

# ELARA Request for State Controller Office Review of East Los Angeles CFA

## Overstated Contract City Law Enforcement Costs (\$2.3 million)

REQUEST #1: ELARA requests that the State Controller review the CFA’s comparison city estimating methodology, data, and findings related to the proposed city’s law enforcement costs.

The CFA estimated the proposed city’s law enforcement cost would be \$21.1 million, based on review of four comparison cities – Carson, Compton, Lancaster and Norwalk (CFA pp. 34-5, 98). Two additional cities—Commerce and Santa Clarita—had been analyzed but were excluded from the estimating averages used in the CFA analysis because Commerce has such a high job-housing ratio as to not be comparable and Santa Clarita had a relatively low crime rate. Nonetheless, Compton was retained in the CFA sample even though its crime rate is substantially higher than in East Los Angeles (Table 5) and the Compton budget was not available for analyzing additional costs. The CFA reported that it established the \$21.1 million cost after assuming sworn staffing levels in East Los Angeles that were comparable to the average of the contract cities (CFA pp. 35, 98). As shown in Table 1, the CFA assumed a sworn staffing level (0.74 per 1,000 residents) higher than the average of the four “comparable” cities (0.67 per 1,000), and non-sworn staffing substantially higher than the average.

**Table 1: East LA CFA Comparison City Analysis - Contract Law Enforcement Estimate Basis**

	Sworn Officers	Non-Sworn	Residents	Sworn per 1,000 Residents	Non-Sworn per 1,000 Residents
Carson	67.6	0	91,714	0.74	0.00
Compton (1)	81.3	4	96,455	0.84	0.04
Lancaster	106.9	0	156,633	0.68	0.00
Norwalk	42.6	0	105,549	0.40	0.00
Santa Clarita (2)	80.1	3	176,320	0.45	0.02
Average (5 cities)				0.62	0.01
Average (exc. Santa Clarita)				0.67	0.01
Average (exc. Compton & Santa Clarita)				0.61	0.00
East LA (CFA)	93.4	19	126,496	0.74	0.15

Notes: (1) Compton's crime rate is significantly higher than East LA and the other comparison cities.  
 (2) Santa Clarita's crime rate is somewhat lower than East LA and the other comparison cities.

The CFA estimate for East Los Angeles amounts to \$166 per capita, which is overstated compared with the average of \$150. The CFA relies on a very small sample to establish contract cities’ law enforcement costs, particularly when it excludes Santa Clarita. Given that Compton should be excluded due to its high crime rate, there are only three cities left in the sample. ELARA analyzed the budgets of four additional cities with comparable crime rates and job-housing ratios—Bellflower, Lynwood, Palmdale and Pico Rivera—to determine per capita costs in a larger sample (see Table 5). The average per capita cost across the seven cities—Carson, Lancaster, Norwalk and the four ELARA cities—was \$148 per capita, as shown in Table 2. Based on ELARA’s analysis, the proposed city’s law enforcement costs were overstated in the CFA by \$2.3 million.

**Table 2: Contract City Law Enforcement Costs, FY 09-10**

	Sheriff Contract Cost	Other City Costs (1)	Sheriff Per Cap	Other Per Cap	Total Per Cap
Carson	\$13,506,118	\$3,413,965	\$147	\$37	\$184
Compton (2)	\$17,085,345	NA	\$177	NA	NA
Lancaster	\$21,470,000	\$2,706,402	\$137	\$17	\$154
Norwalk	\$8,957,340	\$2,824,480	\$85	\$27	\$112
Santa Clarita	\$17,084,587	\$1,806,714	\$97	\$10	\$107
Bellflower	\$8,020,122	\$2,084,218	\$105	\$27	\$132
Lynwood	\$8,421,356	\$1,157,430	\$121	\$17	\$137
Palmdale	\$17,850,444	\$2,819,746	\$117	\$18	\$135
Pico Rivera	\$10,227,177	\$1,103,485	\$162	\$18	\$180
Average (3 CFA cities)			\$123	\$27	\$150
Average (7 cities)			\$125	\$23	\$148
East LA (CFA)	\$21,051,955	\$0	\$166	\$0	\$166

Notes: (1) ELARA excluded code enforcement, animal control and transit guards from other city safety costs. Carson's other costs shown in this Table (unlike the CFA) exclude code enforcement, as those costs are reported elsewhere in the CFA. (2) Compton's budget was not available.

### Unsubstantiated Impacts on Law Enforcement Service Levels

REQUEST #2: ELARA requests that the State Controller comment on the evidence presented in the CFA that service levels would actually decline if the proposed city pays for law enforcement at rates equivalent to those in comparable cities contracting with the Sheriff.

The CFA found that East Los Angeles would face a reduction in law enforcement service levels as a result of its estimated contract cost of \$21.1 million by comparison with existing service levels (CFA pp. 5, 36). The CFA implies that response times might be one half-minute longer due to a reduction in staffing levels. ELARA did not identify any evidence in the CFA that service levels would indeed decline.

By way of background, the County had reported to ELARA that its FY 06-07 costs for serving East Los Angeles were \$24.3 million,<sup>1</sup> but reported those costs had risen to \$36.4 million in FY 09-10 for purposes of the CFA. The County declined to provide ELARA an overview of service costs and levels over the last five years.<sup>2</sup> While costs of policing our community reportedly rose 48 percent in four years, there has been no evidence presented that said cost and staff inflation has resulted in changes in response times or crime rates.

<sup>1</sup> County of Los Angeles Chief Administrative Office, *East Los Angeles Revenue and Expenditure Data*, Attachment XII, June 19, 2007.

<sup>2</sup> County of Los Angeles Chief Executive Office, *Response to East Los Angeles Residents Association Correspondence regarding the Proposed Incorporation of East Los Angeles*, October 4, 2011, Attachment I, p. 1.

## **CFA Transfer of Library Subsidy Disregards Comparison Cities (\$4.5 million)**

REQUEST #3: ELARA requests that the State Controller review the CFA assumptions, analysis and findings with respect to transfer of the County general fund library subsidy of \$4.5 million to the proposed city (CFA pp. 32-3).

The CFA transferred \$4.5 million in library costs to the proposed city. This represents the County's estimate of the operating deficit at the four libraries located in East Los Angeles. Property tax, special tax, and operating revenues cover the remainder of costs at the East Los Angeles libraries. At the Sept. 14, 2011 LAFCO hearing, the CFA author explained that the subsidy would be required by the County Library to sustain current service levels after incorporation, and that otherwise the County would reduce library schedules from 6-7 days weekly to 4-5 days weekly. The CFA states that the County would reduce service levels by 65 percent (CFA pp. 33, 228) if the proposed city does not pay the subsidy.

The CFA assumes the cost and service responsibility would transfer to the new city with no corollary transfer of funding contrary to the mandate of California Government Code §56815, et seq. The CFA transferred subsidy does not account for costs in comparable cities. Government Code §56800(a)(1) requires that the CFA look at both actual County costs for the existing level of service and costs in comparable cities, and make a reasonable determination of the costs expected to be borne by the new city.

Fifty of the 88 cities in the County receive library services from the County Library System. Of those, four cities generate enough revenue to cover library operating costs and three cities have no library. The remainder of the cities' library services is subsidized by the County General Fund. In fact, the County General Fund subsidizes on average 33 percent of library costs in the cities as a whole.<sup>3</sup> None of the cities make significant contributions to library operating costs. Montebello and Norwalk are beneficiaries of the largest County General Fund subsidies.

The County keeps most branch libraries in the unincorporated areas (such as Anthony Quinn, City Terrace and El Camino Real libraries in East Los Angeles) open six days per week with a total of 44 weekly hours open, and certain larger libraries in the unincorporated areas (such as East Los Angeles library) open 6-6 ½ days per week for extended hours. The majority of the County-operated libraries in the cities are open only four days per week with a total of 40 weekly hours open; although some libraries in wealthier cities are run on more favorable schedules (such as 5-6 days per week open but with 35-40 hours weekly total in cities like Agoura Hills and Malibu).<sup>4</sup> None of the cities has a library open 7 days per week.

Based on analysis of library locations and schedules in adjacent areas, ELARA believes that the libraries in East Los Angeles are presently serving territory outside the proposed city boundaries and that the proposed city should not be responsible for subsidizing a regional library hub that was created by the County.

---

<sup>3</sup> County of Los Angeles Public Library, *2008-09 Property Tax and Operating Cost by City*, Nov. 20, 2009 (attached). The document identifies property taxes, special taxes, city contributions and costs by city. The calculation accounts for operating revenues, such as fines, (actuals identified in the County Budget) and excludes the City of Santa Clarita (because it withdrew from the County system and now operates its own libraries). The County provided a copy of its library operating statement for FY 2009-10, but it does not contain information on property tax, special tax or city contribution revenues.

<sup>4</sup> The County of Los Angeles Public Library website lists operating schedules by library.

## Understated Franchise Fee Revenue (\$2.3 million)

REQUEST #4: ELARA requests that the State Controller review the CFA franchise fee estimates (CFA pp. 44-5, 67).

The CFA estimated franchise fee revenue based on County-reported data; similar to its utility user tax estimates, the County’s estimates were missing a substantial amount of revenue based on validity testing with comparable cities. The CFA estimated \$1.3 million in franchise fee revenue is presently generated in East Los Angeles. That amounts to \$11 per capita. By comparison, franchise fees generated \$29 per capita in the CFA comparison cities, and even more in other cities with a similarly low job concentration like East Los Angeles, as shown in Table 3.<sup>5</sup> Hence, there is \$2.3 million in missing revenue from this source.

In ELARA’s view, it is irrelevant whether the CFA underestimate is due to County data errors or to poor revenue recovery under the County’s existing franchise agreements. The proposed city would negotiate franchise agreements with its utility providers, including the solid waste hauler, during the transition period, and would be expected to negotiate reasonable terms like other cities and have reasonable success in collecting the fees from utility providers.

It should be noted that the County does not currently charge a solid waste franchise fee in the proposed city, and stated that it does not do so because the garbage hauler is presently contracted through a County-dependent special district, the Belvedere Garbage Disposal District (BGDD). ELARA has proposed that LAFCO dissolve BGDD and merge it into the new city. The County has voiced no objection to that. Hence, the new city would be in a position to negotiate a franchise agreement with its future hauler.

Table 3: Franchise Fees - East LA vs. Comparison Cities

	Franchise Fees per Capita FY 10	Jobs per Home
<b>East Los Angeles</b>		
Hearing CFA	\$ 10.51	0.72
ELARA Comments	\$ 28.80	0.72
<b>CFA Comparison Cities</b>		
Baldwin Park	\$ 27.19	1.01
El Monte	\$ 17.40	1.28
Hawthorne	\$ 58.55	0.72
Inglewood	\$ 26.35	0.90
Lancaster	\$ 17.05	1.00
Norwalk	\$ 14.21	0.91
Pomona	\$ 39.89	1.36
South Gate	\$ 29.78	0.84
<b>Similar Job-Housing Ratio</b>		
Hawthorne	\$ 58.55	0.72
South Gate	\$ 29.78	0.84
Bellflower	\$ 18.43	0.67
Palmdale	\$ 25.97	0.71

<sup>5</sup> Franchise fee revenues for CFA comparison cities are listed in CFA Table B-1. Franchise fee revenues for each California city are available at <http://www.californiacityfinance.com/Franchises09p.xlsx>.

### **CFA Failed to Provide Impact of Abbreviated Transition Period (\$3.9 million)**

REQUEST #5: ELARA requests that the State Controller comment on the appropriateness of the CFA failing to provide fiscal viability findings under terms proposed by ELARA, specifically the length of the transition period.

The CFA assumed that the transition period (first year of operation) would be 12 months in length. Abbreviated transition periods are relatively common for new California cities (e.g., Rancho Cordova, Elk Grove, Wildomar).<sup>6</sup> Due to the high costs of County-provided services and lower costs that the proposed city is expected to achieve, reducing the length of the transition period and thereby the size of the transition period loan repayments is in the proposed city's interest. Reducing the length of the transition period from 12 to 7 months would have a positive fiscal impact on the proposed city's general fund of \$2.7 million in addition to impacts on the road fund (\$0.9 million) and transit fund (\$0.3 million) during the critical early years of cityhood.

ELARA suggested in its comments submitted on the Public Review Draft CFA that the transition period be shortened to seven months; however, that was disregarded by LAFCO and the CFA author who simply claimed that would not be prudent (CFA p. 189). Of course, the decision on whether to shorten the transition period would be made by the LAFCO Commission rather than the CFA author; however, the CFA author failed to provide information in the CFA on how such policy affects fiscal viability. From ELARA's perspective, for LAFCO's staff and consultant to ignore a relative common practice of LAFCOs granting abbreviated transition periods and the significant impact on the proposed city's costs is prejudicial to a finding of fiscal viability.

### **CFA Ignored Grant Revenues but not Grant-Funded Expenditures (\$4.0 million)**

REQUEST #6: ELARA requests that the State Controller review the CFA assumptions regarding exclusion of formula grants from the new city's revenue sources for conformity with Government Code §56800(a)(1).

The CFA excluded formula grants, such as Community Development Block Grants, Justice Assistance Grant, Local Law Enforcement Block Grant, and COPS under the justification that "cities rarely, if ever, rely on these funding sources to fund recurring operational costs," and that such revenues are unreliable and declining (CFA p. 156).

ELARA estimates that CDBG would have generated \$3.4 million in revenues in FY 09-10, based on analysis of the funding formula, allocations in that year, 2000 Census data in East Los Angeles, and analysis of comparison cities. CDBG rules allow cities to use 15 percent of the funds to finance code enforcement services (a general fund service) and the remainder for capital projects. The remainder of these funds would help finance capital needs in the proposed city's road and transit funds. Also, ELARA analyzed grant sources that the comparison Sheriff contract cities received, and found \$4.97 per capita in grant revenues that were explicitly used to finance Sheriff costs; that would equate to \$0.6 million in missing revenues for the new city. It is clearly biased and erroneous for the CFA to include costs that are financed by grants, but to exclude the revenue source.

Government Code §56800(a)(1) requires that the CFA focus on a particular base year to help prevent this type of bias. The base year for the CFA was FY 09-10, several years into a deep recession, when revenues from various tax sources were at a low. Other cities survived in part through grants. In the CFA, the proposed city's tax revenue estimates are at a recessionary low, its law enforcement costs are based on comparison cities which financed some of those costs through grants, and yet it receives no credit for predictable, formula-driven grants.

---

<sup>6</sup> [http://www.calafco.org/docs/inc-studies/Summary\\_of\\_Recent\\_Incopr\\_Terms&Conditions.pdf](http://www.calafco.org/docs/inc-studies/Summary_of_Recent_Incopr_Terms&Conditions.pdf)

## CFA Understated Utility Users Tax Revenue (\$1.7 million)

REQUEST #7: ELARA requests that the State Controller review the CFA assumptions regarding exclusion of non-residential land lines from the estimates of utility users tax revenue.

The CFA estimated that utility users tax generate \$5.0 million in revenue in East Los Angeles during FY 09-10 (CFA pp. 45, 67). The estimate was based on incomplete and inaccurate data provided by the County<sup>7</sup> and Southern California Edison. The CFA subsequently identified a better data source for the electric tax base, and partially corrected the County’s estimate of telephone tax base which had not included landlines. The CFA author has acknowledged that telephone landlines for non-residential customers (which include the significant public sector presence in East Los Angeles) were not included in the estimate. Based on analysis of comparison cities with a similar base for their utility taxes, there is \$1.7 million in missing revenue, as shown in Table 4.

	Utility Tax Rate	Residents	Revenue FY 08-09	Implicit Tax Base	Implicit Tax Base per Cap
Arcadia	5.00%	56,547	\$5,128,782	\$102,575,640	\$1,814
Bellflower	5.00%	77,194	\$4,118,981	\$82,379,620	\$1,067
El Monte	6.75%	126,308	\$8,477,622	\$125,594,400	\$994
La Verne	6.00%	33,981	\$3,379,051	\$56,317,517	\$1,657
Norwalk	5.50%	109,567	\$6,023,038	\$109,509,782	\$999
Paramount	3.00%	57,874	\$2,252,103	\$75,070,100	\$1,297
Median					\$1,182
East LA-CFA	4.50%	126,496	\$5,007,286	\$111,273,022	\$880
East LA-Comp Base	4.50%	126,496	\$6,729,194	\$149,537,653	\$1,182
Estimated Missing Revenue			\$1,721,908		

Sources: California Local Government Finance Almanac; East LA Hearing CFA

## CFA excluded Revenue Neutrality Payments

REQUEST #8: ELARA requests that the State Controller review the CFA assumptions and findings with respect to revenue neutrality payments associated with compliance with Government Code §56815 (CFA pp. 39, 189).

Although the CFA estimated that incorporation of East Los Angeles would have a positive fiscal impact on the County of \$26 million annually, the CFA did not provide that any portion of that be credited to the new city. The law requires a similar exchange of revenue and responsibility for service delivery. The County presently spends \$17 million in Proposition 172 funds to support service levels in East Los Angeles. The CFA assumes that service responsibility would transfer to the new city without the associated revenue (or an equivalent credit on the new city’s contract law enforcement cost). Instead, that cost has been identified with no corollary transfer of funding contrary to California Government Code §56815 mandates. This amounts to a shortfall of \$17 million in law enforcement funding.

<sup>7</sup> County of Los Angeles Chief Executive Office, *East Los Angeles Revenue and Expenditure Data*, Attachment II, March 1, 2011. The County had estimated only \$2.8 million in revenue from this source.

**Table 5 - Population, Jobs-Housing Ratio, Poverty and Crime Rates by City, Los Angeles County**

	CA Department of Finance Population Estimates			Census Population	SCAG RTP 2008 Projections				ACS 2007-9 (1)		California Crimes, 2009 (2)		
	Jan-09	Jan-10	Avg 2009	2010	Population 2010	Housing Units 2010	Jobs 2010	Jobs- Housing Ratio	% Latino	Poverty Rate	Total Crime Rate	Violent Crime Rate	Property Crime Rate
<b>East Los Angeles</b>			126,496	126,496	140,098	32,462	23,307	0.72	98%	24%	2,574	867	1,275
<b>Comparison Cities</b>													
<b>CFA General</b>													
Baldwin Park	75,666	75,490	75,578	75,390	82,767	17,630	17,870	1.01	82%	16%	2,609	390	1,491
El Monte	114,434	113,740	114,087	113,475	130,412	28,871	36,880	1.28	70%	21%	3,099	628	1,713
Hawthorne	84,465	84,360	84,413	84,293	94,042	29,143	20,866	0.72	52%	16%	3,336	829	1,702
Inglewood	110,164	109,831	109,998	109,673	118,466	37,205	33,599	0.90	48%	17%	3,715	945	1,715
Lancaster	153,613	155,920	154,767	156,633	160,650	49,331	49,280	1.00	38%	20%	2,929	631	1,487
Norwalk	105,330	105,529	105,430	105,549	111,889	27,257	24,679	0.91	70%	10%	2,495	433	1,379
Pomona	149,935	149,311	149,623	149,058	170,229	40,694	55,546	1.36	72%	16%	3,436	647	1,782
South Gate	95,741	94,502	95,122	94,396	105,178	23,960	20,013	0.84	95%	19%	3,338	595	1,945
<b>CFA Sheriff Contract Cities</b>													
Carson	92,198	91,799	91,999	91,714	101,507	26,677	52,616	1.97	38%	7%	3,107	543	1,633
Commerce	12,825	12,830	12,828	12,823	13,524	3,360	48,772	14.52			9,526	1,481	5,597
Compton	96,096	96,444	96,270	96,455	99,522	22,577	30,893	1.37	65%	23%	4,777	1,513	2,253
Lancaster	153,613	155,920	154,767	156,633	160,650	49,331	49,280	1.00	38%	20%	2,929	631	1,487
Norwalk	105,330	105,529	105,430	105,549	111,889	27,257	24,679	0.91	70%	10%	2,495	433	1,379
Santa Clarita	175,103	176,056	175,580	176,320	181,974	59,086	62,227	1.05	30%	8%	2,012	243	1,023
<b>Other Comparable Sheriff Contract Cities</b>													
Bellflower	76,220	76,531	76,376	76,616	79,656	24,097	16,176	0.67	51%	11%	3,161	731	1,806
Lakewood	80,004	80,066	80,035	80,048	84,060	27,264	17,606	0.65	30%	5%	3,117	457	1,534
Palmdale	150,682	152,473	151,578	152,750	182,663	49,143	35,059	0.71	54%	17%	2,932	540	1,471
Pico Rivera	63,095	62,997	63,046	62,942	68,427	17,005	16,336	0.96	91%	9%	2,531	341	1,342
<b>Less Comparable Cities</b>													
<b>Sheriff Contract Cities</b>													
Agoura Hills	20,569	20,398	20,484	20,330	23,347	7,486	11,942	1.60	9%	3%	1,665	132	1,025
Artesia	16,508	16,514	16,511	16,522	17,534	4,607	5,975	1.30			2,059	297	1,217
Avalon	3,674	3,719	3,697	3,728	3,637	1,253	2,868	2.29			3,165	703	1,569
Bradbury	1,017	1,039	1,028	1,048	993	317	247	0.78			973	-	681
Calabasas	22,989	23,053	23,021	23,058	23,750	8,355	15,240	1.82	4%	7%	1,364	87	812
Carson	92,198	91,799	91,999	91,714	101,507	26,677	52,616	1.97	38%	7%	3,107	543	1,633
Cerritos	49,479	49,176	49,328	49,041	55,184	15,700	37,063	2.36	11%	6%	3,748	164	2,037
Cudahy	23,826	23,846	23,836	23,805	26,558	5,685	3,475	0.61	97%	23%	2,735	629	1,238
Diamond Bar	55,379	55,654	55,517	55,544	61,041	18,377	15,809	0.86	19%	3%	1,767	155	1,070
Duarte	21,409	21,345	21,377	21,321	23,221	6,898	6,873	1.00	41%	6%	2,624	374	1,408
Hawaiian Gardens	14,393	14,287	14,340	14,254	16,189	3,664	2,876	0.78			2,141	551	1,095
Hidden Hills	1,862	1,863	1,863	1,856	2,042	600	25	0.04			1,128	107	805
Industry	512	486	499	219	807	121	85,529	706.85			299,800	16,633	159,519
La Canada Flintridge	20,249	20,266	20,258	20,246	21,575	6,970	9,503	1.36			2,049	104	1,190
La Habra Heights	5,398	5,347	5,373	5,325	6,241	1,983	789	0.40			1,266	93	949
La Mirada	48,434	48,528	48,481	48,527	51,772	15,355	19,649	1.28	39%	5%	1,555	165	916
La Puente	39,990	39,879	39,935	39,816	44,923	9,770	8,172	0.84	88%	11%	2,028	453	1,127
Lawndale	32,684	32,761	32,723	32,769	34,477	9,818	5,779	0.59	60%	11%	2,044	529	1,140
Lomita	20,236	20,260	20,248	20,256	21,303	8,203	4,783	0.58	36%	7%	2,390	494	1,126

	CA Department of Finance Population Estimates			Census Population	SCAG RTP 2008 Projections				ACS 2007-9 (1)		California Crimes, 2009 (2)		
	Jan-09	Jan-10	Avg 2009	2010	Population 2010	Housing Units 2010	Jobs 2010	Jobs- Housing Ratio	% Latino	Poverty Rate	Total Crime Rate	Violent Crime Rate	Property Crime Rate
Lynwood	69,766	69,786	69,776	69,772	73,874	14,469	13,378	0.92	85%	18%	2,977	923	1,691
Malibu	12,672	12,659	12,666	12,645	14,402	5,554	9,099	1.64			2,416	197	1,713
Maywood	27,551	27,442	27,497	27,395	29,783	6,500	3,794	0.58	98%	22%	2,258	549	1,182
Paramount	54,201	54,126	54,164	54,098	60,128	14,362	18,544	1.29	80%	19%	3,800	718	2,273
Rancho Palos Verdes	41,537	41,654	41,596	41,643	43,192	15,396	6,406	0.42	9%	4%	1,036	101	647
Rolling Hills	1,868	1,867	1,868	1,860	1,985	658	490	0.74			589	107	321
Rolling Hills Estates	8,036	8,064	8,050	8,067	8,336	2,978	3,897	1.31			2,124	174	1,292
Rosemead	53,877	53,844	53,861	53,764	58,240	14,537	16,658	1.15	35%	14%	2,479	457	1,335
San Dimas	33,596	33,434	33,515	33,371	37,481	12,567	17,650	1.40	27%	7%	2,664	310	1,429
South El Monte	20,326	20,171	20,249	20,116	22,785	4,759	16,335	3.43	84%	20%	3,798	741	1,990
Temple City	35,284	35,516	35,400	35,558	36,098	11,760	6,779	0.58	17%	7%	1,446	158	966
Walnut	29,285	29,222	29,254	29,172	32,353	8,609	9,169	1.07	17%	5%	1,709	147	1,043
West Hollywood	34,462	34,481	34,472	34,399	38,223	23,718	32,185	1.36	12%	14%	5,489	946	2,811
Westlake Village	8,292	8,277	8,285	8,270	9,058	3,335	9,545	2.86			1,774	60	1,086
<b>Cities with Independent Police Departments</b>													
Alhambra	83,221	83,220	83,221	83,089	90,813	29,727	30,222	1.02	36%	13%	2,555	298	1,242
Arcadia	55,975	56,304	56,140	56,364	58,158	20,084	27,128	1.35	12%	8%	3,119	205	1,537
Azusa	46,227	46,382	46,305	46,361	49,174	13,213	18,478	1.40			3,172	529	1,624
Bell	35,630	35,538	35,584	35,477	39,147	9,043	9,051	1.00	92%	23%	2,057	523	947
Bell Gardens	42,288	42,176	42,232	42,072	46,567	9,475	8,075	0.85	96%	24%	2,451	483	1,504
Beverly Hills	34,084	34,136	34,110	34,109	36,433	15,389	58,068	3.77	5%	6%	3,855	237	2,345
Burbank	103,116	103,363	103,240	103,340	112,103	44,130	96,688	2.19	24%	7%	2,842	245	1,325
Claremont	35,259	34,930	35,095	34,926	37,356	11,873	18,530	1.56	18%	6%	2,505	211	1,345
Covina	47,726	47,793	47,760	47,796	50,732	16,502	21,936	1.33	50%	9%	3,926	354	1,832
Culver	38,874	38,896	38,885	38,883	41,081	16,902	45,631	2.70			4,076	478	1,880
Downey	111,254	111,690	111,472	111,772	115,973	34,767	40,580	1.17	71%	11%	3,605	398	2,060
El Segundo	16,581	16,650	16,616	16,654	17,268	7,182	55,146	7.68			4,550	217	2,973
Gardena	58,834	58,854	58,844	58,829	62,452	20,817	30,847	1.48	38%	16%	3,287	647	1,755
Glendale	192,253	191,954	192,104	191,719	210,950	74,058	94,591	1.28	17%	14%	2,118	157	1,029
Glendora	49,840	50,100	49,970	50,073	53,598	17,291	19,015	1.10	29%	5%	2,678	116	1,205
Hermosa Beach	19,312	19,477	19,395	19,506	19,584	9,491	7,061	0.74			4,125	428	2,026
Huntington Park	59,014	58,241	58,628	58,114	67,062	15,486	16,600	1.07	97%	25%	4,890	931	2,516
Irwindale	1,461	1,429	1,445	1,422	1,774	407	13,622	33.47			16,747	1,522	11,488
La Verne	31,234	31,120	31,177	31,063	34,227	11,509	9,553	0.83	31%	7%	2,418	176	1,084
Long Beach	462,211	462,685	462,448	462,257	503,251	169,739	185,938	1.10	40%	19%	3,441	684	1,714
Los Angeles	3,781,951	3,794,586	3,788,269	3,792,621	4,057,484	1,366,985	1,820,092	1.33	48%	19%	3,165	635	1,654
Manhattan Beach	35,147	35,168	35,158	35,135	36,905	14,968	18,954	1.27	9%	3%	2,827	168	1,442
Monrovia	36,407	36,659	36,533	36,590	39,763	13,862	18,075	1.30	37%	9%	3,219	293	1,363
Montebello	62,463	62,471	62,467	62,500	65,728	19,165	26,079	1.36	80%	16%	3,174	314	1,867
Monterey Park	60,441	60,349	60,395	60,269	68,636	20,411	30,943	1.52	28%	13%	1,845	242	1,061
Palos Verdes Estates	13,421	13,444	13,433	13,438	14,175	5,068	3,560	0.70			767	52	476
Pasadena	136,502	136,912	136,707	137,122	149,854	55,606	119,968	2.16	33%	13%	3,412	353	1,630
Redondo Beach	66,162	66,716	66,439	66,748	68,095	29,350	30,586	1.04	15%	6%	2,661	300	1,245

	CA Department of Finance Population Estimates			Census Population  2010	SCAG RTP 2008 Projections				ACS 2007-9 (1)		California Crimes, 2009 (2)		
	Jan-09	Jan-10	Avg 2009		Population 2010	Housing Units 2010	Jobs 2010	Jobs- Housing Ratio	% Latino	Poverty Rate	Total Crime Rate	Violent Crime Rate	Property Crime Rate
San Fernando	23,680	23,671	23,676	23,645	25,452	5,975	15,204	2.54	92%	17%	1,998	380	1,081
San Gabriel	39,798	39,774	39,786	39,718	42,500	12,831	14,497	1.13	25%	12%	1,790	380	847
San Marino	13,107	13,150	13,129	13,147	13,623	4,283	4,894	1.14			1,264	69	777
Santa Fe Springs	16,177	16,206	16,192	16,223	18,778	5,253	50,416	9.60			7,652	809	4,002
Santa Monica	89,295	89,494	89,395	89,736	91,335	46,088	101,871	2.21	13%	11%	4,221	440	1,453
Sierra Madre	10,881	10,917	10,899	10,917	11,063	4,803	3,445	0.72			1,376	92	807
Signal Hill	10,988	11,016	11,002	11,016	11,405	4,183	12,085	2.89			4,372	482	2,181
South Pasadena	25,486	25,596	25,541	25,619	25,899	10,656	9,225	0.87	17%	6%	1,977	117	1,096
Torrance	144,702	145,392	145,047	145,438	150,393	56,409	107,277	1.90	17%	7%	2,168	179	1,032
Vernon	111	114	113	112	95	25	39,483	1,579.3			309,333	43,556	199,111
West Covina	106,231	106,189	106,210	106,098	115,338	32,910	28,138	0.85	54%	10%	3,391	297	1,850
Whittier	84,841	85,293	85,067	85,331	87,689	28,603	31,731	1.11	65%	8%	2,875	396	1,292

Sources: California Department of Finance (population estimates), Census Bureau (2010 population, 2007-9 poverty rates and percent Latino), Southern California Association of Governments' Regional Transportation Plan (jobs-housing ratio), California Attorney General (Part I crimes), and County Sheriff (crimes in East LA).

Notes: (1) Poverty rates and percent Latino tabulated from American Community Survey data and represents a 2007-9 average by city. Statistics were unavailable for smaller cities due to inadequate sample size.

(2) Violent Part I crimes include homicide, rape, robbery and aggravated assault. Part I property crimes include burglary, auto theft, and larceny (over \$400).

County of Los Angeles Public Library  
2008-09 Property Tax and Operating Cost by City

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)
Description	Adjusted for Actual Property Tax Collected	Adjusted for Actual Special Tax Collected	City Contribution	2008-09 Cost By City	Surplus (Shortfall)
<b>Cities with Building Outlets Located within City Boundary</b>					
Malibu	\$ 2,396,679			\$ 1,250,315	\$ 1,146,364
Manhattan Beach	2,631,235			1,639,089	992,146
West Hollywood	1,441,256	255,750		1,072,541	624,465
Santa Clarita	4,870,316	1,431,246		6,069,832	231,730
Hermosa Beach	957,203			783,604	173,599
Diamond Bar	1,583,127			1,660,813	(77,686)
La Canada	1,153,571	206,862		1,446,623	(86,190)
Westlake Village	675,423		40,947	841,065	(124,695)
Walnut	808,697			1,010,631	(201,934)
Avalon	123,753			448,409	(324,656)
Artesia	285,924			661,565	(375,641)
Bell	234,027			652,072	(418,045)
Maywood	127,639	89,846		639,096	(421,611)
Cudahy	92,723	46,654		605,466	(466,089)
South El Monte	313,031			786,795	(473,764)
Lomita	370,102	136,200		1,020,330	(514,028)
Bellflower	950,588		100	1,485,734	(535,046)
La Mirada	856,571			1,394,636	(538,065)
Hawaiian Garden	9,418			548,504	(539,086)
Paramount	442,557		20,000	1,008,031	(545,474)
Bell Gardens	176,000			779,900	(603,900)
Lynwood	538,916	275,289		1,444,940	(630,735)
Baldwin Park	664,115			1,306,990	(642,875)
Pico Rivera	749,077		117	1,433,568	(684,374)
Agoura Hills	910,161			1,627,714	(717,553)
La Verne	599,414			1,326,462	(727,048)
Duarte	216,267	162,688		1,114,142	(735,187)
San Dimas	731,960			1,470,458	(738,498)
Carson	2,519,989			3,281,505	(761,516)
La Puente	390,424			1,174,726	(784,302)
El Monte	1,371,376	473,485		2,634,813	(789,952)
San Gabriel	841,965			1,634,485	(792,520)
Compton	805,391			1,706,941	(901,550)
Lawndale	327,278			1,255,865	(928,587)
San Fernando	240,616			1,196,559	(955,943)
Temple City	691,276			1,655,773	(964,497)
Claremont	604,442		43,084	1,746,782	(1,099,256)
Lakewood	1,635,610	652,905		3,395,374	(1,106,859)
Hawthorne	1,109,676			2,217,438	(1,107,762)
Rosemead	594,843			1,827,530	(1,232,687)
Gardena	1,090,081			2,344,695	(1,254,614)
South Gate	808,128			2,091,930	(1,283,802)
Culver City	909,968	360,857		2,596,629	(1,325,804)
Lancaster	2,342,282			3,683,803	(1,341,521)
Huntington Park	307,912			1,800,931	(1,493,019)
West Covina	1,682,660			3,260,092	(1,577,432)
Montebello	882,924		93,983	2,996,787	(2,019,880)
Norwalk	1,194,195			3,561,048	(2,366,853)
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 45,260,786</b>	<b>\$ 4,091,782</b>	<b>\$ 198,231</b>	<b>\$ 81,593,031</b>	<b>\$ (32,042,232)</b>
<b>Cities Without Building Outlet Located Within City Boundary</b>					
Hidden Hills	247,841			\$ -	\$ 247,841
La Habra Heights	265,398			-	265,398
Bradbury	86,210			-	86,210
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 599,449</b>			<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 599,449</b>
<b>Unincorporated Area</b>					
Unincorporated	\$ 18,343,202	8,455,202		\$ 33,883,287	\$ (7,084,883)
Juvenile Hall	-			272,051	(272,051)
<b>Total - Public Library</b>	<b>\$ 64,203,436</b>	<b>\$ 12,546,984</b>	<b>\$ 198,231</b>	<b>\$ 115,748,369</b>	<b>\$ (38,799,717)</b>

CONFIDENTIAL