  Estimated cost: $1,000,000

- New Computer Aided Dispatching/Records Management System for use in Primary and Alternate Police/Fire Dispatch Centers
  Estimated costs: $1,000,000

- Mass Notification and Warning System: Audible warning systems utilizing sirens and/or voice combined with electronic technology systems utilizing computers, pagers, email, and telephones.
  Estimated costs: $500,000

- Alternate Emergency Police/Fire Dispatch Center (To be combined with Alternate EOC).
  Estimated cost: $1,000,000
o Emergency Operations Center Equipment: Computers, LCD projectors, televisions, phones, and chairs.
   Estimated costs: $125,000

o Alternate Emergency Operations Center Equipment: Computers, LCD projectors, televisions, phones, tables, and chairs.
   Estimated costs: $150,000

o Fiber Optic Information Network: Linking of City owned facilities through a fiber optic network.
   Estimated costs: $2,500,000

o Voice Over Internet Phone System: Replace existing City phone system with voice over internet phone capability.
   Estimated costs: $500,000

Implementation of these resources would dramatically improve the City’s overall readiness and preparedness to address homeland security events and other disasters. These resources would ensure that the City has the ability to communicate with and address the needs of residents, business, industry, the military and the surrounding region.

Sepulveda Boulevard and El Segundo Boulevard divide the City into four major quadrants. The northwest quadrant consists of the residential community, Downtown Business District, the El Segundo Civic Center (City Police and Fire Departments), all schools of the El Segundo Unified School District, City water storage facilities, and the Smoky Hollow commercial and industrial district. The Chevron refinery is located in the southwest quadrant. The southeast and northeast quadrants are primarily Commercial and Industrial areas. El Segundo Boulevard also provides public access to the Pacific Ocean beach recreational areas.

El Segundo Boulevard is the only major arterial roadway for residents, employees, Police and Fire emergency vehicles, and the Chevron refinery entering and exiting the two western quadrants of the City. It handles an average daily traffic in the magnitude of 40,000 to 75,000 vehicle trips. Any disruption of this access mode could have a major impact on the city’s evacuation plans during emergencies.

There are utility poles along the north side of El Segundo Boulevard covered by overhead utility lines that provide power to the western quadrants of El Segundo. These poles are 12” and larger in diameter and 80’-100’ tall. Natural disasters such as earthquake or any homeland security event can cause damage to the poles resulting in the closure of the only major arterial roadway within the two western quadrants.

To address this condition, the Fire and Police and Public Works Departments recommend that the City pursue assistance to mitigate this hazard:
- Undergrounding of overhead utilities
  Estimated cost: $6,000,000

In addition, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requires construction of safe traveling sidewalks and handicap accessible pedestrian ramps whenever the City undertakes construction of improvements.

- ADA sidewalk improvements
  Estimated cost: $1,500,000

Summary

With funding for these aforementioned projects, the City will be able to take significant steps to minimize the impact resulting from the threats associated with homeland security issues or natural disasters to the City.
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action regarding a request from Northrop Grumman to install two 1,334 square-foot permanent wall signs located at 101 Continental Boulevard. (Fiscal Impact: N/A)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
1. Approve Northrop Grumman's request to install two proposed 1,334 square-foot permanent wall signs and adopt a Resolution approving Environmental Assessment No. 802 and Sign Permit 08-01; and/or

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

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
1. Resolution
2. Letter of request from Western Sign Systems, dated August 18, 2008.
3. Sign Plans

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

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

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

I. Background

On August 19, 2008, Northrop Grumman submitted a letter to the City requesting approval of two 1,334 square-foot permanent wall signs mounted at the top of the north and south facing building facades. El Segundo Municipal Code (ESMC) Section §15-18-8(H) requires City Council approval for signs larger than 500 square feet. ESMC §15-18-6(B) requires approval of the sign plan by the Director of Planning and Building Safety. The letter of approval from the Director is attached to this report. The two 1,334 square-foot signs located on the north and south building elevations will face a parking lot and El Segundo Boulevard respectively. The existing 220-foot tall building was the former offices of Xerox Corporation.
The surrounding land uses are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Uses</th>
<th>Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North: Parking Lot and Commercial office</td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South: Golf course</td>
<td>O-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East: Commercial office</td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West: Commercial office</td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Analysis

The applicant is requesting City Council approval of two 1,334 square-foot permanent signs for the Northrop Grumman commercial office building located on the northwest corner of El Segundo Boulevard and Continental Boulevard at 101 Continental Boulevard in the Corporate Office (C-O) Zone in compliance with ESMC § 15-18-8(H). The two proposed signs are included as part of a sign program that includes 6 signs approved by the Director of Planning and Building Safety subject to Council approval of the two oversized signs.

The proposed signs are identical in design, composition, and installation method. Each sign is 166 feet and 11 inches wide and 8 feet high. The signs are composed of .22 gauge sheet metal channel letters, painted blue, and illuminated in white neon.

ESMC Section §15-8-8(B) limits the maximum square footage for wall signs on freestanding buildings to 5% of the building face. The area of the building face on each side where the signs are proposed is 215 feet wide and 220 feet high giving it a building face area of 47,300 square feet. Five percent of the building face area is 2,344 square feet. Therefore, the proposed 1,344 square foot sign is in compliance with the maximum allowed sign area.

The signs are located behind the required minimum 5-foot setback. Additionally, the signs are not located in a required corner clearance or driveway visibility area.

III. Environmental Review

The proposed project is exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Categorical Exemption Section 15311(a), Class 11, as a replacement of minor accessory structures such as on-premise signs. The project consists of two 1,334 square-foot signs on an existing commercial office building. The project is not anticipated to have any significant impacts with regard to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.

IV. Conclusion

Planning staff recommends approval of Environmental Assessment No. 802 and Sign Permit SP 08-01 since the required findings for support have been made.
RESOLUTION NO. ___

A RESOLUTION APPROVING TWO 1,334 SQUARE-FOOT SIGNS ON A COMMERCIAL OFFICE BUILDING AND ADOPT THE CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. EA-802, SIGN PERMIT SP 08-01 LOCATED AT 101 CONTINENTAL BOULEVARD.

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

SECTION 1: The City Council finds and declares that:

A. On August 18, 2008, Western Signs Systems, filed an application for an Environmental Assessment No. 802 and Sign Permit No. 08-01, to install two 1,334 square-foot signs for a commercial office building for the Northrop Grumman Corporation at 101 Continental Boulevard;

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 proposed project was analyzed for its environmental impacts and is deemed categorically exempt under Section 15311(a), Class 11 of the CEQA Guidelines;

E. On October 21, 2008 the City Council held a public hearing and considered the information provided by City staff, public testimony and Western Sign Systems; and

F. This Resolution, and its findings, are made based upon the entire administrative record including, without limitation, testimony and evidence presented to the City Council at its October 21, 2008 public hearing including the staff report submitted by the Planning and Building Safety Department.
SECTION 2: *Factual Findings.* The City Council finds that the following facts exist:

A. The project site is located in the Corporate Office (CO) Zone located at 101 Continental Boulevard;

B. The proposed project is to install two 1,334 square-foot permanent signs on a commercial office building at 101 Continental Boulevard;

C. The two 1,334 square-foot signs comply with ESMC §15-18-8(B) in that they do not exceed 5% of each respective building face;

D. The subject site is currently vacant, and was formerly occupied by the Xerox Corporation; and

E. The proposed signs conform to ESMC §15-18-2 that regulates signs in the City of El Segundo.

SECTION 3: *General Plan.* The proposed project conforms with the City’s General Plan and the zoning regulations in the ESMC as follows:

A. The General Plan land use designation for the site is Corporate Office.

B. The Corporate Office (CO) land category use permits a mixture of office and food serving uses in single-tenant or multi-tenant buildings with limited retail uses in the lobby area.

C. The proposed project will encourage the effective use of signs as a means of communication in the city; maintain and enhance the aesthetic environment and the city’s ability to attract sources of economic development and growth; encourage signs which are integrated with and harmonious in size, design, style, material, and appearance to the buildings and sites which they occupy and surround; the proposed project is consistent with the purpose of the zone in that signs are allowed.

D. The proposed signs are consistent with the General Plan. The General Plan contains several relevant Goals, Objectives, and Policies in the Land Use Element. Staff finds that allowing signs is consistent with the General Plan. The two signs are consistent with Land Use Element Policy LU1-5.2 in that the two signs comply with the quantity, quality and location requirements in the adopted comprehensive sign ordinance. The proposed use is consistent with Land Use Element Goal LU4 in that the two signs provide a means of communication for commercial uses that provide a stable tax base for the City.
E. The surrounding land uses include: a hotel and office uses. The proposed signs for the office use will be compatible with the surrounding uses.

SECTION 4: Environmental Assessment. The City Council makes the following environmental findings:

A. The project is categorically exempt pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15311(a), Class 11; and

B. Accordingly, based upon the evidence presented to the City Council, the City need not prepare an environmental impact report for the proposed project.
SECTION 5: This Resolution is City Council’s final decision and will become effective immediately upon adoption.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 21st day of October, 2008.

________________________
Kelly McDowell, Mayor

ATTEST:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES )
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. _____ as 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 21st day of October, 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 Berger, Assistant City Attorney
August 18, 2008

City of El Segundo
Attn: Paul Samaras
350 Main Street
El Segundo, Ca 90245

RE: Northrop Grumman
101 Continental Blvd.
El Segundo, CA

Western Sign Systems is proposing to manufacture and install 4 internally illuminated wall signs, and 2 illuminated monument signs for “NORTHROP GRUMMAN” at the above referenced property. We understand that any sign over 500sf needs to get City Council approval. Please send this sign package to City Council for approval as soon as possible. Feel free to contact me directly with any questions, comments or changes.

Sincerely,

Tiffany Del Gatto
Western Sign Systems
1020 Linda Vista Dr.
San Marcos, CA 92078
P. (760) 736-6070
F. (760) 736-6073

- Sign Type A: (2) Two 1334 square foot wall signs.
- Sign Type B: (2) Two 276.8 square foot wall signs.
- Sign Type C: (2) Two 6’ x 12’ s/f monument signs.
ILLUMINATED MONUMENT SIGNS - SINGLE FACED (CLR 2)

6' X 12' / 72 SQ. FT.
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31" X 54 1/4" / 276.8 SQ. FT (each set)
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EAST & WEST ELEVATION CHANNEL LETTERS (CLR 2)

8' X 166.11" / 1334.50 SQ. FT (each set)
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NORTH & SOUTH ELEVATION CHANNEL LETTERS (CLR 2)

SIGNAGE

NORTHRUP GRUMMAN