

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

REPORT TO THE CITY COUNCIL

DATE ISSUED:	April 18, 2012	REPORT NO: 12-049
ATTENTION:	Budget and Finance Committee Agenda of April 25, 2012	
SUBJECT:	FY 2013 Recommended Real Adjustments	Estate Assets Department User Fee
REFERENCE:	None	

REQUESTED ACTION:

Approve proposed user fees for Fiscal Year 2013.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approve proposed user fees for Fiscal Year 2013.

SUMMARY:

The City's User Fee Policy 100-05, which was adopted by the City Council on March 10, 2009, provides guidelines for establishing a comprehensive user fee schedule and requires that the full cost of services be identified and all fees be categorized according to the level of cost recovery. The Policy requires all existing fee levels be in line with service costs to ensure that all reasonable costs incurred in the provision of services are being recovered. Per the User Fee Policy, a comprehensive user fee study shall be conducted every three years. The last comprehensive user fee study was conducted in Fiscal Year 2009.

The User Fee Policy stipulates three categories of cost recovery: user fees with 100% cost recovery (Category I), user fees with less than 100% cost recovery (Category II), and penalties and fines (Category III). This report groups the recommended user fee adjustments into these categories.

The cost recovery calculations are based on direct and indirect costs for all fees in order to accurately calculate the cost of providing services. Direct costs are those that can be fully attributed to providing a specific service. An example of a direct cost is the staff time spent performing tasks related to a specific service and includes employee salary and benefits. Indirect costs include allocated central support service costs (IT, risk management, fleet assignment and

usage fees, etc.), departmental support costs, and the full cost associated with staff providing the service.

Approved by 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. All user fee adjustments recommended in this report have been reviewed by the City Attorney's Office for compliance with Proposition 26 (Attachment).

BACKGROUND:

The Real Estate Assets Department provides a wide variety of services to public agencies, current lessees of City-owned land, and to the general public for a nominal fee that many times is not proportional to the service provided. The Department also receives numerous requests for information, review of unsolicited proposals and requests for various other agreements, which can take a substantial amount of staff time to complete.

There are eight types of documents for which the department charges fees. They are as follows:

Consent to Sublease: City's lessees are required by Council Policy 700-10 to request approval of any subleases permitted under the lease agreement. This fee is to cover costs for preparing, processing and administering such sublease agreements.

Consent to Assignment of Leasehold Interest or other modification/document for lessee's benefit - Long Term Agreements (lease term of three or more years): City's lessees are required by Council Policy 700-10 to request approval for all assignments of leasehold interests. This includes selling all or part of a leasehold interest or assigning it to another entity. This fee is to recover costs for negotiating, preparing and processing assignments of leasehold interests. The Consent to Assignment of long term agreements require additional staff time and may require Council approval.

Consent to Assignment of Leasehold Interest or other modification/document for lessee's benefit - Short Term or Non Revenue Agreement (lease term of less than three years): City's lessees are required by Council Policy 700-10 to request approval for all assignments of leasehold interests. This includes selling all or part of a leasehold interest or assigning it to a corporation or partnership. This fee is to recover costs for negotiating, preparing and processing assignments of leasehold interests.

Leases - New, Renewed or Amended - Long Term Agreements: This fee is to recover costs for negotiating, preparing and processing new agreements, renewals, or amendments of existing agreements. Long term agreements require Council approval and additional staff time.

2

Leases - New, Renewed or Amended - Short Term or Non Revenue Agreements: This fee is to recover costs for negotiating, preparing and processing new agreements, renewals, or amendments of existing agreements. Short term agreements generally do not require as many hours or staff to process as long term lease agreements, which require approval by Council.

Easement or Rights on City Property: Easements may be granted over City-owned property for private utilities, such as electrical, telephone, water, sewer, and other uses. All permanent easements or rights conveyed must be approved by City Council. This fee is to recover costs for negotiating, preparing and processing easement deeds, as well as determining the value of the easements.

Permits, Rights of Entry and other temporary uses: Temporary uses of City property cover a wide range of situations and short term uses. This fee is to recover costs for preparing, processing, and administering these permits.

Valuation Processing Fee: This fee is to recover the cost of staff appraisals and review of independent appraisals for City properties for sale, lease, market value adjustments, etc.

FISCAL CONSIDERATIONS:

đ

The Real Estate Assets Department has not changed its user fees since 2003 and proposes to increase most of its user fees based on the Consumer Price Index (Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County CPU – "All Urban Consumers"), which would result in an approximate 2% annual increase since 2003. READ's justification for the increased fee proposal is to conform to the City's User Fee Policy 100-05 of cost recovery. The proposed permit fee increases, if approved, would take effect July 1, 2012, the beginning of Fiscal Year 2013. All proposed fee increases would comply with Proposition 26.

All of the department's fees fall within Category II (less than 100% cost recovery). The department believes that the proposed fees are reasonable and justified, and any greater increase would be unreasonable and could be a financial burden to smaller tenants. The majority of the revenue the department generates comes from the various lease contracts that are being processed or amended. User fees are a very small percentage of the department's total General Fund revenues, which is illustrated in the following table:

Fiscal Year	User Fees Revenue	General Fund Revenues	User Fees as % of General Fund Revenues
2011	\$120,300	\$53,800,000	0.22%
2010	\$39,600	\$53,100,000	0.07%
2009	\$38,800	\$56,400,000	0.07%
2008	\$62,200	\$52,400,000	0.12%

The table below outlines the current fees and cost recovery and the proposed fees and cost recovery per user fee category:

Fee Title	Current Fee	Proposed Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery
Category II			
Consent to Assignment of Leasehold Interest - Long Term Agreements	\$1,680	\$2,000	69%
Consent to Assignment of Leasehold Interest - Short Term or Non Revenue Agreements	\$560	\$670	70%
Consent to Sublease	\$600	\$727	73%
Easements or Rights on City Property	\$1,590	\$1,750	66%
Leases-New, Renewed or Amended - Long Term Agreement	\$3,970	\$4,454	95%
Leases-New, Renewed or Amended - Short Term or Non Revenue Agreements	\$600	\$727	61%
Permits, Rights of Entry and Other Temporary Uses	\$600	\$727	71%
Valuation Processing Fee	\$1,000	\$1,200	35%

PREVIOUS COUNCIL and/or COMMITTEE ACTION: None

đ

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND PUBLIC OUTREACH EFFORTS: N/A.

<u>KEY STAKEHOLDERS:</u> The key stakeholders include other public agencies, current lessees of City-owned land, and the general public.

James Barwick Department Director

Attachment

Office of The City Attorney City of San Diego

MEMORANDUM MS 59

(619) 236-6220

DATE:April 16, 2012TO:James Barwick, Director, Real Estate Assets DepartmentFROM:City AttorneySUBJECT:Proposition 26 Review of Proposed Real Estate Assets Department 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 218.¹

¹ 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."

James Barwick, Director, READ April 16, 2012 Page 2

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 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.²

We have reviewed a detailed summary of the Real Estate Assets Department's (READ) Department's cost recovery calculations as described in Exhibit A and proposed fee adjustments as described in Exhibit B. Our Proposition 26 analysis of each fee is discussed below.

PROPOSED USER FEES ANALYSIS

Authority for the READ's Fees

Pursuant to San Diego Resolution R-208896 (Sept. 25, 1973), "the City Manager is authorized to establish fees to recover costs involved with property acquisition and property management services performed by the Property Department." The Resolution further states that the fees will "recover City costs involved in providing easements, subordination agreements, exchanges, sublease consent, assignment consent, abandonments, and temporary property use permit requests."

As shown on Exhibits A and B (collectively referred to as "READ's User Fee Analysis"), READ is proposing increases to its fees for the following eight City services or products:

- 1) Consent to Assignment of Leasehold Interest Long Term Agreements;
- 2) Consent to Assignment of Leasehold Interest Short Term or Non Revenue Agreements;
- 3) Consent to Sublease;
- 4) Easement or Rights on City Property;
- 5) Leases-New, Reviewed or Amended Long Term Agreements;
- 6) Leases-New, Renewed or Amended Short Term or Non Revenue Agreements;
- 7) Permits, Rights of Entry and other Temporary Uses; and

² 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.

James Barwick, Director, READ April 16, 2012 Page 3

8) Valuation Processing Fee.

The eight fees analyzed by READ are fees which would allow the City to recover its costs associated with providing services of the type authorized by R-208896 (User Fees).

Application of Proposition 26 to READ's Proposed Increases to its User Fees

Proposition 26 added a definition of "tax" to the California Constitution. That definition now requires that "any levy, charge, or exaction of any kind" imposed, increased, or extended by local government agencies on or after November 3, 2010, is considered a special tax unless an exception applies.

Section 1(e)(2) of Proposition 26 excludes from the new definition of "tax": A charge imposed 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 User Fees set forth in READ's User Fee Analysis are for specific services or products which will be provided by READ and which will be charged only to the party requesting those same specific services or products. Therefore, READ's proposed User Fees are the type of "charge" contemplated by the above-listed exception to Proposition 26.

Further, READ's User Fee Analysis analyzes each proposed increase to its User Fees by calculating the direct and indirect costs associated with each User Fee, and then comparing the true cost of providing the User Fee activity to a requesting party against the proposed increased User Fee. READ's User Fee Analysis evidences that even with the proposed increases to the User Fees, the City will receive less than total cost recovery (from 35% to 95% of the true total cost to the City) for the user fee activities associated with the proposed increased User Fees.

Accordingly, as the User Fees set forth in READ's User Fee Analysis are fees for specific government services and/or products provided directly to the payor and are not provided to those not charged, and the proposed increased User Fees do not exceed the reasonable cost of providing the services and/or products associated with each of the individual user fee activities, the proposed increased User Fees reasonably appear to fall within the section 1(e)(2) exception to Proposition 26.

CONCLUSION

The increased User Fees proposed by READ are for services associated with rendering specific government services or products to specific payors who request and receive those same services or products. And, based on READ's User Fee Analysis, the actual administrative costs associated with providing those services or products do not exceed the reasonable cost to the

James Barwick, Director, READ April 16, 2012 Page 4

City of providing those same services or products or READ's proposed increased User Fees. In fact, none of the proposed increased User Fees will constitute full cost recovery for the services or products provided. Accordingly, this Office concludes that the proposed increased User Fees listed in READ's User Fee Analysis are likely exempt from the definition of "tax" under section 1(e)(2) of Proposition 26 and, therefore, are in accordance with the California Constitution.

JAN I. GQLDSMITH, City Attorney By: Debra J. Bevier Deputy City Attorney

DJB:mm:amt Attachments: Exhibits A and B cc: Mark Leonard, Director, Financial Management MS-2012-14

Exhibit A

Fiscal Year 2013 Proposed User Fee Adjustments

Cost Recovery Calculations

19.1% 115.7% Fee Description: This includes selling all or part of a leasehold interest or assigning it to another entity. This fee is to recover costs for negotiating, preparing and processing Overhead Rate: Fee Title: CONSENT TO ASSIGNMENT (LONG TERM) Load Rate: Fee Legal Authority: Reso # 208896 assignments of leasehold interests. Long term agreements require council approval and additional staff time. Date: Sep. 27, 2011 Dept No: 1613 Preparer/Contact: Roswitha Sanchez Department: READ

		NGE		5.20	9.72	8.72	3.64
K		TOTAL COSTS TOTAL COSTS DIRECT COSTS+ LABOR LOAD+ OVERHEAD + FRUNG LOAD)	((++++))				\$2,913.64
ŗ		FRINGE LOAD (FRINGE X LOAD RATE)	(F x 19.1 %)		\$198.10		
I	INDIRECT COSTS	DEPTICITY OVERHEAD (LABOR COST + LABOR LOAD) X DEPTICITY OF)	(% 0'911 × (H + C))	\$637.79	\$359.60	\$127.19	\$1,124.58
Н		LABOR LOAD (LABOR LOAD (LABOR COST X LOAD RATE)	(D×19.1%)		\$49.84		
G		DIRECT COSTS (LABOR COST + FRINGE)	(D + F)	\$787.08	\$432,18	\$153.90	\$1,373.16
F		ESTIMATED FRINGE COST (EST HOURLY FRINGE X HOURS)	(C x E)		\$171.22		
ы	R COSTS	ESTIMATED HOURLY FRINGE	- 1974 - 1986 - 11 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	\$23.16	\$24.46	\$30.80	\$78.42
Q	LABO	REGULAR LABOR COST (HOURLY RATE X HOURS)	(BxC)	\$462.84	\$260.96	\$92.30	\$816.10
v		REGULAR LABOR HOURS		14	7	7	23
в		HOURLY RATE		\$33.06	\$37.28	\$46.15	
A		CLASS CODE		1756	1929	2270	the state of the second s
		JOB CLASS		Property Agent	Supervising Property Agent	Program Manager	andologi at 1400. Conjunt pe to produce to a conjunction of the project state type to the state of the state of

Notes: All fees are deposited into the following account: GL 422065 Curtent fee is \$1,680, Recommending fee increase to \$2,000 for FY13 being a 19% increase.

Fee was last adjusted in 2003.

115.7% 19.1% Fee Description: This includes selling all or part of a leasehold interest or assigning it to another entity. This fee is to recover costs for negotiating, preparing and processing **Overhead Rate:** Fee Title: CONSENT TO ASSIGNMENT (SHORT TERM) Load Rate: Fee Legal Authority: Reso # 208896 Date: Sep. 27, 2011 Dept No: 1613 Preparer/Contact: Roswitha Sanchez assignments of leasehold interests. Department: READ

н

С

Ľ۰.

ы

۵

U

മ

	-	HOURLY	REGULAR	REGULAR LABOR COST (HOURLY RATE X	ESTIMATED HOURLY	ESTIMATED FRINGE COST (EST HOURLY FRINGE X	DIRECT COSTS (LABOR COST +	LABOR LOAD (LABOR LOAD	DEPT/CITY OVERHEAD (LABOR COST + LABOR LOAD) X	FRINGELOAD (FRINGEX	TOTAL COSTS (DIRECT COSTS+ LABOR LOAD + OVERHEAD +
JOB CLASS	CLASS CODE	RATE	HOURS	HOURS)		HOURS)	FRINGE)	LOAD RATE)	DEPT/CITY OH)	LOAD RATE)	FRINGE LOAD)
n de la serie d	and some - the set of the set		1	(BxC)		(C x E)	(D + F)	(D×19.1%)	((D+H) x 116.0%)	(F x 19.1 %)	(C+H+L+J)
Property Agent	1756	\$33.06	S	\$165.30	\$23.16	\$115.80		\$31.57	\$227.78		\$562.57
Supervising Property Agent	1929	\$37.28	2.5	\$93.20	\$24.46	\$61.15	\$154.35	\$17.80	\$128.43	\$11.68	\$312.26
Program Manager	2270	\$46.15	0.5	\$23.08	\$30.80	\$15.40	\$38.48	\$4.41	\$31.80		\$77.63
1 A configuration of the first of the first of the first of the second s Second second sec	a de la companya de l		8	\$281.58	\$78.42	\$192.35	\$473.93	\$53.78	\$388.01		S952.46

Notes: All fees are deposited into the following account: GL 422069

Current fee is \$550. Recommending fee increase to \$670 for FY13 being a 20% increase.

Fee was last adjusted in 2003.

Overhead Rate: Load Rate: Fee Title: CONSENT TO SUBLEASE Fee Legal Authority: Reso # 208896 Fee Description: This fee is to cover costs for preparing, processing and administering such sublease agreements. Date: Sep. 27, 2011 Dept No: 1613 Preparer/Contact: Roswitha Sanchez Department: READ

\$562.57 \$312.26 \$116.42 \$991.26 TOTAL COSTS (DRECT COSTS+ LOAD RATE + OVERHEAD + FRINGE LOAD) (G+H+I+J) ¥ FRINGE LOAD (FRINGE X LOAD RATE) \$22.12 \$11.68 \$4.41 \$38.21 (F x 19.1 %) **,**..., DEPT/CITY 0VERHEAD (LABOR COST + LABOR LOAD) X DEPT/CITY OH) \$47.69 ((D+H) x 116.0 %) \$227.78 \$128.43 \$403.90 INDIRECT COSTS 1 \$31.57 \$17.80 LABOR LOAD (LABOR COST X LOAD RATE) \$55.98 (D'x 19.1%) H \$281.10 \$154.35 \$57.71 \$493.16 DIRECT COSTS (LABOR COST + FRINGE) (J + J) 5 ESTIMATED FRINGE COST (EST HOURLY \$115.80 \$61.15 \$23.10 \$200.05 FRINGE X HOURS) (C x E) ... \$23.16 \$24.46 \$30.80 \$78.42 ESTIMATED HOURLY FRINGE LABOR COSTS ш REGULAR LABOR COST (HOURLY \$165.30 \$93.20 \$34.61 \$293.11 RATE X HOURS) (B x C) Δ REGULAR LABOR HOURS 5 2.5 0.75 8.25 υ \$33.06 \$37.28 \$46.15 HOURLY RATE m CLASS CODE 1756 1929 2270 ۲ Supervising Property Agent JOB CLASS Program Manager Property Agent

Notes: All fees are deposited into the following account: GL 422069

Current fee is \$600. Recommending fee increase to \$727 for FY13 being a 21% increase.

Fee was last adjusted in 2003.

A-3

19.1% 115.7%

Department: READ	Dept No: 1613	Fee Title: EASEMENTS OR RIGHTS ON CITY PROPERTY Load Rate:		19.1%
Preparer/Contact: Roswitha Sanchez	Date: Sep. 27, 2011	Fee Legal Authority: Reso # 208896	Overhead Rate: 115.7	15.7%
Fee Description: Easements may be gra	inted over City-owned property for put	Fee Description: Easements may be granted over City-owned property for public utilities, such as electrical, telephone and other uses. All permanent easements or rights conveyed must be	All permanent easements or rights conveyed must	ust be

Fee Description: Easements may be granted over City-owned property for public utilities, such as electrical, telephone and other uses. I processed through the City Council for approval. This fee is to recover costs for negotiating, preparing and processing easement deeds.

ч

H

ტ

μ.,

ш

Ω

U

m

۷

				Ľ	LABOR COSTS				NDRECT COSTS		
				REGULAR		ESTIMATED	DIRECT		DEPT/CITY		TOTAL COSTS
	-			LABOR COST		FRINGE COST	COSTS		OVERHEAD (LABOR		(DIRECT COSTS+
			REGULAR	(HOURLY	ESTIMATED	(EST HOURLY	(LABOR	LABOR LOAD	COST+LABOR	FRINGELOAD	LABOR LOAD+
		HOURLY	LABOR	RATE X	HOURLY	FRINGE X	COST +	(LABOR COST X	LOAD) X DEPT/CITY	(FRINGE X	OVERHEAD + FRINGE
JOB CLASS	CLASS CODE	RATE	HOURS	HOURS)	FRINGE	HOURS)	FRINGE)	LOAD RATE)	(HO	LOAD RATE)	LOAD)
*				(B x C)		(C x E)	(D + F)	(D x 19.1%)	(D+H) x 116.0 %)	(Fx 19.1%)	(G+H+I+J)
	n ber eine eine der eine Berneten auf der Berneten Berneten Berneten Berneten ber der Berneten ber der Berneten	i na managangan dalaman na dalam dan menungkan dalam	neg Bandan in Disputing and the second state	balantarrayeese Servi Jones Scillor 19 et a	TANDARANA STRUCTURE AND A LOUGH AND ADDRESS OF A	na na katalogo	A		na da managana na managana	THE REAL PROPERTY AND ADDRESS OF THE REAL PROPERTY AND ADDRESS OF THE REAL PROPERTY ADDRESS OF THE PROPERTY ADDRESS OF THE REAL PROP	la oo naa waato la maa ka maa ahaa ahaa ahaa ahaa ahaa ah
Property Agent	1756	\$33.06	13.5	\$446.31	\$23.16	\$312.66	\$758.97	\$85.25	\$615.01		\$1,518.94
Supervising Property Agent	1929	\$37.28	6.5	\$242.32	\$24.46	\$158.99	\$401.31	\$46.28	\$333.91		\$811.87
Program Manager	2270	\$46.15	2	\$92.30	\$30.80	\$61.60	\$153.90	\$17.63	\$127.19	\$11.77	\$310.48
	nan-dalamati kual da alah dalamati kuto' kuto		22		\$78.42	\$533.25	\$1,314.18	\$149.16	\$1,076.11		\$2,641.30
		reaction and the second states are stated as a second state of the	And a substitute of the substitute of	to shake a contract back from the topologic strategic or range	en ruge, understanden vice uit in de la seberarden de la seberarden de la se	and the second second states and the second states and the second s	A Sec of Manufacture 1 wood , Automotive Course	en en son de la companya en la companya de la comp	100 Contraction of the second s	Participation of the second second subscription of the second sec	A second a support of the second s

Notes: All fees are deposited into the following account: GL 422069 Current fee is S1,590. Recommending fee increase to S1,750 for FY13 being a 10% increase. Fee was last adjusted in 2003.

Fee Description: This fee is to recover costs for negotiating, preparing and processing new agreements, renewals, or amendments of existing agreements. Long term agreements require council approval and additional staff time. 115.7% 19.1% Overhead Ra Load Rate: Fee Title: LEASES - NEW, RENEWAL, AMENDED (LONG TERM) Fee Legal Authority: Reso # 208896 Date: Sep. 27, 2011 Dept No: 1613 Preparer/Contact: Roswitha Sanchez Department: READ

Х

ŗ

-

Ħ

G

(Li

ш

۵

ç

B

<

				LA	LABOR COSTS				INDIRECT COSTS		
				REGULAR		ESTIMATED	DIRECT		DEPTICITY		TOTAL COSTS
				LABOR COST		FRINGE COST	COSTS		OVERHEAD (LABOR		(DIRECT COSTS+
			REGULAR	(HOURLY	ESTIMATED	(EST HOURLY	(LABOR	LABOR LOAD	COST + LABOR	FRINGE LOAD	LABOR LOAD +
<u></u>		HOURLY	LABOR	RATEX	HOURLY	FRINGE X	COST +	(LABOR COST X	LOAD) X DEPT/CITY	(FRINGE X	OVERHEAD + FRINGE
JOB CLASS	CLASS CODE	RATE	HOURS	HOURS)	FRINGE	HOURS)	FRINGE)	LOAD RATE)	(HO	LOAD RATE)	(OAD)
				(B × C)		(C x E)	(H + E)	(Dx 19.1%)	((D+H) x 116.0 %)	(F.x. 19.1 %)	(G+H+I+U
								n bendelon vand derklandelone bestelde territet de st		artist with an are found to the first of the first of the	
Property Agent	1756	\$33.06	23	\$760.38	\$23.16	\$532.68	\$1,293.06	\$145.23	\$1,047.79	\$101.74	\$2,587.83
Supervising Property Agent	1929	\$37.28	7 .	\$260.96	\$24.46	\$171.22	\$432.18	\$49.84	1 \$359.60	\$32.70	\$874.33
Program Manager 2270 \$46.1	2270	\$46.15	∞	\$369.20	\$30.80	\$246.40	\$615.60	\$70.52	\$508.75	\$47.06	\$1,241.93
			38	\$1,390.54	\$78.42	\$950.30	\$2,340.84	\$265.59	69	\$181.51	\$4,704.09
A COMMENDER MANAGEMENTER AND AN	THE PARTING A MOUNT OF A DURING THE AVAILABLE AND A DURING THE AVAILABLE AVAILABLE AND A DURING THE AVAILABLE AVAILAB		Service data and deal and the service of the servic	ALCONDUCTOR AND ADDRESS OF ADDRES	A TANK ON THE CONSISTENCE AND A LONG ROOMS BELIEVED IN	The property of the second sec	NU LI ALUGALI LACINITIZZA IN MUNICIPALITY		הניינואינינייני אין איינון איינערייניין אינאין אין אינאין אין איינאינאיט פאיילאינאינאיט איינאין		

Notes: All fees are deposited into the following account: GL 422069

Current fee is \$3,970. Recommending fee increase to \$4,454 for FY13 being a 12.2% increase.

Fee was last adjusted in 2003.

115.7% 19.1% **Overhead Ra** Load Rate: Fee Description: This fee is to recover costs for negotiating, preparing and processing new agreements, renewals, or amendments of existing agreements. Fee Title: LEASES - NEW, RENEWAL, AMENDED (SHORT TERM) Fee Legal Authority: Reso # 208896 Date: Sep. 27, 2011 Dept No: 1613 Preparer/Contact: Roswitha Sanchez Department: READ

К		TOTAL COSTS (DIRECT COSTS+	LABOR LOAD +	(ERHEAD + FRINGE LOAD)	(G+H+J)	en e	\$562.57	\$312.26	\$310.48	\$1,185.31
Ţ	電気であることである		FRINGE LOAD	(FRINGE X OV LOAD RATE)	(F x 19.1 %)		\$22.12	\$11.68	\$11.77	\$45.56
I	DIRECT COSTS	DEPT/CITY	COST + LABOR	DAD) X DEPT/CITY OH)	(D+H) x 116.0 %)	na julio de la compañía de la compañ	\$227.78	\$128.43	\$127.19	\$483.40
Н	NI CONTRACTOR	0		(LABOR COST X L LOAD RATE)	(D x 19.1%)		\$31.57	\$17.80	\$17.63	\$67.00
υ		DIRECT COSTS	(LABOR	COST + FRINGE)	(D+F)		\$281.10	\$154.35	\$153.90	\$589.35
F		ESTIMATED FRINGE COST	(EST HOURLY	FRINGE X HOURS)	(CxE)		\$115.80			\$238.55
E	ABOR COSTS		ESTIMATED	HOURLY FRINGE			\$23.16	\$24.46	\$30.80	\$78.42
D	LAE	REGULAR	COST	(HOURLY RATE X	(B×C)		\$165.30	\$93.20	\$92.30	\$350.80
С		-	REGULAR	LABOR HOURS			5	2.5	2	9.5
В				HOURLY RATE			\$33.06	\$37.28	\$46.15	ระครามปฏิภาพระครามสาวาร
A		L		CLASS CODE			1756	1929	2270	ad ha yoo ha a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a
				JOB CLASS			Property Agent	Supervising Property Agent	Program Manager 2270 \$46.15 2	2.9

Notes: All fees are deposited into the following account: GL 422069

Current fee is \$600. Recommending fee increase to \$727 for FY13 being a 21% increase.

Fee was last adjusted in 2003.

Department: READ	Dept No: 1613 F	Fee Title: PERMITS, RIGHTS OF ENTRY & OTHER TEMP. USES	Load Rate:	19.1%
Preparer/Contact: Roswitha Sanchez	Date: Sep. 27, 2011 F	Fee Legal Authority: Reso # 208896	Overhead Ra	115.7%
e Description: Temporary uses of City	r property cover a wide range of situation	Fee Description: Temporary uses of City property cover a wide range of situations. This fee it to recover costs for preparing and processing these permits.		

К

I

Η

υ

يت)

ы

۵

υ

щ

K

				L	LABOR COSTS				INDIRECT COSTS		
				REGULAR		ESTIMATED	DIRECT		DEPT/CITY		TOTAL COSTS
				LABOR COST		FRINGE COST	COSTS		OVERHEAD (LABOR		DIRECT COSTS+
			REGULAR	(HOURLY	ESTIMATED	(EST HOURLY	(LABOR	LABORLOAD	COST + LABOR	FRINGELOAD	LABOR LOAD +
		HOURLY	LABOR	RATEX	HOURLY	FRINGE X	COST +	(LABOR COST X	LOAD) X DEPT/CITY	(FRINGE X	OVERHEAD + FRINGE
JOB CLASS	CLASS CODE	RATE	HOURS	HOURS)	FRINGE	HOURS)	FRINGE)	LOAD RATE)	OED	LOAD RATE)	LOAD)
				(B x C)		(C × E)	(D + F)	(D x 19.1%)	$((D + H) \times 116.0\%)$	(F x 19.1 %)	(C+T+H+D)
							Maria Maria Anno Persona ana amin'ny fisiana amin'	- 1 JAA DAGA KU DATABANYA KANANG MANANG M	The state \$5 bits without point of a suffy 12 of a sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-	No mangang kang dan kanang kanang kang dan kang	na na managana
Property Agent	1756	\$33.06	5	\$165.30	\$23.16	\$115.80	\$281.10	\$31.57	7 \$227.78	\$22.12	\$562.57
Supervising Property Agent	1929	\$37.28	2.5	\$93.20	\$24.46	\$61.15	\$154.35	\$17.80		\$11.68	\$312.26
Program Manager 2270 \$46,15 1	2270	\$46.15	1	\$46.15	\$30.80	\$30.80	\$76.95	\$8.81	1 \$63.59	\$5.88	\$155.24
c (sci)ora			8.5	\$	\$78.42	\$	\$512.40	67		\$39.68	\$1.030.07

Notes: All fees are deposited into the following account: GL 422069 Current fee is \$600. Recommending fee increase to \$727 for FY13 being a 21% increase.

Fee was last adjusted in 2003.

Department: READ	Dept No: 1613	Fee Title: VALUATION PROCESSING FEE	Load Rate:	19.1%	
Preparer/Contact: Roswitha Sanchez	Date: Sep. 27, 2011	Fee Legal Authority: Reso # 208896	Overhead Rate: 115.7%	115.7%	
				- - - -	

Fee Description: This fee is to recover the cost of staff appraisals and review of independent appraisals for City properties for sale, lease, market value adjustments, etc. The department collects the actual fee charged by any outside appraisers when possible.

м

-

H

ΰ

щ

ш

۵

U

ш

¢

LASS LABOR COST REGULAR REGULAR REGULAR REGULAR DEPTC LABOR COST LABOR COST FRINGE COST COSTS LABOR LABOR OVERHEAD LASS CLASS CODE RATE HOURLY ESTIMATED RENGE COST LABOR LABOR OVERHEAD LASS CLASS CODE RATE HOURLY ESTIMATED RENGE COST LABOR LABOR OVERHEAD LASS CLASS CODE RATE HOURLY FRINGE COST LABOR LOAD COST COST LABOR LOAD COST ON LASS CLASS CODE RATE HOURLY FRINGE COST LABOR COST COST COST LABOR COST COST LABOR COST COST COST LABOR COST COST LABOR COST ON 1756 S33.06 8 \$264.48 \$33.16 \$135.28 \$449.76 \$50.22 141.03 \$1 et 2270 546.15 16 738 \$53.36 \$49.76 \$50.22 \$141.03 \$1					H.	LABOR COSTS				INDIRECT COSTS		記録大い主義の主義主義
Image: Labor Cost Labor Cost Labor Cost FRINGE Cost Costs Labor Costs OverHead HOURLY REGULAR HOURLY ESTIMATED RESTHOURLY RADOR LABOR COSTS LABOR COST LABOR LABOR COST					REGULAR		ESTIMATED	DIRECT	「「「「「「「」」」	DEPT/CITY		TOTAL COSTS
LASS REGULAR (HOURLY REGULAR (HOURLY LABOR CATEX HOURLY ESTIMATED (EST HOURLY (LABOR LABOR LOAD COST + LABOR COSTX LOAD XDB COST + LABOR COSTX LABOR COSTX LOAD XDB COST + LABOR COSTX LOAD XDB COST + LABOR COSTX LOAD XDB COST + LABOR COSTX LOAD XALE) OD 1 1 HOURS HOURS HOURS HOURS HOURS HOURS HOURS HOURS HOURS OD OD 1 1 HOURS					LABOR COST		FRINGE COST	COSTS		OVERHEAD (LABOR		DIRECT COSTS+
LASS HOURLY LABOR RATE X HOURLY FRINGE X COST + (LABOR COST X LOAD RATE) OND XDE CLASS CODE RATE HOURS) FRINGE HOURS) FRINGE HOURS) FRINGE OD OD Interval HOURS) FRINGE HOURS) FRINGE HOURS) FRINGE OD OD Interval HOURS) FRINGE HOURS) FRINGE HOURS) FRINGE OD OD Interval Interval (B×C) (B×C) (B×C) (C×E) (D+F) (D×151%) (D+H)xi Interval Interval S13.16 S185.28 \$449.76 \$50.52 S13.52 \$449.76 \$50.52 141.03 \$1 Interval 2270 \$46.15 16 \$738.40 \$50.86 \$50.52 \$141.03 \$1				REGULAR	(HOURLY	ESTIMATED	(EST HOURLY	(LABOR	LABOR LOAD	COST + LABOR	FRINGELOAD	LOAD RATE+
CLASS CLASS CODE RATE HOURS HOURS FRINGE HOURS FRINGE I.OAD RATE I.OAD RATE (DA 191%) (DA 191%)			HOURLY	LABOR	RATEX	HOURLY	FRINGE X	COST +	(LABOR COST X	LOAD) X DEPT/CITY	(FRINGE X	OVERHEAD + FRINGE
er 2270 \$46.15 16 \$33.06 8 \$264.48 \$23.16 \$185.28 \$449.76 \$50.52 \$141.03 \$1 2449.76 \$533.06 8 \$2564.48 \$23.16 \$185.28 \$449.76 \$50.52 \$141.03 \$1 24 \$1.007 \$8 \$533.40 \$50.80 \$492.80 \$1.231.20 \$141.03 \$1	JOB CLASS	CLASS CODE	RATE	HOURS	HOURS)	FRINGE	HOURS)	FRINGE)	LOAD RATE)	OED .	LOAD RATE)	LOAD)
1756 \$33.06 8 \$264.48 \$23.16 \$185.28 \$449.76 \$50.52 et 2270 \$46.15 16 \$738.40 \$30.80 \$492.80 \$1.231.20 \$141.03 \$1 24 \$1.002.88 \$53.96 \$452.80 \$1.231.20 \$141.03 \$1					(B x C)		(C x E)	(D + F)	(D x 19,1%)	((D + H) x 116.0 %)	(F. X 19.1 %)	(C+I+E+D)
1756 \$33.06 8 \$264.48 \$33.16 \$185.28 \$449.76 \$50.52 er 2270 \$46.15 16 \$738.40 \$30.80 \$492.80 \$1.231.20 \$141.03 \$1 er 2270 \$46.15 16 \$738.40 \$30.80 \$492.80 \$1.231.20 \$141.03 \$1	n de la compañía de l			- VI-LANGER / Land BOOMER L'EPENDARY, Schler	n a fair a daonair ann an tha thana tha a tha			lide and the Wilder good? " Are woon when the		oor alaan la waalan ee u samar waxa min marken oo oo oo oo oo	ara da marte ante a la compañía de s	A CONTRACTOR OF A CONTRACTOR O
2270 \$46.15 16 \$738.40 \$30.80 \$492.80 \$1,231.20 \$141.03 1	ty Agent	1756	\$33.06	8	\$264.48	\$23.16	\$185.28	\$449.76	\$50.52	\$364.45	\$35.39	11.00 6 S
24 \$1 002 88 \$53 96 \$678 08 \$1 680 96 \$191 55	m Manager	2270	\$46.15	16	\$738.40	\$30.80	\$492.80	\$1,231.20	\$141.03	\$1,017.51	\$94.12	\$2,483.86
				24	\$1,002.88	\$53.96	\$678.08	\$1,680.96	\$191.55	\$1,381.96	\$129.51	\$3,383.98

Notes: All fees are deposited into the following account: GL 422069 Current fee is \$1,000. Recommending fee increase to \$1,200 for FY13 being a 20% increase. Fee was last adjusted in 2003.

.

· · · · ·

· · ·

Exhibit B

Fiscal Year 2013 Proposed User Fee Adjustments

Department Summary

Proposed Cost Recovery % %69 61% 71% 35% 70% 73% 66% 95% 670.00 727.00 727.00 727.00 1,200.00 (\$112,000) 2,000.00 1,750.00 4,454.00 Proposed Fee φ φ ფფ **ភ្**ស្ស ស 600.00 1,000.00 560.00 600.00 600.00 ,590.00 3,970.00 1,680.00 **Current Fee** θ ର ୧୫ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ ⇔ Э Unit of Measurement Per Item Consent to Assignment of Leasehold Interest -Consent to Assignment of Leasehold Interest -Permits, Rights of entry and other Temporary Leases-New, Renewed or Amended - Short Leases-New, Renewed or Amended - Long Short Term or Non Revenue Agreements Easement or Rights on City Property Term or Non Revenue Agreements Valuation Processing Fee Long Term Agreements Consent to Sublease Term Agreements Fee Title Uses **Real Estate Assets**

Real Estate Assets - Estimated Revenue Variation of Proposed Fee Adjustments (Rounded to the Thousand):

Attachment I: Proposed FY 2013 User Fee Adjustments Summary

Department