



# Staff Report City of Manhattan Beach

TO:

Honorable Mayor Ward and Members of the City Council

**THROUGH:** Richard Thompson, Interim City Manager

FROM:

Bruce Moe, Finance Director

DATE:

June 15, 2010

**SUBJECT:** 

Public Hearing and Adoption of Fiscal Year 2010-2011 Operating Budget and FY

2011-2015 Capital Improvement Plan

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that the City Council: a) conduct a Public Hearing; b) adopt Resolution No. 6259 establishing the appropriations limit for the 2010-2011 Fiscal Year; c) adopt Resolution No. 6260 approving the FY 2010-2011 Operating Budget; d) adopt Resolution No. 6261 approving the FY 2011-2015 Capital Improvement Plan; e) adopt Resolution No. 6262 approving an increase in the ambulance fees and indexing future rate increases to the L.A. County rate, and increasing the fine schedule for Police false alarms; f) authorize the transfer of \$35,000 of Measure "R" funds to the Proposition "A" Fund to cover the anticipated shortfall of funding in Proposition "A" in FY 2009-2010, and g) assign responsibility to the Finance Subcommittee to review and develop options for the City Council to consider to improve fiscal sustainability in the coming year.

#### **FISCAL IMPLICATION:**

As a result of the various budget study sessions and meetings, there are a number of changes to the proposed budget. These adjustments are presented on Attachment "A" of this report. All changes will appear in the final adopted budget document.

The revised General Fund budget, including all Council-accepted deficit reduction strategies is as follows:

by Ameng other provi-	<u>Original</u>	Revised	Difference
Revenues	\$49,274,023	\$49,274,023	\$-0-
Expenditures	\$51,320,559	<u>\$49,254,226</u>	\$2,066,333
Surplus/(Deficit)	(\$ 2,046,536)	\$ 19,797	\$2,066,333

The revised budget results in an estimated unreserved General Fund balance of \$2,599,381 at the end of FY 2010-2011. The City's Financial Policy reserve of 20% is maintained as is the \$4 million Economic Uncertainty reserve.

Funding for the first year of the FY 2011-2015 Capital Improvement Project (CIP) plan was originally included in the proposed FY 2010-2011 budget. However, as noted during the June 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, funding for projects in the CIP fund for FY 2010-2011 (\$783,000) has been suspended pending a September 2010 Council meeting to discuss general capital projects (Joslyn, Manhattan Heights, Begg Pool, etc.). CIP Funds will remain available and undesignated for City Council to appropriate at that time. The total amount across all funds for CIP's has been revised from \$7,038,000 to \$6,255,000.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

Tonight's meeting is the culmination of the budget process for FY 2010-2011. Several steps need to be taken in order to approve this financial plan that will take effect on July 1, 2010. These include adoption of resolutions approving our legally-required spending limits (Gann limit), approving the operating budget and capital improvements plan, and approving increases in ambulance fees and false alarm fines. In addition, staff is recommending a transfer of funds from Measure "R" transportation funds to the Proposition "A" fund in order to cover a predicted shortfall of approximately \$35,000 (Measure "R" funds may be used for transportation purposes similar to Proposition "A" funds).

### **Budget-Related Resolutions**

The budget related resolutions included with this report establish the City's spending limit in compliance with State law (Resolution No. 6259 – Attachments "B" and "C"); authorize the City Manager to proceed in implementing the FY 2010-2011 proposed operating budget (Resolution No. 6260 – Attachment "D"); and approve the FY 2011-2015 Capital Improvement Plan (Resolution No. 6261 (Attachment "E"). The FY 10-11 budget includes the first year funding of the CIP plan, while out-year projects will be appropriated in the respective future budget years.

#### Appropriation Limit

In 1980, California voters adopted Article XIIIB of the California State Constitution, commonly referred to as the Gann Initiative or Gann Appropriations Limit, placing limits on the amount of tax proceeds that State and local agencies can appropriate each year. The City's limit is adjusted each year for inflation, population and other factors.

On June 5, 1990, Proposition 111 was voted into California law. Among other provisions, Proposition 111 provided for changes in the calculation of the Gann Appropriation Limit. The annual adjustments to the spending limit were liberalized by Proposition 111 to be more closely linked to the rate of economic growth. Beyond local inflation and population factors, the provisions allow a City to use the higher of the percentage growth in personal income or the percent increase in the local tax roll due to non-residential property construction. Additionally, cities can choose to use the rate of change in population either within the City or County, whichever is higher. The City utilized elements of these adjustment factors in calculating this year's Gann Appropriation Limit.

Staff has calculated the Gann limit to be \$49,927,817. The City's tax proceeds subject to the FY 2010-2011 Gann limit equal \$34,670,843. Therefore, the City is within the Gann limitation by \$15,256,974 and in compliance with state law. This Gann limit calculation is attached as Attachment "C."

Section 7910 of the State Government Code requires a governing body to annually adopt, by resolution, an Appropriations Limit for the upcoming fiscal year when the budget is adopted. City Council may do so by adopting Resolution No. 6259 (Attachment "B").

## Proposition "A" and the material and the proposition of the second of th

During budget discussions, staff highlighted the funding situation in Proposition "A" and the need to cover an estimated \$35,000 deficiency in FY 2009-2010. Additionally, FY 2010-2011 has a deficit of \$123,877. To address these funding issues, Council approved the use of Measure "R" transportation funds until more permanent solutions can be discussed. As a result, staff recommends fund transfers from Measure "R" to Proposition "A" of \$35,000 in FY 2009-2010, and \$123,877 in FY 2010-2011. Discussions will be held during FY 10-11 with the Senior Advisory Committee, City staff and the City Council to identify efficiencies and priorities which may be implemented to improve the funding outlook for Proposition "A."

# Ambulance Fees and Police False Alarm Fines

Included in tonight's public hearing is approval of increased Fire Department ambulance fees and Police false alarm fines:

Ambulance Fees: The Fire Department transports both Basic Life Support (BLS) patients requiring non-emergency care, as well as Advanced Life Support (ALS) patients requiring rapid, critical attention. As an authorized patient transporter by the County of Los Angeles, we are entitled to charge for those services. The City's current rate structure, adopted in 2004 using the then-current L.A. County rate, is well below the County's own transportation rates which are typically adopted by other agencies in the county authorized to transport patients. As a result, we have included an increase in rates to the County level as part of our FY 2010-2011 revenue projections. This increase results in \$440,000 in new General Fund revenue. The current rates are \$659 for ALS and \$430 for BLS transportation. The new County of Los Angeles fee schedule effective July 1, 2010 (which is recommended for adoption) is as follows:

County	Dates	AI C	(7/2010)
County	naus-	ALO	1//20101

Advanced Life Support	\$1	,232.50
Code 3	\$	118.00
Per Mile Charge	\$	17.00
Average Equipment Charge	\$	175.00
Oxygen	\$	55.00
Backboard	\$	43.00
Neonatal	\$	164.25
Ice	\$	23.00

County Rates - BLS (7/2010)

\$ 863.25
\$ 46.50
\$ 17.00
\$ 100.00
\$ 55.00
\$ 43.00
\$ 164.25
\$ 23.00
\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$

Resolution No. 6201 (CIP Adoption)

If approved, the rates will be tied to the County of Los Angeles Emergency Medical Services Agency rates, typically adjusted each July 1<sup>st</sup>.

Police False Alarms: Several years ago, the Police department implemented a program to reduce the number of false alarms by imposing a fine for excessive false alarms. These alarms unnecessarily divert Police Department resources from other more important responsibilities, and are costly in terms of resources. The current false alarm program imposes fines on repeat offenders by charging \$190 starting with the third false alarm in a calendar year, and increased fines for additional false alarms. By reducing the number of free false alarms from two to one, we can encourage residents and businesses to more closely monitor, and hopefully reduce, false alarms. In the mean time, the change is estimated to generate \$45,000 in additional revenue, which is included in this year's budget.

In order for these fees to be adopted a public hearing must be held, which has been scheduled for tonight as part of the budget adoption. If approved, the Council can institute these fees by adopting Resolution No. 6262 (Attachment "F").

#### Finance Subcommittee A Hollisogoth to I should be presented and avoiding of both and advert

While the FY 2010-2011 budget has been balanced, we still face challenges ahead. The five year forecast indicates a continuation of deficit positions for at least the next four years, requiring the use of reserves, unless changes are made to our spending structure. For that reason, staff recommends that the City's Finance Subcommittee (Councilmembers Tell and Powell, and City Treasurer Lilligren) be assigned the task during the coming months of identifying and exploring options for improving the City's fiscal situation. The first of such discussions is scheduled for the Finance Subcommittee meeting of July 6, 2010.

Options may include two-tiered benefits with new employees receiving a lower level benefit, employee pension and/or medical contributions, and early retirement programs. It may also include service level reductions. A key part of the long term strategy will certainly involve the upcoming labor negotiations with all three bargaining units (which will involve the entire Council, not just the Finance Subcommittee). The Subcommittee will direct staff to research the specific issues and report back with more information. The goal is to have identified and vetted all options in advance of budget deliberations for FY 2011-2012.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

Staff is pleased to present a balanced FY 2010-2011 operating budget, and the FY 2011-2015 CIP plan for your final consideration and adoption. The final budget will be available in July, and will also be available to our community on the City's website at www.citymb.info.

- Attachments A. Summary of financial changes to the budget
  - B. Resolution No. 6259 (Appropriation Limit)
  - C. Gann limit calculation
  - D. Resolution No. 6260 (Budget Adoption)
  - E. Resolution No. 6261 (CIP Adoption)
  - F. Resolution No. 6262 (Fees Increase)

City of Manhattan Beach FY 2010-2011 Budget Modifications to be Included in Adopted Budget

Department	Description	Expenditures increase/(decrease)	Revenues increase/(decrease)	Notes
II V	Reduce Insurance Fund Charge Outs by \$806.719 (General Fund Benefit – \$720 002)	(200 002)	-	
III.	Eliminate Fleet Rental Charges for FY 2010-2011 hv \$770 840 (General Find Renefit = \$608 330)		Topi mak	
All	Budget for staff vacancies in all departments with the exception of Fire (minimum staffing requirement)		68 17	
	Reduce Information Systems Charge Outs by \$285.827 (General Fund Benefit = \$265.000)			Sixtu For margoris affect? Soft it is unsign or netbodily gread
IV.	Recognize savings from pre-paying CaIPERS Employer contributions			ABTHER ON A CANADA NOT THE TREE NAME OF THE ABOVE OF THE
Public Works	Reduce Landscape extras (General Fund portion = \$25,000)			Implement of the property of t
Public Works	Janitorial - reduction in services in Building Maintenance Fund for \$20,805 (General Fund portion = \$18,000)			with 18E (gradies) in the amount of Godenform on pleasure.  In the month to be permitted to Godenform on pleasure.
Management Services	Eliminate City Council-City Manager Teambuilding budget (\$5500/each program)			Simila udades Especiales el Laphinio de 1860 d'abbons in
Parks & Recreation	Eliminate Payphones in Several Locations	\$ (5,880)		STURBURGER TO THE STREET STREET STREET
Management Services	Eliminate MBEF Wine Auction Table	\$ (5,000)		Commission of the September Self-December 1991 (Self-December 1991)
Management Services	Correction to Council Conferences and Meetings	14 970		Fig. (35) (45) in the color of
	Addition of staffing for Sand Dune registration			The state of the s
Parks & Recreation	program Transfer of one-half employee from Streetscape to Refuse Fund and General Fund Streets	24,037		The Felenco not have a major could be the second of the could not be the second of the could be second of the coul
Public Works	Program (General Fund portion only)	\$ 30,872	Charge Co.	
	nal Proposed Bu	y of Cha	neral/Fund I/#*	
	to Council-Approved Budget	\$ (2,066,333)		. Results of the state of the s
	General Fund Revenue Estimates (unchanged)		(2012)	
	Original Proposed Expenditure Estimates	\$ (51,320,559)		TOOLS AND SECURED WASHINGTON OF COMMISSIONS
	Onginal Budget Deficit	:		ANALYSIS OF THE PROPERTY OF TH
	Revised Expenditure Total	\$ (49,254,226)		
	Revised General Fund Surplus/(Deficit)	\$ 19,797		(60 p. 42)
	Sum	Summary of Changes intother Funds	her Funds 🖓	
	Netrocyala Fund Name	Change in Budgeted Expenditures increase/(decrease)	Change in Budgeted Revenues increase/(decrease)	Bios (086) in a later in the second of the s
				Suspending funding pending Council discussion in

			The state of the s		Reduction in the following allocations, consistent with the General Fund reductions: Building & Operations (\$1,531),
	Water Fund	€9	(115,581)		Information Systems (\$11,571), Fleet Rental (\$33,980) and Insurance Fund (\$68,499).
					Elimination of one-half FTE from Streetscape (\$39,688) with
			No.		resource being allocated to General Fund Streets program in Public Works (\$30,872) and Refuse (\$8,816). Reduction in Fleet Rental allocation (\$12,070) consistent with General
	Street Lighting and Landscaping	49	(51,758)		Fund reduction.
	Building Maintenance & Operations Fund		(37.635)	(20.805)	Reduction of Fleet Rental allocation (\$16,830) consistent with the General Fund reductions. Reduction of the frequency of Janitorial Services throughout the city (\$20,805). Building Maintenance & Operations Fund revenues reduced due to charge-outs.
	Wastewater Fund	· · · ·			Reduction in the Building & Operations (\$383) and Fleet Rental (\$31,130) allocations consistent with the General Fund reductions.
			THE PROPERTY OF STREET		Reduction in the Insurance Fund allocation consistent with
	Fleet Management Fund	69	(18,218) \$	(702,640)	the General Fund reductions. Fleet Management Fund (702,640) revenues reduced from charge-outs.
	Interpretation of frequency and gradual and a second secon	6	(17,786)		Reduction in the Information Systems allocation consistent with the General Fund reductions (\$5,786). Transfer of Rideshare Program from Prop A to AB 2766 (\$12,000).
Syramore	Parking Fund	es es	(3,457)		Reduction in the Information Systems (\$1,157) and Fleet Rental (\$2,300) allocations consistent with the General Fund reductions.
The same	Insurance Reserve Fund	100 to	(2,618) \$	(806,719)	Reduction in the Building & Operations (\$305) and Information Systems (\$2,313) allocations consistent with the General Fund reductions. Insurance Reserve Fund (806,719) revenues reduced from charge-outs.
	Information Systems Find	. U		(285 827)	Reduction in the Building & Operations allocation consistent with the General Fund reductions. Information Systems Fund revenues reduced from charge-outs.
	Stormwater Fund	69			
	AB 2766 Fund	69	12,000		Transfer of Rideshare Program from Prop A to AB 2766
	Refuse Fund	69	8,816		Elimination of one-half FTE from Streetscape with resource being allocated to General Fund Streets program in Public Works (\$30,872) and Refuse (\$8,816).
	Subtotal of Other Non General Fund Changes	49	(1,041,336) \$	(1,815,991)	
	INS 語歌語。	nmary of	Summary of Changes In All Funds 。	spi	
		Exp	Expenditures	Revenues	
	Total of Proposed Changes increase/(decrease)	₩ ₩	(3,107,669) \$	(1,815,991)	
	Revised Budget Totals (All Funds)	9	+	83,464,915	

Page 2 of 2

# Appropriate Limit was adopted by California voters in 1990, and placed limits and the amount of

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH, CALIFORNIA, ESTABLISHING THE APPROPRIATIONS LIMIT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010-2011

SECTION 1. The City Council of the City of Manhattan Beach, California, hereby makes the following findings:

- Government Code Section 7910 requires the City Council to establish its appropriations limit pursuant to Article XIII B of the State Constitution; and
- B. The appropriations limit to be applied to the "proceeds of taxes" as defined by Section 7910 of the Government Code for Fiscal Year 2010-2011 has been calculated to be \$49,927,817

SECTION 2. That the annual adjustment factors used in making such calculation based on the percentage changes in California per capita income and the annual population for the City of Manhattan Beach.

SECTION 3. That this resolution shall become effective as of, on and after the 1<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2010.

SECTION 4. That the City Clerk shall certify to the passage and adoption of this resolution; shall cause the same to be entered among the original resolutions of said City; and shall make a minute of the passage and adoption thereof in the records of the proceedings of the City Council of said City in the minutes of the meeting at which the same is passed and adopted.

PASSED, APPROVED and ADOPTED this 15th day of June, 2010.

Ayes:	
Noes:	
Absent:	
Abstain:	

Mayor, City of Manhattan Beach, California

ATTEST: (neitslugge group 2012 yil) and

OUAO | neitsular beauses islinebise non ni

City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM

City Attorney

Remaining accountation commutes

Harli delicite, orange to insc

# APPROPRIATIONS LIMIT CALCULATION

Article XIIIB of the California State Constitution, commonly referred to as the Gann Initiative or Gann Appropriations Limit, was adopted by California voters in 1980 and placed limits on the amount of proceeds of taxes that State and local agencies can appropriate and spend each year.

The limit is different for every agency and changes each year. The annual limit is based on the amount of tax proceeds that were authorized to be spent in FY 1978-79, modified for changes in inflation and population. Inflationary adjustments are based on increases in the California per capita income or the increase in non-residential assessed valuation due to new construction. An adjustment is also made based on changes in Manhattan Beach's population or County population.

For FY 2010-2011, the estimated tax proceeds appropriated by the Manhattan Beach City Council are under the Limit. The adjusted Appropriation Limit for FY 2010-2011 is \$49,927,817 This amount is the maximum amount of tax proceeds the City is able to appropriate and spend in FY 2010-2011. The appropriations subject to the Limit are \$34,670,343 leaving the City with an appropriations capacity under the Limit of \$15,256,957

Section 7910 of the State Government Code requires a governing body to annually adopt, by resolution, an Appropriations Limit for the upcoming fiscal year.

SPENDING LIMIT CALCULATION FY 20 Appropriations subject to limit	A STATE OF THE STA	STONE OF
FY 2010-2011 Revenues (all funds) Less: Nonproceeds of tax Plus: User fees in excess of costs Total appropriations subject to limit		\$83,464,915 48,794,072 0 <b>\$34,670,843</b>
Appropriation limit  FY 2009-2010 adjusted appropriation limit  A. Population adjustment  (Based on change in City's/County population)	1.0083	\$47,612,334
B. Percent growth in non residential assessed valuation	1.0400	

Total Annual Adjustment = (A multiplied by B)	1.0486320	
Increase in appropriation limit	A STATE OF THE STA	\$2,315,483
FY 2010-2011 appropriation limit		\$49,927,817
Appropriations subject to limit	ABLHOWN AL	\$34,670,843
Remaining propriation capacity		15,256,974
Available capacity as a percent of appropriation limit	t	30.56%

Attackine po "D"

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 6260**

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING THE ANNUAL BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010-2011

SECTION 1. The City Council hereby makes the following findings:

- A. The Manhattan Beach Municipal Code provides that the City Manager of Manhattan Beach shall cause to be prepared and submitted to the City Council an annual budget; and
- B. The budget covering the fiscal year 2010-2011 has been reviewed by the City Council with regard to the approval of estimated revenues and expenditures; and
- C. The City Council has made such necessary revisions to the budget as provided for in Exhibit "A" attached hereto.

<u>SECTION 2</u>. The 2010-2011 proposed budget, as amended by Exhibit "A" attached hereto, is hereby approved and adopted as the official municipal budget for the City of Manhattan Beach.

SECTION 3. The City Clerk is directed to maintain three copies of the municipal budget on file at all times for inspection by the public.

SECTION 4. Effective July 1, 2010 the City Manager is hereby authorized to proceed with the implementation of the work program as incorporated in the approved and adopted budget, and that he has the authority to transfer any sum of appropriated funds between departments and programs provided they do not cross funds.

SECTION 5. Unexpended appropriations may be carried forward to the next fiscal year provided the funds have been previously encumbered for a specific purpose, or apply to authorized, but uncompleted projects in the Capital Improvement Plan.

SECTION 6. This resolution shall become effective as of, on and after the 1<sup>st</sup> day of

SECTION 7. The City Clerk shall certify to the passage and adoption of this resolution; shall cause the same to be entered among the original resolutions of said City; and shall make a minute of the passage and adoption thereof in the records of the proceedings of the City Council of said City in the minutes of the meeting at which the same is passed and adopted.

PASSED, APPROVED and ADOPTED this 15th day of June, 2010.

Noes: Absent: Abstain:		
ATTEST: densit mattennett for still	Mayor, City of Manhattan Beach,	California
City Clerk		

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

By City Attorney

Ayes:

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 6261**

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN FOR FISCAL YEARS 2011-2015

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH, CALIFORNIA, DOES RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The City Council hereby makes the following findings:

A. It is the desire of the Manhattan Beach City Council to develop a proactive capital improvement plan to meet the community's needs and desires for future services, programs and facilities, and improve the City's ability to continue providing essential services in an emergency situation; and

- B. The proposed Capital Improvement Plan was reviewed by the Parking and Public Improvements Commission; and
- C. The proposed Capital Improvement Plan was presented to the City Council on May 18, 2010.

SECTION 2. The Capital Improvement Plan for years FY 2011-2015 is hereby approved and adopted.

SECTION 3. The City Clerk is directed to maintain three copies of the Capital Improvement Plan on file at all times for inspection by the public.

SECTION 4. By adoption of the FY 2011-2015 Capital Improvement Plan, it is the intent of the City Council to revise the five year plan each year by continuing to identify capital improvement projects five years into the future and re-prioritize existing capital improvements based on perceived community need.

SECTION 5. This resolution shall become effective as of, on and after the 1st day of July, 2010.

SECTION 6. The City Clerk shall certify to the passage and adoption of this Resolution; shall cause the same to be entered among the original resolutions of said City; and shall make a minute of the passage and adoption thereof in the records of the proceedings of the City Council of said City in the minutes of the meeting at which the same is passed and adopted.

PASSED, APPROVED and ADOPTED this 15th day of June, 2010.

Ayes: Noes: Absent: Abstain:

Mayor, City of Manhattan Beach, California

ATTEST:

City Clerk

APPROVED &

City Attorney

Ma

vernett/- vii.

ATRACH NENT "F"

# RESOLUTION NO. 6262

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH, CALIFORNIA, ESTABLISHING A SCHEDULE OF FEES TO BE CHARGED BY VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS OF THE CITY FOR PERMITS AND SERVICES, SUPERSEDING ALL PRIOR APPLICABLE INCONSISTENT RESOLUTIONS OR ORDERS IN CONCERT THEREWITH

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH, CALIFORNIA, DOES HEREBY DECLARE, FIND, DETERMINE AND ORDER AS FOLLOWS:

 $\underline{\textbf{SECTION 1.}} \quad \text{The City Council of the City of Manhattan Beach hereby makes the following findings:}$ 

- Departments of the City have reviewed the fee schedule and made certain recommendations to the City Council; and
- B. The schedule of fees for services represents reimbursement for cost incurred by the City in providing direct services to particular individuals or groups rather than to the general populace of the City of Manhattan Beach; and
- It is equitable that the City of Manhattan Beach be compensated for providing such direct services; and
- Administrative fines are established for violations of city ordinances and regulations; and
- E. Departments of the city are recommending adjustments to certain administrative fines as set forth on Exhibit A.

<u>SECTION 2</u>. The fees and fines set forth on Exhibit A, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference, are hereby adopted, any previous fees and fines inconsistent with the fees in Exhibit A are rescinded and replaced.

SECTION 3. The fees and fines adopted hereunder are based upon the actual cost to the City of providing the service or facility for which the fee is charged or the reasonable cost of enforcement.

SECTION 4. Departments of the City have reviewed the fee schedule and made certain recommendations to the City Council. The schedule of fees for permits and services represents reimbursement for costs incurred by the City in providing direct services to particular individuals or groups rather than to the general populace of the City of Manhattan Beach as well as administrative fines for specified violations.

SECTION 5. Specific fees and fines adopted under this resolution supercede all prior like and applicable fees and fines from any and all previous resolutions and ordinances to the extent that they are inconsistent with the fees and fines hereby adopted. Any and all fees and fines and resolution provisions not inconsistent with the provisions of this resolution shall continue in full force and effect.

SECTION 6. The City Manager shall have the authority to interpret the provisions of this resolution for purposes of resolving ambiguities. The City Manager shall have the authority to authorize and require reasonable compensation for the temporary use of City property or receipt of City services not otherwise provided for in this resolution or other applicable resolutions or ordinances. Such compensation shall be based upon the City's fully burdened hourly rates or costs.

SECTION 7. This resolution shall take effect June 15, 2010.

SECTION 8. The City Clerk shall certify to the passage and adoption of this resolution; shall cause the same to be City Council members voting for and against this Resolution and shall post in the office of the City Clerk a certified copy of the full text of this Resolution along with the names of those City Council members voting for and against the Resolution.

## PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 15th day of June, 2010.

Ayes: 10 BHT 30 IIIIIIII00 YTO THE AD INDICATE A Noes: A DEFENDENCE OF A SHEET OF A SHEE

Mayor, City of Manhattan Beach, California

ATTEST:

City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM

City Attorney

# Resolution No. 6262 Exhibit "A"

# **Ambulance Fees**

The following fees will be effective July 1, 2010. The fees will adjust in accordance with the Los Angeles County Emergency Medical Services Agency General Public Ambulance Rates:

Advanced Life Support (ALS)

**Basic Life Support** 

County Rates - BI S (7/2010)

County	Rates -	ALS	(7/2010)

Advanced Life Support	\$1	,232.50
Code 3	\$	118.00
Per Mile Charge	\$	17.00
Average Equipment Charge	\$	175.00
Oxygen	\$	55.00
Backboard	\$	43.00
Neonatal	\$	164.25
Ice	\$	23.00

County Hates - DES (1/2010)	
Basic Life Support	\$ 863.25
Code 2	\$ 46.50
Per Mile Charge	\$ 17.00
Average Equipment Charge	\$ 100.00
Oxygen	\$ 55.00
Backboard	\$ 43.00
Neonatal	\$ 164 25

23.00

# Police False Alarms

The following fine schedule will be effective July 1, 2010. Each rate applies to the number of alarms per calendar year

Ice

1st	No Charge		
2nd	\$	190.00	
3rd	\$	285.00	
4th	\$	380.00	
5th	\$	380.00	
6th	\$	380.00	
7th	\$	380.00	

# Resolution No. 6262 Exhibit A.\*

# speci sonstudina

Une following near will be effective fully 1, 2010. The fees will adjust in according with that as Angelea County Employees when the vice is Angelea (Ponepal Public Andronous Kales).

#### (RAM) this ear said heavily ha

Francisco del Statif

100.811 8	
100.VI 3	
1,00:27F 8	Arciege Equipment Charge
60.46	
TOUGH &	
10110	

185,536	
	парухО

# Police False Alarrus

The full poving flux schedule wall be effective July 1, 2010. Each rate applies to the comber of slague, percuriendar year.