

June 28, 2011
7:30 P.M.
Council Chambers of City Hall
340 Palos Verdes Dr. West
Palos Verdes Estates

**AGENDA
OF A REGULAR MEETING
OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF
PALOS VERDES ESTATES, CALIFORNIA**

Copies of the staff reports or other written documentation relating to each item of business referred to on the agenda are on file in the office of the City Clerk and are available for public inspection. If applicable, materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the Council after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the City Clerk's office during normal business hours. Any person having any question concerning any agenda item may call the City Clerk to make inquiry concerning the item. Upon request, the agenda and documents in the agenda packet can be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Please contact the City Clerk at 310-378-0383, at least 48 hours prior to the meeting to request a disability-related modification or accommodation.

The City Council welcomes and encourages public participation at the Council meetings; however, to allow for the orderly progression of business, each person wishing to comment or make a presentation shall be limited to three (3) minutes. Anyone wishing to address the City Council shall fill out a green speaker's card available at the end of each row in the Chambers. The card permits the City to identify persons for purposes of City Council minute preparation. Please see specific agenda sections below for any other requirements related to meeting participation. The City Council, at the direction of the Mayor with concurrence of the Council, may modify the order of items shown on the agenda.

**NEXT RESOLUTION NO. R11-17
NEXT ORDINANCE NO. 11-699**

CALL TO ORDER

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

MAYOR'S REPORT – Matters of Community Interest

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
JUNE 28, 2011**

CONSENT AGENDA (Items 1-7)

All items under this heading are considered to be routine and will be enacted by one motion, unless a Councilmember, staff, or member of the public requests that an item be removed for separate discussion. An applicant or interested citizen who wishes to appeal any Planning Commission decision (Item # 7a-i) may file an appeal with the City Clerk's office within 15 days after the date of the Planning Commission's decision.

Any item removed from the Consent Agenda will be considered immediately following the motion to approve the Consent Agenda.

1. City Council Minutes
 - a. June 14, 2011; Regular Meeting
 - b. June 18, 2011; Special Meeting

Recommendation: Review and Approve.

2. Resolution R11-11 Approving Final Adjustments to the FY 2010-11 Budget

Recommendation: It is recommended that the City Council adopt Resolution R11-11 to make final adjustments to the FY 2010-11 budget.

3. Resolution R11-12; Approving the Auditor's Report and Setting the Fire and Paramedic Services Special Tax Rate for FY 2011-12

Recommendation: It is recommended that the City Council adopt Resolution R11-12; approving the Auditor's Report and establishing the FY 2011-12 Fire and Paramedic Services special tax rate in conformance with Ordinance 677.

4. Adoption of the FY 2011-2012 Budget: Resolution R11-14; Establishing the FY 2011-12 Appropriations Limit, and R11-15 Adopting the Annual Budget and Fixing the Limitation of Expenditures

Recommendation: It is recommended that the City Council adopt Resolution R11-14 establishing the FY 2011-12 Appropriations Limit and R11-15 adopting the Annual Budget for FY 2011-12.

5. Traffic Safety Committee Meeting Items of June 8, 2011

Recommendation: Review and Approve.

- a. Review of No Parking Restrictions in the Alley next to 711 Yarmouth Road

Action: Recommended that staff leave the parking restrictions in place. (Approved 4-0, Culler absent).

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
JUNE 28, 2011**

- b. Request for Right-Turn Restriction from Via Fernandez onto Via Lopez, and for a Warrant Analysis for STOP Signs on Via Lopez at Via Martinez.

Action: Recommended that staff install STOP signs in both directions on Via Lopez at Via Martinez. (Approved 3-1; Beall dissenting, Culler absent).

- c. Request for Red Curb Parking Restrictions, Signage, and Striping near the Gatos Place/Via Del Monte Intersection:

- Red Curb on Eastbound Via Del Monte for 96 Feet from Gatos Place
- Red Curb on Westbound Via Del Monte for 109 Feet from Gatos Place
- Red Curb on Both Sides of Gatos Place for 29 Feet from the Intersection
- STOP Signs on Via Del Monte, Both Directions, near the Gatos Place/Via Del Monte Intersection
- SLOW PREPARE TO STOP Pavement Markings Painted onto Via Del Monte, Both Directions

Action: Recommended that staff 1) install STOP signs in both directions on Via Del Monte near Gatos Place with advanced warning and stenciling as shown on the Traffic Safety presentation, and 2) install red curbs as shown on the Traffic Safety presentation. (Approved 4-0, Culler absent).

6. Parklands Committee Meeting Items June 13, 2011

Recommendation: Review and Approve.

- a. PC-328-11; Application to remove 1 Weeping Fig tree located in the city parkway adjacent to 2400 Via Carrillo

Applicant: Sigi Caron
2400 Via Carrillo
Palos Verdes Estates, CA 90274

Action: Approved (5-0). The applicant is approved to remove 1 Weeping Fig tree located in the city parkway adjacent to 2400 Via Carrillo according to the 'Standard Conditions For Tree Removal Approvals'. Plant 1 Strawberry tree (*Arbutus unedo*).

- b. PC-329-11; Application to trim 1 Oleander hedge, 1 Pepper tree and 1 Avocado tree located in the city parklands adjacent to 704 Mexico Place

Applicant: Steven Underberger
708 Mexico Place
Palos Verdes Estates, CA 90274

Action: Approved (5-0). The applicant is approved to trim 1 Oleander hedge and 1 Brazilian pepper tree located in the parklands adjacent to 704 Mexico Place to a

consistent height above grade as pictured in the 2007 submitted photo. Trimming to be directed by the City Forester to establish height limit.

- c. PC-330-11; Application to retain and maintain non-standard items located in the parklands adjacent to the rear of 1602 Espinosa Circle

Applicant: Steven and Susan Andelson
1602 Espinosa Circle
Palos Verdes Estates, CA 90274

Action: Approve (5-0). The applicant is approved to retain and maintain non-standard items located in the parklands adjacent to and at the rear of 1602 Espinosa Circle.

- d. PC-331-11; Application to remove two trees located in the parkway adjacent to 2132 Chelsea Road

Applicant: Sarah Kaupp Boyle
2132 Chelsea Road
Palos Verdes Estates, CA 90274

Action: Approved (5-0). The applicant is approved to remove 2 city trees located in the parkway adjacent to 2132 Chelsea Road according to the 'Standard Conditions For Tree Removal Approvals'. Plant 1 tree and pay \$500 to the 'Tree Bank'.

7. Planning Commission Actions of June 21, 2011

Recommendation: Receive and File.

- a. **M-812-11**; Consideration of a Miscellaneous Application for a structure exceeding the maximum allowable height at the single family residence located at 3120 Via La Selva. Lot 6, Block 1802, Tract 6883.

Applicant/Owner: Kevin & Jennifer Ferreyra

Action: Approved (5-0) with standard conditions.

- b. **CDP-83/NC-1418-11**; Consideration of Coastal Development Permit and Neighborhood Compatibility Applications for a new single family residence located at 312 Rocky Point Road. Lot 39, Tract 17606.

Applicant: Jeffrey A. Dahl
18681 Amalia Lane
Huntington Beach, CA 92648
Owner: Kevin & Elizabeth McBride

Action: Approved (5-0) with standard conditions and the following additional conditions: 1) A licensed survey of the building and overall lot coverage shall be completed and submitted to the City to verify compliance with the approved coverage for the subject lot; 2) All non-standard encroachments shall be removed.

- c. **M-804-11;** Consideration of a Miscellaneous Application for a structure exceeding the maximum allowable height at the single family residence located at 1704 Via Boronada. Lot 8, Block 1373, Tract 6889.

Applicant: Jason Richart
1041 W. 18th St., #A-106
Costa Mesa, CA 92627
Owner: Ali Reza

Action: Approved (5-0) with standard conditions and the following additional conditions: 1) Landscape screening is to be provided on the rear and two sides of the deck at least 10 ft. in height, but not to exceed 12 ft.; 2) The color of the deck is to be consistent with the surrounding foliage and hillside.

- d. **GA-1485/M-807-11;** Consideration of revised Grading and Miscellaneous Applications for the new single family residence located at 1820 Paseo Del Sol. Lot 8, Block 1550, Tract 7333.

Applicant: Seed Group, Inc.
1505 Border Ave.
Torrance, CA 90501
Owner: Yulong Huang
6309 Ridgemar Ct.
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

Action: Approved (5-0) with standard conditions and the following additional conditions: 1) The eastern gazebo and the barbecue are to be located outside of the setback; 2) The waterfall is to be off between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.

- e. **M-809-11;** Consideration of a Miscellaneous Applications for a non-standard driveway and a structure exceeding the maximum allowable height at the single family residence located at 2717 Paseo Del Mar. Lot 6, Tract 19787.

Applicant: Seed Group, Inc.
1505 Border Ave.
Torrance, CA 90501
Owner: Marzieh Daneshvar

Action: Approved (3-2, Vandever and Evans dissenting) with standard conditions and the following additional condition: 1) The trees indicated on the plans at the north and

south end of the City right-of-way are to be maintained in the current locations as noted on the site plan.

- f. **NC-1411/GA-1484-11;** Consideration of Neighborhood Compatibility and Grading Applications for a new single family residence located at 2316 Via Acalones. Lot 1, Block 1651, Tract 7330.

Applicant: Tomaro Architecture, Inc.
2617 N. Sepulveda Blvd., #100
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
Owner: Wayne Tsang & Bonnie Ying

Action: Approved (5-0) with standard conditions and the following additional conditions: 1) City standard curb and gutter shall be installed along the Via Acalones frontage per construction plans prepared by a registered Civil Engineer and approved by the City Engineer; 2) The existing pilasters and lights are to be removed from the City right-of-way; 3) Both chimneys are to be the size of the smaller chimney design; 4) Any modifications to the balconies or the openings to the balconies adjacent to 2320 Via Acalones must be processed with the Planning Commission.

- g. **NC-1271R-11;** Revised Neighborhood Compatibility Application for the new single family residence located at 452 Via Almar. Lot 21, Block 1514, Tract 6886.

Applicant/Owner: Brian & Dominique Pheiffer

Action: Approved (5-0) with standard conditions.

- h. **NC-1304R-11;** Revised Neighborhood Compatibility Application for the new single family residence located at 376 Via Almar. Lot 5, Block 1514, Tract 6886.

Applicant: Cauthen Design
17072 Tiffany Cr.
Huntington Beach, CA 92649
Owner: Mr. & Mrs. Kocarlan
364 Via Almar
Palos Verdes Estates, CA 90274

Action: Approved (5-0) with standard conditions.

- i. **M-810-11;** Consideration of a Miscellaneous Application for a structure exceeding the maximum allowable height at the single family residence located at 2601 Pinale Lane. Lot 5, Block 1712, Tract 6885.

Applicant/Owner: Yuka Arellano-Kruse

Action: Approved (5-0) with standard conditions and the following additional conditions: 1) The total height of the fence including the railing is not to exceed 6.5 ft. in height; 2) The fence is to be of open construction with pilasters approvable at the discretion of staff.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

This portion of the agenda is reserved for comments from the public on items which are NOT on the agenda. Due to state law, no action can be taken by the Council this evening on matters presented under this section. If the Council determines action is warranted, the item may be referred to staff or placed on a future Council agenda.

PUBLIC HEARINGS – 7:30 p.m.

Appellant/Applicant shall be provided five (5) minutes for presentation and rebuttal. All other persons addressing the City Council during public hearing shall be limited to three (3) minutes for comment.

8. Appeal of Planning Commission Denial of WT-115-10; Wireless Telecommunication Facilities Application for Equipment Proposed within the City Right-of-Way Adjacent to 2827 Vic Victoria. Lot 7, Tract 30393

Appellant/Applicant: NextG Networks of California, Inc.
890 Tasman Drive
Milpitas, CA 95035

Recommendation: It is recommended that the City Council opened the public hearing, receive public input, close the public hearing and make a decision on the application.

9. Resolution R11-13 Approving the Annual Report and Setting the Rate for the Sewer User Fee to Finance the FY 2011-12 Program of Sanitary Sewer Improvements

Recommendation: It is recommended that the City Council open the public hearing in accordance with Health & Safety Code Section 5470, receive public input, close the public hearing and adopt Resolution R11-13; approving the Sewer User Fee Annual Report, prepared in accordance with Ordinance No. 03-649, establishing the sewer user fee rate for the FY 11-12 sanitary sewer improvement program.

OLD BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA JUNE 28, 2011

10. Request from Athens Services for Seven-Year Contract Extension for Residential Refuse Hauling

Recommendation: This is a matter of Council discretion.

11. Review and Approval of the FY 2011-12 Palos Verdes Stable Budget and Adoption of Resolution R11-16 Approving Increases in Monthly Boarding Rates Effective July 1, 2011

Recommendation: It is recommended that the City Council receive the report, approve the FY 2011-12 Palos Verdes Stable budget and adopt Resolution R11-16 approving increases in monthly boarding rates effective July 1, 2011.

STAFF REPORTS

12. City Manager's Report

DEMANDS

13.
 - a. Authorize Payment of Motion #1 – Payroll Warrant of June 24, 2011
 - b. Authorize Payment of Motion #2 – Warrant Register of June 28, 2011

Recommendation: Authorize Payment of Motions #1 and #2.

MAYOR & CITY COUNCILMEMBERS' REPORTS

- Appointments to Planning Commission, Parklands Committee, and Traffic Safety Committee
- Designation of Officers - Planning Commission, Parklands Committee, and Traffic Safety Committee

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, JULY 12, 2011, IN COUNCIL CHAMBERS OF CITY HALL FOR THE PURPOSE OF A REGULAR MEETING.

- *This City Council meeting can be viewed on Cox Cable, Channel 35, Wednesday, June 29, 2011 at 7:30 p.m., and Wednesday, July 6, 2011, at 7:30 p.m.*

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA JUNE 28, 2011

TO: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL
FROM: JUDY SMITH, ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER
SUBJECT: RESOLUTION R11-11 APPROVING FINAL
ADJUSTMENTS TO THE FY 2010-11 BUDGET

The Issue

Shall the City Council make final adjustments to the FY 2010-11 budget and adopt Resolution R11-11?

Background

This resolution is part of our annual budget process, which recognizes that certain adjustments to revenues and expenditures for FY 2010-11 are necessary in order to more closely reflect anticipated budget results for the current fiscal year. These changes are reflected in the previous year-end estimates provided to the City Council and thus do not affect projected beginning fund balances for FY 2011-12.

Analysis and Findings

The level of budgetary control is at the fund level, which means total expenditures for any fund may not exceed the legally adopted budget, as approved by the City Council. Several of the items outlined in the attached resolution are to account for minor expenditure deviations for special restricted funds (e.g. Gas Tax, COPS, and Corrections Training) and to ensure the adopted budget is not exceeded. General fund changes are proposed to more closely match projected year end estimates for certain revenues and expenditures and will assist the auditors in their review of budget to actual performance.

General fund revenues are decreased by a total of \$5,000 and expenditures increased a net \$10,440, but as mentioned above, the individual component adjustments will assist for purposes of financial statement presentation. Restricted revenues are decreased a total of \$233,500 mainly due to lower interest earnings and the timing of receipt of outside funds for capital project reimbursement, while expenditures financed by restricted revenues are increased a total of \$31,000.

The resolution also includes authorization for certain inter-fund transfers, which require Council approval. The transfers include reimbursement to the general fund for park maintenance activities (Proposition A maintenance monies), transfer to capital of TDA Article 3 funds to reimburse an eligible capital project and a general fund transfer to the insurance fund for the discounted advanced

payment of the general liability insurance retro to the CJPIA. The resolution also provides for the transfer from the general fund to the capital fund the balance of the Haag Estate proceeds (\$248,865), which Council intends to use for City Hall seismic safety improvements. Since this will be a capital project with the total cost of the work (design and construction) likely to exceed the estate proceeds balance, it is appropriate to make those monies available now within the capital fund.

Alternatives Available to the City Council

1. Adopt Resolution R11-11 to adjust the FY 2010-11 budget.
2. Do not approve the adjustments, in which case, certain funds and departments will exceed the adopted budget. Failure to adjust the budget will violate the City's policy of not exceeding legally appropriated limits and resulting in a negative audit comment from the City's independent auditors.

Recommendation

It is recommended that City Council adopt Resolution R11-11 to make final adjustments to the FY 2010-11 budget.

TO: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: JUDY SMITH, ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER

SUBJECT: RESOLUTION R11-12; APPROVING THE AUDITOR'S REPORT AND SETTING THE FIRE AND PARAMEDIC SERVICES SPECIAL TAX RATE FOR FY 2011-12

The Issue

Shall the City Council approve Resolution R11-12, which adopts the Auditor's Report and sets the Fire and Paramedic Services special tax rate for FY 2011-12?

Background

FY 2011-12 represents the 20th year of special dedicated funding for the fire/paramedic contract. In March, 2007, Palos Verdes Estates voters approved (+87%) Ordinance 677 authorizing a ten-year special tax (expiration 6-30-17) to finance fire/paramedic services provided under contract by the Los Angeles County Fire Department. An initial special tax was approved by City voters in 2001 for a six-year period. The special tax replaced a fire benefit assessment, which had been in place since 1991.

The current tax measure allows for a maximum annual rate increase of 4.2% or the actual increase in the fire service contract cost, whichever is less. Revenues and fire contract costs are accounted for in a separate fund, Special Fire Tax (fund 22).

Analysis and Findings

On May 24, 2011, the City received contract cost information from Los Angeles County Fire (attached), which included the final actual cost for FY 10-11 and the estimated cost for FY 11-12. Applying the contract cap described above, the maximum permitted cost for FY 10-11 fire and paramedic services totaled \$3,981,331. The actual cost for FY 10-11 was \$3,915,852 and the County assessed \$11,361 of the prior years' "excess" cap resulting in a final total cost of \$3,927,213. According to the County, the savings are due to lower benefit costs, including worker's compensation. A recap of the recent history of the fire contract cost is included as Attachment 1.

The FY 11-12 estimated contract cost is \$3,936,416 and represents a 0.53% increase compared to the FY 10-11 actual cost (\$3,915,852). It is important to note, the estimated cost does not include

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
JUNE 28, 2011

any assumptions about wage increases for County Fire contracts that expire in December 2011. For the past three years, County Supervisors extended the existing contracts without wage increases. It is important to note, in the event that mid-year wage increases are provided, that the maximum contract cost is capped at \$4,080,318.

The City's assessment engineers, NBS Government Services, have prepared the Auditor's Report, attached as Exhibit A to the resolution. There are two components to the tax – a flat cost per parcel, including vacant parcels, and a cost per square foot of building improvement. As a result of the estimated fire contract cost (+0.53%) there is **no change** in the tax rate for FY 11-12 from FY 10-11.

	<u>FY 2011-12</u>
Per Parcel	\$283.30
Cost/building sq. ft.	\$0.16226
Median home (2,595 sq. ft.)	\$704.36
Cost for fire / paramedic service for median home =	\$1.93/day

A ten-year history of the annual tax rate and cost for a median home is shown in Attachment 2 to this report. The last year in which there was no increase in cost to residents for the fire contract funding was FY 95-96, which was followed by two-consecutive years in which the tax/assessment was reduced (FY 96-97 -0.2% and FY 97-98 -6%). This was due to complicated funding provisions in effect at that time, including a refund against the fire contract cost from excess County pension proceeds. Since the City realized savings in the contract, the savings were passed directly to the residents in the form of a lower tax/assessment.

The Auditor's Report shows the tax rate, the estimated revenues to be derived from the special tax, \$4,002,687, and the projected cost for fire and paramedic services. The anticipated revenue, assuming a 100% collection rate, exceeds the estimated cost by \$61,246 and would increase the fire fund balance by that amount. The ending fund balance for the fire tax fund as of June 30, 2012 is projected at \$309,864. These funds are restricted and can only be used for fire/paramedic contract costs. The funds also provide a hedge in the event of wage increases mentioned above and the City incurs costs up to the contract maximum of \$4,080,318.

Alternatives Available to the City Council

1. Adopt Resolution R11-12, which approves the Auditor's Report and sets the Fire and Paramedic services special tax rate for FY 2011-12.
2. Decline to adopt Resolution R11-12. Without approval of the special tax, the budget would be out of balance by the amount of the tax or ~\$4 million.

Recommendation

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
JUNE 28, 2011**

It is recommended that the City Council adopt Resolution R11-12; approving the Auditor's Report and establishing the FY 2011-12 Fire and Paramedic Services special tax rate in conformance with Ordinance 677.

TO: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: JUDY SMITH, ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER

SUBJECT: ADOPTION OF THE FY 2011-2012 BUDGET: RESOLUTION R11-14; ESTABLISHING THE FY 2011-12 APPROPRIATIONS LIMIT, AND R11-15 ADOPTING THE ANNUAL BUDGET AND FIXING THE LIMITATION OF EXPENDITURES

The Issue

Shall the City Council adopt the required resolutions to approve the City's Fiscal Year 2011-12 budget?

Appropriations Limit FY 2011-12

Article XIII B of the State Constitution requires the adoption of an annual appropriations limit related to certain tax proceeds. Resolution R11-14 is attached for this purpose.

The City's annual appropriations limit, also known as the "Gann" limit, may be adjusted by certain factors that the City Council, at its option, selects. The factors used to calculate the City's FY 11-12 limit are:

California per capita personal income +2.51% as reported by the State Department of Finance, and

Population increase for Los Angeles County +0.38%, as reported by the State.

The City's FY 10-11 appropriations limit was \$16,895,650, which was a reduction from the prior year because of a negative California per capita personal income factor (-2.54%) used to calculate the limit. Applying the factors above, the FY 2011-12 appropriations limit is \$17,385,544 of which, the City's actual appropriations subject to the limitation (tax proceeds) totals \$12,182,080 or 70% of what is allowed.

Budget Process

The City Council has held publicly noticed meetings on March 31 and June 14 at which there was an opportunity for public comment by residents or other interested parties on the proposed budget. There was one change to the preliminary budget dated May 20, 2011 due to the annual street program contracts which were awarded during May. As a result, the capital improvement budget (fund 30) has been increased \$100,000 to fully fund the annual road program.

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
JUNE 28, 2011**

The City's consolidated budget (operating and capital) for FY 2011-12 is \$18,796,190. The operating budget totals \$14,460,190. The capital budget, including sewer and non-sewer projects, totals \$4,336,000 and includes the annual street maintenance programs (\$1.2 million) and construction of the Rocky Point sewer pump station (\$2.96 million).

Alternatives Available to the City Council

1. Approve the resolutions.
2. Approve additional changes to the budget and adopt the resolutions.
3. Defer adopting the budget.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the City Council adopt Resolution R11-14 establishing the FY 2011-12 Appropriations Limit and R11-15 adopting the Annual Budget for FY 2011-12.

TO: JUDY SMITH, ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER
FROM: ALLAN RIGG, PLANNING DIRECTOR
DATE: JUNE 28, 2011
SUBJECT: PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS OF JUNE 21, 2011

The items attached were acted upon by the Planning Commission on June 21, 2011.

The Council may, within fifteen days after the date of the decision on or before the first day following the first Council meeting after the date of the Planning Commission decision, whichever occurs last:

1. Confirm the action of the Planning Commission and grant or deny the application;
2. Set the matter for public hearing and dispose of it in the same manner as on an appeal; or
3. Amend, modify, delete, or add any condition of approval which the Council finds is not substantial under the circumstances relative to or affecting the property subject to the application for a development entitlement. Any determination of the Council pursuant to this paragraph shall be conclusive and final.

In the event the Council does not take one of the actions specified above within the period of time required, the decision of the Planning Commission shall be final.

Recommendation:

Receive and file.

TO: JUDY SMITH, ASST. CITY MANAGER

FROM: ALLAN RIGG, PLANNING DIRECTOR

**SUBJECT: APPEAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION DENIAL OF
WT-115-10; WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATION FACILITIES
APPLICATION FOR EQUIPMENT PROPOSED WITHIN THE CITY
RIGHT-OF-WAY ADJACENT TO 2827 VIA VICTORIA. LOT 7, TRACT
30393.**

**APPELLANT/
APPLICANT: NEXTG NETWORKS, INC.
890 TASMAN DRIVE
MILPITAS, CA 95035**

DATE: JUNE 28, 2011

The Issue

Should the City Council confirm the Planning Commission's decision to deny WT-115-10; Wireless Telecommunication Facilities application for equipment proposed within the City right-of-way adjacent to 2827 Via Victoria?

Background and Analysis

The application proposes a new 11 ft. high steel pole 22 ft. from the edge of pavement. The pole will be 120 ft. south of the driveway located at 2827 Via Victoria. The pole diameter is proposed to be seven inches maximum. Because the pole is set into the hillside, a new 4 ft. high retaining wall and pad will be required. The retaining wall and pad will create 20 sq. ft. of hardscape. There is a mock-up currently built at the site representing this proposal.

Site Description

Via Victoria is a residential street located at the south side of the City near the Rancho Palos Verdes border. Via Victoria ends shortly up the road and is surrounded by streets that are also cul-de-sacs such as Victoria Place and Via Miguel. The utilities are currently undergrounded in this area, making for a visually rural residential neighborhood. In this particular area, there is Parkland to the south side and the east side of the residences along Via Victoria. There is a median with vegetation between Via Victoria and Victoria Place which also contributes to the rural character of the street.

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
JUNE 28, 2011**

There are very few, if any, existing tall poles adjacent to that portion of Via Victoria. Below is a map showing the site location.



Approximate Location of Proposed Wireless Facility

The topography of this area slopes upward as Via Victoria stretches east towards Via Miguel. Due to the topography and the scenic views it affords, much care is given to the development along this street. Development is situated to take advantage of the views and minimize visual obstructions.

The paved portion of the two-lane street varies and is approximately 28 ft. wide near the proposed work. The facility is to be located 120 ft. south of the driveway at 2827 Via Victoria, on the northeastern side of the street.

Staff performed drive tests near the proposed site to assess the existing coverage on a Verizon Wireless phone. The following chart illustrates the findings:

DAY	MORNING	MIDDAY	LATE AFTERNOON
Monday	1-2 bars	2 bars	1-2 bars
Wednesday	2 bars	2 bars	2 bars
Friday	2 bars	2 bars	1-2 bars

Staff performed a variety of tasks including phone calls, texting, and internet usage. There did not appear to be any dropped calls, interruptions, or poor service while performing these tasks.

History

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
JUNE 28, 2011**

Applications for this site were originally submitted to the City on June 11, 2010. The pole with the antennae was proposed to be 31 ft. high and was to be located within the median between Via Victoria and Victoria Place. A mock-up was placed at the site and after feedback from the neighborhood, Director of Planning, Allan Rigg, worked with the applicant to move the pole to a less intrusive location. Ultimately, the pole was moved further up the street adjacent to Parkland and it was also reduced in height. The revised design included a new 27 ft. high steel pole with antenna and a 4 ft. high equipment cabinet. Both structures were to be approximately 4 ft. from the edge of pavement. A new cabinet was to be placed adjacent to 2827 Via Victoria.

Prior to formal Commission review, the City Wireless Consultant, Jonathan Kramer, reviewed the project in January. Mr. Kramer indicated that there is not currently a significant gap in service and there was virtually uninterrupted coverage in the area. Mr. Kramer also concluded that, from an aesthetics standpoint, the site could be redesigned to be less intrusive, as the proposed location was particularly visible to drivers and pedestrians given its height. Suggestions included a flush-to-grade vault as well as placing the antennae on top of a street name sign (approximately 16 feet in height). Mr. Kramer also reviewed the technical data for proposed emissions and it appears that the site will comply with FCC regulations for RF emissions safety. The applicant submitted a response stating that the proposed facility was needed to improve the strength of Verizon's signal to accommodate high speed data and new product offerings.

The project was reviewed by the Planning Commission on February 15, 2011. Residents raised aesthetic concerns regarding the visibility of the proposed pole in their existing views and diminished property values. Commissioners also raised concerns regarding the location of the pole, the height of the pole, the location of the cabinet, the lack of landscaping to screen visibility, and the view impacts identified by residents. It was suggested that the applicant explore all reasonable options to mitigate the impacts to the neighborhood, including the street sign design recommended by Mr. Kramer. Other suggestions included painting the mock-up to show the finished color, working with the residents regarding the design, and noting the number of potential future sites within the City. There was also a concern that the site might not be necessary for this area since research materials did not show a "gap" in coverage.

The project was reviewed by the Planning Commission again on March 15, 2011. At that time, two proposals were provided: Option # 1 was a 23 ft. high pole 4 ft. from the edge of pavement and Option # 2 was a 13 ft. high pole 22 ft. from the edge of pavement. The pole was relocated further up the street and the stand-alone cabinet was eliminated from the design. Concerns were raised regarding the visual impact of both proposals, particularly on the aesthetic impact to nearby residences, and the lack of vegetation and landscaping to screen visibility. It was suggested that landscaping be provided to reduce the exposure of the site and that other alternative locations be explored. Some commissioners were not convinced that the site is necessary and requested a more compelling statement from the applicant regarding the need to remedy a gap in coverage.

The final review of the project took place on May 17, 2011. The application proposed an 11 ft. high steel pole 22 ft. from the edge of pavement. A new 4 ft. high retaining wall was proposed around the pole. The applicant also proposed Lemonadeberry and Giant Buckwheat as additional landscaping around the equipment. While there is no specific gap in coverage, the applicant stated

that the new site is meant to address low coverage quality that results in dropped calls and unsuccessful call attempts. Residents continued to raise concerns related to the need for the project and aesthetic impacts. The Planning Commission indicated that the project was moving in the right direction; however, there is still much resistance from the neighborhood. Moreover, there are no other above-ground facilities in this area and the site could set a precedent. The Commission felt other options still needed to be explored and it was still not clear that the site was necessary for coverage. Some commissioners also raised concerns regarding the aesthetic impact. The Planning Commission was willing to offer another continuance, but the applicant requested a final vote. The Planning Commission voted 3-0 to deny the project.

Appeal

The Planning Commission's decision has now been appealed by the applicant, NextG Networks. The appeal purports that the Planning Commission denial was in error due to the fact that the need for coverage is irrelevant to the findings for approval. Furthermore, the appellant indicates that the Planning Commission should not rely on Mr. Kramer's expert opinion that there is no gap in service.

The appeal includes the appeal documents, the staff reports with all supporting documents as presented to Planning Commission, letters of correspondence, and minutes from all Planning Commission meetings. Please note that the PowerPoint presentation provided in the appeal documents was not reviewed by the Planning Commission.

Applicable regulation and policies

This application is subject to the City's wireless telecommunication ordinance. The wireless telecommunication ordinance requires the applicant to construct mock-ups of all proposed structures, at the proposed location. Notices are then mailed to all property owners within 300 ft., providing 15 days to comment on the project. The Public Works Director reviews the applications and determines whether to approve the project, deny the project, or forward the application to the Planning Commission for decision.

The City has consistently imposed stringent regulations on improvements within the City right-of-way. All above-ground structures within the City right-of-way require review and approval from the Planning Commission, prior to installation. Examples of above-ground structures in the City right-of-way include pilasters, walls, and equipment enclosures for various utility companies. The Planning Commission rarely permits the installation of new above-ground structures within the City right-of-way, and routinely requires the removal of existing above-ground structures. Similarly, vegetation within the City right-of-way is also strictly regulated. Parklands Committee approval is required for removing or planting trees within the public right-of-way. New trees are required to be of the designated street tree species, and deviations from street tree designations are rarely approved. Although these regulations may seem extensive, they have served to preserve the open, pastoral ambiance within the City, protecting the natural beauty that is unique to Palos Verdes Estates.

The municipal code includes several design standards which should be considered in connection with a wireless telecommunication project, including (1) locating facilities at the same site as an existing facility, if feasible, (2) ensuring appropriate setbacks, (3) designing the facilities to be as visually unobtrusive as possible, (4) locating the base station and all wires and cables underground, if feasible, (5) providing screening or innovative design to minimize visibility, (6) installing landscaping, and (7) limiting the height of the antenna to the maximum height limit in the underlying zone.

Correspondence Received

Letters of correspondence received for all Planning Commission meetings are included for review.

Findings Required to Approve

PVEMC Section 18.55 states, “In issuing the [wireless telecommunication facility] permit, the Public Works Director shall take into consideration all comments provided by the public, and may impose conditions on the permit prior to its issuance relating to the time, place, and manner of use of the public property. The Public Works Director may deny the Wireless Facility Permit if the application is incomplete or does not adequately mitigate the Facility’s adverse impact on the health, safety or welfare of the community, including, but not limited to, adverse aesthetic impacts arising from the proposed time, place, and manner of use of the public property.”

CEQA Status

This project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to California Administrative Code Title 14, Chapter 3, Section 15303.

Alternatives Available to Council

The following alternatives are available to the City Council:

1. Confirm the Planning Commission’s decision to deny WT-115-10; Wireless Telecommunication Facilities application for equipment proposed within the City right-of-way adjacent to 2827 Via Victoria.

2. Overturn the Planning Commission's decision and approve WT-115-10; Wireless Telecommunication Facilities application for equipment proposed within the City right-of-way adjacent to 2827 Via Victoria as proposed.
3. Overturn the Planning Commission's decision and approve WT-115-10; Wireless Telecommunication Facilities application for equipment proposed within the City right-of-way adjacent to 2827 Via Victoria, with modifications.

Once a decision is made by the City Council, a final Resolution will be prepared and presented at the following meeting to confirm the City Council's decision.

Recommendation from Staff

Staff recommends that the City Council open the public hearing, receive public input, close the public hearing, and make a decision on the application.

Staff report prepared by:

Stacey Kinsella
Planning Department

TO: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: JUDY SMITH, ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER

SUBJECT: RESOLUTION R11-13 APPROVING THE ANNUAL REPORT AND SETTING THE RATE FOR THE SEWER USER FEE TO FINANCE THE FY 2011-12 PROGRAM OF SANITARY SEWER IMPROVEMENTS

The Issue

Shall the City Council conduct the required public hearing and adopt Resolution 11-13, which approves the Sewer User Fee Annual Report and sets the rate for the sewer user fee to finance the FY 2011-12 sanitary sewer capital improvement program?

Background

FY 11-12 represents the ninth year of the ten-year authorization for the sewer user fee. The fee, approved in June 2003 after a public process dictated by law, is financing a program to upgrade and refurbish the City's sanitary sewer facilities as outlined in the Sewer Master Plan, which was approved and adopted by the City Council in 2003. The sewer user fee is levied under authority of Section 5471 of the Health and Safety Code. It appears on the property tax bill and is collected at the same time as payment for property taxes.

Analysis and Findings

The sewer fee calculation involves the following components:

- Estimated sewer use of each eligible property based on water consumption,
- Maximum permitted sewer unit rate / actual sewer unit rate, and
- Annual sewer capital improvement program budget

The estimated sewer use is based on water consumption using the three lowest months of water use in the City as a whole. The three lowest months are used to provide a factor for landscape water use which does not enter the sewer system and assumes the three lowest months of water use equal the wettest months.

Each parcel's water use for those three lowest months is then averaged and multiplied by 12 (months) to determine that property's annual estimated sewer use. The total of all properties use equals the estimated total sewer units.

The three lowest months of water use for the FY 2011-12 fee calculation were February, March and November 2010. Using these three months to calculate the average annual water use for each eligible property connected to the sewer system results in 1,051,776 units of estimated sewer use. This is a change of -16.5% compared to FY 2010-11 when 1,259,572 sewer units were recorded. The history of the sewer fee calculation is attached to this report.

The sewer fee unit rate is determined by dividing the annual improvement budget (minus interest earnings, plus administration) by the total estimated sewer use. The sewer unit rate may not exceed the maximum allowable rate as provided by ordinance. The maximum unit rate for FY 11-12 totals \$1.35 based on the associated inflation factor (Engineering News Record (ENR) Construction Cost Index for Los Angeles County). Even though a maximum sewer unit rate of \$1.35 could be levied, a unit rate of \$1.00, supplemented by existing sewer fund balance, will provide sufficient revenue to finance the FY 2011-12 sewer improvement program of \$2,960,000, which includes reconstruction, administration and inspection for the Rocky Point sewer pump station.

The \$1.00 sewer unit rate remains unchanged from FY 10-11. Proposition 218 provisions require additional noticing for inflationary increases of property-related fees (water, sewer, refuse); however, because the FY 11-12 \$1.00 unit rate does not exceed the unit rate of \$1.02 approved in the first year of the program, no additional public notice is required. The \$1.00 sewer unit rate will generate fee revenue of \$1,051,776.

The \$1.00 unit rate results in an average sewer fee for a single-family residence (SFR) of \$208. The FY 10-11 average SFR sewer fee was \$250. Although \$208 is the average, the actual cost per property varies based on water use. The overall data shows that 3,442 properties will have a decrease (68%) in the fee compared to last year, while 1,536 properties (30%) will experience an increase. One hundred eleven (111) properties will experience no change in their rate. Looking at all properties, 74% (3,778) will experience a fee increase or decrease within \$100. This is almost exactly the same result as last year when 3,772 of all properties had a change within (+ or -) \$100.

Alternatives Available to the City Council

1. Adopt Resolution R11-13, which approves the Sewer User Fee Annual Report and sets the sewer user fee rate for FY 2011-12, prepared in accordance with Ordinance No. 03-649.
2. Decline to adopt Resolution R11-13. Without approval of the annual report and sewer user fee rate, there is no authority to levy the fee.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the City Council open the public hearing in accordance with Health & Safety Code Section 5470, receive public input, close the public hearing and adopt Resolution R11-13; approving the Sewer User Fee Annual Report, prepared in accordance with Ordinance No. 03-649, establishing the sewer user fee rate for the FY 11-12 sanitary sewer improvement program.

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

JUNE 28, 2011

TO: JUDY SMITH, ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER
FROM: ALLAN RIGG, PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR
SUBJECT: REQUEST FROM ATHENS SERVICES FOR SEVEN-YEAR CONTRACT EXTENSION FOR RESIDENTIAL REFUSE HAULING
DATE: JUNE 28, 2011

The Issue

Should the City Council extend the current residential refuse hauling contract with Athens Services?

Background

The City's current contract with Athens Services (Athens) for single-family refuse and recycling services is scheduled to expire on June 30, 2012. Athens has been the City's refuse hauler since July 1, 2000, although the original award was to Norcal Waste Services Inc. (Norcal) which was subsequently acquired by Athens.

Athens has requested a seven-year extension to this contract resulting in an expiration of June 30, 2019. Their request, attached to this report, includes no change to services or the refuse rate structure. They have offered to provide alternative-fuel trucks that are cleaner running and tie the seven year extension to their need to amortize the purchase cost of these trucks.

Backyard trash collection of single family residences in Palos Verdes Estates is mandated by the Municipal Code. Residents are required to utilize the hauler selected by the City, and pay the associated monthly fee directly to the hauler. Trash, recycling and green waste are all to be kept in a trash yard, accessible to the collector, in a concealed location complying with requirements contained in the City Code. Historically, the City's trash contract has provided for the following:

- Weekly trash and green waste collection, with recyclables collected every other week.
- No limit on the amount of waste collected per week, within reason.
- Annual bulky trash pick-up day, allowing residents to dispose of larger items such as furniture and appliances.
- Emptying of public trash containers in the commercial areas and Parklands.
- Exclusive right and responsibility to provide dumpsters for single family residences, including those for construction debris.
- Annual collection of Christmas trees.

Athens' predecessor, Norcal, was originally awarded the contract starting on July 1, 2000 after a competitive bidding process. They were again awarded a new contract starting on July 1, 2005 after another competitive bidding process. The results of the bids received in 2005 are as follows:

Firm	7 Year Contract /Every Other Week Recyclable Collection
Norcal Waste Services Inc.	\$29.96

Waste Management of Los Angeles	\$35.68
Universal Waste Systems Inc.	\$37.02

The low bid for the option of providing the collection of recyclables every other week was \$29.96, which was 20% higher than the FY 2004/2005 rate of \$24.96 to provide the same service. Staff was not surprised by this increase as we believed from the beginning of the FY 2000-2005 contract that the price was artificially low.

Analysis

It is our standard practice in contracts of this magnitude to request bids in an open and competitive basis. However, we have also historically extended smaller contracts for other services when we are satisfied with the quality of the service that is being provided, and we want to avoid the possibility of a new contractor with a poor quality of service. These extensions have only been done at the same cost as obtained from the original bidding process.

To extend the refuse contract for seven years, or for a different term if proposed by Athens and accepted by the Council, has both positive and negative points to consider:

Negatives:

- The City loses the opportunity to potentially lower the cost of these services to the residents.
- An extension could be perceived as a less transparent process than open bidding.

Positives:

- The costs are capped by the existing contract provisions, while residents could potentially pay more for these services if the bids come in higher as they did in 2005 (+20%).
- There would be no disruption in services with the existing contractor. Service disruptions would be possible while the employees of a new contractor learned the routes and the particulars of individual homes' trash yards.
- The City would avoid costs for the bidding process, whether done in-house or with a consultant.
- Potential additional services (e.g. sharps pickups, battery disposal containers, enhanced hazardous material removals from City Hall, etc.) at no additional cost could be added to the contract as agreed to by the parties. If these are desired, staff would need time to pursue these discussions and bring back the request for extension at a later date.

Staff has been very satisfied with Athens responsiveness, when required, and believes the residents receive excellent service, as evidenced by the almost non-existent complaints received by the City. The recent bulky trash pickup was the smoothest we have had. Few services can create more frustration for residents than less than perfect refuse hauling services. Service issues were one reason competitive bids were sought in 2000, which resulted in the award to Norcal.

We are aware that transparency is a significant objective of local governmental processes. If the Council were so inclined to grant an extension, it would be simply modifying the term of the contract which was awarded under the open and competitive bidding process which was conducted in 2005.

If the Council decides to not extend the contract and determines to go out to bid, we would return to the Council in September to review the specifications for a new contract. A major decision would be whether to keep the current 3-barrel system or to transition to a 2-barrel system where refuse and recyclables are placed into a single barrel and then separated at a recycling facility. Green waste would remain a separate barrel/collection. This could potentially increase diversion, but would be contrary to current practice and would require a significant public education process for residents who are accustomed to segregating recyclables.

Alternatives Available to Council

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
JUNE 28, 2011**

The following alternatives are available to the City Council:

1. Extend the current residential refuse hauling contract with Athens Services for seven years.
2. Extend the current residential refuse hauling contract with Athens Services for a period other than seven years.
3. Direct staff to pursue discussion of possible no cost service enhancements and return at a future date to consider the extension request.
4. Decline to act on the extension request and direct staff to return to the Council to review the specifications of the contract and to subsequently competitively bid the services.

Recommendation from Staff

This is a matter of Council discretion.

Attachments: Athens Letter of May 2, 2011
Staff report 5-10-05, Award of Residential Refuse Contract

TO: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: JUDY SMITH, ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER

SUBJECT: REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE FY 2011-12 PALOS VERDES STABLE BUDGET AND ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION R11-16, APPROVING INCREASES IN MONTHLY BOARDING RATES EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2011

The Issue:

Shall the City Council approve the FY 2011-12 Palos Verdes Stable budget and adopt Resolution R-11-16, approving increases in monthly boarding rates effective July 1, 2011?

Background

HGS Management Company, LLC has operated as the Concessionaire of the Palos Verdes Stable since March 1, 2009. The purpose of this report is to share with the City Council a status report on the FY 2010-11 Budget and to present the proposed FY 2011-12 Stable operating budget and boarding rate increases for review and consideration.

Attachment A to this report is a single page showing the status of the FY 2010-11 Budget and the Proposed Stable Budget for FY 2011-12. Overall, HGS Management is ending 2010-11 with a net profit of \$83,941 – essentially the same amount as the originally projected profit of \$83,190 for FY 2010-11. There are a number of factors which together have contributed to the positive budget performance over the past year including: (1) The renting of many previously vacant stalls at the Stable, (2) a significant increase in revenue from training activity at the Stable in comparison to prior years, (3) additional revenues derived from charging for supplemental services including premium hay, turnout services, and the like, and (4) controlling expenditures and achieving operational efficiencies which will continue into future years. The concessionaire charges rates as shown in Attachment B.

Higher Operational Costs and Recommended Boarding Rate Increase

During the past year, HGS has had to contend with significantly higher hay prices than originally anticipated. This trend is projected to continue into FY 2011-12. Specifically, a single bale of alfalfa has increased in price from \$8.50 per bale from when HGS initially served as Concessionaire to its highest level of \$17.00 per bale. As outlined in the attached memorandum (Attachment C) from HGS, the cost of providing alfalfa for a horse over a period of a month has increased from \$85.00 to \$170.00. As the current rates charged for boarding a horse at the stable include alfalfa

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
JUNE 28, 2011**

hay as the standard feed, the concessionaire is requesting that the boarding rates be increased to help offset the higher hay prices.

The current boarding rates charged at the Palos Verdes Stable are shown below along with the rate structure which the concessionaire is proposing.

Monthly Charges for Boarding

	Existing	Proposed	Increase
Resident In/Out Stall	\$505	\$540	\$35
Non Resident In/Out Stall	\$535	\$580	\$45
Resident Box Stall	\$495	\$535	\$40
Non-Resident Box Stall	\$525	\$575	\$50
Resident Pipe Stall	\$495	\$510	\$15
Non-Resident Pipe Stall	\$525	\$540	\$15

As shown above, the proposed rate structure reflects different increases for different stalls. While the existing price structure has the same monthly rate for box stalls and pipe stalls, the proposed structure prices the pipe stalls at \$25 to \$35 less each month as compared to box stalls.

To put the price increases in perspective, the staff report includes an attached survey of boarding rates charged at other area stable facilities. As reflected on the survey, all other surveyed facilities include a “price break” for occupancy of a pipe stall versus a box stall as reflected in the proposed rate structure.

Additionally, for the In and Out as well as the Box Stalls, the proposed rate structure shows a \$40 monthly differential between the rates charged to PVE residents versus non-residents. The existing differential is \$30 for rates charged to residents vs. non residents in all categories.

Stable Revenues

In the current FY 2010-11 Budget, total Stable revenues are \$52,400 higher than the original budget. This is due primarily to the stable operating at full capacity during most of the past year, along with greater trainer-related revenue than originally assumed. Additionally, the pony camps were extremely popular last summer resulting in over \$6,100 in revenue for the Stable.

For the coming fiscal year, after incorporating the proposed rate structure (and given the continuing high level of stable occupancy), boarding revenue is projected to be \$483,000 -- approximately \$36,000 greater than the projected year-end board revenue for FY 2010-11. Additionally, revenues derived from trainer activity at the stable will generate \$78,000 in FY 2011-12 which is comparable to the projected training revenue in the current fiscal year. All together, the Stable revenue in the proposed FY 2011-12 budget totals \$587,850 – which is 5.2% greater revenue than the projected revenue for the current fiscal year.

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
JUNE 28, 2011**

Stable Expenditures

With regard to Stable expenditures during the current fiscal year, in addition to having higher than anticipated hay expenses, there have been nearly \$13,000 in additional stable improvements by HGS beyond what was originally anticipated. During the past year, HGS completed facility improvements including painting, improvements to the prefabricated trailer on the property, fence repairs, and the like. Similarly, in the category of “outside services,” there were added expenditures from outside vendors for welding, tree-trimming, heavy refuse hauling and trail maintenance.

In the coming year, Stable repair and maintenances costs are budgeted at \$24,000 which is comparable to what was spent in FY 2010-11 by HGS. For FY 2011-12, HGS is intending to further enhance the Stable with enclosing the hay storage area, additional repair/replacement of fencing, and other necessary work. The concessionaire is evaluating a number of potential capital improvements at the Stable and will return to the City at a later date once a recommended list of improvements is complete.

The Stable will generate a profit of \$83,190 in FY 2011-12 after satisfying all obligations under the concession agreement including payment of the 5% concession fee to the City. The concession payment is projected to total \$29,393 for FY 2011-12.

Additional Information

Boarding statistics for occupancy of the Stable are included as Attachment E to this report. As reflected on this page, the stable currently has eight vacant stalls and there is no wait to board at the facility currently.

Attachment F is a seven year budget history of the Stable operation covering the time prior to arrival of HGS Management LLC as the Stable Operator. A review of this budget history helps demonstrate how HGS has been able to enhance the revenue generating capacity of the Stable while simultaneously controlling operating expenditures.

Lastly, Attachment G to this report is the Resolution implementing new boarding rates effective July 1, 2011.

Alternatives Available to Council

The following alternatives are available to the City Council:

- 1) Approve the FY 2011-12 Palos Verdes Stable budget and adopt Resolution R11-16 approving increases in monthly boarding rates effective July 1, 2011.
- 2) Do not approve the budget and boarding rates as presented. This would require the Stable Concessionaire to modify the budget to address City Council concerns.

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
JUNE 28, 2011**

Recommendation

That the City Council receive this report, approve the FY 2011-12 Palos Verdes Stable budget and adopt Resolution R11-16 approving increases in monthly boarding rates effective July 1, 2011.

Attachments

- (A) FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12 Stable Budget
- (B) Existing Board Rates and Fees
- (C) Information on Hay and Proposed Boarding Rates
- (D) Survey of Rates Charged at Other Facilities
- (E) Palos Verdes Stable Capacity Review June 2011
- (F) Resolution R11-16, Approving Increases in Monthly Boarding Rates