Welcome to a meeting of the Board of Directors of the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District. The Park District welcomes citizen participation. If you would like to speak, please follow these simple steps.

Fill out a green Speaker Card, available at the sign-in table, and hand the card to the Recording Secretary or Board of Directors.

If the item you would like to speak about is not on the Agenda, be prepared to speak when the Board Chair calls for “Public Discussion”. The Chair will call the names appearing on the Speaker Cards. If you do not hear your name called, please make this fact known, so that you may be recognized.

If the item you would like to speak about is on the Agenda, the Board Chair will announce the item, request a report from staff, ask Board Members if they have any questions or comments, and then ask if there are any other people in attendance who would like to comment on the item.

When recognized, please speak from the podium. Be professional. Speakers are generally allowed a maximum of five (5) minutes to comment. Depending upon the circumstances, the Board Chair may increase or decrease speaker time. At the conclusion of public comments, the Board Chair will thank the speaker(s) for participating.

The Board Chair may also determine appropriate action, if any, to be taken in response to comments received. Comments will be listened to, questions may be answered, speakers may be requested to further discuss the matter with staff, or an item could be added to a future Agenda or referred to a Board Committee, among other things. Items listed on the Agenda that require action will likely be voted upon by the Board of Directors.

We appreciate your attendance and hope to see you again.

YOUR BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Chair
Dee Dee Cavanaugh
Vice Chair
Mark Johnson
Director
Elaine Freeman
Director
Gene Hostetler
Director
Kate O’Brien

STAFF
General Manager
Larry Peterson
Assistant General Manager
Ed Hayduk
I. CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. ROLL CALL

III. PUBLIC DISCUSSION

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   A. Regular Meeting – May 2, 2013
   B. Special Meeting – May 23, 2013

V. SCHEDULED ITEMS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS
   A. Presentation of the Part-time Employee of the Month for April 2013 to Jason Beck
   B. Presentation of the Full-time Employee of the Month for May 2013 to Douglas Duran

VI. CONSENT AGENDA**
   A. Approval of Check Registers: 5/3/13, 5/17/13, 5/31/13 (payroll); 4/30/13, 5/15/13 (payables)
   B. Receive and File Report on Schedule of Events for June 2013

** Matters listed under the Consent Agenda are considered routine and shall be acted upon without discussion by one motion, unless discussion is desired. In that event, the items will be removed from the Consent Agenda.

VII. CONTINUED BUSINESS

None

VIII. NEW BUSINESS
   A. Approval of Request by Simi Valley Days Foundation for Waiver of Permit Fee Charged by Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District for Use of Rancho Simi Community Park for the Annual Simi Valley Days Event Held in 2012
   B. Approval of Project Conditions for PD-S-1021/TT5734, Located at Tapo Canyon Road and Lost Canyons Drive (Lost Canyons)
   C. Approval of Resolution of the Intention to Levy Assessments for Fiscal Year 2013-14, Preliminarily Approving Engineer’s Report, and Providing for Notice of Hearing
D. Receive and File Proposition 4 – Appropriations Limitation 33-13-a

E. Approval for Publication of Legal Notice Concerning Proposition 4 Appropriations Limitation Amount 33-13-b

IX. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None

X. REPORTS BY BOARD MEMBERS

XI. REPORT BY GENERAL MANAGER

XII. CLOSED SESSION

A. Closed Session Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.95

   Claimant: Ms. Elizabeth Rodriguez
   Agency Claimed Against: Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District

B. Closed Session Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.6

   Conference with Labor Negotiator:

   Agency Negotiators: General Manager and Business & Accounting Supervisor
   Employee Organization: Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District Middle Management Association

C. Closed Session Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.6

   Conference with Labor Negotiator:

   Agency Negotiators: General Manager and Business & Accounting Supervisor
   Employee Organization: Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District Employees Association (“Bargaining Unit”)

D. Closed Session Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.6

   Conference with Labor Negotiator:

   Agency Negotiator: General Manager
   Employee Organization: Unrepresented Employees
E. Closed Session Pursuant to Government Code Sections 54954.5(e) and 54957(b)(1)

Public Employment

Title: General Manager

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

If any individual has a disability that may require accommodation to participate in this meeting, please contact Colleen Janssen at 805/584–4400. Upon advance notification of the need for accommodation, reasonable arrangements will be made to provide accessibility to the meeting.
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MINUTES
RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT
REGULAR MEETING, BOARD OF DIRECTORS
SYCAMORE DRIVE COMMUNITY CENTER
1692 SYCAMORE DRIVE, SIMI VALLEY, CA
MAY 2, 2013

AGENDA ITEM

I. CALLED TO ORDER: 6:30 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Led by Ranger Jim Rosales

II. ROLL CALL: Present: Directors O’Brien, Hostetler, Freeman, Vice Chair Johnson, Chair Cavanaugh

Staff: Ali Bim, Debbi Clarke, Jerry DeRosa, Paul Friedeborn, Doug Gale, Ed Hayduk, Colleen Janssen, Barbara Meinel, Robert Mendez, Eugene Molnar, Theresa Pennington, Larry Peterson, Brian Pierik, Jim Rosales, Robin Walker, Steve Williams

Guests: John Clarke, Andrew Elkins, Cheryl Hayduk, Josie Hirsch, Brandon Molnar, Carol Richards

III. PUBLIC DISCUSSION:

Chair Cavanaugh welcomed Carol Richards from the Leadership Class to the meeting. There was no other public discussion.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

(A) Approval of Minutes of Regular Meeting of April 4, 2013

ACTION: Director Hostetler moved to approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of April 4, 2013; Vice Chair Johnson seconded the motion. Director Freeman abstained. Motion carried.

V. SCHEDULED ITEMS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS:

(A) Presentation of the Part-time Employee of the Month for March 2013 to Ali Bim 35-13-j

Marketing and Community Outreach Specialist Colleen Janssen announced that Ali Bim had been selected Part-time Employee of the Month for March 2013. Ali had actually
received two nominations for March. The first nomination for Ali stated that he has a very positive attitude and a great work ethic. He is a man who wears many hats, working as the District’s Transit Van Driver, Special Events Extraordinaire, Recreation Warehouseman, and much more. He is also very creative and has designed and built numerous things for the Teen Program. Ali’s second nomination also mentioned how he is a man of many hats and that he is very helpful and professional. He finds ways to fix things that seem beyond repair and has made things for Recreation programs that far exceed anyone’s expectations.

Chair Cavanaugh presented Ali with his plaque and thanked him for his hard work. Ali thanked the Board and stated that he really enjoys working with everyone.

Recreation and Leisure Services Administrator Doug Gale stated that he really appreciates Ali’s work and that Ali makes things come together with his hard work behind the scenes.

B. Presentation of the Full-time Employee of the Month for April 2013 to Debbi Clarke 5-13-k

Marketing and Community Outreach Specialist Colleen Janssen announced that Debbi Clarke had been selected Full-time Employee of the Month for April 2013. This is Debbi’s 5th time being chosen as Employee of the Month. The person who nominated Debbi stated that she is one of the first people the public comes in contact with and she always greets everyone with a smile and a willingness to help. She is always professional and goes above and beyond to assist the public and coworkers as well. Debbie handles many tasks for the District, and remains calm and professional in even the most difficult situations.

Chair Cavanaugh presented Debbi with her plaque and mentioned how difficult it is to work in customer relations.

Debbi thanked the Board and said this is the best place she has ever worked.

Recreation and Leisure Services Administrator Doug Gale said the District is very fortunate to have someone so knowledgeable working at the front desk, especially with the After School Club.

General Manager Peterson commented that he can’t imagine a more caring person than Debbi and thanked her for all the things she does.

The following item, VIII. (A), was moved up on the Agenda

VIII. NEW BUSINESS:

(A) Approval of Use of Rancho Tapo Community Park by Simi Valley Cultural Association to Hold Nottingham Village Event on November 16-17, 2013 63-13-a
ACTION: Director Hostetler moved to approve the Use of Rancho Tapo Community Park by Simi Valley Cultural Association to Hold Nottingham Village Event on November 16-17, 2013 with the amendment that staff have the discretion to assign Rangers to the event as needed; Director O’Brien approved the motion as amended. Motion carried.

C. Presentation of FY 2012-13 Park and Building Maintenance Division Accomplishments Oral

Assistant General Manager Ed Hayduk gave a presentation on the accomplishments of the Park and Building Maintenance Division during FY 2012-13. This is the ninth year of presenting the accomplishments to the Board. Areas reviewed were the structure of the Maintenance Department and the Park Inspection Program, which was started in FY 2004-05. Five parks are inspected each month, and in year 9, 91% of the parks inspected received an excellent rating and 9% received a very good rating. The rating system was described as well as what it takes to receive an excellent rating. Graffiti problems were also discussed and an example of recent graffiti was shown to the Board. Among the projects reviewed were: Rancho Tapo Community Park pond pump repair; Deerhill and Valley View yearly soccer field renovation; Mayfair Park planter renovation; Simi Hills Golf Course entry planter renovation project; Sycamore Drive Community Center Buildings A and B roof repair/painting; Mae Boyar main line repair; Rancho Simi Community Park soccer field renovation (done yearly in the winter); Simi Dog Park new sod installation; Strathearn Historical Park gift shop/barber shop boardwalk; Oak Park Community Center planter renovations; Lincoln Park planter renovation; Berylwood Park basketball court installation; Indian Springs playground wood chip installation; Berylwood Elementary School sports field irrigation project; Rancho Tapo Community Park playground wood chip installation; Strathearn gift shop sign facade; Medea Creek Natural Park native plant planting; Strathearn Historical Park church planter renovation; Simi Dog Park Eagle Scout project; Santa Susana display at Strathearn Historical Park and the work on the west side of the Visitors’ Center; Houghton Park playground wood chip installation; Rancho Tapo bocce ball courts, Rancho Tapo Community Park picnic table cement slabs; the chicken coop at Strathearn Historical Park; Rancho Simi Community Park light pole installation; and the Rancho Simi Community Park trellis rehab, which was just started. Sr. Maintenance Supervisors also provided details on some of the projects highlighted.

Assistant General Manager Hayduk stated that he is very proud of the maintenance crews, and that all these projects were done while also performing their routine maintenance efforts.

The Board thanked staff who were present and all the grounds and building maintenance employees for their excellent work throughout the year. General Manager Peterson also mentioned the Assistant General Manager’s dual role over Planning and Maintenance and the cross fertilization between Planning and Maintenance that has occurred, which has greatly leveraged the crews and resulted in big improvements to the parks. Chair Cavanaugh stated that the parks look beautiful and it is obvious that staff takes pride in the parks.
Assistant General Manager Hayduk also thanked Administrative Analyst Robin Walker for preparing the presentation.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA:

(A) Approval of Check Registers: 4/5/13, 4/19/13 (payroll); 3/31/13, 4/15/13 (payables)

(B) Receive and File Report on Schedule of Events for May 2013 39-13-d

(C) Receive and File General Manager’s Notice of Intent to Resign as General Manager of Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District in October 2013 35-13-i

(D) Receive and File 2013 Slate of Board Officers for the California Association of Recreation and Park Districts 22-13-a

ACTION: Director Hostetler moved to approve Consent Agenda Items A-D; Director Freeman seconded the motion. Motion carried.

VII. CONTINUED BUSINESS:

None

VIII. NEW BUSINESS:

(A) Approval of Use of Rancho Tapo Community Park by Simi Valley Cultural Association to Hold Nottingham Village Event on November 16-17, 2013 63-13-a

This item was moved up on the agenda.

(B) Approval of Park Ranger Bike Patrol Program Oral

Ranger Jerry DeRosa gave a presentation on a bike patrol program that the Rangers would like to establish.

ACTION: Director Freeman moved to approve implementation of a Park Ranger Bike Patrol Program including the purchasing of related equipment using existing budgetary allocations; Director O’Brien seconded the motion. Motion carried.

(C) Authorization to Solicit Bids for the Arroyo Simi Greenway Phase 1 Project 176-13-a

ACTION: Director Hostetler moved to authorize the Solicitation of Bids for the Arroyo Simi Greenway Phase 1 Project; Vice Chair Johnson seconded the motion. Motion carried.
(D) **Approval of Award of Contract for the Medea Creek Bike Trail Asphalt Overlay Project Phase 2 51K-13-f**

**ACTION:** Director Hostetler moved to approve the Award of Contract for the Medea Creek Bike Trail Asphalt Overlay Project Phase 2; Director Freeman seconded the motion. Motion carried.

(E) **Approval of Resolution Approving Changes to the Following Section of the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District Policy Manual: Chapter 12, Fees and Charges, Policy 12-403, Robert P. Strathearn Historical Park and Museum 84-13-e**

**ACTION:** Director Freeman moved to Approve Resolution No. 1865 Approving Changes to the Following Section of the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District Policy Manual: Chapter 12, Fees and Charges, Policy 12-403, Robert P. Strathearn Historical Park and Museum; Director O’Brien seconded the motion. Motion carried with the following roll-call vote:

- **Ayes:** Directors O’Brien, Hostetler, Freeman, Johnson, Cavanaugh
- **Noes:** None
- **Absent:** None
- **Abstain:** None

(F) **Approval of Changes to Bylaws for the California Association of Recreation and Park Districts (“CARPD”) 22-13-b**

**ACTION:** Director O’Brien moved to approve Changes to Bylaws for the California Association of Recreation and Park Districts (“CARPD”); Director Hostetler seconded the motion. Motion carried.

(G) **Recommendation to Approve Lease Agreement for Xerox Photocopier 27-13-a**

**ACTION:** Director Freeman moved to Approve Lease Agreement for Xerox Photocopier; Director O’Brien seconded the motion. Motion carried.

IX. **WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS:**

(A) **Letter of Appreciation from Alan Cueba for the Assistance Provided by Park Ranger Jim Rosales 73-13-b**

Letter was received and filed.

(B) **Correspondence from the Youth Council Thanking the District for Participating at the 2013 Youth Summit 73-13-c**

Correspondence was received and filed.
(C) **Award Presented to the District from the Sinaloa Middle School PTSA 73-13-d**  
Award was received and filed.

**X. REPORTS BY BOARD MEMBERS:**

Director Freeman attended a Ventura County Special Districts Association (VCSDA) meeting. A special thank you went to Calleguas. The next VCSDA meeting will be held on June 4 at Strathearn Historical Park.

Director Freeman attended two Historical Society Committee meetings over the past two months.

Director Freeman also attended two Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy meetings and two California Special Districts Association Legislative Committee meetings over the last two months.

Director Freeman attended the City’s Volunteer dinner.

Director O’Brien attended Congressman Julia Brownley’s open house in Thousand Oaks.

Director O’Brien attended the Historical Society Committee meeting and VCSDA meeting along with Director Freeman.

Director O’Brien attended the Box City Event held at the United Methodist Church on April 27. The event was a fundraiser for the Samaritan Center.

Vice Chair Johnson attended a Soccer Committee meeting where they discussed the possibility of combining clubs.

Vice Chair Johnson also attended a Tree Advisory Committee meeting, and mentioned that Arbor Day was wonderful.

Director Hostetler attended a Special Events Committee meeting with Chair Cavanaugh, where it was reported that Simi Valley Days is moving to the Town Center. The proposed Nottingham Village Event to be held at Rancho Tapo Community Park was also discussed.

Chair Cavanaugh attended the Special Events Committee meeting with Director Hostetler.

Chair Cavanaugh attended the Soccer Committee meeting with Director Johnson.

Chair Cavanaugh also attended an Oak Park Committee meeting with Director Hostetler.

Chair Cavanaugh went to the Hats Off to Women Luncheon.
Chair Cavanaugh attended the Simi Valley Police Foundation Poker Run on April 28.

Chair Cavanaugh also attended the May 1 Tree Advisory Committee meeting with Director Johnson.

XI. REPORT BY GENERAL MANAGER:

The General Manager had no items to report.

The Chair called a Closed Session at 9:09 p.m.

The Chair reconvened the meeting at 10:03 p.m.

XII. CLOSED SESSION:

(A) Closed Session Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.6

Conference with Labor Negotiator:

Agency Negotiators: General Manager & Business & Accounting Supervisor
Employee Organization: Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District Middle Management Association

The Chair stated that no reportable action was taken on Closed Session Item XII. (A).

(B) Closed Session Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.6

Conference with Labor Negotiator:

Agency Negotiators: General Manager and Business & Accounting Supervisor
Employee Organization: Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District Employee Association (“Bargaining Unit”)

The Chair stated that no reportable action was taken on Closed Session Item XII. (B).

(C) Closed Session Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.6

Conference with Labor Negotiator:

Agency Negotiators: General Manager
Employee Organization: Unrepresented Employees

The Chair stated that no reportable action was taken on Closed Session Item XII. (C).
(D) Closed Session Pursuant to Government Code Sections 54954.5(e) and 54957(b)(1):

Public Employment

Title: General Manager

The Chair reported that an Ad Hoc Committee comprised of the Chair and Vice Chair has been assigned to review the job description for the General Manager's position.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT:

Vice Chair Johnson moved to adjourn the meeting, Director Hostetler seconded the motion. Chair Cavanaugh adjourned the meeting at 10:06 p.m.

Larry Peterson, District Clerk
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RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT

MINUTES
SPECIAL MEETING
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
BOARD/STAFF BUDGET WORKSHOP

SYCAMORE DRIVE COMMUNITY CENTER, REC ROOM
SIMI VALLEY, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY, MAY 23, 2013, 5:30 P.M.

I. 5:50 P.M. − CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Cavanaugh at 5:35 p.m. Other Board Members present were: Mark Johnson, Gene Hostetler, Kate O’Brien and Elaine Freeman. The following staff members present were: Doug Gale, Wayne Nakaoka, Theresa Pennington, Larry Peterson and Robin Walker.

II. PUBLIC DISCUSSION

None.

III. (A) DISCUSSION AND REVIEW OF THE DISTRICT’S ANNUAL MAINTENANCE ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES AND ENGINEER’S REPORT

General Manager reviewed the procedures required to continue the voter approved maintenance assessment. A handout was provided showing the history of the annual assessment amount per single family household. The proposed annual increase of $0.64 cents will result in an annual assessment amount for fiscal year 2013-14 of $33.88. The Engineer’s Report will appear on the Board’s regular meeting on June 6, 2013.

(B) REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF THE DEPARTMENTAL BUDGET WORKSHEETS AND DRAFT PRELIMINARY BUDGET COVERING FISCAL YEAR 2013-14

General Manager reviewed the significant funding changes to the General Fund and provided a handout identifying those changes and also providing graphs to show the changes in redevelopment receipts, increases in water and pension payments, decreases in development funds and investment returns, and an analysis of the impact of the Pension Reform Act upon District payment rates. District staff in attendance provided supplemental information to explain some of the funding changes. General Manager then went over the Preliminary Budget and explained how the District’s various funds were balanced.
(C) REVIEW OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECT PRIORITIES, 5-YEAR PLAN, AND UPCOMING PLANNING ISSUES

Development Supervisor distributed the draft project priority list and provided an update and description as to the proposed work to be performed together with estimates of the related costs for each of the items appearing on the list. Discussions occurred and staff answered the various questions posed. Director Freeman requested the District to prepare and distribute an update on the status of the Sinaloa project. Development Supervisor indicated a further review of the project would be occurring in the near future after which may be a good time to prepare and distribute any update.

IV. ITEMS FROM THE GENERAL MANAGER (INFORMATIONAL ONLY)

There were no items by the General Manager.

V. ITEMS FROM THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS (INFORMATIONAL ONLY)

Director O’Brien stated that she appreciated the recent CARPD Conference.

Director Hostetler asked the Board members to submit to him any suggestions for improvement of the CARPD Conference.

Director Johnson provided a brief explanation of the Simi Valley Unified School District’s Balance Each Day with Food and Play program to be held at Rancho Simi Community Park this summer.

Director Freeman asked for an update on an inquiry it had received regarding the possibility of extracting oil from District held open space. General Manager provided a responsive update.

Director Freeman restated her opinion that an update should be provided on the status of the Sinaloa project.

Director Freeman suggested the District consider providing its staff with safety training similar to the kind she received at the CARPD Conference.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Larry Peterson, General Manager
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PART-TIME EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH FOR APRIL 2013
The District's Part-Time Employee of the Month for April 2013 is Jason Beck. Jason was hired on April 12, 2012, as a Part-Time GKIII in the Planning, Operations, and Maintenance Department. This is his first award for Part-Time Employee of the Month.

NOMINATION NARRATION
Jason's nomination was signed by four employees. The people who nominated Jason had this to say about him, "Jason Beck is being nominated for employee of the month for the following reasons; this individual shows up to work religiously 15 minutes before our start time and puts in a full eight hour day. I've not known him to call in sick or to complain about anything. When asked to do something, he's always enthusiastic and upbeat. He is a very self-motivated individual.

Jason went to the DMV, spent $80.00, and took a test to become a commercial driver so he could help out here at the District with special projects, so with permit in hand, he is all set to do his driving test in May. Yet another accomplishment is that he finished continuation hours to maintain his certification as a chemical applicator, which also aids the District in that he can treat for pests such as gophers in a park setting. For the above mentioned items he doesn't get reimbursed like a full-time employee does; this is what makes what he is doing unique, all in the hopes of eventually having full-time employment. We all forget sometimes what a part-time individual has to do in order to be competitive in today's potential work force.

Jason has also made time for helping out with events such as Arbor Day, Challenger Field opening ceremony, just to name a few. This was greatly appreciated because it was outside his normal working schedule. At the Simi Valley Days event, Jason also volunteered his time to push a wheelchair-bound child around RSCP so that they could enjoy the day. It was there that I met his mother and where I told her what a fine young
man she had raised. All I've spoke to about Jason Beck concur and tell me what I already know: that this young man is going to go as far as he chooses to go in this life. He's knowledgeable about many things in our industry of landscape maintenance, polite, helpful, and yet very humble.

He told me he has been married for a little over a year with his wife, Sarah, and she's a school teacher. She likes to make care packages for the homeless, so that when they go out and there is someone they see in need, she gives them this package with all kinds of amenities and non-perishable food items. Jason said this is why he is so lucky. How many husbands do you know, so young, who has it all figured out? Please award this individual employee of the month. Thank you."

BOARD ACTION
Jason Beck has been invited to attend the June 6, 2013, board meeting to receive a plaque and a check for $75 from the board chair.

Colleen Janssen
Marketing and Community Outreach Specialist
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RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT
Interoffice Memorandum

Date: June 6, 2013
To: General Manager
From: Marketing and Community Outreach Specialist
Re: Presentation of the Full-Time Employee of the Month for May 2013 to
Douglas Duran

FULL-TIME EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH FOR MAY 2013
The District’s employee of the month for May 2013 is Douglas Duran. Douglas has worked for the District since October 2, 2000, as a Landscape Designer in the Planning, Maintenance, and Operations Department. This is his third award for Employee of the Month; the previous awards were November 2002 and July 2004. Additionally, he was selected as Employee of the Year in 2004.

NOMINATION NARRATION
The person who nominated Douglas had this to say about him, “I believe this person deserves to be nominated for Employee of the Month for the projects at Strathearn Historical Park & Museum in which he has had an important part.

The planning of the newly completed Santa Susana Exhibit at Strathearn Park was a long process, and had many elements that needed careful consideration. The completed exhibit is beautiful, and is a wonderful addition to the Park, thanks in large part to the careful planning of the person being considered.

The restoration of the Barbershop building at Strathearn is another project which was completed with great results thanks to this person. There was a very specific look that the restored barbershop was to have, and because of the attention to detail of the person being considered, the end result is exactly what was wanted.

This person always has a willingness to accept input as well as address concerns or questions regarding the work being done.

For the many hours spent on projects, specifically the projects at Strathearn Historical Park, I believe, along with other RSRPD staff at this location, as well as Historical Society members, that this person is very deserving of the distinction of "Employee of
the Month."

BOARD ACTION
Douglas Duran has been invited to attend the June 6, 2013, board meeting to receive a plaque from the board chair. He is also eligible for a day off with pay in the next 60 days.

Colleen Janssen
Marketing and Community Outreach Specialist
RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT
Interoffice Memorandum

DATE: June 6, 2013

TO: General Manager

FROM: Marketing and Community Outreach Specialist

SUBJECT: Receive and File Report on Schedule of Events for June 2013

REMAINING EVENTS FOR JUNE 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>Jun 6</td>
<td>D-Day ceremony, 10:00 am, Rancho Tapo Comm Park Veterans Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>Jun 6</td>
<td>RSRPD Board Meeting, SDCC, 6:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>Jun 6</td>
<td>Neighborhood Council #1, Community Room, City Hall (usually DARK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Jun 10</td>
<td>Preschool registration day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Jun 11</td>
<td>Neighborhood Council #2, Community Room, City Hall (usually DARK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Jun 12</td>
<td>SVUSD last day of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>Jun 13</td>
<td>Neighborhood Council #3, Community Room, City Hall (usually DARK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Jun 14</td>
<td>OPUSD last day of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Jun 14</td>
<td>SVCC Breakfast meeting, Grand Vista Hotel, 7:30 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Jun 14</td>
<td>Friday Floats, Rancho Pool, $3, 7-9 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>Jun 15</td>
<td>Music in the Park Concert, RSCP, 6:00 pm, “The Spazmatics” (80’s new wave)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Jun 16</td>
<td>Father’s Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Jun 18</td>
<td>Neighborhood Council #4, Community Room, City Hall (usually DARK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>Jun 20</td>
<td>RSRPD Board Meeting, SDCC, 6:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Jun 21</td>
<td>Friday Floats, Rancho Pool, $3, 7-9 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>Jun 22</td>
<td>Music in the Park, OCCP, 6 pm, “DSB” America’s Favorite Tribute Band to Journey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Jun 26</td>
<td>LAF meeting, 8:00 am, SVCC office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Jun 28</td>
<td>Movies in the Park, Rancho Simi Comm Park, “The Lorax”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Jun 28</td>
<td>Friday Floats, Rancho Pool, $3, 7-9 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Jun 28</td>
<td>Movies in the Park, Rancho Simi Community Park, “The Lorax”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>Jun 29</td>
<td>Drive In Movie, Oak Park, “The Lorax”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUTURE EVENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>Jul 4</td>
<td>Independence Day Ceremony, RTCP Veterans Plaza, 10:00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>Jul 4</td>
<td>Fireworks! RSSCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>Jul 4</td>
<td>Neighborhood Council #1, Community Room, City Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Jul 5</td>
<td>Friday Floats, Rancho Pool, $3, 7-9 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>May 4</td>
<td>Fairy Tales in the Park, 4pm, free, Rancho Simi Comm Park, “Jack &amp; the Beanstalk”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>Jul 6</td>
<td>Dive-In Movie, Rancho Pool, “Monsters, Inc.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Jul 9</td>
<td>Neighborhood Council #2, Community Room, City Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>Jul 11</td>
<td>Neighborhood Council #3, Community Room, City Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Jul 12</td>
<td>SVCC Breakfast meeting, Grand Vista Hotel, 7:30 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Jul 12</td>
<td>Friday Floats, Rancho Pool, $3, 7-9 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>Jul 13</td>
<td>Drive In Movie, Oak Park, “Rise of the Guardians”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Jul 14</td>
<td>Shakespeare in the Park, OCCP, Free, 7:00 pm, “King John”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Jul 16</td>
<td>Neighborhood Council #4, Community Room, City Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>Jul 18</td>
<td>RSRPD Board Meeting, OPCC, 6:30 pm, includes budget hearing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fri  Jul 19  Friday Floats, Rancho Pool, $3, 7-9 pm
Sat  Jul 20  Music in the Park, RSCP, 6:00 pm, “Platinum Groove” (Motown to Bruno Mars)
Wed  Jul 24  LAF meeting, 8:00 am, SVCC office
Fri  Jul 26  Friday Floats, Rancho Pool, $3, 7-9 pm
Sat  Jul 27  Dive-In Movie, Rancho Pool, “Ice Age”
Mon  Jul 28  Age 50+ Dodger Game
Tue  Jul 29  Age 50+ Reno/Tahoe trip
Wed  Jul 30  Registration begins for 50+ Community Games
Thu  Aug  1  RSRPD Board Meeting, SDCC, 6:30 pm
Fri  Aug  2  Movies in the Park, Rancho Simi Comm Park, “Hotel Transylvania”
Fri  Aug  2  Friday Floats, Rancho Pool, $3, 7-9 pm
Sat  Aug  4  Fairy Tales in the Park, 4pm, free, Rancho Simi Comm Park, “The Wizard of Oz”
Sat  Aug  3-4  Camping Under the Stars, Oak Canyon Community Park
Thu  Aug  8  Neighborhood Council #1, Community Room, City Hall
Fri  Aug  9  SVCC Breakfast meeting, Grand Vista Hotel, 7:30 am
Sat  Aug 10  Dive-In Movie, Rancho Pool, “Wreck-It Ralph”
Tue  Aug 13  Neighborhood Council #2, Community Room, City Hall
Thu  Aug 15  RSRPD Board Meeting, SDCC, 6:30 pm, includes budget hearing
Thu  Aug 15  Neighborhood Council #3, Community Room, City Hall
Fri  Aug 16  Friday Floats, Rancho Pool, $3, 7-9 pm
Sat  Aug 17  Music in the Park concert, RSCP, 6:00 pm, “Dry County” Simi’s own Bon Jovi band opening for “Fan Halen” Tribute to Van Halen
Mon  Aug 18  Age 50+ Laughlin trip
Mon  Aug 19  SVUSD first day of school year 2013/2014
Tue  Aug 20  Neighborhood Council #4, Community Room, City Hall
Sat  Aug 24  Drive In Movie, Oak Park, “Hotel Transylvania”
Wed  Aug 28  LAF meeting, 8:00 am, SVCC office
Wed  Aug 28  OPUSD first day of school year 2013/2014
Fri  Aug 30  Friday Floats, Rancho Pool, $3, 7-9 pm
Mon  Sep  2  Rancho Tapo Community Park splash pad closing weekend
Mon  Sep  2  Labor Day holiday, RSRPD offices closed
Thu  Sep  5  SVUSD and OPUSD closed due to local holiday (Rosh Hashanah
Thu  Sep  5  RSRPD Board Meeting, SDCC, 6:30 pm
Thu  Sep  5  Neighborhood Council #1, Community Room, City Hall
Sat  Sep  7  Fairy Tales in the Park, 4pm, free, Rancho Simi Comm Park, “The BRAVE Princess; Merida’s Adventures”
Tue  Sep 10  Neighborhood Council #2, Community Room, City Hall
Wed  Sep 11  Patriot Day
Thu  Sep 12  Neighborhood Council #3, Community Room, City Hall
Fri  Sep 13  SVCC Breakfast meeting, Grand Vista Hotel, 7:30 am
Mon  Sep 16-19  CSDA Conference
Tue  Sep 17  Neighborhood Council #4, Community Room, City Hall
Thu  Sep 19  RSRPD Board Meeting, SDCC, 6:30 pm
Sat  Sep 21  Coastal Clean Up Day, RSCP/Arroyo Simi
Sat  Sep 21  Simi Valley Days Parade, 9:00 am (Confirmation of date not yet announced)
Sat  Sep 21  Coastal Clean Up Day in the Arroyo Simi, starts at Rancho Simi Comm Park
Wed  Sep 25  LAF meeting, 8:00 am, SVCC office
Fri  Sep 27  50+ Community Games Opening Ceremony
Sat  Sep 28  Oak Canyon Comm Park splash pad closing weekend

Colleen Janssen
Marketing and Community Outreach Specialist
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RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 6, 2013

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: General Manager

SUBJECT: Approval of Request by Simi Valley Days Foundation for Waiver of Permit Fee Charged by Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District for Use of Rancho Simi Community Park for the Annual Simi Valley Days Event Held in 2012

SUMMARY

The Simi Valley Days Foundation (hereinafter referred to as the “Foundation”) is the entity primarily responsible for putting on the annual Simi Valley Days Parade and Fair. The Foundation has long struggled with event location determinations. In 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012, the carnival/fair was held at Rancho Simi Community Park. In 2013 the event will be held at the Town Center Mall. The Park District determined the park use fee for this event to be $15,000 based upon other similar park rental rates. However, a fifty percent discount on that charge was adopted to account for the event’s new location while it became established. Thus, the rental rate was $7,500 per year for the event’s first four years at Rancho Simi Community Park. In the fifth year the discount was eliminated and the charge became $15,000 for the 2012 event. The District’s permit for the 2012 event also required payment of the unpaid balance for previous years equal to $3,650 (“...due and payable in the future when the event produces a positive cash flow sufficient to pay this outstanding amount.”), and reimbursement for any damages, which total $729.93. See attached schedule of charges and payments. The Foundation has paid $11,150, leaving an unpaid balance of $8,229.93. The Foundation is now requesting Park District approval to waive the unpaid balance in light of the financial performance of the 2012 event. See attached letter with attachment.

BOARD ACTION REQUESTED

Staff recommends the Board extend the fifty percent discount for use of the park for the 2012 event, resulting in a waiver of $7,500, and request payment of $729.93 for damages caused to the park during the 2012 event.

Larry Peterson
General Manager
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>CALCULATED FEE (5 Day Event)</th>
<th>FEE CHARGED (Discounted by 50% due to new location)</th>
<th>AMOUNT PAID</th>
<th>UNPAID BALANCE</th>
<th>DATE DUE</th>
<th>DATE PAID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>October 2008</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>October 2009</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>December 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>October 2010</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$7,500 ($150 (softball) $75 (KowChip - paid))</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>October 2011</td>
<td>December 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000 current $3,650 past due $729.93 damages</td>
<td>$11,150</td>
<td>$8,229.93</td>
<td>November 16, 2012</td>
<td>$3,500 on 12/17/12 $7,500 on 4/19/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL UNPAID BALANCE 5/31/13:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,229.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PO Box 164, Simi Valley CA. 93062

From the desk of

GORDON VOSHAHL

To the Board of Directors of Parks and Rec.  

Attention: Larry Petterson  General Manager

April 26, 2013

Our past history has shown that the Parks and Rec fees were a difficult requirement to meet. We have been fortunate that your Board reduced the fee for four years to $7,500.00 instead of the suggested $15,000.00. We had intended that the event in 2012 would be more profitable and we would be able to pay your requested amount. Unknown to us the Royal High school had their home coming week the same date as our event. This caused our attendance to be down several thousand people and a dollar loss over $12,000.00 as well as a loss on the carnival revenue which is shared by the carnival and the Foundation. We also lost the usage of their parking lots for the weekend.

Attached is a P/L to show our situation. We ask that you accept the $7,500.00 check tendered at this time as payment in full. If you require any further information please feel free to call me at my cell # 818-9430307.

Our primary concern is to have enough money to pay our Insurance and minimal operating cost until the next event as our statement shows.

Thank you for your understanding

Gordon Vosshall
CEO/PRESIDENT

\[Signature\]
## INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT INCOME</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GATE CASH SALES</td>
<td>$63,809.00</td>
<td>$82,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATE CREDIT SALES</td>
<td>$2,934.69</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON-LINE SALES</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARNIVAL INCOME</td>
<td>$29,271.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPONSORS</td>
<td>$23,335.69</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDREN'S DAY SPONSORS</td>
<td>$6,100.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATIONS</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARADE</td>
<td>$4,455.00</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5K &amp; 10K RACE</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAFFLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERCHANT BOOTHS</td>
<td>$12,668.03</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>AND RELATED BANNERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETTING ZOO AND PONYS</td>
<td>$180.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIALITY VENDORS</td>
<td>$163.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>INFLATA, BUBBLE ROLL MARG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLYNESIAN VILLAGE</td>
<td>$1,422.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>GATE SALES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR SHOW</td>
<td>$280.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>ENTRY FEES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOFTBALL TOURNAMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,800.00</td>
<td>ENTRY FEES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOW CHIP BINGO</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>SITE SUB RENTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANNER SALES</td>
<td>$275.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN / BUTTONS / TS</td>
<td>$821.00</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POKER TOURNAMENT</td>
<td>$796.00</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KICK OFF EVENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>$147,160.74</td>
<td>$167,075.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## EXPENSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GATE CHANGE</td>
<td>$11,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORNING KIWANIS</td>
<td>$9,748.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>PRINT MEDIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVERTISING</td>
<td>$4,694.85</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFF SITE SIGNING</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>DUES &amp; FEES, CHAMBER, ETC...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUES &amp; PUBLICITY EVENTS</td>
<td>$612.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERMITS</td>
<td>$160.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL LIABILITY INSURANCE</td>
<td>$9,432.00</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D&amp;O INSURANCE</td>
<td>$905.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTAGE</td>
<td>$289.36</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONE</td>
<td>$1,042.13</td>
<td>$1,100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES</td>
<td>$1,361.74</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINTING</td>
<td>$2,113.54</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>PRINTING, PHOTOCOPIES, ETC...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK &amp; REC. SITE RENTAL</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAX &amp; ACCOUNTING</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGAL</td>
<td>$650.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK CHARGES</td>
<td>$637.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPAIRS &amp; MAINT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEBSITE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREDIT CARD FEES</td>
<td>$1,409.61</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Site Expenses</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniforms</td>
<td>$772.36</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>T-shirts, Cleaning etc...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>$113.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Expense</td>
<td>$275.00</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>$4,612.00</td>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Carts</td>
<td>$3,507.19</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generators</td>
<td>$12,289.38</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIGHT TOWERS &amp; RAMPS</td>
<td>$6,799.84</td>
<td>$6,250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td>$4,546.75</td>
<td>$4,600.00</td>
<td>For Light Towers &amp; Gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Services</td>
<td>$1,179.04</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets &amp; Hand Wash Stations</td>
<td>$4,831.52</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality Tent</td>
<td>$552.16</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Stage Tent</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Canopies &amp; Tents</td>
<td>$10,852.91</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Craft, Merch, Entry, VIP, Carts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>$10,550.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>Front Public Protest, Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Site Signage</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor-Merchant Area</td>
<td>$897.88</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMT Services</td>
<td>$1,973.50</td>
<td>$2,100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security &amp; Ticket Booths</td>
<td>$2,209.13</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticket Booth Expenses</td>
<td>$327.57</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>$5,381.79</td>
<td>$6,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>$780.00</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>2 Way Radios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Banners Cost</td>
<td>$2,891.71</td>
<td>$2,250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Rentals</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tables, Chairs, etc...??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Up</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Knights of Columbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttle Bus Gas</td>
<td>$300.85</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttle Bus Labor</td>
<td>$1,374.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>Boys &amp; Girls Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttle Bus Donation</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>Boys &amp; Girls Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Explorers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Barricades &amp; Signage</td>
<td>$1,000.18</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnival</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parade Expenses</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Sweepers</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooper Scoopers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trophy Presenters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Float Judges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian Judges</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marching Band Judges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttle Bus Gas</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttle Bus Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets &amp; Hand Wash Stations</td>
<td>$418.48</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>Staging &amp; Reviewing Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table &amp; Chair Rentals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Borrow from Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barricade Rental</td>
<td>$2,630.00</td>
<td>$2,600.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parade Route Signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staging Signage</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINTING</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREDIT CARD FEES</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TROPHIES &amp; AWARDS</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHOTOGRAPHY &amp; VIDEO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIFORMS</td>
<td>$175.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTTONS &amp; PROGRAMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND MARSHALL</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATIONS &amp; MISC</td>
<td>$103.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5K &amp; 10K RACE EXPENSES</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CITY PERMITS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ALL BY ELITE SPORTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY PERMITS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DOTTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRICADE RENTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FROM PARADE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KICK OFF PARTY EXPENSES</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADVERTISING</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINTING</td>
<td>$80.98</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENTALS</td>
<td>$213.70</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>LIGHTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSIC &amp; ENTERTAINMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALL RENTAL / FEES</td>
<td>$1,705.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOD &amp; BAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECORATIONS</td>
<td>$162.64</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THANK YOU PARTY</td>
<td>$724.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLYNESIAN VILLAGE EXPENSES</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CANOPIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOILETS &amp; HAND WASH STATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER RENTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAR SHOW EXPENSES</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOON TIME KIWANIS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOFTBALL TOURNAMENT EXPENSE</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARK &amp; REC. SITE RENTAL</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIFORMS</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINTING, PHOTOCOPIES, ETC..</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KOW CHIP BINGO EXPENSES</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARK &amp; REC. SITE RENTAL</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SPECIAL CHILDREN'S DAY        | $3,480.60| $3,000.00|          |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POKER TOURNAMENT EXPENSES</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL INCLUSIVE</td>
<td>$984.00</td>
<td>$1,400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| TOTALS                        | $115,279.19 | $132,275.00|          |
| NET PROFIT                    | $31,881.55  | $34,800.00 |          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT EXPENSES PAID</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARK &amp; REC. SITE RENTAL</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATIONS</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIWANIS</td>
<td>$9,700.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNTS PAYABLE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D &amp; O INSURANCE</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTHLY CHARGES</td>
<td>$2,400.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTALS                            | $26,500.00 |
| PROFIT / LOSS                     | $5,381.55  |
RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

Date: June 6, 2013
To: General Manager
From: Assistant General Manager
Subject: Approval of Project Conditions for PD-S-1021/TT 5734, Located at Tapo Canyon Road and Lost Canyons Drive (Lost Canyons)

A Call for Conditions has been called by the City of Simi Valley for development of a residential gated community consisting of 364 single-family detached homes, a private golf course, and private open space lands. The subject property, consisting of 1,770 acres, is located west of Tapo Canyon Road and Bennett Road, north and south of Lost Canyons Drive, and north of Anderson Drive and Ditch Road. The project is commonly referred to as the Lost Canyons Project.

A Planning Commission public hearing on the proposed development has been scheduled for June 19, 2013 and specifically includes a tentative tract map, phasing plan, and master plan development documents. Attached for the Board of Director’s review and approval are proposed Park District Project Conditions (E-Conditions).

The District has previously commented on the project through approval of the Whiteface Specific Plan. A brief summary of previous actions by the District is described below.

LOST CANYONS PROJECT

The Lost Canyons development is part of the City’s Whiteface Specific Plan, which includes portions of Tapo Canyon, Dry Canyon, and Sand Canyon. The other development included in the Whiteface Specific Plan is the Big Sky community.

On December 1, 2010, the Whiteface Specific Plan was amended by the City of Simi Valley to include specific design components of the Lost Canyons project, including private open space, public multipurpose recreational trails and trailhead, a private park, a maximum of 364 single-family detached houses, elimination of the existing golf course in Dry Canyon, and the conversion of the Tapo Canyon 18-hole public golf course to a private course with clubhouse and restaurant.
Discussions with the developer of the Lost Canyon project date back to 2005. The District's original position was that hillsides and open space areas should be placed in public ownership, as was required in the original Whiteface Specific Plan. In addition, the District expressed the desire to include an active park within the project boundaries, specifically lighted sport fields (see January 19, 2006 correspondence to John McClure).

The District formally outlined its position in a letter to the Mayor and City Council as part of a General Plan Amendment public hearing on the project (PR-631 – see attached letter of January 23, 2006). In that letter, the District formally requested six acres of land within the Project to construct lighted youth sport facilities. Upon review, the City Council directed the applicant to coordinate with the District the need for a public park on the subject property or an off-site property.

Since January 2006 the District has provided written comments to the applicant, including trail alignment, plans for a trailhead along Tapo Canyon Road, and dedication of public open space. In April 2006 the District acquired 153 acres of open space east of Tapo Canyon Road and Lost Canyons Road adjacent to the planned trailhead. In September 2007, the District acquired a 57.50 acre future park site located adjacent to and south of the open space parcel. Preliminary plans call for this site to include lighted athletic facilities (football fields), parking lot, restrooms, picnic facilities, etc.

**CURRENT PROPOSAL**

The current project does not include development of a public park within the boundaries of the Project. The proposed Project Conditions include the allocation of park dedication fees to the planned park site on Tapo Canyon Road. This park is designated as Lost Canyons and included as a Special Use Park in the District’s Real Property Inventory. Fees are estimated to be $1,087,106. The project does include private parklands for residents.

The project does not include any type of public open space dedication, except the proposed trailhead along Tapo Canyon Road. The developer has elected to retain and manage the designated open space under the ownership of the future Homeowners Association. The District has requested multi-purpose recreational trail easements throughout the open space parcels. The applicant has agreed to grant these easements to the District. The District will construct these public multi-purpose recreational trails. These trails will be between 20 feet and 50 feet in width, depending on topography.

The proposed project conditions also include the dedication and construction by the applicant of the planned trailhead. Said trailhead will connect to new trails extending westward through the project and eastward through an existing District trail to Chivos Canyon. The District has also proposed that the property between the Tapo Canyon Road right-of-way and the District’s property be conveyed to the District.
Staff will have trail plans and an overall development plan available for the Board's review.

**Board Action Requested:**

That the Board approve the Project Conditions for PD-S-1021/TT 5734, Located at Tapo Canyon Road and Lost Canyons Drive (Lost Canyons)

![Signature]

Ed Hayduk, Assistant General Manager

EH:bjm
PROPOSED E-CONDITIONS
E-Conditions for Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District:

E-1 Applicant must provide the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District (RSRPD) with the equivalent cash-in-lieu for 5.8786 acres based on the Table of Values in effect at the time a Final Map or Parcel Map for PD-S-1021 / TT 5734 is approved by the City of Simi Valley. In conformance with City of Simi Valley Municipal Code Section 9-68.100B (Conveyance of Land and Payment of Fee to District), park fees shall be deposited with the RSRPD before the Final Map or Parcel Map is approved by the City of Simi Valley. If the number or type of residential dwelling unit change prior to the approval of the Final Map or Parcel Map for the project, the Park Dedication Condition will be modified to accurately reflect actual development. Pursuant to authorization by the RSRPD Board of Directors, it is anticipated that cash-in-lieu funds received from PD-S-1021 / TT 5734 will be committed to Lost Canyons Park upon concurrence of the Planning Commission, CSV.

E-2 The Applicant shall dedicate to the RSRPD, a minimum twenty (20) foot wide multi-purpose public recreational trail easement within the private open space as shown on Exhibit No. 10 (Conceptual Trails Plan) of the Whiteface Specific Plan – Volume II, dated February 14, 2011 and Tentative Tract Map for TT 5734 / PD-S-1021 dated March 26, 2013. If the alignment involves steep terrain in excess of 30% slope, an easement width of up to fifty (50) feet in width may be required to accommodate switchbacks. The trail easement shall be dedicated to the RSRPD by Easement Grant Deed, free and clear of all encumbrances, except for those which will not interfere with the use of the property for Multipurpose Public Recreational Trail Purposes, and which the RSRPD agrees to accept. Dedication of the trail easement to the RSRPD shall be concurrent with the recordation of the Final Map or Parcel Map for the project.

E-3 The Applicant shall dedicate to the RSRPD, Lot “FB” identified on the Tentative Tract Map for TT 5734 / PD-S-1021 dated March 26, 2013, for the construction of a Public Trailhead Parking Lot. Said parcel shall be conveyed to the RSRPD by Grant Deed, in fee simple, free and clear of all encumbrances, except for those which will not interfere with the use of the property as a public trailhead parking lot, and which the RSRPD agrees to accept. Dedication and conveyance to the RSRPD shall be concurrent with the recordation of the Final Map or Parcel Map for the project.

E-4 The Applicant shall design and construct the Public Trailhead Parking Lot to RSRPD Standards in conformance with the conceptual layout identified on Plan Sheet No. 14 of the Tentative Tract Map for TT 5734 / PD-S-1021 dated March 26, 2013 as a public improvements associated with the Applicant’s widening of Tapo Canyon Road. Plans for the construction of the Public Trailhead Parking Lot must be reviewed and accepted by the RSRPD prior to construction.

E-5 The Applicant shall convey to the RSRPD those portions of Lot “AJ” identified on Plan Sheet No. 14 of the Tentative Tract Map for TT 5734 / PD-S-1021 dated March 26, 2013, that immediately fronts Lost Canyons Park (APN 620-0-320-155) and Tapo Canyon Open Space (APN 620-0320-135). Said parcel shall be conveyed to the RSRPD by Grant Deed, free and clear of all encumbrances, except for those which will not interfere with the use of the property for the development and construction of Lost Canyons Park, and which the RSRPD agrees to accept. Dedication and conveyance to RSRPD shall be made concurrent with the completion of the Applicant’s widening of Tapo Canyon Road.
PAST CORRESPONDENCE
John,

My Board of Directors has directed me to write a letter to the City Council regarding your application. Here are our concerns:

(1) The District feels strongly that the hillsides and open space areas should be placed in public ownership, as is currently required in the Specific Plan.

(2) With your project, the adjacent Big Sky Project and others, the District's resources (i.e., quality sports fields) are being stretched to the limit, actually past the limit. We will get some relief from Big Sky (four lighted softball fields). Recent newspaper articles have highlighted the need for additional high end, lighted soccer fields. Therefore, the District feels it cannot pass over the opportunity to develop additional parkland as part of your project.

Our feeling is that a six (6) acre site would accommodate two lighted soccer fields, restroom building, parking lot, and some minimal picnic facilities. As we previously discussed, you have an obligation to provide land or in lieu fees or a combination of both for your project. What we will ask, therefore, is a graded pad and possibly a cash contribution toward the development of the park.

Sorry for the late notice, but this issue came up virtually last week. Also, remember that parks are exempt from the hillside performance standards (with some exceptions).

Call me if you want to meet today, Friday, or on Monday.

Thanks,

Ed

Ed Hayduk
Assistant General Manager
Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District
1692 Sycamore Drive
Simi Valley, CA 93065
Ph.: 805-584-4418
Fax: 805-526-7648
email: ed@rsrpd.us
www.rsrpd.org
January 23, 2006

The Honorable Paul Miller, Mayor of Simi Valley and
Council Members Becerra, Foster, Sojka, and Williamson
City of Simi Valley
2929 Tapo Canyon Road
Simi Valley, CA 93063

Subject: PR-631, Lost Canyons, LLC

Dear Mayor Miller and Council Members Becerra, Foster, Sojka, and Williamson:

The Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District appreciates the opportunity to comment on the proposed Pre-Screening Application by Lost Canyons LLC for proposed amendments to the Tapo and Dry Canyon areas of the Whiteface Specific Plan. The Park District has reviewed the proposed changes and offers the following comments:

1. **Public Open Space Dedications:** The existing Whiteface Specific Plan requires a substantial dedication of land to the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District as public open space. The Applicant proposes to modify the Specific Plan to allow for conservation easements or use agreements rather than dedication of fee title dedications to the Park District. This change appears contrary to current policy of placing our hillsides and special natural areas in public stewardship whenever possible. Over the years, the partnership between the City and the Park District has directly resulted in over 9,000 acres of property being preserved as permanent protected open space in our valley.

The Park District believes that it has been a good steward of the public open space. The District has continually provided financial resources to protect these natural areas, responded to safety issues, and coordinated the construction of miles of public trails within these lands. Why modify a system that has been so successful? The Park District is particularly interested in placing the large parcel of land located south of Lost Canyons Road, as well as the Whiteface Escarpment, a community landmark, into public ownership.

2. **Parkland Dedication:** As the community continues to grow, the District's resources, specifically quality sports fields, are being stretched to the limit. The District has attempted to adjust whenever possible. For example, the adjacent Big Sky
Community’s neighborhood park was recently redesigned to accommodate four lighted girls’ softball fields.

The current proposal for 364 new homes will place more and more demand on our recreational facilities, specifically use of sports fields for our youth. The District believes it cannot pass over the opportunity to acquire additional parkland as part of the Lost Canyons project. Therefore, the Park District requests that the City Council direct the Applicant to provide at least six acres of land (the required dedication under the City’s current Park Dedication Ordinance) within its property or an alternate site which meets Park District requirements.

3. **Multipurpose Trails:** The Park District believes that public access to the Whiteface Escarpment is critical, as well as development of an east-west multipurpose public recreational trail. The Park District therefore requests that the City Council direct the Applicant to continue dialogue with the Park District staff to arrive at a trails plan which meets these goals.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter. The Park District is available at any time to discuss any of these items.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Larry Peterson  
General Manager
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cc: Board of Directors  
Legal Counsel  
Assistant General Manager
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RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 6, 2013

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: General Manager

SUBJECT: Approval of Resolution of the Intention to Levy Assessments For Fiscal Year 2013-14, Preliminarily Approving Engineer’s Report, And Providing For Notice of Hearing

INTRODUCTION

The attached resolution preliminarily approves the Engineer’s Report and authorizes the publishing of a legal notice. That legal notice will indicate the date and time of a public hearing during which the Board may allow and consider public comment in regards to whether or not to levy and collect assessments within the Improvement District for fiscal year 2013-14.

BACKGROUND

On November 18, 1999, the Board adopted Resolution No. 1388, ordering the formation of the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District Parks, Recreation and Open Space Maintenance Improvement District. Pursuant thereto, an assessment was levied in the amount of $24 per single family home in fiscal year 2000-01. Every year the Board must vote on whether to continue the assessment. If continued for fiscal year 2013-14, the assessment for a single family household will be $33.88, representing an increase of $0.64 per year from last’s year assessment amount of $33.24 per single family household.

The annual assessment process requires the District to designate an Engineer of Work, direct the preparation of an Engineer’s Report, and publish notice of a public hearing. The process culminates with a public hearing, providing the public an opportunity to comment and allowing the Board to consider continuation of the assessment as being in the best interests of the people the District serves. The Board previously designated SCI as Engineer of Work. On February 21, 2013, the Board approved a Resolution Directing the preparation of an Engineer’s Report. Since that time, SCI has prepared the attached Engineer’s Report.
After summarizing the various park facilities, this Report sets forth an estimated budget for the District’s planned maintenance and capital expenditures for the next fiscal year. Thereafter, the Report describes the methodology of the assessment and the benefit to be conferred through its continuation, including: enhanced recreational opportunities and expanded access to recreational facilities; protection of open space; increased economic activity; expanded employment opportunities, enhanced quality of life and desirability of the area; increased property values; and reduced cost of local government in law enforcement and public health. The extent of these benefits are described in greater detail in the Engineer’s Report.

The Board is well aware of the financial challenges faced by the District, including longstanding ERAF and redevelopment diversions (now totaling over $35 million). Sadly, the ERAF diversions continue. A new obligation arose beginning with fiscal year 2001-02, requiring the District to pay for a portion of LAFCO’s annual budget. To date, over $144,947 has been diverted to that cause alone. And fiscal years 2004-05 and 2005-06 marked the District’s contribution towards the State budget crisis, which resulted in additional diversions of $1,472,000.

Fortunately, the State’s current financial condition is less precarious and so additional diversions of local property tax revenues are not likely at this time. A more current risk to the District’s financial health is the condition of the real estate market. For close to 5 years property values declined, leading to a corresponding decline in property tax revenues. This reduction in District revenue has occurred at the same time that investment returns have declined substantially and at the same time that prices for water and other items have increased, straining the District’s financial condition.

Under these circumstances the maintenance assessment has proved to be a vital supplement to the District’s budget. The revenue therefrom has allowed the District to improve its maintenance standards, address much needed renovations, and continue to expand park facilities to meet the expanding community population. Assessment receipts have been allocated between both maintenance and capital expenditures. The maintenance allocations now fund seven (7) full-time maintenance positions as well as part-time maintenance and park ranger positions, a portion of the District’s water and electricity costs, and various supplies, equipment and capital purchases.

Also worth remembering is that on December 9, 1999, staff explained how the assessment, if implemented, would allow the District to cover anticipated construction cost shortfalls arising from park improvement and development efforts. The assumption made at that time was that assessment revenues would help fund the following projects; trail construction, youth baseball field upgrades, Coyote Hills Neighborhood Park (fka West Highlands) construction, soccer complex utilities, Rancho Tapo Community Park construction, Sycamore Park construction and more. Assessment revenues have been either expended or budgeted for expenditure for every one of these items. This fact is and has been clearly demonstrated within the District’s capital projects plans and also the budget pages for the Oak Park and Simi Valley Assessment Funds.
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For these reasons staff recommends approval of the attached Resolution preliminarily approving the Engineer’s Report, setting a public hearing, and authorizing publication of a notice specifying June 20, 2013, at 6:30 pm as the date and time of the public hearing. This will ensure the public has an opportunity to testify about the proposed continuation of the assessments. After public comment, the Board may determine whether the public interest, convenience, and necessity require the improvements and this Board’s final action upon the Engineer’s Report and the assessments therein. If approved the assessments would be submitted to the County Auditor Controller for inclusion on the appropriate property tax rolls.

ACTION REQUESTED

Staff recommends approval of the attached Resolution preliminarily approving the Engineer’s Report and authorizing the publishing of a legal notice setting a public hearing for the Board to receive public input and consider whether or not to levy and collect assessments within the Improvement District for fiscal year 2013-14.

\[Signature\]
Larry Peterson
General Manager
RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT

RESOLUTION NO. ______

A RESOLUTION OF THE INTENTION TO LEVY ASSESSMENTS FOR
FISCAL YEAR 2013-14, PRELIMINARILY APPROVING ENGINEER'S REPORT,
AND PROVIDING FOR NOTICE OF HEARING

RESOLVED, by the Governing Board of the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District (the "Board"), County of Ventura, State of California, that

WHEREAS, on July 5, 2001, by its Resolution No. 1472, after receiving a weighted majority of ballots in support of the proposed assessment, this Board ordered the formation of and levied the first assessment within the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District Parks, Recreation and Open Space Maintenance and Improvement District (the "Improvement District") pursuant to the provisions of Article XIIIID of the California Constitution, and the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972 (the "Act"), Part 2 of Division 15 of the California Streets and Highways Code (commencing with Section 22500 thereof); and

WHEREAS, on February 21, 2013 this Board adopted Resolution No. 1862, A Resolution Directing Preparation of the Engineer's Report for the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Maintenance and Improvement District of the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District (the "Improvement District"). Pursuant to this resolution, SCI Consulting Group, the Engineer of Work, prepared an Engineer's Report in accordance with Section 22565, et seq., of the Streets and Highways Code (the "Report") and Article XIIIID of the California Constitution. The Report has been made, filed with the Clerk of the Board and duly considered by the Board and is hereby deemed sufficient and preliminarily approved. The Report shall stand as the Engineer's Report for all subsequent proceedings under and pursuant to the foregoing resolution.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District, (the "Board"), State of California, that it is the intention of this Board to levy and collect assessments within the Improvement District for fiscal year 2013-14; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that within the Improvement District, the existing and proposed improvements are generally described as the installation, maintenance and servicing of public facilities, including but not limited to, landscaping, sprinkler systems, park grounds, park facilities, landscape corridors, ground cover, shrubs and trees, street frontages, playground equipment and hardcourt areas, senior and community centers, drainage systems, lighting, fencing, entry monuments, basketball courts, tennis courts, running tracks, swimming pools, other recreational facilities, security guards, graffiti removal and repainting, and labor, materials, supplies, utilities and equipment, as applicable, for property owned and maintained by the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District. Installation means the construction of recreational improvements, including, but not limited to, land preparation, such as grading, leveling, cutting and filling, sod, landscaping, irrigation systems, sidewalks and drainage, lights, playground
equipment, play courts, recreational facilities and public restrooms. Maintenance means the furnishing of services and materials for the ordinary and usual maintenance, operation and servicing of said improvements, including repair, removal, or replacement of all or part of any improvement; providing for the life, growth, health and beauty of landscaping; and cleaning, sandblasting and painting of walls and other improvements to remove or cover graffiti. Servicing means the furnishing of electric current or energy for the operation or lighting of any improvements, and water for irrigation of any landscaping or the maintenance of any other improvements; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the District may issue bonds or notes to finance the installation, maintenance and servicing of the proposed improvements; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Improvement District consists of the lots and parcels shown on the boundary map on the Improvement District on file with the Clerk of the Board, and reference is hereby made to such map for further particulars; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Reference is hereby made to the Report for a full and detailed description of the Improvements, the boundaries of the Improvement District and the proposed assessments upon assessable lots and parcels of land within the Improvement District; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the authorized maximum assessment rate for the Assessment District includes an annual adjustment by an amount equal to the annual change in the Los Angeles Area Consumer Price Index, not to exceed 3.0% per year. In the event that the actual assessment rate for any given year is not increased by an amount equal to the maximum of 3% or the yearly CPI change plus any CPI change in previous years that was in excess of 3%, the maximum authorized assessment shall increase by this amount. In such event, the maximum authorized assessment shall be equal to the base year assessment as adjusted by the increase to the CPI, plus any and all CPI adjustments deferred in any and all prior years; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the annual increase in the Los Angeles Area Consumer Price Index from December 2011 to December 2012 is 1.93% and the unused CPI carried forward from the previous fiscal year was 0.0%. Therefore, the authorized maximum annual adjustment for fiscal year 2013-14 is 1.93%. Including the authorized annual adjustment, the maximum authorized assessment rate for fiscal year 2013-14 is $33.88 per single family equivalent benefit unit and the proposed fiscal year 2013-14 assessment rate per single family equivalent benefit unit is $33.88.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the public hearing shall be held, before this Board in the Board Room in the Sycamore Drive Community Center, located at 1692 Sycamore Drive, Simi Valley, California 93065 as follows: on Thursday, June 20, 2013 at the hour of 6:30 p.m. for the purpose of this Board's determination whether the public interest, convenience and necessity require the improvements and this Board's final action upon the Engineer's Report and the assessments therein; and

Resolution No. _______
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that prior to the conclusion of the hearing, any interested person may file a written protest with the Clerk of the Board, or, having previously filed a protest, may file a written withdrawal of that protest. A written protest shall state all grounds of objection. A protest by a property owner shall contain a description sufficient to identify the property owned by such owner. Such protest or withdrawal of protest should be mailed to SCI Consulting Group, 4745 Mangels Blvd., Fairfield, CA 94534 or may be hand delivered to the Board prior to the conclusion of the public hearing; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Clerk of the Board shall cause a notice of the hearing to be given by publishing a copy of this resolution once, at least ten (10) days prior to the date of the hearing above specified, in a newspaper circulated in the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District.

ADOPTED as a resolution of the Board of the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District at an adjourned meeting duly held on the 6th day of June, 2013 by the following called vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTENTIONS:

Chair of the Board of Directors
Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District
RANCHO SIMI RECREATION & PARK DISTRICT
PARKS, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE MAINTENANCE AND IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

ENGINEER'S REPORT

FY 2013-14

Pursuant to the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972 and Article XIII D of the California Constitution

Engineer of Work:
SciConsultingGroup
4745 Mangels Boulevard
Fairfield, California 94534
Phone 707.430.4300
Fax 707.430.4319
www.sci-cg.com
RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Dee Dee Cavanaugh, Chair
Mark Johnson, Vice Chair
Elaine Freeman, Director
Gene Hostetler, Director
Kate O'Brien, Director
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Larry Peterson
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Ed Hayduk
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SCi Consulting Group
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# Table of Contents

**Introduction** ........................................................................................................... 1

- Assessment Process ......................................................................................... 3
- Proposition 218 ............................................................................................... 4
- Compliance with Current Law ................................................................... 5

**Plans & Specifications** ...................................................................................... 6

**Fiscal Year 2013-14 Estimate of Cost and Budget** .............................................. 8

- Introduction .................................................................................................. 8
- Summary of District's Improvement Plans ................................................... 8
- Budget for Fiscal Year 2013-14 .................................................................. 8

**Method of Apportionment** .............................................................................. 11

- Method of Apportionment ......................................................................... 11
- Discussion of Benefit .................................................................................. 11
- Benefit Factors ........................................................................................... 12
- Benefit Finding ............................................................................................. 13
- General versus Special Benefit .................................................................. 14
- Calculating General Benefit ...................................................................... 15
- Zones of Benefit .......................................................................................... 18
- Method of Assessment ............................................................................... 19
- Duration of Assessment ............................................................................. 24
- Appeals and Interpretation .......................................................................... 24

**Assessment** .................................................................................................. 25

**Assessment Diagram** .................................................................................... 27
LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1 – ESTIMATE OF COST AND BUDGET ................................................................. 9
FIGURE 2 – RESIDENTIAL ASSESSMENT FACTORS ..................................................... 21
FIGURE 3 – COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL ASSESSMENT FACTORS ............................... 23
FIGURE 4 – SUMMARY COST ESTIMATE ........................................................................ 25
INTRODUCTION

The Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District (the “Park District”) currently provides park facilities and recreational programs for over 147,000 residents. The Park District currently owns, operates and maintains 50 community, neighborhood, special use and natural parks, in addition to extensive trails, and open space areas located throughout the Park District. Currently, the District owns and maintains approximately 522 acres of developed parkland and 5,012 acres of undeveloped parkland and public open space. In addition, the District operates and maintains recreational facilities on 14 school sites. The Park District’s facilities are summarized as follows:

SIMI VALLEY FACILITIES

- Arroyo Park – 2105 Socrates Ave, Simi Valley
- Arroyo Simi Trail
- Arroyo Simi Equestrian Center – 2900 Royal Ave, Simi Valley
- Arroyostow Park – 1700 N. Stow St, Simi Valley
- Atherwood Park – 2271 Alamo St, Simi Valley
- Berylwood Park – 1955 Bridget Ave, Simi Valley
- Big Sky Park – 2251 Lost Canyons Drive, Simi Valley
- Challenger Park – 298 First St, Simi Valley
- Chumash Park & Chumash Trail – Flanagan Dr. & Broken Arrow, Simi Valley
- Citrus Grove Park – 2100 N. Marvel Ct, Simi Valley
- Corriganville Park – 7001 Smith Rd, Simi Valley
- Coyote Hills Neighborhood Park – 275 Valley Gate Rd., Simi Valley
- Darrah Volunteer Park – Royal & Darrah Ave, Simi Valley
- Foothill Park – 1850 Ardenwood Ave, Simi Valley
- Frontier Park – 2163 Elizondo Ave, Simi Valley
- Houghton–Schreiber Park – 4333 Township Ave, Simi Valley
- Knolls Park – 1300 W. Katherine Rd, Simi Valley
- Lincoln Park – 1215 First St, Simi Valley
- Mayfair Park – 2550 Caldwell St, Simi Valley
- Old Windmill Park – 201 East Long Canyon Rd, Simi Valley
- Rancho Madera Community Park – 556 Lake Park Dr, Simi Valley
- Rancho Santa Susana Community Park & Community Center – 5005 Los Angeles Ave, Simi Valley
- Rancho Simi Community Park – 1765 Royal Ave, Simi Valley
- Rancho Tapo Community Park – 3700 Avenida Simi, Simi Valley
- Rocky Pointe Natural Park – Kuehner Drive at Smith Road, Simi Valley
- Runkle Triangle Site – Royal & Arroyo Simi, Simi Valley
- Santa Susana Park and Train Depot – 6503 Katherine Rd, Simi Valley
- Sequoia Park – 2150 Tracy Ave, Simi Valley
- Simi Dog Park – 2251 Lost Canyons Drive, Simi Valley
- Simi Hills Golf Course – 5031 Alamo St, Simi Valley
- Simi Hills Neighborhood Park – 5031 Alamo St, Simi Valley
- Sinaloa Public Golf Course Park – 980 Madera Rd, Simi Valley
- Stargaze Park – 355 Stargaze Ave, Simi Valley
- Strathearn Historical Park – 137 Strathearn Place, Simi Valley.
- Sycamore Drive Community Center & Pool – 1692 Sycamore Dr, Simi Valley
- Sycamore Canyon Neighborhood Park, 502 S. Martha Morrison Dr., Simi Valley
- Sycamore Park – 855 N. Planetree Ave, Simi Valley
- Tierra Rejada Park – 365 Tierra Rejada Road, Simi Valley
- Verde Park – 6045 E. Nelda St, Simi Valley
- Vista del Arroyo – 3455 Chickery Leaf Place, Simi Valley
- Willowbrook Park – 1786 Willowbrook Ln, Simi Valley

**Oak Park Facilities**

- Chaparral Park – 217 N. Medea Creek Lane, Oak Park
- Deerhill Park – 6700 Doubltree Rd, Oak Park
- Eagle View Park – 1240 Hidden Springs Ave, Oak Park
- Indian Springs Park – 4800 Rockfield St, Oak Park
- Mae Boyar Park – 130 Kanan Rd, Oak Park
- Medea Creek Trail – 217 N. Medea Creek Lane, Oak Park
- Oak Canyon Community Park and Oak Park Dog Park – 5600 Hollytree St, Oak Park
- Valley View Park – 100 Los Arcos Dr, Oak Park
- Oak Park Community Center and Gardens – 1000 N. Kanan Road, Oak Park

Prior to 2000, property tax revenues and user fees primarily supported maintenance and improvements of the Park District facilities. However, costs were rising faster than revenues, and the District no longer had sufficient funding to properly maintain its park and recreation areas. Therefore, in absence of a new local revenue source, the baseline level of park and recreation facilities in the Park District (the “Baseline Service”) would be a deteriorating level of maintenance and upkeep of the park and recreation facilities and properties listed above.

In 1999, to address the Park District’s shortfall in park maintenance and improvements funding, the Board proposed an assessment for parks. The Assessments, if approved, would fund the Improvements described under the Plans and Specifications section of this Report. These Improvements are provided throughout the Park District, would enhance the
level of service above and beyond the baseline level of service, and will likely prevent the deterioration of service projected in future years without this revenue source.

**Assessment Process**

In January and February 2000, the Board conducted an assessment ballot proceeding pursuant to the requirements of Article XIIIID of the California Constitution ("The Taxpayer's Right to Vote on Taxes Act") and the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972. During this ballot proceeding, property owners in the Park District were provided with a notice and ballot for the proposed parks assessment ("the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Maintenance and Improvement District" or the "Improvement District"). A 45-day period was provided for balloting and a public hearing was conducted March 9, 2000. At the public hearing, all ballots returned within the 45-day balloting period were tabulated.

It was determined at the public hearing that the assessment ballots submitted in opposition to the proposed assessments did not exceed the assessment ballots submitted in favor of the assessments (with each ballot weighted by the proportional financial obligation of the property for which ballot was submitted). In fact, the final balloting result was 58.9% support for the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Maintenance and Improvement District.

As a result, the Board gained the authority to approve the levy of the assessments for fiscal year 2000-01 and future years. The authority granted by the ballot proceeding includes an annual adjustment in the assessment levies equal to the annual change in the Consumer Price Index for the Los Angeles Area, not to exceed 3%.

In each subsequent year for which the assessments will be levied, the Board must direct the preparation of an Engineer's Report, budgets and proposed assessments for the upcoming fiscal year. After the Engineer's Report is completed, the Board may preliminarily approve the Engineer's Report and proposed assessments and establish the date for a public hearing on the continuation of the assessments. This Report was prepared pursuant to the direction of the Board given in a Resolution adopted on February 21, 2013.

This Engineer's Report ("Report") was prepared to establish the budget for the improvements and services that would be funded by the proposed 2013-14 assessments, determine the benefits received by property from the improvements and services within the Park District and the method of assessment apportionment to lots and parcels within the Park District. This Report and the proposed assessments have been made pursuant to the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972, Part 2 of Division 15 of the California Streets and Highways Code (the "Act") and Article XIIIID of the California Constitution (the "Article").

If the Board approves this Engineer's Report and the proposed assessments by resolution, a notice of public hearing must be published in a local paper at least 10 days prior to the date of the public hearing. The resolution preliminarily approving the Engineer's Report and establishing the date for a public hearing is used for this notice.
Following the minimum 10-day time period after publishing the notice, a public hearing is
held for the purpose of allowing public testimony about the proposed continuation of the
assessments. This hearing is currently scheduled for June 20, 2013. At this hearing, the
Board would consider approval of a resolution confirming the assessments for fiscal year
2013-14. If so confirmed and approved, the assessments would be submitted to the
County Auditor-Controller for inclusion on the property tax rolls for fiscal year 2013-14.

PROPOSITION 218

This assessment is formed consistent with Proposition 218, The Right to Vote on Taxes
Act, which was approved by the voters of California on November 6, 1996, and is now
codified as Articles XIIIIC and XLIID of the California Constitution. Proposition 218 provides
for benefit assessments to be levied to fund the cost of providing services, improvements,
as well as maintenance and operation expenses to a public improvement which benefits
the assessed property.

Proposition 218 describes a number of important requirements, including property-owner
balloting, for the imposition, increase and extension of assessments, and these
requirements are satisfied by the process used to establish this assessment.

SILICON VALLEY TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION, INC. v SANTA CLARA COUNTY OPEN SPACE
AUTHORITY

In July of 2008, the California Supreme Court issued its ruling on the Silicon Valley
Taxpayers Association, Inc. v. Santa Clara County Open Space Authority (“SVTA”). This
ruling is the most significant legal document in further legally clarifying Proposition 218.
Several of the most important elements of the ruling included further emphasis that:

- Benefit assessments are for special, not general, benefit
- The services and/or improvements funded by assessments must be clearly
defined
- Special benefits are directly received by and provide a direct advantage to
property in the assessment district

DAHMES v. DOWNTOWN POMONA PROPERTY

On June 8, 2009, the 4th Court of Appeal amended its original opinion upholding a benefit
assessment for property in the downtown area of the City of Pomona. On July 22, 2009,
the California Supreme Court denied review. On this date, Dahmes became good law and
binding precedent for assessments. In Dahmes the court upheld an assessment that was
100% special benefit (i.e. 0% general benefit) on the rationale that the services and
improvements funded by the assessments were directly provided to property in the
assessment district. The Court also upheld discounts and exemptions from the
assessment for certain properties.
BONANDER v. TOWN OF TIBURON

On December 31, 2009, the 1st District Court of Appeal overturned a benefit assessment approved by property owners to pay for placing overhead utility lines underground in an area of the Town of Tiburon. The Court invalidated the assessments on the grounds that the assessments had been apportioned to assessed property based in part on relative costs within sub-areas of the assessment district instead of proportional special benefits.

BEUTZ v. COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

On May 26, 2010, the 4th District Court of Appeal issued a decision on the Steven Beutz v. County of Riverside ("Beutz") appeal. This decision overturned an assessment for park maintenance in Wildomar, California, primarily because the general benefits associated with improvements and services were not explicitly calculated, quantified and separated from the special benefits.

GOLDEN HILL NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION v. CITY OF SAN DIEGO

On September 22, 2011, the San Diego Court of Appeal issued a decision on the Golden Hill Neighborhood Association v. City of San Diego appeal. This decision overturned an assessment for street and landscaping maintenance in the Greater Golden Hill neighborhood of San Diego, California. The court described two primary reasons for its decision. First, like in Beutz, the court found the general benefits associated with services were not explicitly calculated, quantified and separated from the special benefits. Second, the court found that the City had failed to record the basis for the assessment on its own parcels.

COMPLIANCE WITH CURRENT LAW

This Engineer's Report is consistent with the requirements of Article XIIIC and XIIIID of the California Constitution and with the SVTA decision because the Improvements to be funded are clearly defined; the Improvements are directly available to and will directly benefit property in the Assessment District; and the Improvements provide a direct advantage to property in the Assessment District that would not be received in absence of the assessments.

This Engineer's Report is consistent with Beutz, Dahms and Greater Golden Hill because the Improvements will directly benefit property in the Assessment District and the general benefits have been explicitly calculated and quantified and excluded from the Assessments. The Engineer's Report is consistent with Bonander because the Assessments have been apportioned based on the overall cost of the Improvements and proportional special benefit to each property.
The Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District maintains park facilities in locations throughout its boundaries.

The work and improvements (the "Improvements") are proposed to be undertaken by the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District's Parks, Recreation and Open Space Maintenance and Improvement District (the "Improvement District") and the cost thereof paid from the levy of the annual assessment provide special benefit to Assessor Parcels within the Improvement District as defined in the Method of Assessment herein. In addition to the definitions provided by the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972, (the "Act") the work and improvements are generally described as follows:

Installation, maintenance and servicing of public recreational facilities and improvements, including, but not limited to, turf and play areas, landscaping, ground cover, shrubs and trees, irrigation systems, drainage systems, lighting, fencing, entry monuments, basketball courts, tennis courts, gymnasium, senior center, running tracks, swimming pools, other recreational facilities, security patrols to protect the Improvements, graffiti removal and repainting, and labor, materials, supplies, utilities and equipment, as applicable, at each of the locations owned, operated or maintained by the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District. Plans and specifications for these improvements have been filed with the Executive Director of the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District and are incorporated herein by reference.

As applied herein, "Installation" means the construction of recreational improvements, including, but not limited to, land preparation (such as grading, leveling, cutting and filling) sod, landscaping, irrigation systems, sidewalks and drainage, lights, playground equipment, play courts, recreational facilities and public restrooms.

"Maintenance" means the furnishing of services and materials for the ordinary and usual maintenance, operation and servicing of any improvement, including repair, removal or replacement of all or any part of any improvement; providing for the life, growth, health, and beauty of landscaping, including cultivation, irrigation, trimming, spraying, fertilizing, or treating for disease or injury; the removal of trimmings, rubbish, debris, and other solid waste, and the cleaning, sandblasting, and painting of walls and other improvements to remove or cover graffiti.

"Servicing" means the furnishing of electric current, or energy, gas or other illuminating agent for any public lighting facilities or for the lighting or operation of any other improvements; or water for the irrigation of any landscaping, the operation of any fountains, or the maintenance of any other improvements.

Incidental expenses include all of the following: (a) The costs of preparation of the report, including plans, specifications, estimates, diagram, and assessment; (b) the costs of
printing, advertising, and the giving of published, posted, and mailed notices; (c) compensation payable to the County for collection of assessments; (d) compensation of any engineer or attorney employed to render services in proceedings pursuant to this part; (e) any other expenses incidental to the construction, installation, or maintenance and servicing of the Improvements; (f) any expenses incidental to the issuance of bonds or notes pursuant to Streets & Highways Code Section 22662.5; and (g) costs associated with any elections held for the approval of a new or increased assessment. (Streets & Highways Code §22625).

The assessment proceeds will be exclusively used for Improvements within the Improvement District plus incidental expenses. Reference is made to the Summary of District's Improvement Plans section in the following section of this Report which specifically identifies the parks, recreation areas and other sites to be funded by the assessment proceeds and to the plans and specifications, including specific expenditure and improvement plans by park/recreation site and zone of benefit, which are on file with the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District.
INTRODUCTION
Following are the proposed Improvements, and resulting level of improved parks and recreation facilities, for the Improvement District. As previously noted, the baseline level of service included a declining level of parks and recreation facilities due to shortages of funds for the Park District. Improvements funded by the assessments are over and above the previously declining baseline level of service. The formula below describes the relationship between the final level of improvements, the existing baseline level of service, and the enhanced level of improvements to be funded by the proposed assessment.

\[
\text{Final Level of Improvements} = \text{Baseline Level of Improvements} + \text{Enhanced Level of Improvements}
\]

SUMMARY OF DISTRICT’S IMPROVEMENT PLANS
The budget to be financed by the assessments is partially based on the results of an independent survey conducted for the District, which indicated property owners’ priorities for various improvement projects and park maintenance services. Projects have been selected based on how closely they meet the needs expressed by the survey results. Projects have been chosen throughout the Park District in order to ensure that all properties in the narrowly drawn Park District boundaries will receive improved access to better maintained and improved parks in their area. The multi-year improvement plan includes projects that will add new neighborhood parks and trails to the Park District’s infrastructure; improve park and open space security by enhancing lighting; replace outdated playground equipment; enhanced maintenance of all parks and recreation areas to help ensure the continued beauty, usability, and accessibility of the Park District’s parks, playfields, and open space areas; develop playfields and youth oriented activity areas on undeveloped land owned by the Park District. A detailed project improvement plan has been developed and is available for review at the Park District offices.

BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013-14
The following budget lists the improvement projects and park maintenance and security services that would be funded by the Improvement District in Fiscal Year 2013-14.
### Figure 1 - Estimate of Cost and Budget

**RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT**  
Parks, Recreation and Open Space Maintenance and Improvement District  
Estimate of Cost  
Fiscal Year 2013-14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning Fund Balance, July 2013 - Simi Valley &amp; Oak Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Installation, Maintenance &amp; Servicing Costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Simi Valley</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aler School Program Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chumash Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Sign Replacement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class I Trail Maintenance (Arroyo and Medea Cr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCCP - Upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenger Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Simi Greenway Phase 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSCP - Community Center Roof Repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sycamore Drive Community Center Roof Repair/Replace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Construction/Open Space Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and Operation of Parks and Recreation Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Simi Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oak Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Park Community Center Acoustic Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Sign Replacement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medea Creek Repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aler School Club Facility Upgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and Operation of Parks and Recreation Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Oak Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Installation, Maintenance and Servicing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Administration and County Collection Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Uncollectable Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals for Installation, Maintenance, Servicing and Administration</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Less:
- District Contribution for General and Special Benefits\(^1\) ($10,342,839)
- Beginning Fund Balance, July 2013 - Simi Valley & Oak Park ($457,955)
- Contribution to/from Reserve Fund - Simi Valley $92,641
- Contribution to/from Reserve Fund - Oak Park $28,956

($10,879,197)

Net Cost of Installation, Maintenance, Servicing and Administration $1,714,276

### Budget Allocation to Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Assessment Budget*</th>
<th>$1,714,276</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFE</td>
<td>Adjusted SFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Equivalent Benefit Units - Zone A</td>
<td>45,975.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Equivalent Benefit Units - Zone B</td>
<td>4,609.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Equivalent Benefit Units - Zone C</td>
<td>54.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Equivalent Benefit Units - Zone D</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SFE Units | 50,639.33 | 50,598.46 |

**Assessment per Single Family Equivalent Unit** $33.88

---

Notes to Estimate of Cost:

As determined in the following section, at least 25% of the cost of improvements must be funded from sources other than the assessments to cover any general benefits from the improvements. Therefore, out of the total cost of improvements of $12,393,473 the District must contribute at least $3,098,368 from sources other than the assessments. The District will contribute much more than this amount, which more than covers any general benefits from the improvements.
METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT

This section of the Engineer's Report explains the special and general benefits to be derived from the Improvements to park facilities and District property throughout the Park District, and the methodology used to apportion the total assessment to properties within the Improvement District.

The Improvement District consists of all Assessor Parcels within the boundaries of the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District. The method used for apportioning the assessment is based upon the proportional special benefits conferred to the properties over and above the general benefits conferred to real property in the Improvement District or to the public at large. Special benefit is calculated for each parcel in the Improvement District using the following process:

1. Identification of all benefit factors derived from the Improvements
2. Calculation of the proportion of these benefits that are general
3. Determination of the relative special benefit within different areas within the Improvement District
4. Determination of the relative special benefit per property type
5. Calculation of the specific assessment for each individual parcel based upon special vs. general benefit; location, property type, property characteristics, improvements on property and other supporting attributes

DISCUSSION OF BENEFIT

In summary, the assessments can only be levied based on the special benefit to property. Any and all general benefit must be funded from another source. This special benefit is received by property over and above any general benefits from the Improvements. With reference to the requirements for assessments, Section 22573 of the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972 states:

"The net amount to be assessed upon lands within an assessment district may be apportioned by any formula or method which fairly distributes the net amount among all assessable lots or parcels in proportion to the estimated benefits to be received by each such lot or parcel from the improvements."

"The determination of whether or not a lot or parcel will benefit from the improvements shall be made pursuant to the Improvement Act of 1911 (Division 7 (commencing with Section 5000)) [of the Streets and Highways Code, State of California]."
Proposition 218, as codified in Article XIIIID of the California Constitution, has confirmed that assessments must be based on the special benefit to property and that the value of the special benefits must reasonably exceed the cost of the assessment:

"No assessment shall be imposed on any parcel which exceeds the reasonable cost of the proportional special benefit conferred on that parcel."

The SVTA decision also clarifies that a special benefit is a service or improvement that provides a direct advantage to a parcel and that indirect or derivative advantages resulting from the overall public benefits from a service or improvement are general benefits. The SVTA decision also provides specific guidance that park improvements are a direct advantage and special benefit to property that is proximate to a park that is improved by an assessment:

"[T]he characterization of a benefit may depend on whether the parcel receives a direct advantage from the improvement (e.g. proximity to a park) or receives an indirect, derivative advantage resulting from the overall public benefits of the improvement (e.g. general enhancement of the district's property values)."

Finally, Proposition 218 twice uses the phrase “over and above” general benefits in describing special benefit. (Art. XIIIID, sections 2(l) & 4(f).)

**Benefit Factors**

The special benefits from the Improvements are listed below:

**Extension of a Property’s Outdoor Areas and Green Spaces for Properties Within Close Proximity to the Improvements**

In large part because it is cost prohibitive to provide large open land areas on property in the Improvement District, the residential, commercial and other benefitting properties in the Improvement District do not have large outdoor areas and green spaces. The parks in the Improvement District provide these larger outdoor areas that serve as an effective extension of the land area for proximate properties because the Improvements are uniquely proximate and accessible to property in close proximity to the Improvements. The Improvements, therefore, provide an important, valuable and desirable extension of usable land area for the direct advantage and special benefit of properties with good and close proximity to the Improvements.

According to the industry-standard guidelines established by the National Park and Recreation Association (the "NPRA"), neighborhood parks in urban areas have a service area radius of generally one-half mile and community parks have a service area radius of approximately two miles. The service radii for neighborhood parks and neighborhood green spaces were specifically established to give all properties within these service radii close proximity and easy walking access to such public land areas. Since proximate and
accessible parks serve as an extension of the usable land area for property in the service radii and since the service radii was specifically designed to provide close proximity and access, the parcels within this service area clearly receive a direct advantage and special benefit from the Improvements - and this advantage is not received by other properties or the public at large.

An analysis of the service radii for the Improvements finds that all properties in the Improvement District enjoy the distinct and direct advantage of being close and proximate to parks within the Improvement District. The benefiting properties in the Improvement District therefore uniquely and specially benefit from the Improvements.

PROXIMITY TO IMPROVED PARKS AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

Only the specific properties within close proximity to the Improvements are included in the Improvement District. Therefore, property in the Improvement District enjoys unique and valuable proximity and access to the Improvements that the public at large and property outside the Improvement District do not share.

In absence of the assessments, the Improvements would not be provided and the parks and recreation areas in the Improvement District would be degraded due to insufficient funding for maintenance, upkeep and repair. Therefore, the assessments provide Improvements that are over and above what otherwise would be provided. Improvements that are over and above what otherwise would be provided do not by themselves translate into special benefits but when combined with the unique proximity and access enjoyed by parcels in the Improvement District, they provide a direct advantage and special benefit to property in the Improvement District.

ACCESS TO IMPROVED PARKS, OPEN SPACE AND RECREATIONAL AREAS

Since the parcels in the Improvement District are nearly the only parcels that enjoy close access to the Improvements, they directly benefit from the unique close access to improved parks, open space and recreation areas that are provided by the Assessments. This is a direct advantage and special benefit to property in the Improvement District.

IMPROVED VIEWS

The Park District, by maintaining the landscaping at its park, recreation and open space facilities provides improved views to properties with direct line-of-sight as well as other local properties which benefit from improved views when property is accessed. Therefore, the improved and protected views provided by the Assessments are another direct and tangible advantage that is uniquely conferred upon property in the Improvement District.

BENEFIT FINDING

In summary, real property located within the boundaries of the Improvement District distinctly and directly benefits from closer proximity, access and views of improved parks, recreation facilities, landscaped corridors, greenbelts, trail systems and other public resources funded by the Assessments. The Improvements are specifically designed to
serve local properties in the Improvement District, not other properties or the public at large. The public at large and other properties outside the Improvement District receive only limited benefits from the Improvements because they do not have proximity, good access or views of the Improvements. These are special benefits to property in the Improvement District in much the same way that sewer and water facilities, sidewalks and paved streets enhance the utility and desirability of property and make them more functional to use, safer and easier to access.

GENERAL VERSUS SPECIAL BENEFIT

Article XIIIC of the California Constitution requires any local agency proposing to increase or impose a benefit assessment to “separate the general benefits from the special benefits conferred on a parcel.” The rationale for separating special and general benefits is to ensure that property owners subject to the benefit assessment are not paying for general benefits. The assessment can fund special benefits but cannot fund general benefits. Accordingly, a separate estimate of the special and general benefit is given in this section.

In other words:

\[
\text{Total Benefit} = \text{General Benefit} + \text{Special Benefit}
\]

There is no widely-accepted or statutory formula for general benefit. General benefits are benefits from improvements or services that are not special in nature, are not “particular and distinct” and are not “over and above” benefits received by other properties. SVTA vs. SCCCSA provides some clarification by indicating that general benefits provide “an indirect, derivative advantage” and are not necessarily proximate to the improvements.

In this report, the general benefit is conservatively estimated and described, and then budgeted so that it is funded by sources other than the assessment.

The starting point for evaluating general and special benefits is the current, baseline level of service. The assessment will fund improvements “over and above” this general, baseline level and the general benefits estimated in this section are over and above the baseline.

A formula to estimate the general benefit is listed below:

\[
\text{General Benefit} = \text{Benefit to Real Property Outside the Improvement District} + \text{Benefit to Real Property Inside the Improvement District that is Indirect and Derivative} + \text{Benefit to the Public at Large}
\]
Special benefit, on the other hand, is defined in the state constitution as "a particular and distinct benefit over and above general benefits conferred on real property located in the district or to the public at large." The SVTA v. SCCOSA decision indicates that a special benefit is conferred to a property if it "receives a direct advantage from the improvement (e.g., proximity to a park)." In this assessment, as noted, properties in the Improvement District have close and unique proximity, views and access to the improvements and uniquely improved desirability from the Improvements and other properties and the public at large do not receive significant benefits because they do not have proximity, access or views of the Improvements. Therefore, the overwhelming proportion of the benefits conferred to property is special, and is only minimally received by property outside the Improvement District or the public at large.

In the 2009 Dahms case, the court upheld an assessment that was 100% special benefit on the rationale that the services funded by the assessments were directly provided within the assessment district. It is also important to note that the improvements and services funded by the assessments in Pomona are similar to the improvements and services funded by the Assessments described in this Engineer's Report and the Court found these improvements and services to be 100% special benefit. Also similar to the assessments in Pomona, the Assessments described in this Engineer's Report fund improvements and services directly provided within the Assessment District and every benefiting property in the Assessment District enjoys proximity and access to the Improvements. Therefore, Dahms establishes a basis for minimal or zero general benefits from the Assessments. However, in this Report, the general benefit is more conservatively estimated and described, and then budgeted so that it is funded by sources other than the Assessment.

**CALCULATING GENERAL BENEFIT**

In this section, the general benefit is conservatively estimated and described, and then budgeted so that it is funded by sources other than the assessment.

**BENEFIT TO PROPERTY OUTSIDE THE IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT**

Properties within the Improvement District receive almost all of the special benefits from the Improvements because properties in the Improvement District enjoy unique close proximity and access to the Improvements that is not enjoyed by other properties of the public at large. However, certain properties within the proximity/access radius of the Improvements, but outside of the boundaries of the Improvement District, may receive some benefit from the Improvements. Since this benefit is conferred to properties outside the Improvement District boundaries, it contributes to the overall general benefit calculation and will not be funded by the Assessments.

The properties outside the Improvement District and within the proximity radii for neighborhood parks in the Improvement District receive benefits from the Improvements. Since these properties are not assessed for their benefits because they are outside of the area that can be assessed by the District, this is form of general benefit to the public at large and other property. A 50% reduction factor is applied to these properties because they are all geographically on only one side of the Improvements and are over twice the...
average distance from the improvements compared to properties in the Assessment District. The general benefit to property outside of the Improvement District is calculated as follows with the parcel and data analysis performed by SCI Consulting Group.

**Criteria:**

11,739 parcels outside the District but within either 0.5 miles of a neighborhood park or within 2 miles of a community park in the Improvement District

46,920 parcels in the Improvement District

50% relative benefit compared to property within the Improvement District

**Calculation**

General benefit to property outside the Improvement District

\[
(11,739/46,920+11,739) \times 5 = 10.0\%
\]

Although it can reasonably be argued that improvements inside, but near the Park District boundaries are offset by similar park and recreational improvements provided outside, but near the Park District’s boundaries, we use the more conservative approach of finding that 10.0% of the improvements may be of general benefit to property outside the Improvement District.

**Benefit to Property Inside the District that is Indirect and Derivative and to the Public at Large**

The "indirect and derivative" benefit to property within the Improvement District is particularly difficult to calculate. A solid argument can be presented that all benefit within the Improvement District is special, because the Improvements are clearly "over and above" and "particular and distinct" when compared with the baseline level of service and the unique proximity, access and views of the improvements enjoyed by benefiting properties in the Improvement District.

Nevertheless, the SVTA vs. SCCOSA decision indicates there may be general benefit "conferred on real property located in the district" A measure of the general benefits to property within the Assessment area is the percentage of land area within the Improvement District that is publicly owned and used for regional purposes such as major roads, rail lines and other regional facilities because such properties used for regional purposes could provide general benefits property in the District and/or to the public at large. Approximately 2.6% of the land area in the Improvement District is used for such regional purposes, so this is a measure of the general benefits to property within the Improvement District and/or to the public at large.

The general benefit to the public at large can also be estimated by the proportionate amount of time that the Park District’s parks and recreational facilities are used and enjoyed by individuals who are not residents, employees, customers or property owners in
the Park District. Surveys of park and recreation facility usage conducted by SCI Consulting Group in similar park districts found that less than 4% of the Park District's facility usage is by those who do not live or work within District boundaries. When people outside the Improvement District use parks, they diminish the availability of parks for people within the Improvement District. Therefore, another 4% of general benefits are allocated for people within the Improvement District.

Combining these three measures of general benefits, we find that 10.6% of the benefits from the Improvements are general benefits to the public at large and/or property in the Improvement District.

**Total General Benefits**

Using a sum of these measures of general benefit, we find that approximately 23.1% of the benefits conferred by the Improvements may be general in nature and should be funded by sources other than the assessment.

\[
\text{GENERAL BENEFIT} = \\
10.0\% \quad \text{(Outside the District)} \\
+ 10.6\% \quad \text{(Inside the District - Indirect and Derivative and to the Public at Large)} \\
= 20.6\% \quad \text{(Total General Benefit)}
\]

Although this analysis finds that 20.6% of the assessment may provide general benefits, the Assessment Engineer establishes a requirement for a minimum contribution from sources other than the assessments of 25%. This minimum contribution above the measure of general benefits will serve to provide additional coverage for any other general benefits.

The Park District's total budget for maintenance and improvement of its parks and recreational facilities is $12,393,473. Of this total budget amount, the Park District will contribute $10,342,839 from sources other than the assessments for park maintenance and improvement. This contribution by the Park District equates to approximately 83% of

---

1. When District facilities are used by those individuals, the facilities are not providing benefit to property within the Park District. Use under these circumstances is a measure of general benefit. For example, a non-resident who is drawn to utilize the Park District facilities and shops at local businesses while in the area would provide special benefit to business properties as a result of his or her use of the Improvements. Conversely, one who uses Park District facilities but does not reside, work, shop or own property within the Park District boundaries does not provide special benefits to any property and is considered to be a measure of the general benefits.
the total budget for maintenance and improvements and constitutes far more than the amount attributable to the general benefits resulting from the Improvements.

ZONES OF BENEFIT

The Park District's recreation facilities and grounds, as identified in the Plans and Specifications, are open to the community and are used extensively throughout the year. The District's facilities are relatively uniformly distributed throughout the central areas of the District. Within this central area of the Park District, which is designated as Zone of Benefit "A" or "Zone A," all properties are deemed to have relatively equal access to the parks, recreational facilities and open space areas of the Park District.

The Park District also includes the separate community of Oak Park that is distinctly separated from Zone A by distance and topography. The community of Oak Park is separated from other urban areas by open space, so it is designated as Zone of Benefit "B" or "Zone B." The parks and recreational facilities in Oak Park are deemed to be generally equal to those in Zone A; therefore the relative level of benefit to properties in Zone B is deemed to be equal to properties in Zone A.

Properties in the far northern area of the Park District are far removed from the parks and recreational facilities. Moreover, these properties have limited access to these facilities. Therefore, this area is designated as Zone of Benefit "C" or "Zone C." These properties are approximately 4 times the distance from the parks and recreational facilities as are properties in Zone A. Since the benefits can diminish with distance, the relative benefit to properties in Zone C is determined to be 1/4 of that for Zone A.

Properties located in the far southeastern areas of the Park District are also separated by distance and geography from current parks and recreational facilities. This area is currently unimproved and there are no plans for the District to build or maintain parks in this area. Similar to those properties in Zone C, these properties have limited access to the District's parks and recreational facilities. Therefore, this area, designated as Zone D, is deemed to receive similar benefits as Zone C, at a rate of 1/4 of that for Zone A.

All assessed properties within the Zones A and B are within the industry-accepted proximity/service area for parks and recreation facilities. As noted, these proximity radii were specifically established to only encompass properties with good proximity and access to local parks and in effect make local parks within the proximity radii an extension of usable land area for the properties in the area. The benefits from the Improvements within each Zone of Benefit do not vary further based on proximity of the parcels to the Improvements because the increased benefits of greater proximity to the Improvements are generally offset by a parallel increase in negative factors such as higher levels of traffic, noise, etc. that comes with increased proximity. Consequently, since all parcels in the Improvement District have good access and proximity to the Improvements and the benefits to relatively closer proximity are offset by other factors, additional proximity is not considered to be a factor in determining benefit within each Zone of Benefit. In other words, the boundaries of the Improvement District and the Zones of Benefit have been
narrowly drawn to include only properties that have good proximity and access and will specially benefit from the improvements.

The SVTA vs. SCCOSA decision indicates:

_In a well-drawn district — limited to only parcels receiving special benefits from the improvement — every parcel within that district receives a shared special benefit. Under section 2, subdivision (i), these benefits can be construed as being general benefits since they are not "particular and distinct" and are not "over and above" the benefits received by other properties "located in the district."

We do not believe that the voters intended to invalidate an assessment district that is narrowly drawn to include only properties directly benefiting from an improvement. Indeed, the ballot materials reflect otherwise. Thus, if an assessment district is narrowly drawn, the fact that a benefit is conferred throughout the district does not make it general rather than special. In that circumstance, the characterization of a benefit may depend on whether the parcel receives a direct advantage from the improvement (e.g., proximity to park) or receives an indirect, derivative advantage resulting from the overall public benefits of the improvement (e.g., general enhancement of the district's property values).

In the Improvement District, the advantage that each parcel receives from the Improvements is direct, and the boundaries are narrowly drawn to include only parcels that benefit from the assessment. Therefore, the even spread of assessment throughout each narrowly drawn Zone of Benefit is indeed consistent with the SVTA vs. SCCOSA decision and satisfies the "direct relationship to the locality of the improvement." standard.

**METHOD OF ASSESSMENT**

As previously discussed, the assessments provide specific improvements that confer direct and tangible special benefits to properties in the Improvement District. These benefits can partially be measured by the occupants on property in the Improvement District because such parcel population density is a measure of the relative benefit a parcel receives from the Improvements. Therefore, the apportionment of benefit is partially based the population density of parcels.

It should be noted that many other types of "traditional" assessments also use parcel population densities to apportion the assessments. For example, the assessments for sewer systems, roads and water systems are typically allocated based on the population density of the parcels assessed. Moreover, assessments have a long history of use in California and are in large part based on the principle that benefits from a service or
improvement funded by assessments that is enjoyed by tenants and other non-property owners ultimately is conferred directly to the underlying property.\(^2\)

The next step in apportioning assessments is to determine the relative special benefit for each property. This process involves determining the relative benefit received by each property in relation to a single family home, or, in other words, on the basis of Single Family Equivalents ("SFE"). This SFE methodology is commonly used to distribute assessments in proportion to estimated special benefit and is generally recognized as providing the basis for a fair and appropriate distribution of assessments. For the purposes of this Engineer's Report, all properties are designated a SFE value, which is each property's relative benefit in relation to a single family home on one parcel. In this case, the "benchmark" property is the single family detached dwelling which is one Single Family Equivalent or one SFE.

In the process of determining the appropriate method of assessment, the Engineer considered various alternatives. For example, an assessment only for residential improved property was considered but was determined to be inappropriate because commercial, industrial and other properties also receive direct benefits from the improvements.

Moreover, a fixed or flat assessment for all properties of similar type was deemed to be inappropriate because larger properties receive a higher degree of benefit than other similarly used properties that are significantly smaller. (For two properties used for commercial purposes, there is clearly a higher benefit provided to the larger property in comparison to a smaller commercial property because the larger property generally supports a larger building and has higher numbers of employees, customers and guests that would benefit from proximity and improved access to well maintained and improved parks and recreational facilities. So the potential population of employees or residents is a measure of the special benefits received by the property.) Larger parcels, therefore, receive an increased benefit from the assessments.

Finally, the special benefits derived from the assessments are conferred on property and are not based on a specific property owner's use of the improvements, or a specific property owner's occupancy of property or the property owner's demographic status such as age or number of dependents. However, it is ultimately people who value the special benefits described above and use and enjoy the Park District's park and recreational

\(^2\) For example, in *Federal Construction Co. v. Ensign* (1922) 59 Cal.App. 200 at 211, the appellate court determined that a sewer system specially benefited property even though the direct benefit was to the people who used the sewers. "Practically every inhabitant of a city either is the owner of the land on which he resides or on which he pursues his vocation, or he is the tenant of the owner, or is the agent or servant of such owner or of such tenant. And since it is the inhabitants who make by far the greater use of a city's sewer system, it is to them, as lot owners or as tenants, or as the servants or agents of such lot owners or tenants, that the advantages of actual use will redound. But this advantage of use means that, in the final analysis, it is the lot owners themselves who will be especially benefited in a financial sense."
facilities. In other words, the benefits derived to property are related to the average number of people who could potentially live on, work at, or otherwise could use a property, not how the property is currently used by the present owner. Therefore, the number of people who could or potentially live on, work at or otherwise use a property is one indicator of the relative level of benefit received by a property.

In conclusion, the Assessment Engineer determined that the appropriate method of assessment apportionment should be based on the type and use of property, the relative size of the property, its relative population and usage potential and its proximity to parks and recreational facilities. This method is further described below.

RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES

Certain residential properties in the Improvement District that contain a single residential dwelling unit are assigned one Single Family Equivalent or 1.0 SFE. Traditional houses, zero-lot line houses and town homes are included in this category of single family residential property.

Properties with more than one residential unit are designated as multi-family residential properties. These properties benefit from the improvements in proportion to the number of dwelling units that occupy each property and the average number of people who reside in multi-family residential units versus the average number of people who reside in a single-family home. The population density factors for the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District, as depicted below, provide the basis for determining the SFE factors for residential properties. Using the total population in a certain property type in the area of the Park District from the 1990 Census and dividing it by the total number of such households, finds that approximately 3.42 persons occupy each single family residence, whereas an average of 2.25 persons occupy each multi-family residence. Using the ratio of one SFE for each single-family residence, which equates to one SFE for every 3.42 persons, 0.66 SFE would equate to one multi-family unit or 0.66 SFE for every 2.25 residents. Likewise, each condominium unit receives 0.69 SFE and each mobile home receives 0.51 SFE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Occupied Households</th>
<th>Persons Per Household</th>
<th>SFE Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>81,762</td>
<td>23,901</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominium</td>
<td>5,942</td>
<td>2,532</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>10,138</td>
<td>4,497</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home on Separate Lot</td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The single family equivalency factor of 0.66 per dwelling unit for multifamily residential properties applies to such properties with 20 or fewer units. Properties in excess of 20 units typically offer on-site recreational amenities and other facilities that tend to offset some of the benefits provided by the improvements. Therefore the benefit for properties in
excess of 20 units is determined to be 0.66 SFE per unit for the first 20 units and 0.10 SFE per each additional unit in excess of 20 dwelling units.

COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL PROPERTIES

SFE values for commercial and industrial land uses are based on the equivalence of special benefit on a land area basis between single family residential property and commercial property. The SFE values for other types of business and industrial land uses are established by using average employee densities because the special benefit factors described previously can be measured by the average number of people who work at commercial/industrial properties.

In order to determine employee density factors, the findings from the San Diego Association of Governments Traffic Generators Study (the “SANDAG Study”) are used because these findings were approved by the State Legislature for use in justifying commercial and industrial school facilities fees and are considered to be a good representation of the average number of employees per acre of land area for commercial and industrial properties. As determined by the SANDAG Study, the average number of employees per acre for commercial property is 24.

In comparison, the average number of people residing in a single family home in the area is 3.42. Since the average lot size for a single family home in Rancho Simi is approximately 0.20 acres, the average number of residents per acre of residential property is 17.

The employee density per acre is generally 1.4 times the population density of single family residential property per acre (24 employees per acre / 17 residents per acre). Therefore, the average employee density can be used as the basis for allocating benefit to commercial or industrial property since a property with 1.4 employees receives generally similar special benefit to a residential property with 1 resident. This factor of equivalence of benefit between 1 resident to 1.4 employees is the basis for allocating commercial/industrial benefit. Table 2 shows the average employees per acre of land area or portion thereof for commercial and industrial properties and lists the relative SFE factors per fifth acre for properties in each land use category.

Commercial and industrial properties in excess of 5 acres generally involve uses that are more land intensive relative to building areas and number of employees (lower coverage ratios). As a result, the benefit factors for commercial and industrial property land area in excess of 5 acres is determined to be the SFE rate per fifth acre for the first 5 acres and the relevant SFE rate per each additional acre over 5 acres. Institutional properties that are used for residential, commercial or industrial purposes are also assessed at the appropriate residential, commercial or industrial rate.
**Figure 3 – Commercial/Industrial Assessment Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Commercial/industrial</th>
<th>Average Employment</th>
<th>SFE Units per Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Per Acre</td>
<td>1/5 Acre *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Storage or Parking Lot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The SFE factors for commercial and industrial parcels apply by the fifth acre of land area or portion thereof. (Therefore, the minimum assessment for any assessable parcel in these categories is the SFE Units listed herein.

**Vacant Properties**

The benefit to vacant properties is determined to be proportional to the corresponding benefits for similar type developed properties; however, at a lower rate due to the lack of improvements on the property. A measure of the benefits to the land is the average value of land in relation to improvements for developed property. As a general average, appraisers often use a factor of 25% to 30% of developed property value as land value. It is reasonable to assume, therefore, that approximately 25% of the benefits are related to the underlying land and 75% are related to the improvements and the day to day use of the property. Using this ratio, the SFE factor for vacant parcels is 0.25 per parcel.

As properties are approved for development, their value increases. Likewise, the special benefits received by vacant property increases as the property is approved for development, or becomes closer to being fully improved. When property is approved for development with a final map, the property has passed the final significant hurdle to development and can shortly undergo construction. Since the property is nearing the point of development, its special benefits increase. In addition, these properties are generally sold soon after completion of improvements, so the properties receive the additional benefit of desirability from prospective buyers due to the special benefits provided by proximity to improved parks and recreational facilities of the Park District. It is therefore determined that property with final map approval receives 50% of the relative benefit to improved property of similar use-type.

**Other Properties**

All properties that are specially benefited are assessed.

Church parcels and property used for educational purposes typically generate employees on a less consistent basis than other non-residential parcels. Moreover, many of these parcels provide some degree of on-site amenities that serve to offset some of the benefits...
from the Improvement District. Therefore, these parcels receive minimal benefit and are assessed an SFE factor of 1.

Miscellaneous, small and other parcels such as roads, right-of-way parcels, and common areas typically do not generate significant numbers of employees, residents, customers or guests and have limited economic value. These miscellaneous parcels receive minimal benefit from the Improvements and are assessed an SFE benefit factor of 0.

**DURATION OF ASSESSMENT**

It is proposed that the Assessment be levied for fiscal year 2000-01 and every year thereafter, so long as the parks and recreational areas need to be improved and maintained. Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District requires funding from the Assessments for its Improvements in the Improvement District. As noted previously, the Assessment can be levied annually after the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District Board of Directors approves an annually updated Engineer’s Report, budget for the Assessment, Improvements to be provided, and other specifics of the Assessment. In addition, the District Board of Directors must hold an annual public hearing to continue the Assessment.

**APPEALS AND INTERPRETATION**

Any property owner who feels that the assessment levied on the subject property is in error as a result of incorrect information being used to apply the foregoing method of assessment, may file a written appeal with the General Manager or her or his designee. Any such appeal is limited to correction of an assessment during the then current or, if before July 1, the upcoming fiscal year. Upon the filing of any such appeal, the General Manager or his or her designee will promptly review the appeal and any information provided by the property owner. If the General Manager or her or his designee finds that the assessment should be modified, the appropriate changes shall be made to the assessment roll. If any such changes are approved after the assessment roll has been filed with the County for collection, the General Manager or his or her designee is authorized to refund to the property owner the amount of any approved reduction. Any dispute over the decision of the General Manager or her or his designee, shall be referred to the Board of Directors of the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District and the decision of the Board shall be final.
WHEREAS, said Resolution directed the undersigned Engineer of Work to prepare and file a report presenting an estimate of costs, a diagram for the Improvement District and an assessment of the estimated costs of the improvements upon all assessable parcels within the Improvement District, to which Resolution and the description of the proposed improvements therein contained, reference is hereby made for further particulars;

NOW, THEREFORE, the undersigned, by virtue of the power vested in me under the Act and the order of the Board of said Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District, hereby make the following assessment to cover the portion of the estimated cost of the improvements, and the costs and expenses incidental thereto to be paid by the assessment district.

The amount to be paid for the improvements and the expense incidental thereto, to be paid by the Improvement District for the fiscal year 2013-14 is generally as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{|l|c|}
\hline
\text{Component} & \text{FY 2013-14 Budget} \\
\hline
\text{Park Maintenance} & $8,749,675 \\
\text{Park Improvements and New Parks} & $3,544,365 \\
\text{Incidental Expenses} & $99,433 \\
\hline
\text{TOTAL BUDGET} & $12,393,473 \\
\hline
\text{Less:} & \\
\text{Park District Contribution for General and Special Benefits} & ($10,342,839) \\
\text{Beginning Fund Balance, July 2011 - Simi Valley & Oak Park} & ($457,955) \\
\text{Contribution to / (from) Reserve Fund - Simi Valley & Oak Park} & $121,597 \\
\hline
\text{NET AMOUNT TO ASSESSMENTS} & $1,714,276 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

As required by the Act, an Assessment Diagram is hereto attached and made a part hereof showing the exterior boundaries of the Improvement District. The distinctive number of each parcel or lot of land in the said Improvement District is its Assessor Parcel Number appearing on the Assessment Roll.

I do hereby assess and apportion the net amount of the cost and expenses of the improvements, including the costs and expenses incident thereto, upon the parcels and lots of land within the Improvement District, in accordance with the special benefits to be received by each parcel or lot, from the improvements, and more particularly set forth in the Cost Estimate and Method of Assessment hereto attached and by reference made a part hereof.

The assessment is subject to an annual adjustment tied to the Consumer Price Index-U for the Los Angeles Area as of December of each succeeding year (the "CPI"), with a
maximum annual adjustment not to exceed 3%. Any change in the CPI in excess of 3% shall be cumulatively reserved as the "Unused CPI" and shall be used to increase the maximum authorized assessment rate in years in which the CPI is less than 3%. The maximum authorized assessment rate is equal to the maximum assessment rate in the first fiscal year the assessment was levied adjusted annually by the minimum of 1) 3% or 2) the change in the CPI plus any Unused CPI as described above.

The change in the CPI from December 2011 to December 2012 was 1.93% and the Unused CPI carried forward from the previous fiscal year is 0.00%. Therefore, the maximum authorized assessment rate for fiscal year 2013-14 is increased by 1.93% which equates to $33,888 per single family equivalent benefit unit. The estimate of cost and budget in this Engineer's Report proposes assessments for fiscal year 2013-14 at the rate of $33.88, which is less than the maximum authorized assessment rate.

The assessment is made upon the parcels or lots of land within the Improvement District in proportion to the special benefits to be received by the parcels or lots of land, from the improvements.

Each parcel or lot of land is described in the Assessment Roll by reference to its parcel number as shown on the Assessor's Maps of the County of Ventura for the fiscal year 2013-14. For a more particular description of the property, reference is hereby made to the deeds and maps on file and of record in the office of the County Recorder of the County.

I hereby place opposite the Assessor Parcel Number for each parcel or lot within the Assessment Roll, the amount of the assessment for the fiscal year 2013-14 for each parcel or lot of land within the Improvement District.

Dated: May 29, 2013

Engineer of Work

By ________________________________

Engineer of Work, License No. C052091
The Improvement District includes all properties within the boundaries of the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District. The boundaries of the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Maintenance and Improvement District are displayed on the following Assessment Diagram.
APPENDIX A – 2013-14 ASSESSMENT ROLL

An Assessment Roll (a listing of all parcels assessed within the Improvement District and the amount of the assessment) will be filed with the Secretary of the Board and is, by reference, made part of this report and is available for public inspection during normal office hours.

Each lot or parcel listed on the Assessment Roll is shown and illustrated on the latest County Assessor records and these records are, by reference made part of this report. These records shall govern for all details concerning the description of the lots or parcels.
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RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

DATE:       June 6, 2013
TO:         Board of Directors
FROM:       General Manager
SUBJECT:    Receive and File Proposition 4 - Appropriations Limitation

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to provide an overview of Proposition 4 and to demonstrate the calculation of the District’s appropriation limitation for fiscal year 2013-14. The public must be provided an opportunity to inspect the calculation. Once that occurs, staff will request the Board at a future meeting to approve a resolution establishing the appropriations limitation for FY 2013-14.

BACKGROUND

On November 6, 1979, California voters approved Proposition 4, the so-called Gann Spending Limitation, which added Article XIIIIB to the California Constitution. In June 1990, Article XIIIIB was amended by the voters through their approval of Proposition 111. Essentially, these propositions limit the amount of tax revenues the District can collect each year and subsequently appropriate. Whenever a local government cannot appropriate all of its tax revenues, because appropriations exceed the calculated limitation, these “excess revenues” must be returned. This may be accomplished by the granting of a tax credit or refund, by providing a temporary suspension of tax rates or fee schedules, or by any other means consistent with the intent of Section 2 of Article XIIIIB.

This process requires each governmental entity to set its Appropriation Limit each fiscal year with 1978-79 as the base year; then adjust each subsequent year by using a combination of the increase in population (either within its jurisdiction or within the county in which it is located), and the change in per capita personal income. The Department of Finance provides this information to each local government no later than May 1st.

“Appropriations subject to limitation” is defined as any authorization to expend, during a fiscal year, the proceeds of taxes levied by or for that entity and the proceeds of subventions to that entity. “Proceeds of taxes” includes all tax revenues and the proceeds to an entity of government, from (1) regulatory licenses, user charges, and user fees to the extent that those proceeds exceed the costs reasonably borne by that entity in providing the regulation, product, or service, and (2) the
investment of tax revenues. It also includes "subventions" received from the State (essentially, unrestricted state subsidies). Appropriations does not include appropriations for debt service, and qualified capital outlay projects, that is, land or construction with a value in excess of $100,000 and a useful life of 10 or more years.

The Board approved appropriations limitation for fiscal year 2012-13 was $15,206,176 (see attached Exhibit A and B). Based upon the price and population data supplied by the California Department of Finance, staff is able to calculate the appropriations limitation for the next fiscal year to be $16,091,830. Based upon this the District’s appropriations will be 69.14% (see attached Exhibit C) of the calculated appropriations limitation, and no further action is necessary.

Note that these calculations are based upon the District’s Preliminary Budget, which has not yet been approved by the Board of Directors. That will take place on June 20, 2013.

RECOMMENDATION

Receive and File.

Larry Peterson
General Manager
## CALCULATION OF APPROPRIATION LIMITATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation Limitation FY 2012-13</td>
<td>$15,206,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Change in Income (as a percent)*</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Change (as a percent)*</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Converted to a Ratio</td>
<td>1.0512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Converted to a Ratio</td>
<td>1.0067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculation of factor for FY 2013-14</td>
<td>1.05824304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation Limitation FY 2013-14</td>
<td>$16,091,830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Exhibit A*
### Appropriations Subject to Limitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proceeds of Taxes</th>
<th>Fund 30-0-0000-2: Oak Park Assessment</th>
<th>Fund 30-0-0000-1: Simi Valley Assessment</th>
<th>Fund 10: General Fund</th>
<th>Fund 80: Enterprise Fund</th>
<th>Fund 70: Special Zone Tax</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secured (Net of E.R.A.F.)</td>
<td>$9,110,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$147,874</td>
<td>$3,257,874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$105,450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$240,450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Year</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>$61,000</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
<td>$245,832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowners Exemption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$83,259</td>
<td>$1,528</td>
<td>$54,788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryover from Prior Year</td>
<td>$21,626</td>
<td>$436,329</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Subventions</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Pass Through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,233,551</td>
<td>$1,233,551</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Year Assessment</td>
<td>$142,000</td>
<td>$1,474,447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,616,447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$6,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>$170,526</td>
<td>$1,975,776</td>
<td>$10,251,810</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$172,468</td>
<td>$12,570,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments/Exclusions*</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After School Club Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenger Field</td>
<td>($644,100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($644,100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCP Upgrades</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinatra Park</td>
<td>($800,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($800,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations Subject to Limitation</td>
<td>$170,526</td>
<td>$1,331,676</td>
<td>$10,251,810</td>
<td>($500,000)</td>
<td>$172,468</td>
<td>$11,126,480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Per Government Code and State Constitution, appropriations for qualified capital outlay projects (land and construction with life in excess of 10 years and value greater than $100,000) are not appropriations subject to the limitation.

Exhibit B
## APPLICATION OF APPROPRIATION LIMITATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation Limitation</td>
<td>$16,091,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations Subject to Limitation</td>
<td>$11,126,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Proposed Appropriations to Limitation for FY 2013-14</td>
<td>69.14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit C
RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 6, 2013
TO: Board of Directors
FROM: General Manager
SUBJECT: Approval for Publication of Legal Notice Concerning Proposition 4 Appropriations Limitation Amount

SUMMARY

The Board’s approval of the District’s Appropriations Limitation requires the publishing of a legal notice. The attached legal notice serves to inform the public of the opportunity to inspect the District’s calculation. A minimum of 15 days of notice is required. If approved, staff will publish the legal notice and request the Board to approve the Appropriations Limitation for fiscal year 2013-14 during the Board’s meeting of July 18, 2013.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Board approve for publishing the attached legal notice concerning Proposition 4 Appropriations Limitation.

[Signature]
Larry Peterson
General Manager
LEGAL NOTICE

Documentation, used in the determination of the Appropriations Limitation and other necessary determinations, for the Fiscal Year 2013-14 of the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District is available for review in the administrative offices at the Sycamore Drive Community Center, 1692 Sycamore Drive, Simi Valley, California between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Saturday, Sunday and holidays excepted.

A Resolution establishing the 2013-14 Appropriations Limitation in accordance with Article XIIIB of the Constitution of the State of California will be placed on the agenda for Board approval at the regularly scheduled Board meeting of July 18, 2013. Any questions concerning this process may be addressed to the District’s General Manager: Larry Peterson at (805) 584-4407.

__________________________
Larry Peterson, District Clerk
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