

**REPORT OF THE
CHIEF LEGISLATIVE ANALYST**

CF11-1357-S1
WAS#12-08-0688

Date: August 20, 2012

To: Honorable Members of the Los Angeles City Council

From: Gerry F. Miller, Chief Legislative Analyst



Subject: **REVENUE DAY**

Attached you will find an updated matrix of revenue options for your consideration. As you recall, we have prepared similar matrices for past Revenue Day discussions. The attached has been updated to reflect progress on some issues, as well as some new possible revenue ideas.

The intent of the attached is to provide a comprehensive listing of potential ongoing revenue actions or cost avoidance strategies to help address the City's General Fund structural deficit. Possible funding alternatives to provide enhanced services are not included. While it is essential that we explore options for service restoration and enhancement, we advise that the immediate focus should be on identifying alternatives to address the General Fund deficits the City is facing over the next several years simply to maintain existing levels of service.

The matrix is organized into six sections: (1) General Tax measures for possible placement on the March 2013 ballot; (2) Special Tax measures for operating costs for possible placement on the March 2013 ballot; (3) Special Tax measures for new facilities and capital costs for possible placement on the March 20213 ballot; (4) general revenue items that do not require voter approval; (5) Public Private Partnerships (P3s); and (6) status of instructions to report dealing with revenue issues.

We believe strongly that the City must pursue voter approval of additional ongoing general tax revenues on the March 2013 Municipal Election. The City has made great strides in addressing our structural deficits over the last several years. General Fund civilian staff is now 5,000 fewer than just a few years ago and at lower levels than it was 20 years ago. Additionally, with creative ideas and strong cooperation from our employees and their representatives, the City has been able to reduce pension and retiree healthcare obligations as well as healthcare costs for active employees. However, our service levels are reaching a point where simply continuing to cut costs will result in unacceptable service levels and significantly impact the quality of life in the City.

Honorable Members of the Los Angeles City Council
August 20, 2012

It should be noted that the City has had no new General Fund tax revenues in nearly 20 years. With the passage of Proposition 218 in 1996, the City is required to obtain either a majority or two-thirds voter approval for virtually any new tax or fee. The City has, on a couple of occasions, attempted to obtain voter approval for certain programs, such as gang reduction and youth development, but has been unsuccessful.

The only significant additional General Fund revenue that has been generated was moving to full cost recovery for refuse collection activities. Prior to 2006, the refuse collection program was subsidized by the General Fund. In 2006, the Council and Mayor increased refuse collection fees and, in 2008, approved a full cost recovery level. Improved cost recovery reduced the General Fund subsidy of the refuse collection program, thereby generating savings for other City costs and programs. As a result, annual revenues for the refuse collection program for 2012-13 are estimated at \$271M compared to the 2005-06 base level of \$86M, an increase of \$185M. However, these additional General Fund revenues were utilized for service enhancements as opposed to offsetting General Fund deficits. By way of comparison, for the same period of time, the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) budget has increased by \$144M in direct costs. When related costs, such as pensions, are included in the calculation, LAPD costs have increased by \$592M during the period 2005-06 to 2012-13 (estimated). Since 2005-06, the Los Angeles Fire Department has increased by \$38M in direct costs and by \$202M with related costs.

The first deadline for placing an item on the March 2013 ballot is October 31, 2012. We recommend initially focusing on the attached issues that may be placed on the ballot so that any additional information can be gathered and actions brought forward to the Council prior to the deadline. Ongoing analysis should continue on the remaining items so that the Council and Mayor have sufficient information for the preparation of the 2013-14 Budget.

GFM:SMT:KEK

City Primary Nominating Election March 5, 2013	Estimated cost: Funding for 2 or 3 ballot measures is typically included in the annual Adopted Budget, with minor incremental cost if the number of measures exceeds that amount.	General Tax: Measure requires 50%+1 vote of the electorate to pass.	DEADLINE for Council to request ballot measures for March 2013 Ballot: <u>October 31, 2012</u>
City General Election May 2013		Special Tax: Requires 2/3 Council Vote & Mayoral approval. Measure requires 2/3rds vote of the electorate to pass.	DEADLINE for Council to request ballot measures for May 2013 Ballot: <u>January 16, 2013</u>

FOR EACH OF THE ITEMS IN SECTION 1, BELOW, A MARCH 2013 OR MAY 2013 BALLOT MEASURE PROPOSING TO INCREASE THE TAX RATE WOULD REQUIRE A MAJORITY VOTE FOR APPROVAL IF STRUCTURED AS A GENERAL TAX, AND A 2/3 VOTE IF USE OF THE PROCEEDS IS SPECIFIED.

SECTION 1

ISSUE	BACKGROUND OR PROPOSAL	UPDATE
Documentary Transfer Tax	<p>Currently, the City of Los Angeles requires payment of a documentary transfer tax of \$4.50/\$1000 of property sales value. In 2011-12, this assessment is estimated to generate \$100M in city revenue.</p>	<p>The City may consider increasing its documentary transfer tax to \$9/\$1000 of property sales value. The CAO analyzed this option in its May 25, 2012 report (CF 12-0600-S149), noting that such an increase would place Los Angeles in context with other major California cities. This increase could generate up to \$100M in additional revenue, although the documentary transfer tax is a volatile revenue source that has varied from a high of \$217M in 2005-06 to a low of \$84M three years later (2008-09).</p>
Sales Tax	<p>The current Sales Tax rate in Los Angeles is 8.75%. This is comprised of the State’s sales tax of 7.25% and three County transportation taxes of 0.5% each (1.5% total).</p> <p>California law caps the maximum local sales tax chargeable by cities and counties at 2%. When added to the State’s 7.25% sales tax, the total sales tax in jurisdictions at this maximum level would be 9.25%.</p> <p>However, an exclusion from the 2% cap was authorized for the MTA in 2003 (SB 314, Chapter 785 Murray), which allowed the LA County to impose an additional 0.5% tax increase for transportation projects. That authorization resulted in Measure R. Therefore, only 8.25% of the City’s current 8.75% sales tax is applicable to the maximum sales tax levy calculations. Therefore, the City’s maximum potential sales tax rate is 9.75%.</p>	<p>Most cities in LA County apply a tax rate of 8.75%. Some cities have higher rates. Avalon, El Monte, Inglewood, Santa Monica, and South El Monte have a sales tax rate of 9.25%. Because of the Measure R exemption, Pico Rivera and South Gate have a 9.75% sales tax rate.</p> <p>Los Angeles could request voter approval to increase the city’s sales tax by up to 1%, in increments of 0.25%.</p> <p>Each 0.1% increase in sales tax rates would generate about \$40M in revenue.</p>

<p>Parking Occupancy Tax</p>	<p>The City imposes a 10% tax on all parking fees collected from patrons at parking facilities, which in 2011-12 generated \$88.2M in Parking Users' Tax income.</p> <p>Current rates in other major cities: Pittsburgh (37.5%), San Francisco (25%), Chicago (18.75% to 50%), New York (10.5% to 18.5%), Miami (15%), Philadelphia (20%), Seattle (12.5%), and Oakland (10%).</p>	<p>Increasing the City's Parking Occupancy tax from 10% to 15% could generate an additional \$40M on an annual basis.</p>
<p>Transient Occupancy Tax</p>	<p>The City's current tax is 14% on hotel/motel bills. In 2011-12, the TOT generated \$150M in General Fund revenues.</p>	<p>The City may consider increasing the TOT to 15% or 16%. Each 1% increase would generate approximately \$11M.</p> <p>State Controller data shows that cities' TOTs range from a low of 3.5% (City of Bell), to a high of 15% (City of Anaheim). The median rate is a TOT of 10%. 53 cities have no TOT.</p>
<p>Utility Users Tax/ Communication Users Tax</p>	<p>The City's current Communication Users Tax is set at 9% (5% for telemarketers). The Electric Users Tax is 10% (12.5% for commercial and industrial users) The Gas Users Tax is 10% (5% for non-profits)</p> <p>In 2011-12, the City received \$243M from the CUT, \$304M from the Electric Users Tax, and \$68M from the Gas Users Tax.</p>	<p>If the Council wishes to proceed with a modification to this tax, focus should be on the Electric Users Tax and Gas Users Tax categories.</p> <p>Each 1% in additional Electric Users Tax will generate about \$30M, while each 1% adjustment in the Gas Users tax would generate about \$6.8M, and a 1% increase in the CUT would generate \$24M. It should be noted that, in February 2008, voters approved City of LA Measure S, setting the City's Communication Users Tax (CUT) at 9%.</p>
<p>Barrel tax on petroleum extraction.</p>	<p>Motion (Hahn-Krekorian) (CF 08-04110S1) proposed a barrel tax for the March 2011 Ballot.</p>	<p>Proposition O was placed on the March 2011 ballot, proposing a \$1.44/barrel tax on crude oil extracted within the City. This measure was projected to generate \$4M but failed to be approved by the electorate.</p>

Billboard Tax	As part of the 2010-11 Budget deliberations, Budget Motion 7 (Rosendahl-Garcetti) proposed to place a billboard tax on the March 2011 Ballot.	The CLA and CAO submitted a joint report on October 8, 2010, analyzing options for the proposed ballot measure, and summarizing other cities' experiences, and recommending a ballot measure to propose a 12% tax on off-site signs (CF 10-0600-S46). This could generate approximately \$24M. Following the Budget & Finance Committee hearing, the matter was referred to the PLUM Committee. No ballot measure was developed.
Sports/Entertainment Ticket Tax	Presented during the 2011 Council Revenue Day discussions	No action taken. Should the Council wish to explore this option, further analysis should be conducted regarding the events to which this tax would be applied, and the implementation and collection mechanism.

FOR EACH OF THE ITEMS IN SECTION 2, BELOW, A MARCH 2013 OR MAY 2013 BALLOT MEASURE TO INCREASE THE TAX RATE WOULD REQUIRE A 2/3 VOTE.

SECTION 2

ISSUE	BACKGROUND OR PROPOSAL	UPDATE
Property Tax	<p>In 2011, the County assessed 607,465 single family residential parcels, 109,277 residential income parcels, and 65,780 commercial/industrial parcels in the City of Los Angeles (total 782,522) with a total assessed value of \$409.1B.</p> <p>There is approximately 1.68 billion square feet of improved residential structures, and 6.41 billion square feet of residential property, including vacant residential property, within the City of Los Angeles.</p>	<p>The City may choose to place a parcel tax or some other property based assessment (square footage, etc) on the March 2013 ballot to fund a special purpose. This measure would require a 2/3 vote for approval, in compliance with Proposition 218.</p> <p>Each \$10 per-parcel tax would generate approximately \$7.8M</p> <p>Each \$1 per 100-square-foot tax levy on <u>improved residential structures</u> would generate approximately \$17M.</p> <p>Each \$1 per 100-square-foot tax levy on <u>residential property</u> (including vacant property) would generate \$64M.</p>

<p>Special Fire Assessment - Levy a special tax per parcel for fire and paramedic services.</p>	<p>In 1997, LA County voters approved Prop E to levy an annual assessment on all improvements to fund County fire services. The current rate for a single family dwelling is \$56.17, and the rate varies for other types of structures.</p> <p>In 2002, LA County voters approved Prop B to levy a per-square-foot tax to fund County trauma rooms, emergency services and bioterrorism preparedness. The current rate for this tax is 3.72 cents/square foot.</p>	<p>Each \$10 per parcel assessment would generate \$7.8M.</p> <p>Each \$1 per 100-square-foot of residential building improvement would generate \$17M.</p> <p>A Fire Assessment of \$55/parcel/year would generate approximately \$43M annually with full implementation.</p> <p>However, prior to determining the proposed assessment, a determination would need to be made regarding the portion of LAFD current costs that are not currently recovered and, therefore, eligible for recovery from a special assessment.</p>
<p>Special Assessment for Park Services</p>	<p>A 2009 Citywide Community Needs Assessment Survey by Recreation & Parks indicated that the greatest needs were for adult fitness & wellness programs, special events/festivals, nature/environmental programs, walking/biking groups, family programs, adult continuing education programs, and adult art, dance, performing arts.</p>	<p>Depending on the prioritized list of services, the City may choose to place on the ballot a special assessment for ongoing revenue for recreation programs and services.</p> <p>During the 2012-13 budget deliberations, estimates were that Recreation & Parks' General Fund reimbursement requirement for such items as water, electricity, retirement, flex benefits, and GSD expenses, totaled \$67.7M. Their actual reimbursement payment for 2012-13 was estimated to be \$42.9M, leaving a remaining \$24.7M in Recreation & Parks expenses to be paid from the General Fund.</p> <p>A special assessment for recreation programs could cover these costs.</p>

<p>Gang Reduction and Youth Development Tax</p>	<p>Property based tax to fund gang prevention and intervention programs</p>	<p>The City placed a \$36-per-parcel tax on the November 2008 for Gang Prevention, Intervention, After-School and Job Training Programs. This measure would have generated \$30M, but failed to receive 2/3 voter approval.</p> <p>The Council may choose to place a similar measure on the ballot to create a permanent funding source to maintain and increase programs.</p>
<p>Community Plan Updates</p>	<p>Motion (Garcetti-Reyes) proposed to place on the March 2011 ballot a measure to fund the update of Community Plans on a ten-year cycle.</p>	<p>The CLA and CAO submitted a joint report analyzing this proposal (CF 10-1618). No ballot measure was subsequently developed.</p> <p>The Council may choose to place on the ballot a measure to maintain and increase the City's efforts regarding community plans.</p>

FOR THE ITEM IN SECTION 3, BELOW, A MARCH 2013 OR MAY 2013 BALLOT MEASURE TO INCREASE THE TAX RATE WOULD REQUIRE A 2/3 VOTE.

SECTION 3

ISSUE	BACKGROUND OR PROPOSAL	UPDATE
Bond measure or Special Assessment for Recreation & Park facilities	A 2009 Citywide Community Needs Assessment Survey by Recreation & Parks indicated that the greatest facility needs were for biking trails, small neighborhood parks, large community and regional parks, shelters and picnic areas and nature trails.	Depending on the prioritized list of facilities, the City may choose to place on the ballot a bond measure or special assessment for new/expanded facilities.

EACH OF THE ITEMS IN SECTION 4, BELOW, MAY BE ACTED UPON BY THE COUNCIL AND MAYOR WITHOUT A VOTE OF THE ELECTORATE.

SECTION 4

ISSUE

BACKGROUND OR PROPOSAL

UPDATE

<p>Business Tax</p>	<p>The City currently imposes a tax on businesses based on gross receipts. Tax rates vary from \$1.01 per \$1000 to \$5.07 per \$1000, depending on the applicable business classification. In 2011-12, the City's business tax generated \$437M.</p>	<p>Current Council discussions regarding business taxes are considering various modifications to the Business Tax structure, including the possible elimination of certain business taxes. Those policy discussions are ongoing. It should be noted that the business tax can be decreased by the Mayor and Council, but any increase would require a vote by the electorate.</p>
<p>Parking Fines</p>	<p>2012-13: Increased parking fines by \$5, and disabled parking violations by \$10. Status: Ordinance No. 182183 Adopted 7/6/2012, Effective 8/11/2012.</p> <p>This new ordinance is expected to increase parking fine revenue from \$141M in 2011-12 to \$152M in 2012-13.</p>	<p>The Council may consider further increases in parking fines across the board, or for selected categories.</p>
<p>EMS Voluntary Fee</p>	<p>Several Southern California cities (e.g., Glendale, Santa Ana, Fullerton, Huntington Beach, Arcadia, and Anaheim) have instituted a voluntary EMS fee.</p> <p>Payment of this voluntary fee will entitle the subscriber to free EMS service for those with insurance and reduced cost EMS service for those without insurance.</p> <p>Propose a fee of \$10 on the DWP monthly bill.</p> <p>Previously estimated this would generate up to \$10M annually, based on a 15% participation rate.</p>	<p>Council originally endorsed this proposal on February 10, 2010. In 2011, Budget Motion 4 (Hahn-Rosendahl) requested a status report and instructed preparation of the necessary ordinances. The 2012-13 Adopted Budget instructed the CAO and Fire Department to report by January 1, 2013 on the "Voluntary Subscription and Treatment/No Transport programs that have been proposed in previous budgets. The report should contain information about the experience other cities have had with similar programs." No report has been submitted to date on this matter.</p>

Ambulance Billings	Explore the feasibility of charging for “treatment/non-transport” for any medical treatment provided at the scene (Medicare non-reimbursable).	While a non-transport fee could generate significant revenue, further financial and legal analysis should be conducted with regard to this proposal.
New Cost Recovery for LAFD	Charge a Stand by fee for special events Charge for the cost of removing standing or rushing water Charge individuals for rescue services, as authorized by the State Government Code Establish tiered hazardous material storage fees based on volume, rather than a flat fee.	Presented at the prior Council Revenue Days. No action taken.
New Cost Recovery for LAPD	Charge other law enforcement agencies at “market rate” for LAPD training rather than just full cost recovery City Attorney advises that “market rate”, and not just full cost recovery, could be charged by the City if the services can only be provided by a governmental entity.	Currently, LAAC 22.239 limits costs charged by the LAPD to “handling and instructing the person” which is interpreted to be cost recovery, only. This Section can be amended to delete that reference enabling the LAPD to charge “market rate” for services, such as training provided to other law enforcement agencies. Presented at prior Council Revenue Day. No action taken.
Non-Profit Leasing Policy	Since 2008, Council committees have considered various proposals to establish a new policy for non-profit leases involving City facilities. Under the proposed policies, non-profit tenants would become financially responsible for such items as utilities, maintenance, custodial, and could be charged a lease rate closer to market.	On June 1, 2010, the current draft of the Non-Profit Lease Subsidy and Real Property Sale' Policy was referred to the Arts, Parks, Health, and Aging Committee for further analysis and discussion.

<p>Signage Policy</p>	<p>The 2011-12 Adopted Budget contained a series of instructions regarding signs, including an instruction for a specified working group to evaluate various sign-related issues.</p> <p>The 2012-13 Adopted Budget instructed the CAO, and various departments to report to PLUM, Arts/Parks, and Budget & Finance with recommendations relative to increasing the City's revenue from advertising, signage, and naming at City facilities, including a survey of other cities,, the possible use of a Municipal Marketing firm and, a comprehensive review of the City's current and potential advertising, signage, and naming revenues, including, but not limited to those at the Los Angeles International Airport, Los Angeles Department of Transportation, Los Angeles Zoo, the Recreation and Parks Department, and the Los Angeles Convention Center.</p>	<p>In response to the 2011-12 Budget Instruction, the Planning Department submitted a preliminary report on May 11, 2011 indicating they would soon be submitting a draft ordinance for a "Comprehensive Sign Program."</p> <p>Building & Safety subsequently submitted a report to the PLUM Committee on May 21 2012 outlining a fee-supported Sign Code Administrative Program (SCAP) to regulate and enforce exterior on-site signage on all commercial businesses.</p> <p>On December 5, 2011, the Planning Department submitted a report outlining proposed "time, place, and manner restrictions" for a Citywide sign policy.</p> <p>No report has been submitted in response to the 2012-13 Adopted Budget instructions.</p>
<p>Telecomm Policy</p>	<p>In December 2003, Council approved Ordinance No. 175602 (CF 98-0882) which delegated to the General Manager of General Services the authority to market City buildings and property as sites for the placement of telecommunications equipment, and execute any agreements for up to 5 years.</p>	<p>On February 3, 2010, Motion (Cardenas-Huizar) requested an update from GSD regarding the telecomm leasing authority approved in Ordinance No. 175602. Multiple hearings were held in the IT&GS Committee, including the latest hearing on January 17, 2012, and this matter is pending in the IT&GS Committee.</p>
<p>Telecomm on Street Lights</p>	<p>Motion (Wesson-Cardenas) was introduced on June 8, 2011, instructing staff to explore the feasibility of allowing wireless carriers to install "lightRadio" or similar technology on City-owned utility poles/facilities (CF 11-0964)</p>	<p>The ITA submitted a report on August 31, 2011, recommending that, should this program proceed, installations should be precluded at or near police stations, fire stations, and other City radio sites, in order to avoid radio frequency interference and desensitization to the City's public safety radio systems. This matter is pending in the IT&GS Committee.</p>

<p>Administrative Citation Enforcement (ACE) Program</p>	<p>CF 10-0085: The City Attorney has submitted multiple draft ordinances in response to instructions from the Budget & Finance Committee. The latest revision was submitted on July 26, 2012 and is pending in the Budget & Finance Committee.</p>	<p>Various meetings have been held with the City Attorney to discuss the CLA's concerns with language that has been included in each draft of their proposed Administrative Citation Enforcement program.</p>
<p>Commission on Revenue Efficiency (CORE)</p>	<p>On March 22, 2012, CORE submitted eight reports to the City Council:</p> <p>Final Report 1 - Promoting Local Procurement & Business Preference Review (Council File 12-0430)</p> <p>Final Report 2 - Survey of City Departments: Strategies to Foster Innovations & Efficiencies (Council File 12-0430-S1)</p> <p>Final Report 3 - Assessing Business-Related Police Permits & Fees (Council File 12-0430-S2)</p> <p>Final Report 4 - Failure to Manage City Properties Leased to Non-Profits (Council File 12-0430-S3)</p> <p>Final Report 5 - Lost in the Parking Lot: Stopping Rogue Parking Operators (Council File 12-0430-S4)</p> <p>Final Report 6 - Managing Our Money: Intergovernmental Revenue Sources (Council File 12-0430-S5)</p> <p>Final Report 7 - Improving Collection of Unpaid Parking Tickets: Rental Cars & New Technology (Council File 12-0430-S6)</p> <p>Final Report 8 - Follow-up to CORE's Blueprint to Reform of City Collections (Council File 12-0430-S7)</p>	<p>Dozens of recommendations for improving City collections, and streamlining City operations to improve efficiencies, were included in each of CORE's eight reports. The reports were dually referred to one or more of the Council's Policy Committees, and to the Budget & Finance Committee.</p> <p>The Inspector General of Revenue Collection is currently preparing a report to Council on the status of the recommendations in each of the CORE reports.</p>

ITEMS IN SECTION 5, BELOW, ARE BEING PURSUED AS POTENTIAL PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS, AND WILL NOT REQUIRE A VOTE OF THE ELECTORATE

SECTION 5

ISSUE	BACKGROUND OR PROPOSAL	UPDATE
Privatization of the Zoo	Various proposals have been suggested to develop an alternative management structure for the LA Zoo, including the possible privatization of Zoo operations.	On August 12, 2011, the Council approved various actions related to the Zoo, including authorization to proceed on two ‘tracks’ – one related to efficiencies to generate savings, and a second related to an RFP for an alternative management structure for the Zoo. (CF 11-0993).
Privatization of the Convention Center	Motion (Perry-Zine) was introduced on May 8, 2012 instructing the CAO to report “with recommendations as to how the City can more effectively attract national and international convention business.” (CF 12-0692)	The CAO submitted a report on August 3, 2012, with various recommendations, including: authorizing the CAO to release an RFP for the future operation and maintenance of the Convention Center; expanding the duties of the Convention Center Commission; and creation of a Chief Executive Officer position.

ITEMS IN SECTION 6, BELOW, ARE BUDGET INSTRUCTIONS INCLUDED IN THE 2012-13 ADOPTED BUDGET

SECTION 6

2012-13 Adopted Budget Instructions and request for reports:

12-0600-S18 - Instruct the City Administrative Officer and Chief Legislative Analyst to present a comprehensive report to the Mayor and Council on potential ballot measures to be considered for the March 2013 Primary Nominating Election to provide additional funding for public services.
Status: Part of Revenue Day (CF 11-1357-S1)

12-0600-S125 - Instruct all departments with pending fee increases that are included in the Proposed Budget, with the assistance of the City Attorney, to report to Council no later than June 30, 2012 with ordinances to effectuate the change in fees. This is to ensure that estimated revenue included in the 2012-13 Budget is realized, in accordance with the Annual Fee Studies Policy.

Status: Instruction is in Budget & Finance Committee.

Fee ordinances have been transmitted for the following:

- Engineering (12-0600-S155, Approved by Council, pending Mayoral approval)
- Planning – General Plan fee temporary increase for Zoning Code rewrite (12-0600-S160, pending in PLUM Committee)
- LADOT - Parking Fines (Ordinance No. 182193)
- Zoo – Admission Fee increase (Ordinance No. 182186)

Fee ordinances have not been transmitted for the following:

- Planning – Case Management Full Cost Recovery
- Street Services – Peak Hour Compliance Fee adjustment
- Fire – Plan Review Fee (CF 11-1443)

12-0600-S126 - Instruct all departments to review their fee structures annually and to report to the Budget and Finance Committee by January 1, 2013 with ordinances, status reports or negative replies concerning fee adjustments for the 2013-14 fiscal year.

Status: In Budget & Finance Committee. No report submitted to date.

11-1443 - Include nine months of revenue from Fire Plan Review fees previously approved by Council; request the City Attorney to prepare and present the necessary ordinance.

Status: 1/25/2012: Council approved instruction to the City Attorney to prepare Ordinance. No ordinance submitted to date.

12-0600-S139 – Instruct the City Administrative Officer with Bureau of Street Services and the Bureau of Street Lighting to report to the Public Works Committee on combining street lights, sidewalk repair and tree trimming into one assessment district for on-going maintenance districts.

Status: In Public Works Committee. No report submitted to date.

12-0600-S145 – Instruct the Planning Department to report on the impact of the surcharge on the Community Plans and a permanent plan to fund the Community Plans.

Status: Planning Department report submitted 8/2/2012. PLUM Committee continued item on 8/7/2012.

12-0600-S2 - Instruct the Department of Building and Safety and City Administrative Officer to report to the Planning and Land Use Management and Budget and Finance Committees regarding the creation of a fee similar to the Systematic Code Enforcement Program (SCEP) in Building & Safety to address code enforcement issues.

Status: In PLUM Committee. No report submitted to date.

12-0600-S9 - Instruct the Department of Building and Safety and the City Administrative Officer to report to the Planning and Land Use Management and Budget and Finance Committees by July 15, 2012 regarding Code Enforcement full cost recovery efforts.

Status: In PLUM Committee. No report submitted to date.

12-0600-S53 - Instruct the City Administrative Officer, with the assistance of the Fire Department and Los Angeles World Airports, to report to the Budget and Finance Committee on the feasibility of full cost reimbursement, including reimbursement of secondary costs, for services provided to the Airports. The report should address Federal Aviation Administration concerns and steps that might be taken to ensure full cost recovery.

Status: In Budget & Finance Committee. No report submitted to date.

12-0600-S55 - Instruct the Fire Department to report to the Public Safety and Budget and Finance Committees on the feasibility of charging the County of Los Angeles for hospital transports of inmates provided by the City.

Status: In Public Safety Committee. No report submitted to date.

12-0600-S93 - Instruct the Fire Department to report to the Public Safety Committee with a review of the proposed False Alarm Fee, pursuant to Council File 12-0122.

Status: In PLUM Committee. No report submitted to date.

12-0600S64 - Instruct the Los Angeles Housing Department to report to the Housing, Community and Economic Development Committee regarding pursuing liens against delinquent properties and the current efforts made by the Housing Department to collect fines and penalties. The report should include information about the practices of other cities.

Status: Housing Department report submitted on 7/30/2012. HCED Committee continued the matter on 8/1/2012.

12-0600-S74 - Instruct the Planning Department, with the assistance of the City Administrative Officer and the City Attorney, to report to the Planning and Land Use and Budget and Finance Committees regarding a full cost recovery fee for first and second level planning appeals. The report should address possible differentiation between meritorious and frivolous appeals cases, as well as the proximity of communities of interest.

Status: In PLUM Committee. No report submitted to date.