OAK PARK MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MINUTES of an official Meeting June 18, 2020. The Oak Park MAC held an official meeting on Thursday, June 18, 2020 at 2:00 PM remotely by Zoom.

1. Call to Order of the meeting

The meeting was called to order by *Chair Seema Chandra* at 2:00 PM. *Alon Glickstein* and *Jane Nye, JL Diaz* and *Janice Smets* were also present.

2. Flag Salute

Jane Nye led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Adoption of the Agenda

The MAC voted 5-0 to adopt the agenda, with *Jane Nye* making the motion seconded by *JL Diaz*.

4. Approval of the Minutes of February 25, 2020

Alon Glickstein moved to approve the draft minutes, seconded by JL Diaz, and passed 5-0.

5. Public Safety reports

Ventura County Sheriff's Office Captain Renee Ferguson reported to the MAC about the previous months. She said that the situation in Oak Park had been mostly quiet but that two patterns did emerge, namely some porch thefts and thefts of catalytic converters. Only one stolen car was reported in recent months, as well as several burglaries from vehicles. She noted that the presence of more residents staying home could have reduced the opportunities for crime generally.

CHP Community Liaison Officer Sergeant Dekker introduced himself, saying that he was from the area and had served twelve years with the Moorpark station CHP. He said that since January in Oak Park officers had dealt with nine vehicle collisions, of which four were categorized as minor injury collisions. There were no cases of DUI, which he said may have resulted from the pandemic lockdown conditions. There had been one vehicle theft. The radar trailer had been placed on westbound Kanan Road near Los Arcos from April 20 through May 5. *Alon Glickstein* asked whether it was permissible to park trailers alongside streets, and he replied that it was not. *Alon Glickstein* noted that a trailer was routinely parked near 179 Kanan Road.

6. Comments of Ventura County Supervisor Linda Parks

Supervisor Parks deferred to Ventura County Public Health Director Rigoberto Vargas.

7. Information Items

a. Update on COVID-19 from Ventura County Public Health Director Rigoberto Vargas.

He reported that the County registered 47 new positive cases of Covid-19 that day, and one death. *Alon Glickstein* asked where the nearest testing site was, and *Supervisor Parks* chimed in that it was at the Newbury Park Library. *Alon Glickstein* asked when testing results are available, and he responded that it usually took between 24 and 36 hours. *Alon Glickstein* asked then what were the procedures if someone tested positive, and he responded that the person testing positive would be contacted by the primary care physician or a public health nurse. *Janice Smets* asked about wearing masks, and he responded that a new order had just taken effect that day requiring the wearing of masks in public. He congratulated the residents of Supervisor Parks' District for showing an infection rate lower than the County average. He said that the Oak Park rate per 100,000 residents was 147. He encouraged the community to keep up the good work. He noted

there had been outbreaks in Santa Paula and Fillmore related to work places and to social gatherings. He emphasized that social gatherings remained prohibited.

Deena Parry asked about the mortality rate, and he said it was 2 or 2.5%. She asked about recommendations on mask types, and he directed her to the State of California website on the pandemic. She asked what was being done for children and other residents restricted to their homes, and he mentioned the programs for rental assistance and business assistance and other programs that could be accessed via the County, State, and CDC (federal Center for Disease Control) websites. **Supervisor Parks** said that the County's Human Services and Behavioral Health Department had a very robust program of extensive outreach for addressing community needs. **Deena Parry** emphasized that there needed to be more ways to support the well-being of residents. **Mr. Vargas** said that business sectors such as weddings and nail salons were reopening and that the County was now off the State's monitoring list. **JL Diaz** requested that Human Services attend the next MAC meeting. **Supervisor Parks** said that the County's analysis on face masks written by **Dr. Levin**.

6. Comments of Ventura County Supervisor Linda Parks

She welcomed County staff from Public Works and Real Estate Services to the meeting. She expressed appreciation to Enhanced Landscape for introducing the use of an alternative to glyphosate called W.O.W. in the public landscaping treatment of turf in Oak Park. She noted that two seats on the MAC would be up for election in the fall, and that residents were encouraged to visit the Elections website to understand the procedures for filing to run. She noted that the RSRPD park district Board was holding a meeting later that day to introduce its budget for the upcoming year and to give an update about the pandemic and the park district. She expressed appreciation to *Seema Chandra* and *Diane Starzak* for partnering with her office to post messages on the community sign boards. She spoke about savings achieved in the expenses for running the Kanan Shuttle. *Janice Smets* said that she was trying out the W.O.W. weed treatment product along with some of her neighbors and was very excited about the product. *Seema Chandra* asked whether the landscape company had increased its charges for this product, and Real Estate Services staff said there was no change. *Deena Parry* thanked the MAC for working to end the use of glyphosate, and *Supervisor Parks* also thanked everyone for supporting the change.

7. Information Items

a. Update on COVID-19 from Ventura County Public Health Director Rigoberto Vargas (see above)

b. The conversion of Oak Park street lights to LED bulbs

There was a discussion among MAC members about the conversion underway. *Charles Alvarez* from Real Estate Services who was administering the project explained that the Board of Supervisors had approved the conversion as a way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and energy use, and that to respond to residents' complaints and MAC members' concerns that lights were too bright, Southern California Edison (SCE) did not allow a widespread use of full shields because that turned streetlights into spotlights. Likewise reducing the wattage of the lights was not allowed by SCE. Nevertheless he would continue trying to respond to residents' complaints on a case by case manner. He noted that the annual cost savings of LED lighting would be under \$10K, and that the goal was to reduce the carbon imprint of the community energy use. *Supervisor Parks* said she appreciated the MAC giving input on whether or not to continue the conversion of Oak Parks' streetlights to LED lights. The majority agreed to not oppose the conversion, and *Alon Glickstein* expressed support for having brighter lights that he said was a crime deterrent. He stressed that the MAC should not have to pay for the project or mitigations to

impacts of the project, and that the County should push for changes to the wattage output to solve brightness problems where there are complaints.

8. Public Comments

Derek Ross from the Oak Park Unified School District Board gave an update on how the School District had been addressing issues related to the pandemic.

William Liu asked for support in placing additional waste containers along Kanan Road. He noted that there were no receptacles from the high school to the Starbucks on the south side of the road. The MAC members agreed to pursue ways of solving the litter problem. His comments are attached here.

9. Council Comments

Jane Nye's comments are attached. *Seema Chandra* expressed concern about small businesses during the pandemic lockdown, and she encouraged community members to support and patronize them.

10. Written Communications

a. Tentative date August 27 of the Ventura County Planning Commission appeal hearing PL20-0033, for the Planning Director's March 2020 decision to approve PL16-0059 Conditional Use Permit for 55 foot tall Verizon wireless facility, 700 feet east of the Churchwood/Kanan Road intersection

Jane Nye shared an update about the appeal filed by community member *David Lelie*. *Supervisor Parks* noted that he would get a refund of his appeal fee if his appeal were successful. In response to the Council Comments of Jane Nye, she also noted that the Pure Water Project was not without controversy, and that pharmaceutical products were not all removed in the proposed conversion from waste water to drinking water.

11. Advisory Matters

a. MAC recommendation, draft Fiscal Year 2020/2021 County Service Area #4 (CSA #4) budget

Debra Cavaletto from Public Works made a presentation about the preliminary budget that the Board of Supervisors had approved earlier in the week. The budget is attached here. In an unusual move, the Board had decided to postpone an adoption of a County budget, which includes the CSA #4 budget, until the autumn, due to the uncertainties caused by the pandemic situation. The MAC members agreed to vote on the CSA #4 budget in the autumn.

- b. MAC recommendation, the consolidation of Oak Park's election of two MAC members on Nov. 3, 2020 with other elections held then
- c. MAC recommendation, notice to the Ventura County Clerk of the two elective offices to be filled on the Oak Park MAC in the Nov. 3, 2020 election
- d. MAC recommendation, the funding source for candidates' ballot statements in the Nov. 3, 2020 election

e. MAC recommendation, other election services for the Nov. 3, 2020 election The four items pertaining to the November 3, 2020 election were combined by the MAC members into one motion and vote. *Seema Chandra* made a motion seconded by *JL Diaz* and passed by the MAC unanimously to accept the items.

12. Adjournment

Chair Chandra adjourned the meeting at 4:37 PM.

Subject: FW: MAC - Jane Nye's Notes for Jun 18 meeting

OPUSD – no updates, as school has been closed since March

- Janice had forwarded a resident's concern about OP not providing meals for kids
 - OPUSD responded that larger school districts are stepping up to help out
 - This summer, we're continuing our annual Lunch at the Library program, providing free lunches for children & teens. This summer, lunches will be available for no-contact grab & go pickup, to allow for physical distancing.
 - Starting Jun 16 Aug 7, children & teens ages 18 and younger can visit any LA County library and pick up a free nutritious meal. Lunches are available for pickup Tue – Fri, 12 – 1 pm
 - Lunch at the Library is a partnership with the LA County Department of Parks and Recreation, and is supported by the California Summer Meal Coalition and California Library Association. The program is funded this year by a California State Library Grant.
- Seema asked about OPHS tennis courts being locked
 - Courts are now open

Triunfo Water and Sanitation District

Web site has been updated

PURE Water Project is making great progress – Triunfo Demo facility on Las Virgenes will be opened to the public for tours & ribbon cutting – Sep 11

- This pilot plant is the precursor for a \$100 million water purification plant that will be completed by 2030 and provide 1.6 billion gallons per year of locally-sourced drinking water.
- The source water for the pilot and full-scale plants will be from highly treated recycled water currently used for irrigation or discharged into Malibu Creek.
- The pilot plant will evaluate advanced purification technologies including reverse osmosis and ultraviolet disinfection, ensuring that the water meets all drinking-water standards.
- The facility will be located at the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District Headquarters in Calabasas and will provide the means for designers to test various purification systems, operators to undergo training and the public to view the process in action.

JPA (Joint Powers Admin – LVMWD & TWSD) Project – Composting

On May 29, the Rancho Las Virgenes Composting Facility finally got back to doing what it does best, composting.

In November 2018 the Woolsey Fire ripped through the facility, damaging multiple pieces of equipment and buildings.

Now, after 18 months of construction, repairs, upgrades and maintenance, Rancho is once again able to turn bio-solids captured at the Tapia Water Reclamation facility into exceptional quality garden compost.

Getting Rancho back up and operating was also a priority as the facility represents key components to the JPA's mission to bring water full circle and close the sustainability loop.

• By utilizing the captured bio-solids and turning them into compost to be given away to the community Rancho produces a beneficial product.

The production of compost also allows the JPA to forgo traditional means of solids management such as the carbon intensive and costly process of trucking the bio-solids to agricultural areas where they can be land applied or simply dumped into a landfill.

• Accomplishing the creation of a beneficial product while eliminating waste is integral to being truly sustainable, a key mission of the JPA.

The Community Compost program is one of the most popular and successful JPA outreach programs. Under normal circumstances, compost is available for pick up on Saturdays from 8:00 am until 1:00 pm.

- Customers provide their own sealable container(s) such as a plastic storage bin with a lid, sturdy plastic bags; or if you're loading a pickup truck or trailer, you must have a cover to secure the load in place.
- Each individual is responsible for filling their own containers.

Callegus Potable Water Interconnect Project & Pumping Station – Lindero Cyn Rd

Dan Drugan reported that the project is still in the final design phase at this point. When he has a better estimate on when 'shovels will be hitting the ground' he'll send me an email.

I attended the 2020 LVMWD International Women's Day Event in March (just before COVID-19 stopped public gatherings)

3rd Annual International Women's Day Event

3 women mayors spoke about their experiences – Agoura, Calabasas, and Westlake Village (4th woman mayor from Malibu couldn't attend)

I also spoke as a new Director for TWSD

Update on Verizon Towers

- Temporary Cell on Wheels has been removed from behind Churchwood Dr
 - Kilburn site is now operating after repairs were completed (required after damage from the Woolsey fire)
- New Verizon Tower (Churchwood) Ventura County Planning Director approved the new tower even thought the MAC sent a letter against approval
 - Hearing was held just at the beginning of the COVID-19 shutdown
 - They received one appeal from an individual, Mr. David Lelie at the cost of \$1K for filing an appeal
 - The appeal case number is PL20-033
 - Based on their current backlog, the appeal is scheduled to be heard by the Planning Commission on Aug 27

Glenn Karpinski's complaint about Mae Boyer Park

- ALL of the caution tape used to restrict the use of the playground equipment and swings at Mae Boyer Park has been removed
- Much of the tape remains laying on the ground as partly connected to the equipment
- A plywood panel remains at the top of a slide to restrict its use
- I forwarded to Dan Paranick who responded immediately and agreed to fix
- Jun 10 tape again removed by someone 😕
- Jun 16 another email from Glenn (to Dan P and me) tape down, no consistency across the parks are the play areas open or closed?

COUNTY SERVICE AREA NO. 4 - Oak Park FY 20 Budget and Estimated

FY 20 Budget and Estimated FY 21 Budget Request	FY 20		FY 20	FY 20	FY 21
i i zi buuget Kequest	Adopted Budget		Actual to 05/31/20	Estimated Year End	Requested Budget
REVENUE	2				
Property Taxes	\$ 782,000	\$	769,349	\$ 783,230	\$ 813,700
Interest Earned	39,600		26,335	39,600	31,000
Special Assessment (1)	91,600		129,479	132,780	91,600
Other Revenue - Misc Sub-Total Revenue	 - 913,200		14,000 939,163	14,000 969,610	936,300
			333,103		
Fund Balance Carry-over Total Revenue and Fund Balance	\$ 276,400 1,189,600	\$	939,163	\$ 214,940 1,184,549	\$ 306,800 1,243,100
EXPENSES					
Landscape/Street Sweeping					
Landscape Contract Maintenance	\$ 154,500	\$	122,500	\$ 147,000	\$ 160,000
Landscape Repair/Remediation/Emergency Work/Consulting	205,000		55,791	184,050	210,000
Landscape Repair - FEMA Project	-		102,510	102,510	-
Street Sweeping (26 times per year) Minor Equipment repair and/or replacement/other	67,000 5,000		39,600 140	47,520 5,000	52,000 5,000
Total Landscape/Street Sweeping Expense	 431,500		320,541	 486,080	 427,000
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,			,	,
Utilities					
Landscape irrigation- Oak Park Water	315,000		175,847	281,630	314,000
Landscape irrigation - SCE Street Lighting - SCE	30,000 111,300		3,840 93,401	8,320 108,459	30,000 113,000
Total Utility Expense	 456,300		273,088	 398,409	 457,000
Retrofit					
Oak Park Green Streets Urban Retrofit	-		-	-	24,000
Total Retrofit Expense	0		-	0	24,000
Community Support/Services					
School Crossing Guard Reimbursement (Currently 13 guards)	144,100		49,254	144,100	167,000
Kanan Road Shuttle	30,000		-	30,000	36,000
MAC Support Elections (Unit 1921) - ballots	5,000		-	5,000	5,000 5,000
CERT Support & SDE	- 2,500		- 1,339	- 2,500	2,500
Volunteers in Policing (VIP) Program	28,000		-	28,000	30,000
Total Community Support/Services	209,600		50,593	209,600	245,500
Administration Support					
Voice/Data	-		• • • •	-	
Indirect Cost Recovery	4,700		4,707	4,700	4,400
Purchasing Charges / Materials ISF Administration (PWA charges-RES)	2,100 34,400		1,911 31,635	2,100 37,660	2,000 34,900
Administration (Fiscal Services)	29,600		22,200	29,600	31,500
Attorney Services	10,000		-	5,000	5,000
Collection & Billing Svcs (ACO Collection & Admin Fees)	11,400		-	 11,400	11,800
Total Administration Support	92,200		60,453	90,460	89,600
TOTAL EXPENSES	1,189,600		704,675	1,184,549	1,243,100
Contingency	1,189,000	_	-	 1,104,549 0	 0
TOTAL PROPOSED BUDGET	\$ 1,189,600	\$	704,675	\$ 1,184,549	\$ 1,243,100
(1) Appual Accompany: 5.201 units accorded at \$17.28 per unit = \$0.	 · •		•		

Г

(1) Annual Assessment: 5,301 units assessed at \$17.28 per unit = \$91,601.28

Ending Cash Balance May 31, 2020 Accounts Payable as of FY20, AP11 Accounts Receivable as of FY20, AP11 Adjusted Ending Cash Balancece May 31, 2020	\$ 2,072,811 - - 2,072,811
Estimated Revenues to June 30, 2020 Estimated Expenditures to June 30, 2020 Estimated Ending Fund Balance June 30, 2020	\$ 30,447 (479,874) 1,623,384

COUNTY SERVICE AREA NO. 4 - Oak Park

5-Year Fiscal Projection

5-Year Fiscal Projection	FY 20 Adopted Budget		FY 20 Estimated Year End			FY 21 Requested Budget		FY 22 Projected Budget		FY 23 Projected Budget	FY 24 Projected Budget			FY 25 Projected Budget		
REVENUE																
Property Taxes	\$	782,000	\$	783,230	\$	813,700	\$	838,100	\$	863,200	\$	889,100	\$	915,800	(1)	
Interest Earned		39,600		39,600		31,000		22,400		16,300		9,700		2,600	(2)	
Special Assessment		91,600		132,780		91,600		91,600		91,600		91,600		91,600	(3)	
Other Revenue - Misc	¢	-	*	14,000	*	-	*	050 400	¢	074 400	*	000 400	¢	4 040 000	(14)	
TOTAL REVENUE	\$	913,200	Ф	969,610	Þ	936,300	Þ	952,100	Þ	971,100	Þ	990,400	\$	1,010,000		
EXPENSES																
Landscape/Street Sweeping																
Landscape Contract Maintenance	\$	154,500	\$	147,000	\$	160,000	\$	164,800	\$	169,700	\$	174,800	\$	180,000	(4)	
Landscape Repair/Remediation/Emergency Work/Consulting		205,000		184,050		210,000		210,000		210,000		210,000		210,000	(4)	
Landscape Repair - FEMA Project Street Sweeping (26 times per year)		0 67,000		102,510 47,520		0 52,000		0 52,000		0 52,000		0 52,000		0 52,000	(4)	
Minor Equipment repair and/or replacement/other		5,000		5,000		5,000		5,000		5,000		5,000		5,000		
Total Landscape/Street Sweeping Expense		431,500		486,080		427,000		431,800		436,700		441,800		447,000	-	
Utilities																
Landscape irrigation- Oak Park Water		315,000		281,630		314,000		332,800		352,800		374,000		396,400	(5)	
Landscape irrigation - SCE		30,000		8,320		30,000		30,900		31,800		32,800		33,800	(6)	
Street Lighting - SCE		111,300		108,459		113,000		113,000		113,000		113,000		116,400	(6)	
Total Utility Expense		456,300		398,409		457,000		476,700		497,600		519,800		546,600	_	
Retrofit																
Oak Park Green Streets Urban Retrofit		0		0		24,000		25,200		26,500		27,800		29,200	(15)	
Total Retrofit Expense		0		0		24,000		25,200		26,500		27,800		29,200		
Community Support/Services																
School Crossing Guard Reimbursement (Currently 13 guards)		144,100		144,100		167,000		178,356		190,484		203,437		217,271	(7)	
Kanan Road Shuttle		30,000		30,000		36,000		74,880		77,875		80,990		84,230	(8)	
MAC Support		5,000		5,000		5,000		5,000		-		5,000		5,000	$\langle 0 \rangle$	
Elections (Unit 1921) - ballots CERT Support		_ 2,500		- 2,500		5,000 2,500		2,500		5,000 2,500		2,500		5,000 2,500	(9)	
Volunteers in Policing (VIP) Program		28,000		2,300		30,000		2,500		2,300		2,300		2,300	(10)	
Total Community Support/Services		209,600		209,600		245,500		287,259		303,178		320,065		342,983	_()	
Administration Support																
Voice/Data		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		
Indirect Cost Recovery		4,700		4,700		4,400		4,500		4,600		4,700		4,800	(11)	
Purchasing Charges / Materials ISF		2,100		2,100		2,000		2,100		2,200		2,300		2,400	• •	
Administration (PWA charges-RES)		34,400		37,660		34,900		35,900		37,000		38,100		39,200		
Administration (Fiscal Services)		29,600		29,600		31,500		32,400		33,400		34,400		35,400	(12)	
Attorney Services		10,000		5,000		5,000		5,000		5,000		5,000		5,000	(12)	
Collection & Billing Svcs (ACO Collection & Admin Fees) Total Administration Support		11,400 92,200		11,400 90,460		11,800 89,600		11,800 91,700		11,800 94,000		11,800 96,300		11,800 98,600	(13)	
		32,200		30,400		09,000		91,700		54,000		30,300		30,000		

COUNTY SERVICE AREA NO. 4 - Oak Park

5-Year Fiscal Projection

FY 20 Adopted Budget		FY 20 Estimated Year End		FY 21 Requested Budget		FY 22 Projected Budget	FY 23 Projected Budget			FY 24 Projected Budget	I	FY 25 Projected Budget
 1,189,600 0		1,184,549 0		1,243,100 0		1,312,659 0		1,357,978 0		1,405,765 0		1,464,383 0
\$ 1,189,600	\$	1,184,549	\$	1,243,100	\$	1,312,659	\$	1,357,978	\$	1,405,765	\$	1,464,383
\$ 276,400	\$	214,940	\$	306,800	\$	360,559	\$	386,878	\$	415,365	\$	454,383
	\$	2,072,811 - -										
		2,072,811	•									
	¢	30,447 (479,874)	¢	1 316 584	¢	956 025	¢	569 147	¢	153 782	¢	(300,600)
\$	Adopted Budget 1,189,600 0 \$ 1,189,600	Adopted Budget 1,189,600 0 \$ 1,189,600 \$ \$ 276,400 \$	Adopted Budget Estimated Year End 1,189,600 1,184,549 0 0 \$ 1,189,600 \$ 1,184,549 \$ 276,400 \$ 214,940 \$ 2,072,811 - - - - - -	Adopted Budget Estimated Year End F 1,189,600 0 1,184,549 0 0 0 \$ 1,189,600 \$ 1,184,549 \$ 214,940 \$ \$ \$ 276,400 \$ 214,940 \$ \$ 2,072,811 - - - - - 2,072,811 - - 30,447 (479,874) - -	Adopted Budget Estimated Year End Requested Budget 1,189,600 0 1,184,549 0 1,243,100 0 \$ 1,189,600 \$ 1,184,549 1,243,100 \$ 276,400 \$ 1,184,549 214,940 \$ 1,243,100 \$ 276,400 \$ 214,940 \$ 306,800 \$ 2,072,811 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - <td>Adopted Budget Estimated Year End Requested Budget 1,189,600 0 1,184,549 0 1,243,100 0 \$ 1,189,600 1,184,549 1,243,100 \$ \$ 1,189,600 \$ 1,184,549 \$ 1,243,100 \$ \$ 276,400 \$ 214,940 \$ 306,800 \$ \$ 2,072,811 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -</td> <td>Adopted Budget Estimated Year End Requested Budget Projected Budget 1,189,600 1,184,549 1,243,100 1,312,659 0 0 0 0 0 \$ 1,189,600 \$ 1,184,549 \$ 1,243,100 \$ 1,312,659 \$ 276,400 \$ 214,940 \$ 306,800 \$ 360,559 \$ 2,072,811 - - - - - - - 30,447 30,447 - -</td> <td>Adopted Budget Estimated Year End Requested Budget Projected Budget 1,189,600 1,184,549 1,243,100 1,312,659 0 0 0 0 0 \$ 1,189,600 \$ 1,184,549 1,243,100 \$ 1,312,659 \$ \$ 1,189,600 \$ 1,184,549 \$ 1,243,100 \$ 1,312,659 \$ \$ 276,400 \$ 214,940 \$ 306,800 \$ 360,559 \$ \$ 2,072,811 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -</td> <td>Adopted Budget Estimated Year End Requested Budget Projected Budget Projected Budget 1,189,600 0 1,184,549 0 1,243,100 0 1,312,659 0 1,357,978 0 \$ 1,189,600 0 \$ 1,184,549 0 \$ 1,243,100 0 \$ 1,312,659 0 \$ 1,357,978 0 \$ 1,189,600 0 \$ 1,184,549 0 \$ 1,243,100 0 \$ 1,312,659 0 \$ 1,357,978 0 \$ 276,400 \$ 214,940 0 \$ 306,800 0 \$ 360,559 0 \$ 386,878 \$ 2,072,811 </td> <td>Adopted Budget Estimated Year End Requested Budget Projected Budget Projected Budget 1,189,600 0 1,184,549 0 1,243,100 0 1,312,659 0 1,357,978 0 0 \$ 1,189,600 \$ 1,184,549 1,184,549 1,243,100 1,243,100 1,312,659 1,357,978 1,357,978 386,878 \$ \$ 2,072,811 </td> <td>Adopted Budget Estimated Year End Requested Budget Projected Budget Projected Budget Projected Budget Projected Budget 1,189,600 1,184,549 1,243,100 1,312,659 1,357,978 1,405,765 \$ 1,189,600 \$ 1,184,549 \$ 1,243,100 \$ 1,312,659 \$ 1,357,978 \$ 1,405,765 \$ 1,189,600 \$ 1,184,549 \$ 1,243,100 \$ 1,312,659 \$ 1,357,978 \$ 1,405,765 \$ 276,400 \$ 214,940 \$ 306,800 \$ 360,559 \$ 386,878 \$ 415,365 \$ 2,072,811 -</td> <td>Adopted Budget Estimated Year End Requested Budget Projected Budget Projected Projected <</td>	Adopted Budget Estimated Year End Requested Budget 1,189,600 0 1,184,549 0 1,243,100 0 \$ 1,189,600 1,184,549 1,243,100 \$ \$ 1,189,600 \$ 1,184,549 \$ 1,243,100 \$ \$ 276,400 \$ 214,940 \$ 306,800 \$ \$ 2,072,811 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Adopted Budget Estimated Year End Requested Budget Projected Budget 1,189,600 1,184,549 1,243,100 1,312,659 0 0 0 0 0 \$ 1,189,600 \$ 1,184,549 \$ 1,243,100 \$ 1,312,659 \$ 276,400 \$ 214,940 \$ 306,800 \$ 360,559 \$ 2,072,811 - - - - - - - 30,447 30,447 - -	Adopted Budget Estimated Year End Requested Budget Projected Budget 1,189,600 1,184,549 1,243,100 1,312,659 0 0 0 0 0 \$ 1,189,600 \$ 1,184,549 1,243,100 \$ 1,312,659 \$ \$ 1,189,600 \$ 1,184,549 \$ 1,243,100 \$ 1,312,659 \$ \$ 276,400 \$ 214,940 \$ 306,800 \$ 360,559 \$ \$ 2,072,811 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Adopted Budget Estimated Year End Requested Budget Projected Budget Projected Budget 1,189,600 0 1,184,549 0 1,243,100 0 1,312,659 0 1,357,978 0 \$ 1,189,600 0 \$ 1,184,549 0 \$ 1,243,100 0 \$ 1,312,659 0 \$ 1,357,978 0 \$ 1,189,600 0 \$ 1,184,549 0 \$ 1,243,100 0 \$ 1,312,659 0 \$ 1,357,978 0 \$ 276,400 \$ 214,940 0 \$ 306,800 0 \$ 360,559 0 \$ 386,878 \$ 2,072,811 	Adopted Budget Estimated Year End Requested Budget Projected Budget Projected Budget 1,189,600 0 1,184,549 0 1,243,100 0 1,312,659 0 1,357,978 0 0 \$ 1,189,600 \$ 1,184,549 1,184,549 1,243,100 1,243,100 1,312,659 1,357,978 1,357,978 386,878 \$ \$ 2,072,811	Adopted Budget Estimated Year End Requested Budget Projected Budget Projected Budget Projected Budget Projected Budget 1,189,600 1,184,549 1,243,100 1,312,659 1,357,978 1,405,765 \$ 1,189,600 \$ 1,184,549 \$ 1,243,100 \$ 1,312,659 \$ 1,357,978 \$ 1,405,765 \$ 1,189,600 \$ 1,184,549 \$ 1,243,100 \$ 1,312,659 \$ 1,357,978 \$ 1,405,765 \$ 276,400 \$ 214,940 \$ 306,800 \$ 360,559 \$ 386,878 \$ 415,365 \$ 2,072,811 -	Adopted Budget Estimated Year End Requested Budget Projected Budget Projected Projected <

Notes & Assumptions:

(1) Secured property taxes estimated to increase 3.5% for FY21 based on FY19 actuals, and then 3% thereafter.

- (2) Interest Earnings is based on the average cash balance each year. Interest rate for FY21 is estimated at 1.7% and Fiscal Services estimates 1.7% thereafter.
- (3) Annual Assessment: 5,301 units assessed at \$17.28 per unit = \$91,601.28
- (4) Regular maintenance & upkeep. Estimated 3% annual increase thereafter based on FY21 Budget. Fire damage identified for FEMA reimbursement repaired.
- (5) Water Usage expense by FY as follows: FY17 \$190,548, FY18 \$234,295, FY19 \$157,078. Decreased in FY19 and in beginning of FY20 due to Woolsey Fire damage.
- Oak Park Water projection based on an estimated 6% annual increase.
- (6) Streetlights SCE budget created before LED implementation. Potential savings with LED conversion reflected in future years remaining flat until FY25 with an estimated increase of 3%.
- (7) Projection includes increase of approximately 7% annually.
- (8) Kanan Shuttle FY21 Budget and projection based on current assumptions:
- *Ridership is free of charge
- *Current FY20 allocation based on previous approval: Oak Park School District \$25,000, City of Agoura \$35,000, and CSA 4 \$30,000.
- *Update FY20 CSA 4 shares estimated at \$30,000 is now projected to be \$24,000 (June 10, 2020).
- *In FY22 and thereafter, estimate of costs based on CSA 4 taking over full box ratio cost with an estimated increase of 4.0% annually.
- (9) Fiscal Services estimated Election expenses for FY23 and FY25.
- (10) Volunteers in Policing (VIP) On February 26, 2019, COV Board of Supervisors authorized signing of 5-year agreement with City of Thousand Oaks.
 - *Update Estimated cost for FY20 =\$25,000 (June 10, 2020). For FY22 and thereafter, estimated 3% annual increase.
- (11) County Voice, Indirect Cost Recovery & Purchasing Charges for FY21 per Budget Development Manual. Estimated to increase 3% annually thereafter.
- (12) Admin charges per budget. Estimated to increase 3% annually thereafter.
- (13) Auditor and Tax Collector's Fees to administer property tax collection.
- (14) \$14,000 SCE Settlement for the Woolsey Fire. Additional \$16,000 from settlement for CSA 4 to be presented to the Board for approval on June 23rd. *FEMA has not closed out the Woolsey Project. Estimated reimbursement of approximately \$95,000 if all project costs approved.
- (15) Oak Park Green Streets Urban Retrofit- Budgeted at 50% of estimated costs. Estimated to increase 5% annually thereafter.





Proposal: Add four trash cans on Kanan Road

By William Liu

 Follow up on my proposal to add trash cans on Kanan road that I submitted on February 25th, 2020 MAC Meeting.

Decision? Next steps ?





Proposal to Grow Water Lilies at Medea Creek

By William Liu Nini Tu

2020-06-18





Where – Medea Creek Trail

Near Conifer / Parkview Dr





Why Growing Water Lilies

Current Issue:

- O Water is dirty
- O Not pleasant for local residents and kids walking and playing around
- O No animal wants to live there

Solution – Growing Water Lilies

- Looks very pretty
- Covers the unclean plants at the top, like algae
- Helps keep the algae growth down by blocking out sunlight
- Keeps the water clear and clean looking by absorbing nutrients in the water that would normally feed the undesirable algae
- Their shade gives respite from the sunlight and any possible predators to fish and other small animals in the creek





Appendix - How to Grow Water Lilies

- Use a large ceramic pot with several holes punched in the sides and bottom.
- Fill the pot to within 3 inches of the top with silt, loam or clay soil and mix in a small amount of slow-release fertilizer labeled for use with aquatic soil.
- Plant the rhizome close to one side of the pot at a 45-degree angle with the eye pointing up.
- Cover the soil with a layer of pea gravel, keeping the gravel away from the top of the rhizome as much as possible.
- Place the pot in the bottom of the pond, adjusting the depth to that recommended for your specific variety. Most call for a depth of between 6 and 18 inches. If necessary, you can raise the depth by placing the pot on top of rocks.

We can remove the pots if they are no longer wanted or things don't' go well – EASY ~!



