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

STAFF
District Manager
Larry Peterson
I. CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. ROLL CALL

III. PUBLIC STATEMENTS (ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA)

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   A. Regular Meeting – June 2, 2016

V. SCHEDULED ITEMS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS
   A. Public Hearing and Approval of Resolution Approving Engineer’s Report, Confirming Diagram and Assessment and Ordering Levy of Assessment for Fiscal Year 2016-17

VI. CONSENT AGENDA**
   A. Approval of Check Register: 5/31/16 (payables)
   B. Approval of Agreement Providing Authority for Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District to Utilize the School Bus Services of Simi Valley Unified School District
   C. Approval and Adoption of Full-time Employee Classification Schedule by Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District Board of Directors

   ** 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. Tour of Runkle Canyon Park Oral
   B. Authorization to Solicit Bids for the Arroyo Simi Greenway Phase 2 Construction Project 176-16-a
   C. Resolution Authorizing Execution of a Fuel Modification Zone Easement and Maintenance Agreement Granting to Pinehurst, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company, a Non-Exclusive Easement In, On, Over, Under, Along and Across a Portion of Property Known as Hummingbird Ranch Open Space 193-16-a
   D. Authorization to Issue a Request for Bids for an Irrigation Control System for Simi Hills Golf Course 120-16-b
E. Selection of Candidate for Seat B of the CSDA Board of Directors Election 2016 23-16-d

F. Approval of Resolution Nominating Candidate to Serve as the Alternate Special District Member of the Ventura Local Agency Formation Commission for Term Beginning January 1, 2017 46-16-a

G. Approval of Pay and Benefit Changes for: (1) Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District Middle Management Association, (2) Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District Employee Association (Bargaining Unit), and (3) Unrepresented District Employees 35-16-o

IX. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS OF NOTE

None

X. REPORTS BY BOARD MEMBERS

XI. REPORT BY DISTRICT MANAGER

XII. CLOSED SESSION

A. Closed Session Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.6

   Conference with Labor Negotiator:
   Agency Negotiators: District Manager and Director of Administration
   Employee Organization: Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District Middle Management Association

B. Closed Session Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.6

   Conference with Labor Negotiator:
   Agency Negotiators: District Manager and Director of Administration
   Employee Organization: Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District Employees Association (“Bargaining Unit”)

C. Closed Session Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.6

   Conference with Labor Negotiator:
   Agency Negotiator: District Manager and Director of Administration
   Employee Organization: Unrepresented Employees

D. Closed Session Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.8

   Conference with Real Property Negotiator
   Re: Land Disposition: Property Located In Ventura County at 1692 Sycamore Drive, Simi Valley, Ca
Assessor Parcel Numbers:
642-0-231-285
642-0-231-295
642-0-280-075
642-0-280-085
642-0-280-095

Agency Negotiators: District Manager, Director of Planning and Maintenance and Legal Counsel
Negotiating Parties: Area Housing Authority/USA Properties
Under Negotiation: Price and Terms of Payment

E. Closed Session Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.8

Conference with Real Property Negotiator
Re: Land Acquisition: Property Located in Ventura County Commonly Referred to as Alamos Canyon Located West Adjacent to the Simi Valley Landfill and Recycling Center
Assessor Parcel Numbers:
615-0-150-37 615-0-150-35
615-0-150-32 (portion) 615-0-150-28
615-0-150-14 615-0-150-13
615-0-110-13 (portion) 500-0-292-26
500-0-292-25 500-0-292-24
500-0-292-23 500-0-292-18
500-0-292-17 (portion) 500-0-292-15
500-0-292-10 500-0-291-32
500-0-291-28 500-0-291-26
Which together total approximately 326 acres

Agency Negotiators: District Manager, Director of Planning and Maintenance and Legal Counsel
Negotiating Parties: The Nature Conservancy and Waste Management
Under Negotiation: Price and Terms of Payment

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

If any individual has a disability that may require accommodation to participate in this meeting, please contact Human Resources 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
1692 SYCAMORE DRIVE, SIMI VALLEY, CA 93065
JUNE 2, 2016, 6:30 P.M.

AGENDA ITEM

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Led by Brian Reed

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

Staff: Jackie Cochran, Doug Gale, Wayne Nakaoka, Carol Odenberg, Theresa Pennington, Larry Peterson, Brian Pierik, Esq., Brian Reed

Guests: Mike Evans, Jeff Jones, Dan Mason, Danny Sison, Deborah Tapia

III. PUBLIC DISCUSSION (ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA):

Dan Mason, representing AYSO, asked the Board to consider expediting the installation of the lights at Rancho Simi Community Park. He stated there is a safety issue at the Park and having the lights installed will help secure the area. Lighting the fields will also relieve some of the pressure on other soccer fields where players go to practice.

A Simi Valley police officer also spoke on the safety issue at the Park and the benefits of adding the lights. He said they regularly receive calls, day and night, for police service in the surrounding areas of the Park. The installation of lights will benefit that area as a whole, and provide added security for those using the fields in the evenings at the Park.

Danny Sison, representing S.V. Soccer Foundation, said that Rancho Simi Park is a great facility in the daytime, but the area is a challenge at night. He asked the District to move the lighting project forward as installing the lights at the Park will benefit all those attending soccer practices at the Park, and also help secure that area at night.

Deborah Tapia, representing AYSO, asked the Board to accelerate the lighting project at Rancho Simi Park as installing lights there will help ensure the safety of those using the facility.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

(A) Approval of Minutes of the Regular Meeting – May 5, 2016

ACTION: Director Freeman moved to Approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of May 5, 2016; Vice Chair O’Brien seconded the motion. Motion carried with a unanimous vote.
Approval of Minutes of the Budget Workshop – May 27, 2016

ACTION: Director Cavanaugh moved to Approve the Minutes of the Budget Workshop of May 27, 2016; Director Johnson seconded the motion. Motion carried with a unanimous vote.

V.

SCHEDULED ITEMS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS:

(A)

Presentation of the Full-time Employee of the Month for April 2016 to Jackie Cochran_35-16-1

Director of Administration reviewed the nomination, followed by Chair Hostetler’s presentation of the Employee of the Month award to Jackie Cochran. Jackie thanked everyone for the award. Golf Course Manager Reed stated that she does a terrific job at the Golf Course. She has an unbelievable workload and operates with class and efficiency. He thanked Jackie for all her work. On behalf of the entire Board, Chair Hostetler also expressed their appreciation for everything that Jackie does at the Simi Hills Golf Course.

VI.

CONSENT AGENDA:

(A)

Approval of Check Registers: 4/15/16, 4/29/16 (payroll); 4/30/16, 5/16/16 (payables)

ACTION: Director Johnson moved to Approve Item A; Vice Chair O’Brien seconded the motion. Motion carried with a unanimous vote.

VII.

CONTINUED BUSINESS:

None.

VIII.

NEW BUSINESS:

Director of Administration introduced Jeff Jones, MRCA’s Assistant Financial Officer. Mr. Jones explained the purpose of having a preliminary budget, and noted some material changes from this year’s to last year’s budget. He then invited questions from the Board. A question was raised regarding the elimination of nine positions at MRCA. He said attrition was the reason for three terminations, and they are hopeful the other six will be absorbed into other positions.

(A)

Approval of Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority Preliminary Budget for Fiscal Year 2016-2017_131-16-b

ACTION: Director Johnson moved to Approve Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority Preliminary Budget for Fiscal Year 2016-2017; Vice Chair O’Brien seconded the motion. Motion carried with a unanimous vote.

(B)

Approval of Resolution of the Intention to Levy Assessments for Fiscal Year 2016-17, Preliminarily Approving Engineer’s Report and Providing for Notice of Hearing_179-16-b

ACTION: Director Freeman moved to Approve Resolution No. 1919 of the Intention to Levy Assessments for Fiscal Year 2016-17, Preliminarily Approving Engineer’s Report and Providing for Notice of Hearing; Director Cavanaugh seconded the motion. Motion carried with the following roll-call vote:
Ayes: Directors Johnson, Freeman, Cavanaugh, O’Brien, Hostetler
Noes: None
Absent: None
Abstain: None

(C) Adoption of Preliminary District Operating and Capital Improvement Budget for Fiscal Year 2016-17 124-16-a

ACTION: Director Freeman moved to Approve Adoption of Preliminary District Operating and Capital Improvement Budget for Fiscal Year 2016-17; Director Cavanaugh seconded the motion. Motion carried with a unanimous vote.

(D) Approval for Publication of Legal Notice Allowing for Public Inspection of Preliminary Budget and Specifying Date and Time of Public Hearings on District’s Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2016-17 124-16-b

ACTION: Director Cavanaugh moved to Approve Publication of Legal Notice Allowing for Public Inspection of Preliminary Budget and Specifying Date and Time of Public Hearings on District’s Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2016-17; Vice Chair O’Brien seconded the motion. Motion carried with a unanimous vote.

(E) Receive and File Proposition 4 – Appropriations Limitation 33-16-a

Proposition 4 – Appropriations Limitation was received and filed. No action was taken by the Board.

(F) Approval for Publication of Legal Notice Concerning Proposition 4 Appropriations Limitation Amount 33-16-b

ACTION: Director Johnson moved to Approve Publication of Legal Notice Concerning Proposition 4 Appropriations Limitation Amount; Director Cavanaugh seconded the motion. Motion carried with a unanimous vote.

(G) Approval of Personnel Changes: (1) Creation of Full-time Recreation Specialist; (2) Creation of Full-time Groundskeeper I Position; (3) Reclassification of Part-time Site Director at Strathern Historical Park to Full-time Historical Park Specialist; (4) Reclassification of Part-time Mechanic V to Full-time Mechanic – Golf Courses; (5) Reclassification of Part-time Recreation Specialist III to Full-time Recreation Assistant 35-16-m

ACTION: Director Freeman moved to Approve Personnel Changes: (1) Creation of Full-time Recreation Specialist; (2) Creation of Full-time Groundskeeper I Position; (3) Reclassification of Part-time Site Director at Strathern Historical Park to Full-time Historical Park Specialist; (4) Reclassification of Part-time Mechanic V to Full-time Mechanic – Golf Courses; (5) Reclassification of Part-time Recreation Specialist III to Full-time Recreation Assistant; Director Johnson seconded the motion. Motion carried with a unanimous vote.

(H) Approval of California Special District Association (“CSDA”) Bylaws Amendments 23-16-c

ACTION: Director Freeman moved to Approve California Special District Association (“CSDA”) Bylaws Amendments; Director Cavanaugh seconded the motion. Motion carried with a unanimous vote.
(I) Resolution Calling Regular General District Election for November 8, 2016 and Requesting Consolidation of the Regular General District Election with the Statewide General Election 36-16-a

ACTION: Director Cavanaugh moved to Approve Resolution No. 1920 Calling Regular General District Election for November 8, 2016 and Requesting Consolidation of the Regular General District Election with the Statewide General Election; Director seconded the motion. Motion carried with the following roll-call vote:

Ayes: Directors Johnson, Freeman, Cavanaugh, O’Brien, Hostetler
Nose: None
Absent: None
Abstain: None

(J) Approval of Agreement with Envenom Corporation for the Preparation of Biological Reports and Studies for Lost Canyons Park 189-16-b

ACTION: Director Johnson moved to Approve Agreement with Envenom Corporation for the Preparation of Biological Reports and Studies for Lost Canyons Park in the amount of $34,120.00; Director O’Brien seconded the motion. Motion carried with a unanimous vote.

IX. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS OF NOTE:

None.

X. REPORTS BY BOARD MEMBERS:

Director Cavanaugh did not have any items to report on since the Budget Workshop.

Director Freeman attended the Employee Appreciation function and thought it was great fun.

Vice Chair O’Brien did not have any items to report.

Director Johnson did not have any items to report.

Chair Hostetler attended the Employee Appreciation function along with Director Freeman. They thanked the Director of Administration and the other employees who worked on the event, and said they did an outstanding job.

XI. REPORT BY DISTRICT MANAGER:

The District Manager and Director of Recreation attended a California State Parks Grant workshop to learn about soccer grant opportunities. He said the source is unexpended Prop. 40 funds in the amount of $16 million. They are looking for agencies to apply that have projects which will involve community engagement and expand access to youth activities, such as artificial turf or lights. The deadline to apply for the grant is November 1, 2016, and July 2017 is when the awards will be announced.

The District Manager attended the 2016 CARPD Conference.

The District Manager attended an MRCA Special Meeting and a Regular Meeting.

The District Manager attended the Employee Appreciation picnic.
The Golf Course Manager invited the Board to attend the City Championship being held at the Simi Hills Golf Course over the following weekend, and noted that the awards presentations will take place on Sunday afternoon. He also provided some information about the closure of the Lost Canyons Golf Course, and then gave an update on the remodeling of the golf shop at Sinaloa Golf Course.

The Chair called a Closed Session at 7:15 p.m.

The Chair reconvened the meeting at 8:16 p.m.

XII. CLOSED SESSION:

(A) Closed Session Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.6

Conference with Labor Negotiator:
Agency Negotiators: District Manager and Director of Administration
Employee Organization: Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District Middle Management Association

(B) Closed Session Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.6

Conference with Labor Negotiator:
Agency Negotiators: District Manager and Director of Administration
Employee Organization: Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District Employees Association ("Bargaining Unit")

(C) Closed Session Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.6

Conference with Labor Negotiator:
Agency Negotiator: District Manager and Director of Administration
Employee Organization: Unrepresented Employees

(D) Closed Session Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.8

Conference with Real Property Negotiator

Re: Land Disposition: Property Located in Ventura County at 1692 Sycamore Drive, Simi Valley, Ca

Assessor Parcel Numbers: 642-0-231-285
642-0-231-295
642-0-280-075
642-0-280-085
642-0-280-095

Agency Negotiators: District Manager, Director of Planning and Maintenance and Legal Counsel

Negotiating Parties: Area Housing Authority/USA Properties

Under Negotiation: Price and Terms of Payment
(E) Closed Session Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.8

Conference with Real Property Negotiator

Re: Land Acquisition: Property Located in Ventura County Commonly Referred to as Alamos Canyon Located West Adjacent to the Simi Valley Landfill and Recycling Center

Assessor Parcel Numbers:

615-0-150-37 615-0-150-35
615-0-150-32 (portion) 615-0-150-28
615-0-150-14 615-0-150-13
615-0-110-13 (portion) 500-0-292-26
500-0-292-25 500-0-292-24
500-0-292-23 500-0-292-18
500-0-292-17 (portion) 500-0-292-15
500-0-292-10 500-0-291-32
500-0-291-28 500-0-291-26

Which together total approximately 326 acres

Agency Negotiators: District Manager, Director of Planning and Maintenance and Legal Counsel

Negotiating Parties: The Nature Conservancy and Waste Management

Under Negotiation: Price and Terms of Payment

The Chair stated there were no reportable actions taken on Items XII. (A) through (E).

XIII. ADJOURNMENT: Director Johnson moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:22 p.m.; Vice Chair O’Brien seconded the motion. Motion carried with a unanimous vote.
RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 16, 2016
TO: Board of Directors
FROM: District Manager
SUBJECT: Public Hearing and Approval of Resolution Approving Engineer's Report, Confirming Diagram and Assessment and Ordering Levy of Assessment for Fiscal Year 2016-17

SUMMARY

On June 2, 2016, the Board set a public hearing to receive the public’s input into the annual assessment process. Notice of this public hearing has since been published which indicates that it will occur on June 16, 2016. At that time, after receiving any public comment, the Board must determine whether the public interest, convenience, and necessity require the ordering of a levy of assessment for fiscal year 2016-17. If approved as stated within the attached Engineer’s Report, the annual assessment for a single family household will be $35.22, an increase of $0.70 cents from last year.

The District’s approved Preliminary Budget for Fiscal Year 2016-17 makes the assumption the Board will approve the assessment and order the levy for fiscal year 2016-17. The two pages from the Preliminary District Operating and Capital Improvement Budget for Fiscal Year 2016-17, which reflect these anticipated assessment revenues and expenditures for both Simi Valley and Oak Park are attached. A copy of the June 2, 2016 staff report is also attached for your reference.

Together, these documents demonstrate that, in addition to ordinary course maintenance expenditures (park maintenance labor, electricity and equipment), a large percentage of next fiscal year’s assessment funds are allocated towards completion of renovations, upgrades and/or construction for after school club facilities, volleyball courts, pool amenities and walkways. The assessment revenue makes it possible for the Park District to meet higher maintenance standards for the benefit of the community.
As this is a public hearing, staff recommends the Board take the following actions with regard to this item:

1. Receive staff’s report
2. Open public hearing
3. Receive public testimony
4. Close public hearing
5. Consider for approval the attached resolution

ACTION REQUESTED

Based upon the District’s financial status, the needs, expectations and demands of the District’s residents, and the planned priority projects, staff recommends the Board approve the attached Resolution Approving Engineer’s Report, Confirming Diagram and Assessment and Ordering Levy of Assessment For Fiscal Year 2016-17.

Larry Peterson
District Manager
RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT

RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION APPROVING ENGINEER'S REPORT,
CONFIRMING DIAGRAM AND ASSESSMENT AND ORDERING LEVY OF
ASSESSMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016-17

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

WHEREAS, on November 18, 1999 by its Resolution No. 1388, 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 "Assessment 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, the purpose of the Assessment District is for the installation, maintenance and servicing of improvements to the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District, as described in the Engineer’s Report; and

WHEREAS, this Board designated SCI Consulting Group as Engineer of Work and ordered said Engineer to make and file an Engineer's Report for the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Maintenance and Improvement District; and

WHEREAS, the report was duly made and filed with the Board and duly considered by this Board and found to be sufficient in every particular, whereupon it was determined that the report should stand as the Engineer’s Report for all subsequent proceedings; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the aforesaid resolution, that June 16, 2016 at the hour of 6:30 p.m. at the Board Room in the Sycamore Drive Community Center, located at 1692 Sycamore Drive, Simi Valley, California 93065, were appointed as the time and place for a hearing by this Board on the question of the levy of the assessment, notice of which hearing was given as required by law; and

WHEREAS, at the appointed time and place the hearing was duly and regularly held, and all persons interested and desiring to be heard were given an opportunity to be heard, and all matters and things pertaining to the levy were fully heard and considered by this Board, and all oral statements and all written protests or communications were duly heard, considered and overruled, and this Board thereby acquired jurisdiction to order the levy and the confirmation of the diagram and assessment prepared by and made a part of the Engineer's Report to pay the costs and expenses thereof;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS FOUND, DETERMINED AND ORDERED, that:
1. The public interest, convenience and necessity require that the levy be made.

2. The Parks, Recreation and Open Space Maintenance and Improvement District benefited by the improvements and assessed to pay the costs and expenses thereof, and the exterior boundaries thereof, are as shown by a map thereof filed in the office of the Board, which map is made a part hereof by reference thereto.

3. The assessment is levied without regard to property valuation.

4. The Engineer's Report as a whole and each part thereof, to wit:

(a) the Engineer's estimate of the itemized and total costs and expenses of maintaining the improvements and of the incidental expenses in connection therewith;

(b) the diagram showing the assessment district, plans and specifications for the improvements to be maintained and the boundaries and dimensions of the respective lots and parcels of land within the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Maintenance and Improvement District; and

(c) the assessment of the total amount of the cost and expenses of the proposed maintenance of the improvements upon the several lots and parcels of land in the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Maintenance and Improvement District in proportion to the estimated special benefits to be received by such lots and parcels, respectively, from the maintenance, and of the expenses incidental thereto;

are finally approved and confirmed.

5. Final adoption and approval of the Engineer's Report as a whole, and of the plans and specifications, estimate of the costs and expenses, the diagram and the assessment, as contained in the report as hereinabove determined and ordered, is intended to and shall refer and apply to the report, or any portion thereof as amended, modified, or revised or corrected by, or pursuant to and in accordance with, any resolution or order, if any, heretofore duly adopted or made by this Board.

6. The assessment to pay the costs and expenses of the maintenance of the improvements for fiscal year 2016-17 is hereby levied.

7. Based on the oral and documentary evidence, including the Engineer's Report, offered and received at the hearing, this Board expressly finds and determines (a) that each of the several lots and parcels of land will be specially benefited by the maintenance of the improvements at least in the amount if not more than the amount, of the assessment apportioned against the lots and parcels of land,
respectively, and (b) that there is substantial evidence to support, and the weight of the evidence preponderates in favor of, the aforesaid finding and determination as to special benefits.

8. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution, but in no event later than the second Monday in August following such adoption, the Board shall file a certified copy of the diagram and assessment and a certified copy of this resolution with the Auditor of the County of Ventura. Upon such filing, the County Auditor shall enter on the County assessment roll opposite each lot or parcel of land the amount of assessment thereupon as shown in the assessment. The assessments shall be collected at the same time and in the same manner as County taxes are collected and all laws providing for the collection and enforcement of County taxes shall apply to the collection and enforcement of the assessments. After collection by the County, the net amount of the assessments, after deduction of any compensation due the County for collection, shall be paid to the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Maintenance and Improvement District of the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District.

9. The moneys representing assessments collected by the County, shall be deposited in the District Treasury to the credit of the improvement funds for the greater Simi Valley and Oak Park areas previously established under the distinctive designation of the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Maintenance and Improvement District. Moneys in the improvement funds shall be expended only for the maintenance, servicing, construction or installation of the improvements.

10. This special assessment is in conformance with Proposition 218 and the special district will defend or hold harmless the County of Ventura from any challenges of the assessments.

ADOPTED as a resolution of the Board of the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District at an adjourned meeting duly held on the 16th day of June 2016 by the following called vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTENTIONS:

Chair of the Board of Directors
Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District
ENGINEER'S REPORT
PREPARED FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016-17
RANCHO SIMI RECREATION & PARK DISTRICT
PARKS, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE MAINTENANCE AND IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

ENGINEER'S REPORT

FY 2016-17

PURSUANT TO THE LANDSCAPING AND LIGHTING ACT OF 1972
AND ARTICLE XIIIID OF THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION

ENGINEER OF WORK:
SCIConsultingGroup
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FAIRFIELD, CALIFORNIA 94534
PHONE 707.430.4300
FAX 707.430.4319
WWW.SCI-CG.COM
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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 6,012 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 Doubletree 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 increase 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 20, 2014.

This Engineer's Report ("Report") was prepared to establish the budget for the improvements and services that would be funded by the proposed 2014-15 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 16, 2016. At this hearing, the Board would consider approval of a resolution confirming the assessments for fiscal year 2016-17. 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 2016-17.

**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 XIIIC and XIIIID 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

**DAHMS 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, Dahms became good law and binding precedent for assessments. In Dahms 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 §22526).

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.
FISCAL YEAR 2016-17 ESTIMATE OF COST AND BUDGET

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 2016-17

The following budget lists the improvement projects and park maintenance and security services that would be funded by the Improvement District in Fiscal Year 2016-17.
### 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 2016-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance, July 2016 - Simi Valley &amp; Oak Park</td>
<td>$153,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Installation, Maintenance &amp; Servicing Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simi Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alamos Canyon Acquisition</td>
<td>$2,922,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After School Program Facility</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Simi Greenway - Phase 2</td>
<td>$970,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Simi Greenway - Phase 3</td>
<td>$66,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berylwood Skate Plaza</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chumash Park</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 1 Trail Maintenance (Arroyo and Medea Cr.)</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardian Building Acquisition</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardian Building Buildout</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Update - Initial Study</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Canyons Bike Park</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knolls Station Renovation</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Madera Community Park Volleyball Courts</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCP - Lagoon Renovation</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCP - Park Sign Replacement</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCP Pool Picnic Pads and Shelters</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCP Soccer Field Lighting Design and Permitting</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCP - Tennis Court Lighting Replacement</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSCP - Roof Replacement Project</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Efficiency</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runkle Park Construction</td>
<td>$82,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straithearn Park - Colony House</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walmart Grant</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkway Renovations - Various</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Equipment</strong></td>
<td>$300,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and Operation of Parks and Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>$7,740,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Simi Valley</strong></td>
<td>$15,844,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medea Creek Repair</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Park Community Center Bollard Lights</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and Operation of Parks and Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>$1,227,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Equipment</strong></td>
<td>$67,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Oak Park</strong></td>
<td>$1,254,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Installation, Maintenance and Servicing</strong></td>
<td>$17,069,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Administration and County Collection Costs</td>
<td>$29,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Uncollectable Assessments</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Administration</strong></td>
<td>$84,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals for Installation, Maintenance, Servicing and Administration</strong></td>
<td>$17,153,724</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Less:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Contribution for General and Special Benefits¹</td>
<td>($15,250,865)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance, July 2016 - Simi Valley &amp; Oak Park</td>
<td>($153,798)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to/from Reserve Fund - Simi Valley</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to/from Reserve Fund - Oak Park</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($15,394,663)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Cost of Installation, Maintenance, Servicing and Administration**

$1,789,062

---

### Budget Allocation to Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Assessment Budget</th>
<th>$1,789,062</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Single Family Equivalent Benefit Units - Zone A | 46,173.05 | 46,173.05 |
| Single Family Equivalent Benefit Units - Zone B | 4,610.14  | 4,610.14  |
| Single Family Equivalent Benefit Units - Zone C | 54.25     | 13.56     |
| Single Family Equivalent Benefit Units - Zone D | 0.00      | 0.00      |

| SFE Units | 50,837.44 | 50,796.75 |

**Assessment per Single Family Equivalent Unit**

$35.22

---

### Notes to Estimate of Cost:

1. 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 $17,183,724 the District must contribute at least $4,295,931 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

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:

"The 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(i) & 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 benefiting 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 X111C 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. SCCOSA 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 or 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:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46,920 Parcels in the Improvement District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% Relative benefit compared to property within the Improvement District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation**

\[
\text{General benefit to property outside the Improvement District} = \frac{11,739}{(46,920+11,739)} \times 0.5 = 10.0\% 
\]

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.

![General Benefit Calculation](image)

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 $17,183,724. Of this total budget amount, the Park District will contribute $15,250,865 from sources other than the assessments for park maintenance and improvement. This contribution by the Park District equates to approximately 89% 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.

**Figure 2 – Residential Assessment Factors**

<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 Land Use</th>
<th>Average Employees Per Acre</th>
<th>SFE Units per 1/5 Acre *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 are applies by the 1/5th acre of land area of 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.
ASSOCIATION

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 2016-17 is generally as follows:

Figure 4 – Summary Cost Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2016-17 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park Maintenance</td>
<td>$8,968,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Improvements and New Parks</td>
<td>$8,130,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidental Expenses</td>
<td>$84,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BUDGET</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,183,724</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park District Contribution for General and Special Benefits</td>
<td>($15,250,865)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance, July 2014 - Simi Valley &amp; Oak Park</td>
<td>($153,798)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to / (from) Reserve Fund - Simi Valley &amp; Oak Park</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NET AMOUNT TO ASSESSMENTS** $1,779,062

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 and 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 increase tied to the increase, if any, in 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 2014 to December 2015 was 2.03% and the Unused CPI carried forward from the previous fiscal year is 0.00%. Therefore, the maximum authorized assessment rate for fiscal year 2016-17 is increased by 2.03% which equates to $35.22 per single family equivalent benefit unit. The estimate of cost and budget in this Engineer's Report proposes assessments for fiscal year 2016-17 at the rate of $35.22, which is equal to 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 2016-17. 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 2016-17 for each parcel or lot of land within the Improvement District.

Dated: May 31, 2016

[Signature]
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 – 2016-17 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.
SIMI VALLEY AND OAK PARK ASSESSMENT
FUNDS FROM DISTRICT’S PROPOSED PRELIMINARY
BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016-17
## SUMMARY OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES
OAK PARK ASSESSMENT FUND NO. 30-0-0000-2

### REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Actual 2014-15</th>
<th>Approved 2015-16</th>
<th>Recommended 2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Revenue</td>
<td>151,855</td>
<td>154,844</td>
<td>154,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Year</td>
<td>150,429</td>
<td>150,394</td>
<td>150,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Year</td>
<td>1,286</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>3,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Fund Transfer</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryover (Prior Year)</td>
<td>67,252</td>
<td>85,969</td>
<td>78,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>219,107</td>
<td>240,813</td>
<td>233,642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Employee Benefits</td>
<td>66,614</td>
<td>73,083</td>
<td>68,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services, Supplies and Capital Equipment</td>
<td>53,294</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>137,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Maintenance - Contract Services 6310</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>67,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds Maintenance Contract Services</td>
<td>52,922</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies - Clothing and Safety</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities - Water</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Outlay</strong></td>
<td>13,230</td>
<td>77,730</td>
<td>27,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagleview Bridge</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mae Boyar Park Walkway</td>
<td>8,407</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mae Boyar Park Oleander Replacement</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6,706</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medea Creek Repair</td>
<td>4,823</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Park Community Center Bollard Lights</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>31,024</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>133,138</td>
<td>240,813</td>
<td>233,642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SUMMARY OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES
**SIMI VALLEY ASSESSMENT FUND NO. 30-0-0000-1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUES</th>
<th>Actual 2014-15</th>
<th>Approved 2015-16</th>
<th>Recommended 2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Year</td>
<td>1,547,771</td>
<td>1,586,953</td>
<td>1,605,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>1,526,185</td>
<td>1,558,253</td>
<td>1,576,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Year</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>20,776</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Fund Transfer</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carryover (Prior Year)</strong></td>
<td>(164,840)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund 50 - RTCP Pavilion</td>
<td>29,081</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund 90 - Arroyo Simi Trail</td>
<td>(193,921)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund 90 - Challenger Field</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>1,803,630</td>
<td>2,171,111</td>
<td>1,680,341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salaries and Employee Benefits</strong></td>
<td>695,310</td>
<td>857,724</td>
<td>964,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and Operations</td>
<td>695,310</td>
<td>857,724</td>
<td>964,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services, Supplies and Capital Equipment</strong></td>
<td>420,800</td>
<td>346,387</td>
<td>500,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing &amp; Safety Supplies</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds Maintenance</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities - Electricity</td>
<td>333,315</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles/Capital Equipment</td>
<td>87,310</td>
<td>246,387</td>
<td>300,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Outlay</strong></td>
<td>103,362</td>
<td>967,000</td>
<td>215,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After School Program Facility Upgrade</td>
<td>66,814</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenger Field at Apollo*</td>
<td>(42,996)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc Golf Course</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardian Building Buildout</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayfair Park Bridge Renovation</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Madera Community Park Volleyball Courts</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCP Pool Picnic Pads and Shelters</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCP Park Pool Resurfacing</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>206,000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Tapo Community Park Pavilion</td>
<td>77,824</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runkle Park</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>306,000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboard Plaza</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkway Renovations - Various</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website/Rec Software Upgrades</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>1,219,472</td>
<td>2,171,111</td>
<td>1,680,341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes CDBG 12-13 of $11,250, CDBG 13-14 of $6,250, and Amanda McPherson Foundation of $20,418.
PREVIOUS STAFF REPORT TO BOARD EXPLAINING ASSESSMENT AND ENGINEER'S REPORT
RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 2, 2016

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: District Manager

SUBJECT: Approval of Resolution of the Intention to Levy Assessments For
Fiscal Year 2016-17, 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 2016-17.

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 2016-17, the assessment for a single family household will be $35.22, representing an increase of $0.70 (or 2.03%) per year from last’s year assessment amount of $34.52 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 4, 2016, 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 ERAF and redevelopment diversions (now totaling over $42 million). 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 $84,398 has been diverted to that cause alone. And fiscal years 2004-05 and 2005-06 marked the District's additional 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. The District's financial health is also affected by 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 occurred at the same time that investment returns declined substantially and at the same time that prices for water, contracted services, part-time wages and benefits, and other items have increased, placing additional strain on 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 demands of an expanding community population. Assessment receipts have been allocated between both maintenance and capital expenditures. The maintenance allocations now fund nine (9) full-time maintenance positions as well as part-time park ranger positions, a portion of the District's electricity costs, and various supplies, equipment and capital purchases and improvements.

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.
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 16, 2016, 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 2016-17.

[Signature]

Larry Peterson
District Manager
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RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 16, 2016
TO: Board of Directors
FROM: Director of Recreation
SUBJECT: Approval of Agreement Providing Authority for Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District to Utilize the School Bus Services of Simi Valley Unified School District

SUMMARY

The Park District requires bus services to transport participants in its programs from one location to another. The Park District has a long history of utilizing the bus services of the Simi Valley Unified School District. Their drivers and buses have a trustworthy reputation and their rental rates have compared favorably to the competition. The attached agreement indicates the terms of use; which staff believes are reasonable. Therefore, staff recommends the Board approve the attached agreement and authorize the General Manager to execute the agreement. The agreement was presented and approved at the June 7, 2016 Simi Valley Board of Education Meeting and allows the Park District to continue utilizing the bus services of Simi Valley Unified School District through June 30, 2021.

BOARD ACTION REQUESTED

Staff recommends the Board approve the attached agreement providing authority for Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District to continue utilizing the school bus Services of Simi Valley Unified School District.

Doug Gale
Director of Recreation
Title: Approval of Agreement No. A17.025 – Renewal of Five-Year Bus Agreement Between Simi Valley Unified School District and Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District

Business & Facilities
Consent #17

Prepared by: Ron Todo, Associate Superintendent
Business & Facilities

June 7, 2016
Page 1 of 1

Background Information

The five-year renewal of the bus agreement between Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District and the Simi Valley Unified School District will expire on June 30, 2016. The agreement authorizes the Park District to use School District buses or community recreation purposes, all expenses reimbursed, such use not to conflict with School District programs. The Park District agrees to pay the School District:

1. Driver’s salary plus 20% overhead expenses (retirement, social security, workman’s compensation, etc.).

2. Average per mile operational costs as determined on the most current State Transportation Report available.

3. Depreciation cost of 10% of the operational cost.

4. Seven cents per mile insurance charge.

The Park District is requesting a five-year renewal of this agreement with the same terms and conditions as in the previous agreement. Staff recommends the Board of Education approve the five-year agreement with the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District for use of School District buses.

Fiscal Analysis

Invoice/Payment Process

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Board of Education approve Agreement No. A17.025, Renewal of Five-Year Bus Agreement between Simi Valley Unified School District and Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District.

On motion # by Trustee ______________, seconded by Trustee ______________ and carried by a roll-call vote of ______________, the Board of Education approved Agreement No. A17.025, Renewal of Five-Year Bus Agreement between Simi Valley Unified School District and Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District.

Ayes: ______________ Noes: ______________ Absent: ______________ Abstained: ______________
BUS AGREEMENT WITH
RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT

THIS AGREEMENT is hereby made and entered into on the first day of July 2016, between the SIMI VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, a public school district of Ventura County, California, hereinafter referred to as the School District, and the RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT, a public district of Ventura County, California, hereinafter referred to as the Recreation District.

It has been determined by the Board of Directors of the Recreation District and the Governing Board of the School District that in order to promote and preserve the health and general welfare of the people of Simi Valley, it is desirable to provide programs of community recreation. In order to carry out these programs of community recreation, it is necessary for the Recreation District to have adequate transportation facilities available.

The School District has buses available which from time to time are not in use for school purposes and is desirous of assisting the Recreation District in carrying out its community recreation program. Therefore, for the above stated reasons and under the authority of Education Code 39835, the Recreation District and the School District do hereby enter into the following agreement:

1. The School District agrees to furnish the Recreation District the use of School District buses for community recreation purposes during the term of this Agreement.

2. The Recreation District agrees to pay the School District:

   A. Driver’s salary plus twenty percent (20%) overhead expenses, (Retirement, Social Security, Workman’s Compensation, etc.).

   B. Average per mile operational costs as determined on the most current State Transportation Report available.

   C. Depreciation cost of ten percent (10%) of the operational cost.

   D. Seven cents ($.07) per mile insurance charge.

3. Use of these buses by the Recreation District shall be limited to those times when (a) buses are not needed by the School District; (b) a driver and one backup crew is available during the entire trip, for this reason holiday usage should be encouraged; and (c) usage will not jeopardize effective functioning of the pupil transportation services.

4. The buses shall be driven by the regularly employed and licensed School District bus drivers. The driver’s salary will be paid by the School District.
5. The Recreation and Park District will provide the following:
   
   A. Lodging needs of the bus driver on overnight trips.
   
   B. All fees required in connection with the trip.

6. The buses shall be maintained and operated in conformance with the provisions of the California Education Code, Title V and XIII of the California Administrative Code, the California Vehicle Code, and the District Rules and Regulations for Pupil Transportation.

7. This Agreement shall be in effect from July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2021. The Agreement may be terminated by either party by giving the other party ninety (90) days written notice.

8. The route to be followed including places where the bus will stop on the trip shall be agreed upon by the Recreation District and the School District prior to use of the bus by the Recreation District.

9. The School District shall keep in force a liability insurance policy or appropriate self insurance in the amount of $1,000,000 combined single limit for the death or injury to person or persons and property damage to protect both the School District and the Recreation District.

   The School District hereby agrees to indemnify and hold the Recreation District, its officers and employees harmless from all claims, costs, liabilities, including attorney’s fees arising out of the use of the school buses by the Recreation District or its guests, patrons, agents, employees, licensees, contractors, passengers and/or invitees and which are the result of negligence and/or misconduct of the School District or its officers, agents, employees, licensees, and contractors or which are the result of maintenance and operation of the school buses.

10. The Recreation District shall keep in force a liability insurance policy or appropriate self insurance in the amount of $1,000,000 combined single limit for the death or injury to person or persons and property damage to protect both the School District and the Recreation District.

   The Recreation District hereby agrees to indemnify and hold the School District, its officers and employees harmless from all claims, costs, liabilities, including attorney’s fees arising out of the use of school buses by the Recreation District or its guests, patrons, agents, employees, licensees, contractors, passengers and/or invitees and which are the result of the negligence and/or misconduct of the Recreation District or its guests, patrons, agents, employees, licensees, contractors, passengers and/or invitees.

11. When the Recreation District wishes to conduct a trip with the use of the buses of the School District, it must execute a “Transportation Request and Driver Report” form. Each trip must be made out on a separate form. This trip request will not be considered if the form has not been completed to the fullest extent. A complete description of the destination should include such information as the exact location and the complete address. Additional helpful information would be the parking facilities, time schedule, etc. It is also necessary in accordance with the terms of this contract to submit a pre-planned route in addition to this regular form.
The Recreation District will submit the “Transportation Request and Driver Report” form to the Director of Student Safety & Transit or his representative at least ten (10) school days in advance of the trip date. Final trip approval will be indicated by the return of a copy carrying signatures of the Director of Student Safety & Transit or his representative to the Recreation District. No commitments will be made to any individual or group prior to receipt of the final trip approval.

SIMI VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

By: ________________________________ Date: __________________________

Ron Todo
Associate Superintendent
Business & Facilities

RANCHO SIMI RECREATION & PARK DISTRICT

By: ________________________________ Date: __________________________

Larry Peterson
General Manager
RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

DATE:       June 16, 2016

TO:         Board of Directors

FROM:       District Manager

SUBJECT:    Approval and Adoption of Full-time Employee Classification Schedule by Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District Board of Directors

SUMMARY

The California Code of Regulations at Section 570.5(a)(1), among other things, requires the governing body to approve and adopt employee pay schedules. Recently approved full-time positions necessitate amendments to the Full-time Employee Classification schedule. The Full-time Employee Classification schedule has been amended to reflect the addition of the following full-time positions; Recreation Specialist, Historical Park Specialist, Mechanic – Golf Courses, and Recreation Assistant. The amended Classification schedule is attached for your approval and adoption and will be placed onto the District’s website thereafter. The effective date is indicated as June 16, 2016.

BOARD ACTION REQUESTED

Staff recommends the Board approve and adopt the Full-time Employee Classification Schedule.

[Signature]
Larry Peterson
District Manager
## FULL-TIME EMPLOYEE CLASSIFICATIONS AND MONTHLY PAY RANGES

Approved and Adopted by the Board of Directors on June 16, 2016

Effective June 16, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Degree Req'd?</th>
<th>Exempt/Hourly</th>
<th>Bargaining Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>Human Resources Specialist</td>
<td>2,847</td>
<td>3,667</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>None - confidential position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>Accounting Specialist</td>
<td>2,847</td>
<td>3,667</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>Mechanic - Golf Courses</td>
<td>3,461</td>
<td>4,459</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>Assistant Golf Course Superintendent</td>
<td>3,636</td>
<td>4,683</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>Park Ranger</td>
<td>3,914</td>
<td>5,042</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>4,012</td>
<td>5,168</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>Marketing &amp; Operations Assistant - SHGC</td>
<td>4,012</td>
<td>5,168</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>Senior Park Ranger</td>
<td>4,533</td>
<td>5,538</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>RSRPD Middle Management Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>Computer Support Specialist</td>
<td>5,003</td>
<td>6,444</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>RSRPD Middle Management Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>Executive Assistant</td>
<td>5,003</td>
<td>6,444</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>None - confidential position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>Sr. Maintenance Supv. - SHGC</td>
<td>5,516</td>
<td>7,105</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>RSRPD Middle Management Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>Golf Course Manager/Head Golf Pro.</td>
<td>6,239</td>
<td>8,037</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>RSRPD Middle Management Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director of Administration</td>
<td>8,464</td>
<td>10,364</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District Manager</td>
<td>12,944</td>
<td>15,851</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANNING AND MAINTENANCE DEPARTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Degree Req'd?</th>
<th>Exempt/Hourly</th>
<th>Bargaining Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>Historical Park Specialist</td>
<td>2,847</td>
<td>3,667</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>Groundskeeper I</td>
<td>3,379</td>
<td>4,352</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>Buildings Maintenance Worker I</td>
<td>3,461</td>
<td>4,459</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>Weekend Lead Person</td>
<td>3,636</td>
<td>4,683</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>Groundskeeper II</td>
<td>3,636</td>
<td>4,683</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>Buildings Maintenance Worker II</td>
<td>3,727</td>
<td>4,801</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>Administrative Secretary</td>
<td>4,012</td>
<td>5,168</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>Crew Leader - Buildings Maintenance</td>
<td>4,111</td>
<td>5,295</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>Crew Leader - Irrigation</td>
<td>4,318</td>
<td>5,562</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>Crew Leader - Heavy Equip. Op.</td>
<td>4,318</td>
<td>5,562</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>Buildings Specialist - Carpenter</td>
<td>4,318</td>
<td>5,562</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>Buildings Specialist - Electrician</td>
<td>4,318</td>
<td>5,562</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>Buildings Specialist - Mechanic</td>
<td>4,318</td>
<td>5,562</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>Buildings Specialist - Painter</td>
<td>4,318</td>
<td>5,562</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>Buildings Specialist - Pools &amp; Water Features</td>
<td>4,318</td>
<td>5,562</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>Buildings Specialist - Utility</td>
<td>4,318</td>
<td>5,562</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>Sr. Maintenance Supv. - Grounds</td>
<td>5,516</td>
<td>7,105</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>RSRPD Middle Management Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>Sr. Maintenance Supv. - Bidgs.</td>
<td>5,516</td>
<td>7,105</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>RSRPD Middle Management Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>Landscape Designer</td>
<td>5,656</td>
<td>7,286</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>RSRPD Middle Management Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>Senior Management Analyst</td>
<td>5,799</td>
<td>7,470</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>RSRPD Middle Management Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director of Planning and Maintenance</td>
<td>8,464</td>
<td>10,364</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RECREATION DEPARTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Degree Req'd?</th>
<th>Exempt/Hourly</th>
<th>Bargaining Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>Recreation Assistant</td>
<td>3,461</td>
<td>4,459</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>Building Maintenance Worker I</td>
<td>3,461</td>
<td>4,459</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>Building Maintenance Worker II</td>
<td>3,727</td>
<td>4,801</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>Customer Service Representative</td>
<td>3,727</td>
<td>4,801</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>Recreation Specialist</td>
<td>3,727</td>
<td>4,801</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>Administrative Secretary</td>
<td>4,012</td>
<td>5,168</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>Rancho Simi Employee's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>Recreation Coordinator</td>
<td>4,533</td>
<td>5,839</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>RSRPD Middle Management Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>Recreation Supervisor II</td>
<td>5,799</td>
<td>7,470</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>RSRPD Middle Management Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director of Recreation</td>
<td>8,855</td>
<td>10,843</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Printed on: 06/09/16
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RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 16, 2016

TO: District Manager

FROM: Director of Planning and Maintenance

SUBJECT: Authorization to Solicit Bids for the Arroyo Simi Greenway Phase 2 Construction Project

Background and Overview:

The Park District’s Arroyo Simi Greenway Phase 1 and Phase 2 revitalization projects arose from a visioning study that was conducted as a result of a partnership between the City of Simi Valley, Ventura County Watershed Protection District, Simi Valley Unified School District, and Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District. This visioning study was used as the basis for the creation of the Arroyo Simi Greenway Specific Plan.

The Arroyo Simi Greenway Specific Plan identifies potential goals and objectives for the revitalization of the Arroyo Simi Flood Control Channel, including the promotion of healthy recreational opportunities and transportation alternatives other than automobiles. Some of the major goals include: improving air and water quality, enhancing riparian habitat, improving recreational access and uses, providing additional rest and picnic areas, and installation of educational interpretive exhibits.

Construction began on Phase 1 in December 2013, and was completed in June 2014. Funding to construct the Phase 1 improvements was primarily paid for through a grant awarded to the Park District from the California Natural Resources Agency in the amount of $802,275.

Phase 1 improvements included the construction of two miles of new asphalt bikeway along the southerly side of the Arroyo Simi Flood Control Channel between Sequoia Avenue and Erringer Road, construction of seventeen (17) new easy-to-access trail entries, installation of directional signage, benches, bicycle racks, educational interpretive exhibits, and other amenities.

The Park District was also awarded a second grant for $885,642 in California River Parkways Grant funds to complete Phase 2 of the Greenway project. This second phase includes the construction of two new asphalt bikeway sections totaling 1.67 miles. One section extends from Erringer Road westward to First Street (1.04 miles) and the second section extends from Madera Road westward to Stargaze Place (0.63 miles). The project also includes the construction of three new trail entries (two on the west side of Madera Road and one at Stargaze Place) and three new signalized trail/street crossings parallel to the Arroyo Simi Channel at Royal Avenue, Sycamore Drive, and Erringer Road. In addition, identification/directional signage, park benches, trash receptacles, and educational interpretive exhibits will be installed along the newly paved trail sections.
At its meeting of April 2, 2105, the Board of Directors approved an agreement with Stantec Consulting Services (formally Penfield and Smith) for the preparation of the construction plans and specifications for the Phase 2 portion of the Arroyo Simi Greenway Project. The construction plans and specifications are now complete and have been submitted to the City of Simi Valley and Ventura County Watershed Protection District for plan check review. In May 2016 staff received notification that the construction plans and specifications for the project were deemed acceptable by both agencies for construction.

Adequate funds to construct this project have been earmarked in the District’s Preliminary FY 2016-17 Budget under the Grants Fund account (Fund 90) in the amount of $970,000. This budget allocation is a combination of the California Rivers Parkways Grant received from the California Natural Resources Agency in the amount of $886,642 plus a Park District contribution of $83,358. In addition, the City of Simi Valley will be contributing $150,000 towards the project for the construction of the three signalized trail/street crossings at Erringer Road, Sycamore Drive and Royal Avenue.

**Board Action Requested:**

That the Board authorize the Solicitation of Bids for the Arroyo Simi Greenway Phase Two Construction Project.


Wayne Nakaoka
Director of Planning & Maintenance
THIS PAGE IS BLANK
RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 16, 2016

TO: District Manager

FROM: Director of Planning and Maintenance

SUBJECT: Resolution Authorizing Execution of a Fuel Modification Zone Easement and Maintenance Agreement Granting to Pinehurst, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company, a Non-Exclusive Easement In, On, Over, Under, Along and Across a Portion of Property Known as Hummingbird Ranch Open Space

Background and Overview:

As part of the current development conditions for PD-S-1030 for the residential development located in the northeast corner of the 118 Freeway and Kuehner Drive, Park District staff conditioned the developer (Pinehurst, LLC) to accept and maintain those portions of the one hundred foot fuel modification zone and storm drain improvements which reside within the open space along the easterly boundary of the project. In addition, staff conditioned the developer to prepare a “Fuel Modification Zone Maintenance and Monitoring Plan” to define the maintenance responsibilities for which the developer and future homeowners association must abide by.

At the time of recordation of the original tract map for the project (TT 2908, circa 1992), the Park District accepted a 41.48 acre open space parcel from the developer with a reservation that minor storm water improvements and the project’s fuel modification zone may overlap and encroach within the first 100’ along the westerly boundary of the open space parcel. This reservation also indicated that the developer would be responsible to convey any easement established for the fuel modification zone and the maintenance thereof to the future homeowners association.

At this time Pinehurst, LLC, is requesting that the Park District accept and execute the attached “Fuel Modification Zone Easement and Maintenance Agreement”.

The Resolution and Easement have been reviewed by the District’s legal counsel.

Fiscal Impact:

Except for infrequent maintenance monitoring and compliance inspections by Park District staff, there is no fiscal impact to the Park District associated with the execution of this easement and maintenance agreement.
**Board Action Requested:**

That the Board approve the Resolution Authorizing Execution of a Fuel Modification Zone Easement and Maintenance Agreement Granting to Pinehurst, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company, a Non-Exclusive Easement In, On, Over, Under, Along and Across a Portion of Property Known as Hummingbird Ranch Open Space.

Wayne Nakaoka  
Director of Planning and Maintenance
RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT

RESOLUTION NO. _________

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A FUEL MODIFICATION EASEMENT AND MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT GRANTING TO PINEHURST, LLC, A CALIFORNIA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, A NON-EXCLUSIVE EASEMENT IN, ON, OVER, UNDER, ALONG AND ACROSS A PORTION OF PROPERTY KNOWN AS HUMMINGBIRD RANCH OPEN SPACE

WHEREAS, the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District is holder of fee title to certain real property commonly referred to as the Hummingbird Ranch Open Space in the City of Simi Valley, County of Ventura, State of California; and

WHEREAS, it has been determined that certain non-exclusive easement rights in, on over, under, along and across a certain portion of said property are required by Pinehurst, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company, to permit ingress, egress, grading, construction, installation, maintenance, repair, replacement, landscaping and other related improvements, and for drainage, irrigation and other related purposes; and

WHEREAS, a Fuel Modification Zone Easement and Maintenance Agreement conveying to Pinehurst, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company, certain non-exclusive easement rights in, on, over, under, along and across a certain portion of the property has been presented to the Board of Directors of the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District, and said Fuel Modification Zone Easement and Maintenance Agreement has been reviewed by District staff and legal counsel and found to be in proper form.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Fuel Modification Zone Easement and Maintenance Agreement presented to the Board of Directors conveying to Pinehurst, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company, certain non-exclusive easement rights to permit ingress, egress, grading, construction, installation, maintenance, repair, replacement, landscaping and other related improvements, and for drainage, irrigation and other related purposes in, on, over, under, along and across a certain portion of the Hummingbird Ranch Open Space, the legal description of which is specifically set forth in said Easement and Maintenance Agreement, is hereby approved, and the Chair of the Board of Directors for the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District is hereby authorized and directed to execute the same on behalf of the District and deliver said Easement and Maintenance Agreement to Pinehurst, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company.

The foregoing Resolution was approved by the Board of Directors of the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District at a regular meeting held on June 16, 2016, at 1692 Sycamore Drive, Simi Valley, California, on a motion by

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Chair, Board of Directors
Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District
GRANT OF EASEMENT DEED

This is to certify that the interest in real property conveyed by the foregoing Fuel Modification Zone Easement and Maintenance Agreement dated ______________, from Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District, a public entity, to Pinehurst, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company, is hereby granted by order of the Board of Directors on June 16, 2016, and the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District consents to recordation thereof in the Official Records of Ventura County, California.

DATED: ________________  Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District

By: ____________________________  Larry Peterson, District Manager
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF ________________________

On ________________________ before me, ________________________ (insert name and title of the officer)

personally appeared ________________________, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

Witness my hand and official seal.

Signature ________________________ (seal)

Signature of Notary Public
RECORDING REQUESTED BY
AND WHEN RECORDED MAIL TO:

PINEHURST, LLC
1000 Dove Street, Suite 300
Newport Beach, California 92660
Attention: Jennifer Chung

APN:

(Space above this line reserved for Recorder's use)

The undersigned grantor declares:

DOCUMENTARY TRANSFER TAX IS $0.00. This is a conveyance of an easement, and the consideration and value is less than $100.00. Rev. & Tax Code § 11911

FUEL MODIFICATION ZONE EASEMENT AND MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT

This FUEL MODIFICATION ZONE EASEMENT AND MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT (the “Agreement”) is made as of this _____ day of ____________ 2016 (“Effective Date”) by and between RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT (“Grantor”) and PINEHURST, LLC, a California limited liability company (“Grantee”) (collectively, the “Parties” and individually, a “Party”), with reference to the following facts:

RECITALS

A. Grantor is the owner of that certain real property located in the City of Simi Valley (“City”), County of Ventura (“County”), State of California, as more particularly described in Exhibit C attached hereto (the “Grantor Property”).

B. Grantee is the record owner of certain real property located in the City of Simi Valley, County of Ventura, State of California, as more particularly described in Exhibit D attached hereto (the “Grantee Property”), which is located adjacent to the Grantor Property.

C. In connection with its development of the Grantee Property as a residential subdivision (the “Grantee Project”), Grantee is required to maintain a 100-foot-wide fuel modification zone on a portion of the Grantor Property that is adjacent to the Grantee Property. (The Grantor Property and Grantee Property are sometimes referred to herein collectively as the “Properties.”)

D. Grantor has agreed to grant to Grantee a fuel modification zone easement for weed abatement and maintenance of storm drain facilities over the Grantor Property, all as more fully described herein.
AGREEMENT

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants and conditions contained herein and other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged, Grantor and Grantee hereby agree as follows:

1. Incorporation of Recitals and Exhibits. The above Recitals and the attached Exhibits A through F, inclusive, are incorporated by this reference and made part of this Agreement.

2. Grant of Easement. Grantor hereby grants to Grantee and its successors and assigns (for the benefit of themselves and each of their respective agents, employees, tenants, sub-tenants, contractors, sub-contractors, invitees, licensees, guests, visitors, and servants (collectively, the “Grantee Parties”), an irrevocable, nonexclusive, permanent easement (the “FMZ Easement”) in, on, over, under, along and across that portion of the Grantor Property more particularly described on Exhibits A and B attached hereto (the “FMZ Easement Area”) to permit ingress, egress, weed abatement, maintenance, repair and replacement of storm drain facilities and other related purposes as required by the conditions of approval for the Grantee Project. Grantee, its successors and assigns shall, at their sole expense, (a) maintain the FMZ Easement Area, including, without limitation, the storm drain facilities therein, in accordance with the requirements of the Tract No. 2908 and Hummingbird Creek Fuel Modification Zone Maintenance and Monitoring Plan attached as Exhibit E hereto, and (b) take all measures reasonably required to identify and protect the oak tree mitigation planting identified in the Habitat Enhancement and Restoration Plan attached as Exhibit F hereto from injury or damage arising out of the use of the FMZ Easement.

3. Insurance. From and after the Effective Date, Grantee (or its successors or assigns) shall maintain at all times a commercial general liability insurance policy from a reputable insurance company with a combined single limit of liability of not less than One Million Dollars ($1,000,000) and, for so long as the same is commercially available, a Two Million Dollar ($2,000,000) aggregate limit (the “Grantee Insurance Policy”). Grantor shall be named as an additional insured on the Grantee Insurance Policy. On the date hereof and within thirty (30) days of Grantor’s written request from time to time (which request shall not be made more than once per the term of any insurance policy), Grantee (or its successors or assigns) shall provide Grantor with a certificate of insurance evidencing Grantee’s (or its successors’ or assigns’) coverage in compliance herewith. In the event the Grantee Insurance Policy is terminated or fails to satisfy the requirements of this Section, the Grantor’s insurance carrier or the Grantee (or its successors or assigns) shall provide Grantor a minimum of forty-five (45) days advance notice of same (the “Insurance Notice”). In the event Grantor receives the Insurance Notice, upon fifteen (15) days advance notice to Grantee (or its successors or assigns), Grantor shall have the right to purchase insurance coverage on Grantee’s (or its successors’ or assigns’) behalf satisfying the requirements of this Section and Grantee (or its successors or assigns) shall reimburse Grantor the amount of any commercially reasonable premiums paid by Grantor for such insurance within thirty (30) days of Grantee’s (or its successors’ or assigns’) receipt of written evidence of Grantor’s payment of such premiums plus annual interest at the rate of ten percent (10%) accruing from the date of payment of such premiums by Grantor until
the date of reimbursement by Grantee or its successors or assigns.

4. **Indemnity.** From and after the Effective Date, Grantee (or its successors or assigns) shall indemnify, defend and hold harmless Grantor and Grantor’s members, officers, directors, employees and agents (collectively, the “Grantor Parties”) from and against any and all claims, demands, suits, losses, costs, liabilities, damages and expenses arising on or after the Effective Date and arising out of, related to, or caused by the access, construction, installation, maintenance, repair, replacement and use of the FMZ Easement by Grantee or the Grantee Parties, or their respective successors and assigns.

5. **Successors and Assigns.** This Agreement shall inure to the benefit of and be binding on the Parties hereto and their respective successors and assigns. Grantee shall have the right to (a) convey the FMZ Easement (following the Effective Date) to its successor(s)-in-interest in all or any portion of the Grantee Property, and (b) assign Grantee’s rights, and delegate Grantee’s duties, under this Agreement, to a third party, including, without limitation, a homeowners association or maintenance district formed in connection with Grantee’s development of the Grantee Project, provided that such conveyance, assignment and assumption shall be pursuant to a recorded instrument. In the event that Grantee assigns this Agreement, and the assignee thereof assumes such rights and duties arising from and after the date of such assignment, Grantee shall be released from all obligations hereunder arising or accruing following the date of assignment (including, without limitation, the insurance, maintenance and indemnification obligations described above), and Grantor shall look solely to such assignee for performance hereunder from and after the date of such conveyance, assignment and assumption (but Grantee shall not be released from liability or obligations arising or accruing prior to the date of such conveyance, assignment and assumption).

6. **Miscellaneous.**

a. Grantor represents and warrants that it has the full right, power and authority to execute and deliver this Agreement.

b. This Agreement and the rights and obligations hereunder shall run with the Properties and shall be enforceable by and binding on all subsequent owners of the Properties in accordance with applicable law, including, without limitation, Section 1468 of the California Civil Code.

c. If an action is commenced to enforce or interpret any provision of this Agreement, the prevailing party as determined by a final court judgment, shall be entitled to recover from the other party such reasonable attorneys’ fees and expenses.

d. This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of California.

e. This Agreement contains all of the agreements of the Parties with regard to the matters contemplated hereby and supersedes all prior agreements, understandings and negotiations, whether written or oral, concerning the matters which are the subject of this Agreement.
Agreement. This Agreement may not be amended, changed, or modified, except by a written agreement signed by both Parties.

f. If any term, covenant, condition, or provision of this Agreement, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, shall to any extent be held by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, void, or unenforceable, the remainder of this Agreement, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, shall remain in full force and effect and shall in no way be affected, impaired, or invalidated thereby.

g. Each Party shall execute such further documents, papers and instruments and take such further action as is necessary, appropriate or helpful as the other Party may reasonably request in order to carry out the purposes and intent of this Agreement.

h. This Agreement may be executed in one or more counterparts, each of which shall be deemed to be an original and all of which taken together shall be deemed to be one and the same document. The persons executing this Agreement warrant and represent that they have the authority to execute this Agreement and represent that they have the authority to bind the Party for which they are signing to the performance of the obligations hereunder.

[SIGNATURES ON NEXT PAGE]
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Agreement has been executed as of the Effective Date.

"GRANTOR"

RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT

By: ____________________________
Name: __________________________
Its: ____________________________

"GRANTEE"

PINEHURST, LLC.
a California limited liability company

By: ____________________________
Name: __________________________
Its: ____________________________
STATE OF CALIFORNIA  )
COUNTY OF  ) ss.

On _____________, before me, _________________, Notary Public, personally appeared  
__________________, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

______________________________
Signature

My Commission Expires: _________________  This area for official notarial seal

A Notary Public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  )
COUNTY OF  ) ss.

On _____________, before me, _________________, Notary Public, personally appeared  
__________________, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

______________________________
Signature

My Commission Expires: _________________  This area for official notarial seal

FMZ Easement and Maintenance Agreement -6-
EXHIBIT A

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF THE FMZ EASEMENT AREA

REAL PROPERTY IN THE CITY OF SIMI VALLEY, COUNTY OF VENTURA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

THAT PORTION OF LOT 26 OF TRACT 2908, IN THE CITY OF SIMI VALLEY, COUNTY OF VENTURA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAPRecorded IN BOOK 124, PAGES 20 THROUGH 28 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHERLY CORNER COMMON TO LOTS 3 AND LOT 26 OF SAID TRACT 2908, SAID POINT ALSO BEING AN ANGLE POINT ON THE NORTHERLY LINE OF THE PROPERTY DESCRIBED AS PARCEL 1A IN THE FINAL ORDER OF CONDEMNATION, DATED OCTOBER 25, 1966, IN BOOK 3059, PAGE 301, OFFICIAL RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY;

THENCE, ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 26, NORTH 23°10'42" EAST A DISTANCE OF 144.34 FEET;

THENCE, NORTH 65°46'53" EAST A DISTANCE OF 143.78 FEET;

THENCE, NORTH 31°20'34" EAST A DISTANCE OF 198.55 FEET;

THENCE, NORTH 12°33'53" EAST A DISTANCE OF 103.31 FEET;

THENCE, NORTH 26°47'49" EAST A DISTANCE OF 81.31 FEET;

THENCE, NORTH 47°11'13" WEST A DISTANCE OF 83.89 FEET;

THENCE, NORTH 20°56'34" WEST A DISTANCE OF 181.00 FEET;

THENCE, NORTH 46°10'26" WEST A DISTANCE OF 204.89 FEET;

THENCE, NORTH 15°13'05" WEST A DISTANCE OF 122.00 FEET;

THENCE, NORTH 22°02'38" WEST A DISTANCE OF 4.00 FEET TO THE NORTHWESTERLY CORNER OF SAID LOT 26 OF TRACT 2908, ALSO BEING A POINT ON THE SOUTHEASTERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY OF KUEHNER DRIVE, 60 FEET WIDE, AS SHOWN ON SAID MAP OF TRACT 2908;

THENCE, ALONG SAID NORTHWESTERLY LINE OF LOT 26 AND SAID SOUTHEASTERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE, NORTH 67°57'22" EAST A DISTANCE OF 101.19 FEET;

THENCE, LEAVING SAID NORTHWESTERLY LINE OF LOT 26 AND SAID SOUTHEASTERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE, SOUTH 51°13'05" EAST A DISTANCE OF 110.31 FEET TO A POINT ON A LINE THAT IS PARALLEL WITH AND 100.00 FEET EASTERLY, AS MEASURED AT RIGHT ANGLES, FROM THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 26;
THENCE, ALONG SAID PARALLEL LINE, THE FOLLOWING COURSES AND DISTANCES:

SOUTH 46°10'26" EAST A DISTANCE OF 199.58 FEET;
SOUTH 20°56'34" EAST A DISTANCE OF 180.07 FEET;
SOUTH 47°11'13" EAST A DISTANCE OF 135.92 FEET;
SOUTH 26°47'49" WEST A DISTANCE OF 144.16 FEET;
SOUTH 12°33'53" WEST A DISTANCE OF 107.36 FEET;
SOUTH 31°20'34" WEST A DISTANCE OF 246.08 FEET;
SOUTH 65°46'53" WEST A DISTANCE OF 95.77 FEET;

THENCE, LEAVING SAID PARALLEL LINE, SOUTH 70°39'15" EAST A DISTANCE OF 67.65 FEET TO A POINT ON THE NORTHWESTERLY LINE OF PARCEL 1B AS DESCRIBED IN SAID FINAL ORDER OF CONDEMNATION;

THENCE, ALONG THE NORTHWESTERLY AND WESTERLY LINES OF SAID PARCEL 1B, SOUTH 55°39'33" WEST A DISTANCE OF 43.48 FEET TO AN ANGLE POINT THEREIN;

THENCE, SOUTH 08°03'31" WEST A DISTANCE OF 92.76 FEET TO THE SOUTHWESTERLY CORNER OF SAID PARCEL 1B, SAID POINT ALSO BEING A POINT ON THE NORTHERLY LINE OF SAID PARCEL 1A AND THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 26;

THENCE, ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE SAID PARCEL 1A AND SAID LOT 26, NORTH 70°39'15" WEST A DISTANCE OF 195.86 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

CONTAINING 3.25 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

ALSO AS SHOWN ON EXHIBIT "B" ATTACHED HERETO AND BY THIS REFERENCE MADE A PART HEREOF.

SUBJECT TO COVENANTS, CONDITIONS, RESTRICTIONS, RESERVATIONS, EASEMENTS AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY OF RECORD, IF ANY.

PREPARED BY: PROACTIVE ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS UNDER THE DIRECTION OF:

[Signature]
CHARLES J. MOORE, L.S. 9106

OCTOBER 6, 2015
J.N. 06.203.000
EXHIBIT B

DEPICTION OF THE FMZ EASEMENT AREA

[Attached]
EXHIBIT C

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF GRANTOR PROPERTY

REAL PROPERTY IN THE CITY OF SIMI VALLEY, COUNTY OF VENTURA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

LOT 26 OF TRACT NO. 2908 IN THE CITY OF SIMI VALLEY, COUNTY OF VENTURA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, PER MAP FILED IN BOOK 124 PAGES 20 TO 28, INCLUSIVE, OF MAPS. EXCEPT THAT PORTION OF LOT 25 CONVEYED TO VENTURA COUNTY WATER WORKS DISTRICT NO. 8 SET FORTH IN THAT CERTAIN GRANT DEED RECORDED MARCH 16, 1993, AS INSTRUMENT NO. 93-046491 IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY.
EXHIBIT D

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF GRANTEE PROPERTY

REAL PROPERTY IN THE CITY OF SIMI VALLEY, COUNTY OF VENTURA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS;

PARCEL A:

LOTS 3 THROUGH 9, INCLUSIVE, AND 19 THROUGH 22, INCLUSIVE, OF TRACT NO. 2908, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 124, PAGES 20 THROUGH 28, INCLUSIVE OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY.


PARCEL B:


EXHIBIT E

TRACT NO. 2908 AND HUMMINGBIRD CREEK FUEL MODIFICATION ZONE
MAINTENANCE AND MONITORING PLAN

[Attached]
TRACT NO. 2908 AND HUMMINGBIRD CREEK
FUEL MODIFICATION ZONE
MAINTENANCE AND MONITORING PLAN

Prepared for:
Pacific Communities Builders, Inc.
1000 Dove Street, Suite 300
Newport Beach, CA 92660

Prepared by:
L. Newman Design Group
31300 Via Colinas, Suite 104
Westlake Village, CA 91362

November 13, 2015
LNDG Job No. 2282-02
I. Goals

The Home Owners Association for Tract No. 2908 will be responsible for the future maintenance of a 100-foot wide Fuel Modification Zone (FMZ) from the tract boundary on the west side into the open space known as Hummingbird Creek. This document will be a guide for the HOA in managing the maintenance of the FMZ and of the storm drainage system inside the same tract boundary, adjacent to the proposed community wall (see enclosed site plan of Tract No. 2908).

II. Scope of Work

A. The HOA shall hire a landscape maintenance contractor who will furnish supervision, labor, equipment and transportation required to maintain the 100' FMZ in an attractive, safe, and healthy condition. The landscape maintenance contractor shall, at all times throughout the year, use proper landscape maintenance industry standards and methods of weed abatement and removal. All workmanship shall conform to or be acceptable to the HOA and Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District (RSRDP).

B. The landscape maintenance contractor shall be in charge of weed abatement within the 100-foot FMZ and of maintaining the storm drainage system along the proposed community wall.

C. It will not be the responsibility of the HOA to maintain the mitigation plants that will be a part of the Habitat Enhancement and Restoration Plan PD-S-942. The maintenance of those plants will be the responsibility of another party. It will be the responsibility of the HOA to protect the mitigation plantings and the existing oak trees when carrying out the weed abatement and storm drainage system maintenance.

III. Weed Abatement

A. Weed abatement in the 100-foot FMZ will be done in order to 1) provide an environment that will encourage the establishment of the restoration plants as described in the Habitat Enhancement and Restoration Plan (HERP) prepared by Rincon Consultants, Inc. dated January 21, 2010 and 2) to thin the density of the weedy vegetation to reduce the amount of fuel in order to slow the rate of fire spread if it occurs nearby.

B. It will be the responsibility of the landscape maintenance contractor to understand the goals of the HERP and to be able to identify the mature oak trees, seedling oak trees and the coyote brush that will be planted to re-establish the oak tree savanna. The weed abatement operation must not damage the new plants, the protective cages or irrigation system that may be present in the FMZ. It will be the responsibility of the maintenance contractor and HOA to report to RSRPD if any plants, cages, or irrigation systems are damaged or found to have been damaged.

C. Furthermore, as mitigation plants mature, the FMZ shall be maintained by the HOA to create space between existing trees and shrubs to reduce the density of the vegetation. This shall be done in accordance with the guidelines of the Ventura County Fire Department.

D. The following was excerpted from the Habitat Enhancement and Restoration Plan prepared by Rincon Consultants, Inc. If followed, the stated techniques will reduce the density of vegetation and reduce the fuel load without endangering the health of the restoration plants. (In the following excerpt, disregard "prior to oak tree installation").

Sec. 4.2.2 Weed control in the planting areas will be accomplished primarily by mechanical and hand-removal techniques [prior to oak tree installation]. Some weeds will likely require herbicide treatment
in areas of high concentration. Limited applications of an herbicide (e.g., Rodeo™ or Roundup™) may be used to combat noxious perennial weeds. The herbicide will be applied at appropriate times of the year when significant runoff is not expected. Rodeo™ may be used depending on the severity of the exotic species invasion. Various types of Roundup™ may be used outside of drainages to control perennial noxious weeds. Spot spraying will be the primary method used to apply the herbicides. Spot spraying is conducted with a backpack sprayer and targets sporadic occurrences of weeds. Herbicide will be applied by a qualified herbicide applicator, and herbicide applications will follow Ventura County Agricultural Extension recommendations and guidelines.

IV. Storm Drainage Maintenance

A. The storm drainage system consists of a 3-foot wide concrete swale that aligns 2 feet west of the proposed community property-line wall adjacent to the Hummingbird Creek open space and 100-foot FMZ. The swale shall be maintained clear of accumulated dirt, debris, branches, weeds or any objects that impede the flow of water to the drainage swale outlets that are placed periodically at the low points. The purpose is to insure that water flows to the low points of the swale and to the natural flow lines of the open space topography and does not overflow the swales and erode the soil. Any debris found shall be cleared with hand tools and removed from the site and disposed of legally. The swales shall not be cleared by using water to wash away accumulated soil and debris.

B. Normally, access to the site will be on foot to provide ordinary maintenance. In the case of an extraordinary event (e.g. excessive rain causing the soil around the swale to wash out) access may be needed by large equipment and/or a vehicle.

V. Maintenance Schedules

A. Weed abatement initially shall be scheduled to occur on a quarterly basis. This may be altered depending on the time of year and the success of the abatement. At no time may weeds be allowed to inhibit the growth of the mitigation plants or not be in accordance with the Ventura County’s guidelines.

B. The storm drainage system shall be inspected and cleared if necessary 3 to 4 time per year, more often during the rainy season than during the summer, e.g. November, January, March, and July. The schedule will depend on the weather and storm events that occur in any given year.
EXHIBIT F

HABITAT ENHANCEMENT AND RESTORATION PLAN

[Attached]
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DATE: June 16, 2016

TO: District Manager

FROM: Golf Course Manager

SUBJECT: Authorization to issue a Request for Bids for an Irrigation Control System for Simi Hills Golf Course

SUMMARY

On May 28th, 2015, staff presented plans to the Board for proposed improvements at Simi Hills Golf Course. The primary goal of these improvements is to replace our aging irrigation system in conjunction with turf reduction and various other improvements. On August 6th, 2015, the Board approved an amendment to our agreement with Damian Pascuzzo, and approved a consulting agreement with Bryant Taylor Gordon Irrigation Design (BTG) to design the centerpiece of these improvements; the irrigation distribution and control system.

Due to timeline and funding complications, the decision was made in October 2015 by the Golf Committee to delay the major renovations for a time to be determined. In January 2016, staff presented a concept for completing many of the smaller aspects of the renovation in advance of the major renovation, and possibly breaking the project into three phases over the next three years. The Committee considered the improvements proposed for the first phase of this plan and provided direction to proceed with the first phase.

Staff continues to work with Damian Pascuzzo and Bryant Taylor Gordon to develop and refine plans for the irrigation system and turf reduction projects. Bryant Taylor Gordon is continuing to work on the full irrigation system design, which will be completed now that the full topographic survey has been completed and provided to the District. The retained consultants have previously provided the plans and specifications for the computer control system, which is a key aspect of the project. Staff believes installing the new control system now will enable them to better control the application of irrigation water to the course, and better control the reductions required by the current drought measures.

This Irrigation Control System is designed to be forward compatible so it will integrate with our new irrigation system when installed in the next couple of years.

The Irrigation Control System consists of a new Computerized Central Control Computer, Maintenance Radio System, Field Satellite Controllers, software and technical support. The scope for this Request for Bids is to provide pricing and delivery terms for all equipment and services listed in the Technical Specifications (attached). Installation and setup will be done by golf course personnel.
The anticipated timeline and milestones are as follows:

- Request Board Authorization to issue Request for Bids on Thursday, June 16.
- Advertise RFP on Wednesday, June 22nd.
- Bids due on Wednesday, July 13th.
- Select bidder on Friday, July 15th.
- Signed contract and staff report due Friday, July 29th.
- Request Board authorization to award contract, Thursday, August 4th.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

This Irrigation Control System is part of our overall Irrigation System Renovation so funds expended at this time will reduce the amount which will be spent on the rest of the Irrigation System when it is installed. The Control System is forward compatible and is designed specifically to control our new system when it is installed. The approved Preliminary Budget allocates $500,000 towards current year course improvement projects, none of which has been expended to date.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Board authorization to issue a Request for Bids for the Irrigation Control System for Simi Hills Golf Course.

[Signature]

Brian Reed, Golf Course Manager
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RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 16, 2016

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: District Manager

SUBJECT: Selection of Candidate for Seat B of the CSDA Board of Directors Election 2016

SUMMARY

The District recently received an official ballot from CSDA listing three candidates vying to serve on Seat B of the CSDA Board of Directors: Anthony Kalvans, San Miguel Community Services District; Jeff Hodge, Santa Ynez Community Services District; and, Sharon Rose, Goleta Sanitary District. A copy of the Ballot and Candidate Statements are attached. Staff recommends the Board select a candidate and direct the District Manager to complete and return the ballot to CSDA.

BOARD ACTION REQUESTED

Staff recommends the Board select a candidate and direct the District Manager to complete and return the ballot to CSDA.

Larry Peterson
District Manager
COASTAL NETWORK

SEAT B

term ends 2019

Please vote for only one.

☐ Anthony Kalvans
San Miguel Community Services District

☐ Jeff Hodge
Santa Ynez Community Services District

☐ Sharon Rose
Goleta Sanitary District

SIGNATURE:

MEMBER DISTRICT:

DATE:

Must be received by 5pm, August 5, 2016. CSDA, 1112 I Street, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95814
CALIFORNIA SPECIAL DISTRICTS ASSOCIATION

2016 BOARD ELECTIONS

MAIL BALLOT INFORMATION

Dear Member:

A mail ballot has been enclosed for your district’s use in voting to elect a representative to the CSDA Board of Directors in your Network for Seat B.

Each of CSDA’s six (6) networks has three seats on the Board. Each of the candidates is either a board member or management-level employee of a member district located in your network. Each Regular Member (district) in good standing shall be entitled to vote for one (1) director to represent its network.

We have enclosed the candidate information for each candidate who submitted one. Please vote for only one candidate to represent your network in Seat B and be sure to sign, date and fill in your member district information. If any part of the ballot is not complete, the ballot will not be valid and will not be counted.

Please utilize the enclosed return envelope to return the completed ballot. Ballots must be received at the CSDA office at 1112 I Street, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95814 by 5:00pm on Friday, August 5, 2016.

If you do not use the enclosed envelope, please mail in your ballot to:
California Special Districts Association
Attn: 2016 Board Elections
1112 I Street, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95814

Please contact Charlotte Lowe toll-free at 877.924.CSDA or charlottel@csda.net with any questions.
2016 CSDA BOARD CANDIDATE INFORMATION SHEET

The following information MUST accompany your nomination form and Resolution/minute order:

Name: Anthony Kalvans
District/Company: San Miguel Community Services District
Title: Director
Elected/Appointed/Staff: Elected
Length of Service with District: 3 years

1. Do you have current involvement with CSDA (such as committees, events, workshops, conferences, Governance Academy, etc.):
   only in county chapter

2. Have you ever been associated with any other state-wide associations (CSAC, AGWA, League, etc.):
   NO

3. List local government involvement (such as LAFCo, Association of Governments, etc.):
   VP San Miguel Advisory Council, VP
   SLO County Chapter CSDA, citizens transportation advise
   and water resources advisory committee

4. List civic organization involvement:
   Vice President San Miguel Lions Club

**Candidate Statement – Although it is not required, each candidate is requested to submit a candidate statement of no more than 300 words in length. Any statements received in the CSDA office after June 2, 2016 will not be included with the ballot.**
2016 CSDA BOARD CANDIDATE INFORMATION SHEET

The following information MUST accompany your nomination form and Resolution/minute order:

Name: Sharon Rose

District/Company: Goleta Sanitary

Title: Board President

Elected/Appointed/Staff: Elected

Length of Service with District: 4 years

1. Do you have current involvement with CSDA (such as committees, events, workshops, conferences, Governance Academy, etc.):

   - Attended local chapter meetings
   - Attended first governance academy

2. Have you ever been associated with any other state-wide associations (CSAC, ACWA, League, etc.):

   - G5MDL - Golden State Manufactured Homeowners League
   - CA Dept. of Health -

4. List local government involvement (such as LACoA, Association of Governments, etc.):

   - SCAMPR - Vice President (So. Coast Alliance Mobile Home Park Residents)
   - Member of Goleta Coalition, CSDA - Local Chapter
   - University Park Homeowners Association (President)

5. List other organization involvement:

   - Goleta Sanitary Board Member (President)
   - Retired: Santa Barbara Co. Alcohol & Drug Program Prevention Manager

**Candidate Statement** — Although it is not required, each candidate is requested to submit a candidate statement of no more than 300 words in length. Any statements received in the CSDA office after June 2, 2016 will not be included with the ballot.
Dear CSDA Members:

My name is Sharon Rose. I have served as an elected board member of Goleta Sanitary District for three and a half years. I have also served actively in two statewide associations engaged in passing legislation: The Golden State Manufactured Home Owners League and The CA Tobacco Control Program.

My professional experience includes: government and non-profit management, private industry news media and raising a family.

After years in public service in the High Sierras, I moved to the Central Coast 11 years ago. I feel my skills will help CSDA meet their organizational needs, both in Sacramento and at the chapter level.

Local government is the strongest branch of our democracy. It’s where “we the people” know each other personally and get things done. As a former county official who served in rural and urban areas, I learned the value of finding common goals, innovation and vision. Good governance exists in the smallest and largest places. It builds trust; which in turn builds healthy, resilient communities.

With politics as our backdrop, we know the wind changes. What’s important to me is when change occurs, good people remain who are dedicated to working together—regardless of alliance. I know we all share a common goal of protecting California’s quality of life—economically, socially and environmentally.

The drought crisis, coupled with energy and economic challenges, teach the future calls for innovation and collaboration.

My toolkit includes a willingness to serve, an open mind, creativity, collaborative decision-making and networking, communications and fundraising skills, a sense of humor, the ability to listen, a willingness to study the issues, ability to borrow and share ideas, and the ability to compromise.

Thank you. I respectfully request your vote to the CSDA board.

Sharon Rose

Goleta, California
2016 CSDA BOARD CANDIDATE INFORMATION SHEET

The following information MUST accompany your nomination form and Resolution/minute order:

Name: Jeff Hodge

District/Company: Santa Ynez Community Services District

Title: General Manager

Elected/Appointed/Staff: Staff

Length of Service with District: 2.5 years

1. Do you have current involvement with CSDA (such as committees, events, workshops, conferences, Governance Academy, etc.):

None

2. Have you ever been associated with any other state-wide associations (CSAC, ACWA, League, etc.):

Association of California Water Agencies (ACWA), California Association of Sanitation Agencies (CASA).

3. List local government involvement (such as LAFCo, Association of Governments, etc.):

None

4. List civic organization involvement:

None

**Candidate Statement** – Although it is not required, each candidate is requested to submit a candidate statement of no more than 300 words in length. Any statements received in the CSDA office after June 2, 2016 will not be included with the ballot.
Jeff is currently the General Manager of the Santa Ynez Community Services District.

Jeff has a Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science and a Master’s degree in Business Administration.

He has over 20 years’ experience managing Special Districts in Colorado, Arizona and California. He has managed special districts that provided Fire, Police, Water, Sewer, Trash, Cemetery, Roads, Street Lights, Parks and Recreation, and Drainage.

Jeff has a California Grade IV Wastewater Plant Operator certification and the highest Wastewater treatment certification level in Colorado and Arizona. He also holds certification in Water Treatment and Water Distribution in Arizona. He was elected to a Fire District Board and Park and Recreation District Board for four years.

Jeff was instrumental in helping form a Park and Recreation District in Southern Colorado.

He was appointed to an airport advisory board in Colorado and Arizona and is a two time past president of different local Rotary Clubs.

He has experience in writing, introducing and shepherding legislation for Special Districts, permitting and constructing new water and wastewater facilities and upgrading existing facilities.

Jeff is married to Christine and has two daughters and one granddaughter.

Jeff enjoys flying, sailing, kayaking and exploring all the great things California and the world has to offer.

Jeff Hodge
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RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 16, 2016
TO: Board of Directors
FROM: District Manager
SUBJECT: Approval of Resolution Nominating Candidate to Serve as the Alternate Special District Member of the Ventura Local Agency Formation Commission for Term Beginning January 1, 2017

SUMMARY

The Ventura County Local Agency Formation Commission ("LAFCO") has called upon independent special districts to consider nominating a candidate to serve as the alternate independent special district member of LAFCO for the term beginning January 1, 2017 (see attached). The term of one of the two special district members of LAFCO held by Bruce Dandy expires on January 1, 2017. Alternate Commissioner Mary Anne Rooney will then become the regular LAFCO member. The new alternate member that is elected will serve in that capacity from January 1, 2017 to January 1, 2019, and then likely become a regular member of LAFCO on January 1, 2019, when the term of Commissioner Elaine Freeman expires.

The LAFCO Commission meets regularly ten times per year and specially on an as-needed basis. Meetings occur at the Ventura County Government Center and typically start at 9 am on the third Wednesday of each month. The alternate member is not entitled to vote or attend closed sessions. Essentially, the alternate member monitors the Commission meetings until they become a regular member.

After nominations are received, LAFCO will distribute a ballot containing the name(s) of all nominees together with the resumes or candidate statements provided to them. Once received, staff will present that information to the Park District Board together with a recommendation that it select and vote in favor of a candidate.

BOARD ACTION REQUESTED

Staff recommends the Board consider nominating a candidate for the upcoming LAFCO election to serve as the alternate independent special district member, using the attached resolution.

Larry Peterson
District Manager
RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT

RESOLUTION NO. _____

RESOLUTION: NOMINATING CANDIDATE TO SERVE AS
THE ALTERNATE SPECIAL DISTRICT MEMBER
OF THE VENTURA LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION
FOR TERM JANUARY 1, 2017 TO JANUARY 1, 2019

WHEREAS, the Executive Officer of the Ventura Local Agency Formation Commission ("LAFCO") has notified the District of a vacancy for an alternate member representing independent special districts in Ventura County to serve a term of January 1, 2017 to January 1, 2019, and has issued a call for nominations to be submitted in writing pursuant to California Government Code Section 56332(c); and

WHEREAS, the Ventura County Independent Special District Selection Committee has adopted Rules and Regulations concerning vacancies on LAFCO and the time for consideration of candidates for appointment; and

WHEREAS, the Rules and Regulations of the Ventura County Independent Special District Selection Committee require that nominations shall be by resolution and candidates nominated shall submit a resume or candidate statement; and

WHEREAS, at the time and in the manner required by law, the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District met on June 16, 2016, to consider the call for nominations by the LAFCO Executive Officer; and

WHEREAS, ______________________ is a member of the Board of Directors of the ______________________, has expressed an interest in serving on LAFCO, resides in Ventura County and is qualified to serve on LAFCO pursuant to California Government Code Section 56332(d);

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED AND ORDERED, that the Board of Directors of the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District hereby nominates ______________________ for election to serve as the alternate special district member of LAFCO for the term January 1, 2017 to January 1, 2019 to represent independent special districts in Ventura County; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the District Manager is directed to transmit a signed copy of this Resolution and a copy of the resume or candidate statement to the Ventura LAFCO Executive Officer.
The foregoing Resolution was approved by the Board of Directors of the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District at a special meeting held on June 16, 2016, at 1692 Sycamore Drive, Simi Valley, California, on motion made by

Ayes:

Noes:

Absent:

Abstain:

Chair of the Board of Directors
Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District
June 6, 2016

Chair of the Board
Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District
1692 Sycamore Drive
Simi Valley, CA 93065

RE: CALL FOR NOMINATIONS – Ventura LAFCo Independent Special District Alternate Member

Dear Chair of the Board:

The term of one of the two special district members of LAFCo, held by Bruce Dandy, expires on January 1, 2017. The basic process for selecting special district members to LAFCo is set forth in Government Code §56332. In Ventura County, the Independent Special District Selection Committee (VCISDSC), comprised of representatives from each of the 30 independent special districts in Ventura County, has adopted a separate set of Rules and Regulations that include provisions about how elections for LAFCo vacancies are to be conducted.

The Rules and Regulations of the VCISDSC provide that when a LAFCo special district member completes his/her term of office, the alternate special district member shall automatically become a special district regular member of LAFCo for a new four-year term. Thus, based on the VCISDSC Rules and Regulations, Alternate Commissioner Mary Anne Rooney will become a regular member starting a new four-year term on January 1, 2017. As such, it is necessary to select a special district alternate member to complete Ms. Rooney's term, which expires January 1, 2019.

Based on Government Code §56332 and the VCISDSC Rules and Regulations, I have determined that a meeting of the VCISDSC for the purpose of selecting a special district alternate member is not feasible due to the likelihood that a quorum will not be achieved. Thus, both the nominating process and the election itself will be conducted by mail (some special districts have consented to conducting the election via electronic mail).

Your district is encouraged to participate in this election process. A schedule is enclosed together with a list of the 30 independent special districts in Ventura County that are eligible to participate. This list also identifies those districts that have consented to conducting the election via email. Because special district alternate members automatically become
regular members upon the completion of a regular member term of office, the new alternate member likely will become a regular member on January 1, 2019 when the term of Commissioner Elaine Freeman expires.

If your district wishes to nominate a Board member to be a candidate for the LAFCo special district alternate member seat, the VCISDSC Rules and Regulations provide that:

1. Your Board may nominate only one candidate.
2. The nomination specifying the name of the nominee must be by a written resolution approved by a majority of your Board (sample resolution enclosed)
3. The nominating resolution and a candidate’s statement or resume of no more than 1 page must be returned to Kai Luoma, Executive Officer, at Ventura LAFCo via certified mail (or via email for those districts that have previously consented)

The deadline for submitting nominating resolutions and candidate’s statements/resumes is 5 P.M., Friday, August 12, 2016. Any nomination that does not comply with the VCISDSC requirements or is submitted after the deadline will not be considered.

General information about LAFCo, including information about the current Commission and terms of office, is available at the Ventura LAFCo web site at www.ventura.lafco.ca.gov. Special district alternate members of LAFCo can participate fully in LAFCo proceedings, but they cannot vote except in the absence of, or due to the abstention of, one of the two special district regular members. In addition, special district members who vacate their position on the board of their special district automatically vacate their LAFCo position.

Alternate members are expected to attend all LAFCo meetings. There are approximately 10 regular LAFCo meetings each year with special meetings scheduled as necessary. Regular LAFCo meetings start at 9:00 a.m. on the third Wednesday of each month, except for June, when the Commission’s regular meeting is scheduled for the second Wednesday of the month. The Commission is typically dark in August and December.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Please let me know if further information is desired.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Kai Luoma
Executive Officer

c: General Manager
# ELECTION SCHEDULE

## 2016 LAFCo Independent Special Districts Alternate Member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAFCo call for elections letter mailed via certified mail (or via email to those special districts that have provided consent)</td>
<td>No Later than Friday, June 10, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominations due to LAFCo Executive Officer via certified mail (or via email from those special districts that have provided consent). Must include Board nominating resolution and candidate’s statement or resume.</td>
<td>By 5:00 P.M., Friday, August 12, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballots mailed from LAFCo via certified mail (or via email to those special districts that have provided consent)</td>
<td>No later than Friday, August 26, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Day - Ballots due to LAFCo Executive Officer via certified mail (or via email from those districts that have provided consent)</td>
<td>By 5:00 P.M., Friday, October 14, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election results mailed from LAFCo via certified mail (or via email to those special districts that have provided consent)</td>
<td>No later than Friday, October 21, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INDEPENDENT SPECIAL DISTRICTS IN VENTURA COUNTY

*As of June 2016*

1. Bardsdale Public Cemetery District
2. Bell Canyon Community Services District*
3. Blanchard/Santa Paula Library District*
4. Calleguas Municipal Water District*
5. Camarillo Health Care District*
6. Camrosa Water District*
7. Casitas Municipal Water District*
8. Channel Islands Beach Community Services District
9. Conejo Recreation & Park District*
10. El Rancho Simi Public Cemetery District
11. Fillmore-Piru Memorial District
12. Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency*
13. Hidden Valley Municipal Water District
14. Meiners Oaks Water District*
15. Montalvo Community Services District*
16. Ojai Valley Sanitary District*
17. Ojai Water Conservation District*
18. Oxnard Drainage District No. 1
19. Oxnard Drainage District No. 2*
20. Oxnard Harbor District*
21. Piru Public Cemetery District
22. Pleasant Valley County Water District
23. Pleasant Valley Recreation & Park District*
24. Rancho Simi Recreation & Park District*
25. Saticoy Sanitary District*
26. Triunfo Sanitation District*
27. United Water Conservation District*
28. Ventura County Resource Conservation District*
29. Ventura Port District
30. Ventura River County Water District*

* Special Districts that have provided written consent to conduct the election via email.
RESOLUTION OF THE [DISTRICT NAME]

NOMINATING [NAME OF BOARD MEMBER] TO FILL THE TERM OF 1/1/2015 – 1/1/2019 FOR THE ALTERNATE SPECIAL DISTRICT MEMBER OF THE VENTURA LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

WHEREAS, the Executive Officer of the Ventura Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) has notified the District of an anticipated vacancy on LAFCo for an alternate member representing the independent special districts in Ventura County to fill the term from 1/1/2015 to 1/1/2019, and has issued a call for nominations to be submitted in writing pursuant to California Government Code Section 56332(c); and

WHEREAS, the Ventura County Independent Special District Selection Committee has adopted Rules and Regulations concerning vacancies on LAFCo and the time for consideration of candidates for appointment; and

WHEREAS, the Rules and Regulations of the Ventura County Independent Special District Selection Committee require that nominations shall be by resolution and candidates nominated shall submit a resume or candidate statement; and

WHEREAS, at the time and in the manner required by law, the [NAME OF DISTRICT] met on [DATE] to consider the call for nominations by the LAFCo Executive Officer;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the [NAME OF DISTRICT] as follows:

1) [NAME OF BOARD MEMBER] is hereby nominated to fill the anticipated vacancy in the term beginning 1/1/2015 and expiring 1/1/2019 as the alternate member of the Ventura LAFCo representing independent special districts in Ventura County.

2) The General Manager shall transmit a signed copy of this Resolution and a copy of the resume or candidate statement for [NAME OF BOARD MEMBER AND NAME OF BOARD MEMBER] to the Ventura LAFCo Executive Officer.

This resolution was adopted on [DATE].

AYES

NOES

ABSTAINS

Dated: _______________  Chair, [NAME OF DISTRICT]
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RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 16, 2016
TO: District Manager
FROM: Director of Administration
SUBJECT: Approval of Pay and Benefit Changes for: (1) Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District Middle Management Association, (2) Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District Employee Association (Bargaining Unit), and (3) Unrepresented District Employees

SUMMARY

The District has been engaged in labor negotiations with the District’s Middle Management Association and Employee Association (also known as the Bargaining Unit). During the negotiation period staff has presented the Middle Management Association’s and Bargaining Unit’s requests to the Board in closed session. Those requests have been analyzed, discussed and responded to by staff, under direction of the Board. Agreement has since been reached and approval of the agreed to terms is now recommended.

The District’s practice has been to apply negotiated salary and benefit changes to the District’s unrepresented employees, which currently includes; District Manager, Executive Assistant, Director of Recreation, Director of Planning and Maintenance, and Director of Administration.

Staff now recommends approval of the following negotiated changes for all full-time employees; a pay schedule increase of 3% effective July 1, 2016, a flexible benefit increase in the amount of $35 per month, an 80% discount off After School Club and Summer Camp registration for children of full-time employees and part-time employees working an average of 30 hours per week under the Affordable Care Act. The two attached Letters of Agreement state the proposed changes for the Middle Management Association and the Bargaining Unit.
RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the indicated changes and authorization for the District Manager to sign the Letter of Agreements on behalf of the District and proceed with the implementation of the changes, which will also include Policy Manual revisions that will be placed onto the next meeting agenda.

Theresa Pennington
Director of Administration
RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT

LETTER AGREEMENT WITH THE RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT
MIDDLE MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION
2016-2017

The following items have been negotiated in good faith and agreed upon by the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District Board of Directors and the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District’s Middle Management Association:

- 3% Cost of Living increase effective July 1, 2016
- Increase flexible benefit amount: $35/month effective July 1, 2016.
- Full-time and Part-time employees working an average of 30 hours per week under the ACA are permitted an 80% discount on District’s Before and After School Clubs and Summer Camp, excluding field trips, for employee’s children if they reside with the employee, effective July 1, 2016.
- The increase to offset the pension obligation on January 1, 2018 remains at 3%. Classic CalPERS members will pay 3% of the pension obligation effective January 1, 2018.

Clarification: On January 1, 2013, the California Public Employees’ Pension Reform Act of 2013 (PEPRA) went into effect. Pursuant to PEPRA District employees that were never a member of a public retirement system before January 1, 2013 are considered “New” members of PERS. Employees that were members of PERS before January 1, 2013 are considered “Classic” members of PERS. Under PEPRA New members are obligated to pay the employee share of PERS, which is currently 6.25% of pay. Classic members are not currently obligated to pay the employee share of PERS. By previous agreement, the District will increase all full-time employee compensation by the amount of 3% on January 1, 2018. At that same time, Classic members of PERS will begin to contribute 3% of their pay towards their employee share of PERS. Full-time New members of PERS will also receive the 3% increase in pay, but their obligation to pay PERS will not increase from the 6.25% at that time.

Both parties agree that the benefit change will be effective July 1, 2016. The Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District Middle Management Association agrees and will support the items that were negotiated in good faith.
For the District:

Larry Peterson  
District Manager

For Middle Management:

Jeannie Liss  
President

Date Approved by the Board of Directors
RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT

LETTER AGREEMENT WITH THE RANCHO SIMI RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT
EMPLOYEE’S ASSOCIATION
2016-2017

The following items have been negotiated in good faith and agreed upon by the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District Board of Directors and the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District’s Employee Association:

- 3% Cost of Living increase effective July 1, 2016
- Increase flexible benefit amount: $35/month effective July 1, 2016.
- Full-time and Part-time employees working an average of 30 hours per week under the ACA are permitted an 80% discount on District’s Before and After School Clubs and Summer Camp, excluding field trips, for employee’s children if they reside with the employee, effective July 1, 2016.

- The increase to offset the pension obligation on January 1, 2018 remains at 3%. Classic CalPERS members will pay 3% of the pension obligation effective January 1, 2018.

Clarification: On January 1, 2013, the California Public Employees’ Pension Reform Act of 2013 (PEPRA) went into effect. Pursuant to PEPRA District employees that were never a member of a public retirement system before January 1, 2013 are considered “New” members of PERS. Employees that were members of PERS before January 1, 2013 are considered “Classic” members of PERS. Under PEPRA New members are obligated to pay the employee share of PERS, which is currently 6.25% of pay. Classic members are not currently obligated to pay the employee share of PERS. By previous agreement, the District will increase all full-time employee compensation by the amount of 3% on January 1, 2018. At that same time, Classic members of PERS will begin to contribute 3% of their pay towards their employee share of PERS. Full-time New members of PERS will also receive the 3% increase in pay, but their obligation to pay PERS will not increase from the 6.25% at that time.

Both parties agree that the benefit change will be effective July 1, 2016. The Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District Employee’s Association agrees and will support the items that were negotiated in good faith.
For the District:  

Larry Peterson  
District Manager

For Employee’s Association:

John Dodson  
President

Date Approved by the Board of Directors