OAK PARK MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MINUTES of an official Meeting September 9, 2020. The Oak Park MAC held a special meeting on Wednesday, September 9, 2020 at 3:00 PM remotely by Zoom.

1. Call to Order of the meeting

The meeting was called to order by *Chair Seema Chandra* at 3:00 PM. *Alon Glickstein* and *Jane Nye, JL Diaz* also participated. *Janice Smets* was absent.

2. Flag Salute

Supervisor Parks led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Adoption of the Agenda

The MAC voted 4-0 to adopt the agenda, with *Jane Nye* making the motion seconded by *JL Diaz*.

4. Approval of the Minutes of June 18, 2020

Jane Nye moved to approve the draft meeting minutes, seconded by *Seema Chandra*, and passed 4-0, with the request of Jane Nye to include the written proposal submitted in June by the *Liu family* regarding addressing litter on the south side of Kanan Road and adding water lilies to Medea Creek.

5. Public Safety reports

Ventura County Sheriff's Office Senior Deputy John Chiaromonte reported to the MAC about the previous months. He said that there had been some thefts from unlocked vehicles as well as thefts of catalytic converters. He noted that the Volunteers in Policing (VIP's) had worked Oak Park in January and February prior to the pandemic.

6. Comments of Ventura County Supervisor Linda Parks

Supervisor Parks welcomed Public Works staff to the meeting for the budget item. She gave an update about the County's efforts to reduce COVID-19 cases and allow for more re-opening. Regarding the upcoming election November 3, she noted that over 70% of voters were already voting by mail in the County. She noted that the General Plan update being worked on by the county would include strong additions for addressing climate change, and introduce larger setbacks from oil wells. She said she had participated in hearings about cleaning up the Santa Susana Field Lab. *Seema Chandra* requested a ballot drop off box within Oak Park, and Supervisor Parks supported the idea. She noted the recent "Acorn" article on the 11-year-old resident *William Liu* who had picked up trash in Oak Park and brought the need for additional trash cans to the attention of the MAC.

7. Public Comments

The Liu family, including Bing Xu, Jasmine and William Liu, inquired about progress on their request for adding trash cans along the south side of Kanan Road. Jane Nye explained her work doing an audit of the litter there, and said that the area could be added to a Public Works "adopt a road" program. She said that the majority of trash was thrown from vehicles, and Bing Xu Liu disagreed, saying that 40% was also dog waste. *Jane Nye* said that she would send the Liu's the results of her audit, and that the MAC still needed to discuss the issue on a future agenda. Bing Xu Liu commented that water lilies planted by her family were already blooming at Oak Canyon Park.

8. Council Comments

Alon Glickstein noted that the CHP had successfully addressed complaints about oversized vehicle parking on Kanan Road.

Seema Chandra congratulated residents on saving the tree designated for removal at Mae Boyar Park. She asked about the status of the LED streetlights conversion, and Charles Alvarez from Public Works responded that it was almost completed.

Jane Nye's written comments are attached.

9. Written Communications

Seema Chandra shared information from Oak Park Library about participation in the summer reading program. A quarter of the winners of the various County-wide contests in the program had been Oak Park residents. She also shared a letter to the school district by a former student about systemic racism.

10. Advisory Matters

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

Debra Cavaletto from Public Works was on hand to address questions. The budget is attached here. In an unusual move, the Board had decided in June 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 in June to vote on the CSA #4 budget in the autumn.

Seema Chandra made a motion seconded by Alon Glickstein and passed by the MAC 4-0.

b. MAC recommendation, property owner request for removal of 3 pine trees in CSA #4 maintained area along Hawthorne Street

Valerie Lopez from Public Works and the property owner presented the complaints that the tree was a fire hazard, and that it was damaging the wall at the home. *Charles Alvarez* noted that a policy for dealing with such complaints was in order, because in Oak Park such complaints were on the increase. *Alon Glickstein* noted that this could be considered more of a legal matter than a decision for the MAC to make. *Seema Chandra* said that she would schedule a field trip with County staff to inspect the situation before making any decision, and the MAC members concurred with this approach.

11. Adjournment

Chair Chandra adjourned the meeting at 4:28 PM.

Add to June Minutes

Please add Public Comment to June 18, 2020 Meeting Minutes – Jasmine and William Lui presented a new proposal to add Water Lilies to Medea Creek to beautify our community

Jane Nye's Council Comments

Trash story in Acorn on Aug 27 re William Liu – <u>https://www.theacorn.com/articles/oak-park-boy-talks-trash-then-picks-it-up/</u>

- William requested a follow-up from his request in our Feb MAC meeting Add 4 trash cans on Kanan
- I worked with Lisa McCullough, Environmental Resource Analyst III in Water & Sanitation department of Public Works to complete a Trash Audit
 - Walked 3 miles of Kanan from Lindero Cyn Rd to Deerhill 2x week for 1 month
 - Picked up trash, photographed it, and maintained a spreadsheet of trash found + conditions
- Options:
 - Add 2-4 trash cans on South side of Kanan and/or
 - Have OPUSD consider Ventura County's Transportation's Adopt-a-Road Program Here is the link for review: <u>https://s29422.pcdn.co/wp-</u>
 - content/uploads/2020/07/Adopt-a-Road-Link-for-Guidelines-Page-v2.pdf
- Recommend that this topic be added to a future MAC meeting agenda to be discussed with the MAC Board on how to proceed

Follow-up on Jasmine and William Lui's request to add Water Lilies to Medea Creek – I contacted Dan Paranick and Wayne Nakaoka (RSRPD) – here is Wayne's response to Willian and Nini:

- Establishing Water Lilies (Nymphaea Alba) is certainly a creative way to enhance the biodiversity of Medea Creek. Unfortunately, Water Lilies require ponds or slow moving water to survive and are often planted in full sun-shine where the water depth is 8" to 12" deep. While there are areas along Medea Creek that meet this requirement, accessing them for elementary school age children is not advisable.
- As an alternative, they could plant the Water Lilies in the Oak Park Lagoon (pond). The pond meets all of the requirements for the Water Lilies to grow and is a safe location for Nini and William to plant them.
- If they want to pursue this volunteer project, please have them contact Ms. Jeannie Liss at the Oak Park Community Center @ 818. 865.9304. I have copied Jennie on this e-mail to provide her with some background information. Once the necessary paperwork has been completed (hold-harmless and release forms from the parents), I will be more than happy to assist them with their planting project.

Brookside curb follow-up (trip hazard) as reported by Glenn Karpinski – work completed Jul 31 by Brendan Callahan, Maintenance and Operations OPUSD

Complaint about lost cat flyers posted all over Oak Park sent to Supervisor Parks' office on Aug 20 – I removed many on my Trash Audit Walk, we need to consider adding TO-like service to remove garage sale signs, posters, and flyers (it's a budget discussion)

Request from a resident, Ericka Carrick, on Aug 22 for replacing 2 Conifer St signs that are peeling as posted on Next Door – I followed up and Ericka will submit a request via the Public Works app

Ventura Public Works added Pedestrian Crossing signs on Aug 23 near Deerhill & Poppyview per resident, Julie Ajakh's request

Verizon appeal by David Lelie upheld on Aug 27 by Planning Commission – no Verizon tower off of Churchwood/Hawthorne in Monte Carlo neighborhood, \$1K appeal fee refunded

- Verizon filed a timely appeal of the Planning Commission's decision on the Churchwood project – will be appealed to the Ventura County Board of Supervisors
- We don't have a date for the Board of Supervisors hearing

Triunfo PURE Water demo facility – ribbon cutting ceremony on Fri, Sep 11 – Seema Chandra will be a speaker representing Ventura County and Oak Park

- 140 people invited + 500 spots for public Zoom call-ins
- Demo facility will start giving tours in Oct (Zoom or in person)
- I took a tour and sampled the water last week very impressed with the facility see web link, below:

https://www.ourpureh2o.com/

Elections

- The proposed list of Vote By Mail (VBM) Drop Box Locations does not include Oak Park!
 - <u>file:///C:/Users/jmnye/AppData/Local/Microsoft/Windows/INetCache/IE/060EF</u> KQZ/NOTICE-OF-IPVLs-and-Drop-Boxes-Comment-Period-v9%20(1).pdf
- We need to have a Vote By Mail (VBM) Drop Box Location in Oak Park
 - Although no VBM Drop Box is currently shown for Oak Park, the Registrar said ballots can be dropped off at an in-person location – OPHS
- 3 people running for 2 open MAC seats:
 - Maria Soosai
 - Jane Nye
 - Seema Chandra

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		_	
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	^		_	4 0 4 0 0 0 0	(14)
TOTAL REVENUE	\$	913,200	\$	969,610	\$	936,300	\$	952,100	\$	971,100	\$	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	• •
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	
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		2,300		2,300		30,000		2,300		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	(11)
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	(10)
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	
		52,200		50,400		09,000		91,700		54,000		50,300		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.



