## Office of The City Attorney City of San Diego

### MEMORANDUM MS 59

(619) 236-6220

**DATE:** 

April 16, 2012

TO:

Donna Wallace, Assistant Personnel Director, Personnel

FROM:

City Attorney

**SUBJECT:** 

Proposition 26 Review of Proposed Personnel User Fees for FY 2013

#### INTRODUCTION

Under Council Policy 100-05, general fund departments are required to conduct comprehensive user fee studies every three years. These fee studies ensure City departments identify and recover all reasonable and allowable costs incurred in providing government services.

Financial Management staff has asked participating departments to obtain an opinion on the legality of their proposed user fee adjustments and additions from the Office of the City Attorney in light of Proposition 26. Approved by the voters in 2010, Proposition 26 amends articles XIII A and XIII C of the California Constitution to provide that a levy, charge, or exaction of any kind imposed, increased, or extended by a local government is a tax unless an exception applies. Exceptions to Proposition 26 include user fees; government service or product fees; regulatory fees; government property entrance fees; fines and penalties imposed by a court or local government; property development impact fees; and assessments and property-related fees governed by Proposition 218.<sup>1</sup>

Each Proposition 26 exception involves its own legal standard for determining the amount of a legally permissible fee. Under article XIII C, section 1(e)(1)(2)(3) of the California Constitution, which discuses some of the exceptions to Proposition 26, no fee may exceed the reasonable cost of providing the service. However, such fees should reimburse the government entity for all reasonable direct and indirect expenses incurred. *United Business Commission v. City of San Diego*, 91 Cal. App. 3d 156, 166 (1979). As noted in *United Business Commission*, ". . . the municipality need only apply sound judgment and consider 'probabilities according to the best honest viewpoint of informed officials' in determining the amount of the fee." *Id*. This Office has advised City staff to explain the link between the cost and the service provided and justify all fee calculations based on a study of the costs associated with the fee for Council's consideration

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For a fuller discussion of Proposition 26, see City Att'y MOL No. 11-3 (Mar. 4, 2011), "Proposition 26 and Its Impact on City Fees and Charges."

Donna Wallace, Assistant Personnel Director April 16, 2012 Page 2

and approval. Therefore, depending on the particular type of fee and individual department activities, staff for each City department developed their proposed user fee adjustments using the comprehensive Citywide method developed by Financial Management and Comptroller staff.<sup>2</sup>

We have reviewed a detailed summary of the Personnel Department's cost recovery calculations as described in Exhibit A and proposed fee adjustment described in Exhibit B. Our Proposition 26 analysis of the Livescan Fingerprinting Fee is discussed below.

#### **DISCUSSION**

The User Fee Summary for the Personnel Department describes a fee for providing fingerprinting of Rural Metro employees and contractors doing business with the City for background checks. The User Fee Summary indicates that the Personnel Department does not propose any change to the existing fee. Proposition 26 does not apply to fees that are not being modified so long as the authority for the fee has not expired or been rescinded. Accordingly, the fingerprint fee does not implicate the provisions of Proposition 26.

Nonetheless, we note that the above described fee is not a "tax" under Proposition 26 because two exceptions apply: the "user fee" exception and the "government service or product" exception. The "user fee" exception relates to a charge imposed for a specific benefit conferred or privilege granted directly to the payor that is not provided to those not charged, and which does not exceed the reasonable costs to the local government of conferring the benefit or granting the privilege. Similarly, the "government service or product" exception relates to the imposition of a fee for a specific government service or product provided directly to the payor that is not provided to those not charged, and which does not exceed the reasonable costs to the local government of providing the service or product. The fingerprint fee falls under the "user fee" and/or "government service or product" exception because it is imposed for a specific benefit, privilege, service or product that is not provided to those not charged, and does not exceed the Department's reasonable costs of providing the service.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The method was approved by Financial Management and the Comptroller and provided to the departments by Financial Management. The number (budget item) used to apportion rates (overhead and load) against direct cost is the responsibility of each department based on the contents and knowledge of their individual department activities. This Office did not independently verify or recalculate the numbers provided or the validity of the methodology.

Donna Wallace, Assistant Personnel Director April 16, 2012 Page 3

### CONCLUSION

Proposition 26 is not triggered because the Personnel Department is not proposing a modification to its fees. Additionally, the above described fee is exempt from the definition of "tax" under Proposition 26.

JAN I. GOLDSMITH, CITY ATTORNEY

Lori Thacker

Deputy City Attorney

LT:ccm:amt

Attachments: User Fee Departmental Cost Recovery Calculations

User Fee Summary

cc: Mark Leonard, Department Director, Financial Management

MS-2012-13

# Exhibit A Fiscal Year 2013 Proposed User Fee Adjustments Cost Recovery Calculations

Fee Title: Dept No: 1212 Department: Personnel

Addendum Index Code G-3.

Fee Description: Fingerprinting of Rural Metro employees and Contractors doing business with the City for Background Check. Per Personnel Regulation 21.1% Overhead Rate: Load Rate: Live Scan Fingerprinting Preparer/Contact: Shohreh Mc Date: 9-27-2011 Fee Legal Authority:

22.77 3.30 1.28 19.24 8.12 + LABOR LOAD + OVERHEAD + DIRECT COSTS FRINGE LOAD) TOTAL COSTS (1+1+0+1) (Exlaborioad 6.12 0.08 0.55 0.21 1.42 FRINGEX FRINGE LABOR LOAD) LOAD INDIRECT COSTS 3.25 (% HO × (5 + 0)) (LABOR COST + 0.32 LABOR LOAD) X DEPT/CITY OVERHEAD) 8.10 (C x labor load %) 8 COSTX LABOR (LABOR LOAD) ഗ 69 69 69 69 69 69 69 67.40 (LABOR-COST + FRINGE) 2.61 15.29 6.44 1.01 18.11 (C+E) COSTS မာ 8.18 2.63 29.01 FRINGE X HOURS) HOURLY (D x B) COST: (EST FRINGE 69 ESTIMATE D'HOURLY FRINGE 170.98 38.42 16.78 26.30 16.36 49.01 24.11 Ω G DIRECT COSTS COST (HOURLY RATE X HOURS) 38.39 0.63 9.93 1.63 13.81 LABOR  $(A \times B)$ 69 LABOR HOURS PER SERVICE OCCURRENCE 0.02 0.40 1,45 0.50 0.01 മ 19.85 81.73 62.50 21.45 HOURLY SALARY 60 60 60 60 60 60 FB Supervising Personnel Analyst/1927 JOB CLASS and CLASS CODE Test Administration Specialist/1419 Assistant Personnel Director/2131 Senior Personnel Analyst /1650 Payroll Audit Specialist/1647 Personnel Director/2171 PE Costs

Cost Calculations 1

Commitment item 422046 is used to capture this revenue. Based on the survey conducted of the following agencies the fingerprinting fees will not be increased and will remain at \$65.00 to stay competitive Notes:

Personnel-User Fee Departmental Analysis.xlsx

# Exhibit B Fiscal Year 2013 Proposed User Fee Adjustments Department Summary

Department: Personnel

	Compliance with Prop 26 (YN)	Pending	1		1						AMMITTALABAGOATITA	İ		and a fine and a fine a	and a column and a	
	Tior with		-									[		A LACABORATION AND A STATE OF THE STATE OF T	111111111111111111111111111111111111111	
	mt Categ % Level (I y III)	=	A PERSONAL PROPERTY OF THE PERSONAL PROPERTY O	-		,										
013	Fee Amor for 100% Cost Recover	\$84.88														
FINE PROPOSED FY 2013	Fee Amount Catagory Cost for 100% Level (1 in or Cost) Recovery W Recovery III	77%										The state of the s				
IN THE REOF	Projected Annual Revenue	\$16,030.00	o, un adapa remindue	_ ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,					Marketon of Commercial	an afternoon of the second			geography ville- 4- 2			
	Fee Amount	\$65.00	governi je se je se						magnesia men							
	Fee: Category evel (I, 11 o	=							-							
	Cost Recovery %	77%				al ar consideration in the light state of the light	ALTONOMAC SEPTEMBER						:			
FY 2011	Actual Cost Revenues Recovery 2	\$16,640.00			_						· ·					
	Total Cost from Cost alculations (tab)	\$84.88				-			20 - 20 - 20 - 20 - 20 - 20 - 20 - 20 -					And the second s		Article and Article State of the State of th
	Total Cost Fee Amount Calculations	\$65.00			81.00 Sales (1874 ) 1874 (1974 )				e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e						AND STREET	
25	Calendar Year of Last Revision	2002						-		To constitute the same of the					Management and Market	
	_	AR 95.25 and Personnel Regulations Addendum Index Code G-3		and and a property of the second of the seco						MARINANA MARINA			The state of the s			To the state of th
	Fee Description	Finger printing of Rural Metro employees and Contractors doing business with the City for background check.														noneman irrar pies president at the second
	Fee D	Finger printing of Rural Metro er business with the City for backgi		And the second control of the second												The state of the s
Department.	Fee Title	Live scan Fingerprinting						TOTAL						Valence de la companya de la company		AND LITERAL BEAUTIFUL TO A CONTRACT OF THE PARTY OF THE P

haudited unless audited numbers become available

FY 2013 Personnel-User Fee Departmental Analysis (2).xtsx