



PLEASANT VALLEY RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT
PARK MAINTENANCE AND RECREATION IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

FINAL ENGINEER'S REPORT

FISCAL YEAR 2019-20

MAY 2019

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

ENGINEER OF WORK:
SCIConsultingGroup
4745 MANGELS BOULEVARD
FAIRFIELD, CALIFORNIA 94534
PHONE 707.430.4300
FAX 707.430.4319
www.sci-cg.com

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	6
OVERVIEW	6
ASSESSMENT PROCESS	7
ENGINEER'S REPORT AND CONTINUATION OF ASSESSMENTS	8
LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS	8
PLANS & SPECIFICATIONS	11
FISCAL YEAR 2019-20 ESTIMATE OF COST AND BUDGET	13
INTRODUCTION	13
SUMMARY OF DISTRICT'S IMPROVEMENT PLANS	13
METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT	16
METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT	16
DISCUSSION OF BENEFIT	16
BENEFIT FACTORS	17
BENEFIT FINDING	19
GENERAL VERSUS SPECIAL BENEFIT	19
CALCULATING GENERAL BENEFIT	21
ZONES OF BENEFIT	23
METHOD OF ASSESSMENT AND PROPORTIONALITY	25
METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT	28
COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL PROPERTIES	29
VACANT PROPERTIES	30
OTHER PROPERTIES	31
DURATION OF ASSESSMENT	31
APPEALS AND INTERPRETATION	31
ASSESSMENT	33
ASSESSMENT DIAGRAM	36
APPENDIX A - 2019-20 ASSESSMENT ROLL	39

TABLE OF FIGURES

TABLE 1 - ESTIMATE OF COST, FY 2019-20.....	14
TABLE 2 - SUMMARY OF PARCELS AND ASSESSMENTS BY ZONE OF BENEFIT.....	24
TABLE 3 - RESIDENTIAL DENSITY AND ASSESSMENT FACTORS.....	29
TABLE 4 - COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL DENSITY AND ASSESSMENT FACTORS.....	30
TABLE 5 - SUMMARY COST ESTIMATE.....	33

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

INTRODUCTION

OVERVIEW

The Pleasant Valley Recreation and Park District (the "Park District") currently provides park facilities and recreational programs for its service area of 26,400 parcels. The Park District currently owns, operates and maintains 28 neighborhood, community, and regional parks which are distributed throughout the Park District. (For locations of the Park District's facilities, see the Diagram following in this Report.)

The Park District's facilities are summarized as follows:

DISTRICT PARKS

- ❖ **ADOLFO PARK**, (3.0 acres), 3601 N. Adolfo.
- ❖ **ARNEILL RANCH PARK**, (5.0 acres), 1301 Sweetwater.
- ❖ **BIRCHVIEW PARK**, (0.7 acres), 5564 Laurel Ridge Lane, Birchview/Laurel Ridge.
- ❖ **CALLEGUAS CREEK PARK**, (3.0 acres), 675 Avenida Valencia.
- ❖ **CAMARILLO OAK GROVE PARK**, (24.55 acres), 6968 Camarillo Springs Road.
- ❖ **CARMENITA PARK**, (1.0 acres), 1506 Sevilla.
- ❖ **CHARTER OAK PARK**, (5.7 acres), 2500 Charter Oak Drive.
- ❖ **COMMUNITY CENTER PARK**, (12.9 acres), 1605 E. Burnley Street, Carmen/Burnley.
- ❖ **DOS CAMINOS PARK**, (4.4 acres), 2198 N. Ponderosa Road, Las Posas/Ponderosa.
- ❖ **ENCANTO PARK**, (3.0 acres), 5300 Encanto.
- ❖ **FOOTHILL PARK**, (2.3 acres), 1501 Cranbrook Street.
- ❖ **FREEDOM PARK**, (33.9 acres), 275 E. Pleasant Valley Road, Skyway/Eubanks.
- ❖ **HERITAGE PARK**, (9.0 acres), 1630 Heritage Trail, Joshua Trail/Heritage Trail.
- ❖ **LAS POSAS EQUESTRIAN PARK**, (2.0 acres), 2084 Via Veneto, El Tuaca/Via Veneto.
- ❖ **LAURELWOOD PARK**, (1.5 acres), 2127 Dexter, Mobil/Dexter.
- ❖ **LOKKER PARK**, (7.0 acres), 848 Vista Coto Verde, Calle Higuera/Avenida Sultura.
- ❖ **MEL VINCENT PARK**, (5.0 ACRES), 668 CALISTOGA ROAD.
- ❖ **MISSION OAKS PARK**, (20.2 acres), 5501 Mission Oaks Boulevard, Mission Oaks/Oak Canyon.
- ❖ **NANCY BUSH PARK**, (3.4 acres), 1150 Bradford.

- ❖ PITTS RANCH PARK, (10.0 acres), 1400 Flynn Road.
- ❖ BOB KILDEE COMMUNITY PARK, (13.0 acres), 1030 Temple Avenue, Ponderosa/Temple.
- ❖ QUITO PARK, (5.0 acres), 7073 Quito Court, Calle Dia/Quito.
- ❖ SPRINGVILLE PARK, (5.0 acres), 801 Via Zamora.
- ❖ TRAILSIDE PARK, (0.5 acres), 5462 Cherry Ridge Drive, Willow View/Maple View.
- ❖ VALLE LINDO PARK, (10.0 acres), 889 Aileen Street, Valle Lindo/Aileen.
- ❖ PLEASANT VALLEY FIELDS, (55.0 acres), 3777 Village at the Park Drive.
- ❖ WOODCREEK PARK, (5.0 acres), 1200 Woodcreek Road, Lynwood/Woodcreek.
- ❖ WOODSIDE PARK, (5.0 acres), 247 Japonica Avenue, Ridgeview/Japonica.

ASSESSMENT PROCESS

In 2001, due to the combination of limited revenues, a growing community and expanding park acreage, the Park District projected that it would not be able to adequately maintain its current and future parks and recreation facilities. Therefore, the Board proposed the establishment of an assessment district to provide adequate revenues for park maintenance services as well as for expanding and improving park facilities to meet the growing demand placed on the parks.

In February and March 2001 the Board conducted an assessment ballot proceeding pursuant to the requirements of Article XIID 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 District were provided with a notice and ballot for the proposed parks assessment ("the Parks Maintenance and Recreation Improvement District" or the "Improvement District"). A 45-day period was provided for balloting and a public hearing was conducted on March 21st, 2001. 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). The final balloting result was 58.7% weighted support in favor of the benefit assessments for the Pleasant Valley Recreation and Park District's Park Maintenance and Recreation Improvement District.

As a result, the Board gained the authority to approve the levy of the assessments for the fiscal year 2001-02 and to continue to levy them in future years. The authority granted by the ballot proceeding includes an annual adjustment in the assessment levies equal to the annual change in the Consumer Price Index for the Los Angeles Area, not to exceed 3%.

ENGINEER'S REPORT AND CONTINUATION OF ASSESSMENTS

In each subsequent year for which the assessments will be continued, 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 adopted on February 6, 2019.

This Engineer's Report ("Report") was prepared to establish the budget for the continued improvements and services ("Improvements") that would be funded by the proposed 2019-20 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 XIID of the California Constitution (the "Article").

The Board preliminarily approved this Engineer's Report and the continuation of the 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 5, 2019. At this hearing, the Board would consider approval of a resolution confirming the continuation of the assessments for fiscal year 2019-20. If the assessments are so confirmed and approved, the levies would be submitted to the County Auditor/Controller by August 2019 for inclusion on the property tax roll for fiscal year 2019-20.

LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS

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 XIIC and XIID 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 vs. SCCOSA”). 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 specified and identified
- Special benefits are directly received by and provide a direct advantage to property in the assessment district
- The assessments must be proportional to the special benefits conferred

This Engineer’s Report is consistent with the SVTA vs. SCCOSA decision and with the requirements of Article 13C and 13D of the California Constitution because the improvements to be funded are clearly defined; the benefiting properties in the Improvement District enjoys close and unique proximity, access and views to the Improvements; the Improvements serve as an extension of usable land area for benefiting properties in the Improvement District and such special benefits provide a direct advantage to property in the Improvement District that is not enjoyed by the public at large or other property; and the assessments are proportional to the special benefits conferred.

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 XIIC and XIID 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 Improvement District; and the improvements provide a direct advantage to property in the Improvement 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 Improvement 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.

PLANS & SPECIFICATIONS

The Pleasant Valley Recreation and Park District maintains park facilities in locations throughout its boundaries.

The work and improvements (the "Improvements") proposed to be undertaken by the Pleasant Valley Recreation and Park District's Park Maintenance and Recreation 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, playground equipment, hard court surfaces, ground cover, shrubs and trees, irrigation and sprinkler systems, landscaping, park grounds and facilities, drainage systems, lighting, fencing, entry monuments, basketball courts, tennis courts, gymnasiums, senior centers, running tracks, swimming pools, landscape corridors, trails, 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 Pleasant Valley Recreation and Park District. Any plans and specifications for these improvements have been filed with the General Manager of the Pleasant Valley 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 and the more detailed budgets and improvement plans of the Park District, which are on file with the Pleasant Valley Recreation and Park District.

FISCAL YEAR 2019-20 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

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. A detailed project improvement plan has been developed and is available for review at the Park District offices.

TABLE 1 - ESTIMATE OF COST, FY 2019-20

	<i>Total Budget</i>	
Installation, Maintenance & Servicing Costs		
Capital Improvements	\$857,434	
Equipment and Facility Replacement	\$64,000	
Services and Supplies	\$2,168,167	
Maintenance and Operations of Improvements ¹	<u>\$2,099,918</u>	
Subtotal - Installation, Maintenance and Servicing	\$5,189,519	
Administrative Costs:		
Assessment Administration and County Charges	\$21,966	
Allowance for Uncollectible Assessments	<u>\$14,380</u>	
Subtotals - Incidentals	\$36,346	
Total for Installation, Maintenance, Servicing and Administration	\$5,225,865	
Total Benefit of Improvements	\$5,225,865	
Single Family Equivalent Units (SFE)	27,842	
Benefit Received per SFE Unit	\$187.70	
Less:		
District Contribution for General Benefits ²	(\$1,306,466.25)	
District Contribution for Special Benefits	(\$2,775,856.75)	
Beginning Fund Balance (July 1, 19)	(\$669,959)	
Contribution to Reserve Fund/Improvement Fund/Contingency ³	<u>\$676,851</u>	
	<u>(\$4,075,431)</u>	
Net Cost of Installation, Maintenance and Servicing (Net Amount to be Assessed)	\$1,150,434	
Budget Allocation to Property		
Total Assessment Budget*	\$1,150,434	
	Unadjusted SFE	Adjusted SFE
Single Family Equivalent Benefit Units - Zone A	<u>26,809.81</u>	26,809.81
Single Family Equivalent Benefit Units - Zone B	495.24	123.81
Single Family Equivalent Benefit Units - Zone C	1,816.89	908.45
Adjusted SFE Units		<u>27,842.07</u>
Assessment per Single Family Equivalent Unit		\$41.32

* All assessments are rounded to lower even penny. Therefore, the budget amount may slightly differ from the assessment rate

Notes to Estimate of Cost:

1. The item, Maintenance and Operation of Improvements provides funding for enhanced maintenance of all parks and recreation facilities on a daily basis, seven days per week. Improvements include mowing turf, trimming and caring for landscaping, fertilization and aeration of grounds and playfields, routine maintenance and safety inspections, painting, replacing/repairing broken or damaged equipment, trash removal and cleanup, irrigation and irrigation system maintenance, and other services as needed.
2. 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 \$5,225,865, the District must contribute at least \$1,306,466 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.
3. This amount is the projected ending fund balance as of June 30, 2020. The Fund Balance shown includes operating reserves and the Capital Improvement Reserve Fund.
4. The Act stipulates that proceeds from the assessments must be deposited into a special fund that has been set up for the revenues and expenditures of the Improvement District. Moreover, funds raised by the assessment shall be used only for the purposes stated within this Report. Any balance remaining at the end of the fiscal year, July 1, must be carried over to the next fiscal year. The funds shown under contribution to Reserve Fund / Improvement Fund / Contingency are primarily being accumulated for future capital improvement and capital renovation needs.

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 maintained 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 Pleasant Valley 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. Identification of the direct advantages (special benefits) received by property in the Improvement District
3. Calculation of the proportion of these benefits that are general
4. Determination of the relative special benefit within different areas within the Improvement District
5. Determination of the relative special benefit per property type
6. 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 XIID of the California Constitution, has confirmed that assessments must be based on the special benefit to property:

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

Since assessments are levied on the basis of special benefit, they are not a tax and are not governed by Article XIII A of the California Constitution.

The SVTA v. SCCOSA decision also clarifies that a special benefit is a service or improvement that provides a direct advantage to a parcel, in contrast to a general benefit which provides indirect or derivative advantages. The SVTA v. SCCOSA 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. XIID, sections 2(i) & 4(f).) The SVTA v. SCCOSA decision further clarifies that special benefits must provide a direct advantage to benefiting property and that examples of a special benefit include proximity to a park, expanded or improved access to open space or views of open space.

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 this service radii close proximity and easy 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.

Moreover, almost every neighborhood park in the Improvement District does not provide a restroom or parking lot. Such public amenities were specifically excluded from neighborhood parks because neighborhood parks are designed to be an extension of usable land area specifically for properties in close proximity, and not the public at large or other non-proximate property. The occupants of proximate property do not need to drive to their local park and do not need restroom facilities because they can easily reach their local neighborhood park and can use their own restroom facilities as needed. This is further tangible evidence of the effective extension of land area provided by the Improvements to proximate parcels in the Improvement District and the unique direct advantage the parcels within the Improvement District receive from the Improvements.

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. As noted in the following section, several Zones of Benefit have been specifically drawn within the Improvement District to further recognize the unique levels of proximity and special benefits to properties in the Improvement District. The benefiting properties in the Improvement District therefore uniquely and specially benefit from the Improvements and several unique areas of special benefits have been narrowly drawn.

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 the Improvements are accessed or passed. 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, open space, 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 XIIC 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:

Total Benefit	=	General Benefit	+	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:

General Benefit	=	Benefit to real property outside of improvement district	+	Benefit to real property inside of improvement district	+	Benefit to 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. 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 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.

Assumptions:

3,616 parcels outside the district but within either 0.5 miles of a neighborhood park or 2.0 miles of a community park within the Improvement District.

25,370 parcels in the Improvement District.

50% relative benefit compared to property within the Improvement District.

Calculation of General Benefit to Property Outside the Improvement District

$$(3,616 / (25,370 + 3,615)) * 0.5 = 6.2\%$$

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 6.2% 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*

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 indirect benefits to the public at large. Approximately 2.0% 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.

BENEFIT TO THE PUBLIC AT LARGE

The general benefit to the public at large can 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 District¹. A survey of park and recreation facility usage conducted by SCI Consulting Group found that less than 5% of the Park District’s facility usage is by those who do not live or work within District boundaries.² When people outside the Improvement District use parks, they diminish the availability of parks for people within the Improvement District. Therefore, another 5% of general benefits are allocated for people within the Improvement District. Combining these two measures of general benefits, we find that 10% of the benefits from the Improvements are general benefits to the public at large.

TOTAL GENERAL BENEFITS

Using a sum of these three measures of general benefit, we find that approximately 18.2% of the benefits conferred by the Improvements may be general in nature and should be funded by sources other than the assessment.

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.

² . A total of 200 park users were surveyed on different days and times during the months of November and December 2000. Nine respondents (4.5%) indicated that they did not reside or work within the Park District.

General Benefit Calculation

	6.2%	(Outside the Assessment District)
+	2.0%	(Inside the district – indirect and derivative)
+	10.0%	(Public at Large)
=	18.2%	(Total General Benefit)

Although this analysis finds that 18.2% 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 \$5,225,865. Of this total budget amount, the Park District will contribute \$4,082,323 from sources other than the assessments for park maintenance and operation. This contribution by the Park District equates to approximately 78% of the total budget for maintenance and improvements and constitutes far more than the amount attributable to the general benefits from the Improvements.

ZONES OF BENEFIT

The Pleasant Valley Recreation and Park District's parks and recreation facilities are generally concentrated in the areas encompassing the City of Camarillo. The outlying, generally more rural areas of the Park District have limited park and recreation facilities and properties in these areas (collectively "area") are generally less proximate to the Improvements. Therefore, this area receives relatively lesser special benefits from the assessments than properties located within the City of Camarillo. This area of lesser benefit is defined to include all parcels within District boundaries that are located outside of the City limits, excluding the upper northwest section of the unincorporated areas of the Park District, generally known as the Heights and Spanish Hills³. This area is hereinafter referred to as Zone of Benefit B or Zone B and is depicted on the Assessment Diagram included with this Report. All parcels within the City of Camarillo or within the unincorporated areas described as the Heights or Spanish Hills are classified into Zone of Benefit A or Zone A.

Relative proximity and access to the Park District's facilities is a measure of the level of special benefit conferred by the assessments. Parcels in Zone B are approximately four times farther removed from the Park District's facilities as those within Zone A; therefore

³ . The area of Heights and Spanish Hills is generally located in the northwest unincorporated section of the Park District. The Las Posas Equestrian Park and Springville Park is located within this area. In addition, this area has similar proximity to the Park District's parks and facilities as do other parcels within the City of Camarillo.

these properties are determined to receive 1/4 (25%) the level of benefit as those within Zone A.

Leisure Village and The Springs are two retirement communities generally located on the eastern side of the City of Camarillo. Both communities provide their own recreational facilities and programs to their residents, and the Park District does not own or maintain facilities within the two communities. Consequently, the recreational facilities and services offered by Leisure Village and The Springs offset some of the benefits provided by the Park District's facilities, so these properties receive lower levels of special benefit. Although the residents and employees of Leisure Village and The Springs use facilities within each community, they also can and do utilize the Park District's facilities and programs, such as the Senior Center, Community Center, and Pleasant Valley pool.

A survey of property owners conducted by Godbe Research and Analysis in August 2000, found that property owners in these communities utilized Park District facilities generally approximately at one-half the frequency of property owners outside these communities. Using relative frequency of use as a measure of benefit, the Engineer has determined that a benefit of 1/2 the level of benefit as those within Zone A is appropriate. Therefore, properties in Leisure Village and The Springs are classified into Zone of Benefit C or Zone C and are determined to receive a benefit of 1/2 (50%) the level of benefit as those within Zone A.

The summary of parcels and assessments by Zone of Benefit is listed in the following table.

TABLE 2 - SUMMARY OF PARCELS AND ASSESSMENTS BY ZONE OF BENEFIT

	<i>Zone of Benefit</i>			<i>Total</i>
	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	
Total Parcels	23,289	774	2,398	26,461
SFE Units (Unadjusted for Benefit Weighting)	26,809.81	495.24	1,816.89	29,121.94
Benefit Adjustment Factor	100%	25%	50%	
Assessment Rate per SFE	\$41.32	\$10.33	\$20.66	
Total Assessment	\$1,107,781.35	\$5,115.83	\$37,536.95	\$1,150,434.13

The Zones of Benefit are shown on the Assessment Diagram and are listed for each parcel on the Assessment Roll.

Assessed properties within the Improvement District 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. 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, 44 Cal.4th 431, 456, 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 AND PROPORTIONALITY

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.⁴

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 all 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

⁴ 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."

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 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, its location and its proximity to parks and recreational facilities. Furthermore, the proportional special benefit derived by each identified parcel is apportioned based upon the following:

1. The entirety of the capital cost of the Improvements;
2. The maintenance and operation expenses of the Improvements;
3. And the cost of the property-related service being provided.

This method is further described below.

Pursuant to the Landscape and Lighting Act of 1972 and Article XIID of the Constitution of the State of California, all parcels that have special benefit conferred upon them as a result of the Improvements shall be identified and the proportionate special benefit derived by each identified parcel shall be determined in relationship to the entire cost of the Improvements. Only parcels that receive direct special benefit are assessed, and each parcel is assessed in proportion to the estimated benefit received.

Each parcel's benefit is determined by the difference between the general and special benefits being conferred on the properties by the Improvements; and the proportion of the special benefit conferred on the various land uses within the Assessment District. This method is further depicted below.

EQUATION 1 – SPECIAL BENEFIT APPORTIONMENT FACTORS

<p>Special Benefit $\approx \Sigma$ (Special Benefit apportionment factors including use property type, size, location, and proximity to Improvements)</p>

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 "benchmark" property, a single family detached dwelling on one parcel (one "Single Family Equivalent Unit" or "SFE"). This SFE methodology is commonly used to distribute assessments in proportion to estimated special benefits and is generally recognized as providing the basis for a fair and appropriate distribution of assessments. In this Engineer's Report, all properties are assigned an SFE value, which is each property's

relative special benefit in relation to a single family home on one parcel (the benchmark parcel). The formula for this special benefit assignment is as follows.

EQUATION 2 – RELATIVE SPECIAL BENEFIT (SFE)

$$\text{Relative Special Benefit} \approx \frac{\text{Special Benefit for a Specific Parcel}}{\text{Special Benefit for the Benchmark Parcel}}$$

Finally, to apportion the cost of Improvements to each parcel the total cost of the Improvements funded by the Assessments is divided by the total SFE benefit units assigned to all parcels. The resulting rate per SFE unit is then multiplied by the SFE units assigned to a parcel to determine the proportional assessment for each parcel.

EQUATION 3 – ASSESSMENT APPORTIONMENT

$$\text{Assessment for Parcel} = \frac{\text{Entire Cost of Improvements}}{\text{Total SFE Benefit Units}} * (\text{SFE Benefit Units for Parcel})$$

METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT

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 townhomes are included in this category.

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 Pleasant Valley 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 3.32 persons occupy each single family residence, whereas an average of 2.16 persons occupy each multi-family residence. Using the ratio of one SFE for each single-family residence, which equates to one SFE for every 3.32 persons, 0.65 SFE would equate to one multi-family unit or 0.65 SFE for every 2.16 residents. Likewise, each condominium unit receives 0.71 SFE and each mobile home receives 0.51 SFE.

TABLE 3 - RESIDENTIAL DENSITY AND ASSESSMENT FACTORS

	<i>Total Population</i>	<i>Occupied Households</i>	<i>Persons per Household</i>	<i>SFE Factor</i>
Single Family Residential	34,333	10,343	3.32	1.00
Condominium	9,464	4,030	2.35	0.71
Multi-Family Residential	5,633	2,602	2.16	0.65
Mobile Home on Separate Lot	1,712	1,014	1.69	0.51

Source: 1990 Census, city of Camarillo (the most recent data available when the Improvement District was established).

The single family equivalency factor of 0.65 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 0.65 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 the average commercial/industrial property. The SFE values for various commercial and industrial land uses are further defined 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 as being 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 and industrial property is 24.

In comparison, the average number of people residing in a single family home in the area is 3.32. Since the average lot size for a single family home in the Park District is approximately 0.27 acres, the average number of residents per acre of residential property is 12.30.

The employee density per acre is generally 2 times the population density of single family residential property per acre (24 employees per acre / 12.3 residents per acre). Therefore, the average employee density can be used as the basis for allocating benefit to commercial or industrial property since a commercial/industrial property with 2 employees receives generally similar special benefit to a residential property with 1 resident. This factor of equivalence of benefit between 1 resident to 2 employees is the basis for

allocating commercial/industrial benefit. Table 4 shows the average employees per acre of land area or portion thereof for commercial and industrial properties and lists the relative SFE factors per quarter 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 quarter 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.

TABLE 4 - COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL DENSITY AND ASSESSMENT FACTORS

Type of Commercial/Industrial Land Use	Average Employees Per Acre ¹	SFE Units per 1/4 Acre ²
Commercial	24	1.00
Office	68	2.83
Shopping Center	24	1.00
Industrial	24	1.00
Self Storage or Parking Lot	1	0.04

1. Source: San Diego Association of Governments Traffic Generators Study.

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

VACANT PROPERTIES

The benefit to vacant properties is determined to be proportional to the corresponding benefits for similar type developed properties; however, at a lower rate due to the lack of improvements on the property. A measure of the benefits accruing to the underlying land is the average value of land in relation to improvements for developed property. An analysis of the Fiscal Year 2000-01 assessed valuation data from the County of Ventura, found that 35% of the assessed value of improved properties is classified as the land value. It is reasonable to assume, therefore, that approximately 35% of the benefits are related to the underlying land and 65% are related to the improvements and the day to day use of the property. Using this ratio, the SFE factor for vacant parcels is 0.35 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 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

Article XIIID provides that publicly owned properties must be assessed unless there is clear and convincing evidence that those properties receive no special benefit from the assessment.

All properties that are specially benefited are assessed. Other publicly owned property that is used for business purposes similar to private residential, commercial, industrial or institutional uses is benefited and assessed at the same rate as such privately owned property.

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

As noted previously, the Board gained the authority to approve the levy of the assessments for the fiscal year 2001-02 and to continue to levy them in future years. It is proposed that the Assessment be levied for fiscal year 2019-20 and continued every year thereafter, so long as the parks and recreational areas need to be improved and maintained. Pleasant Valley Recreation and Park District requires funding from the Assessments for its Improvements in the Improvement District. The Assessment can continue to be levied annually after the Pleasant Valley 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 the Pleasant Valley Recreation and Park District and the decision of the Board of the Pleasant Valley Recreation and Park District shall be final.

ASSESSMENT

WHEREAS, on February 6, 2019 the Pleasant Valley Recreation and Park District Board of Directors adopted its Resolution Designating Engineer of Work, and Directing Preparation of the Engineer's Report for the Pleasant Valley Recreation and Park District, County of Ventura, California;

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 Improvements therein contained, reference is hereby made for further particulars;

NOW, THEREFORE, the undersigned, by virtue of the power vested in me under said Act and the order of the Board of said Pleasant Valley 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 Improvement 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 2019-20 is generally as follows:

TABLE 5 - SUMMARY COST ESTIMATE

	<i>F. Y. 2019-20</i> <u>Budget</u>
Parks Maintenance	\$4,332,085
Parks Improvements	\$857,434
Contingency and Reserve	\$676,851
Incidental Expenses	<u>\$36,346</u>
TOTAL BUDGET	\$5,902,716
Less:	
Beginning Fund Balance (July 1, 19)	(\$669,959)
Park District Contribution	<u>(\$4,082,323)</u>
NET AMOUNT TO ASSESSMENTS	\$1,150,434

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

I do hereby assess and apportion said net amount of the cost and expenses of said improvements, including the costs and expenses incident thereto, upon the parcels and lots of land within said Improvement District, in accordance with the special benefits to be

received by each parcel or lot, from the improvements, and more particularly set forth in the Cost Estimate and Method of Assessment hereto attached and by reference made a part hereof.

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

The change in the CPI from December 2017 to December 2018 was 3.24%. Therefore, the maximum authorized assessment rate for fiscal year 2019-20 is increased by 3.00% which equates to \$41.32 per single family equivalent benefit unit. The estimate of cost and budget in this Engineer's Report proposes assessments for fiscal year 2019-20 at the rate of \$41.32. The assessment ballot proceeding conducted in 2001 authorized an annual adjustment in the assessment levies equal to the annual change in the CPI, not to exceed 3%. The maximum authorized assessment rate for fiscal year 2019-20 is within the limits of the authorized CPI increase.

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 said 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 2019-20. 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 said 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 2019-20 for each parcel or lot of land within the Improvement District.

Dated: April 17, 2019

Engineer of Work



A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "John W. Bliss". The signature is written over a light gray rectangular background.

By _____
John Bliss, License No. C52091

ASSESSMENT DIAGRAM

The Improvement District includes all properties within the boundaries of the Pleasant Valley Recreation and Park District. The boundaries of the Improvement District are displayed on the following Assessment Diagram. The lines and dimensions of each lot or parcel within the Improvement District are those lines and dimensions as shown on the maps of the Assessor of the County of Ventura, for fiscal year 2019-20, and are incorporated herein by reference, and made a part of this Diagram and this Report.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE GENERAL MANAGER OF THE PLEASANT VALLEY RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT, COUNTY OF VENTURA, CALIFORNIA, THIS ____ DAY OF _____, 2019.

GENERAL MANAGER

RECORDED IN THE OFFICE OF THE GENERAL MANAGER OF THE PLEASANT VALLEY RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT, COUNTY OF VENTURA, CALIFORNIA, THIS ____ DAY OF _____, 2019.


GENERAL MANAGER

AN ASSESSMENT WAS CONFIRMED AND LEVIED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE PLEASANT VALLEY RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT ON THE LOTS, PIECES AND PARCELS OF LAND ON THIS ASSESSMENT DIAGRAM ON THE ____ DAY OF _____, 2019 FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019-20 AND SAID ASSESSMENT DIAGRAM AND THE ASSESSMENT ROLL FOR SAID FISCAL YEAR WERE FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY AUDITOR OF THE COUNTY OF VENTURA ON THE ____ DAY OF _____, 2018. REFERENCE IS HEREBY MADE TO SAID RECORDED ASSESSMENT ROLL FOR THE EXACT AMOUNT OF EACH ASSESSMENT LEVIED AGAINST EACH PARCEL OF LAND.








GENERAL MANAGER


FILED THIS ____ DAY OF _____, 2019, AT THE HOUR OF ____ O'CLOCK ____ M. IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY AUDITOR OF THE COUNTY OF VENTURA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AT THE REQUEST OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE PLEASANT VALLEY RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT.

COUNTY AUDITOR, COUNTY OF VENTURA



Legend

-  Interstate
-  Major Road
-  Local Road
-  Parks
-  District Boundary Line
-  City boundaries
-  Zone of Benefit Boundary



Note:

REFERENCE IS HEREBY MADE TO THE MAPS AND DEEDS OF RECORD IN THE OFFICE OF THE ASSESSOR OF THE COUNTY OF VENTURA FOR A DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE LINES AND DIMENSIONS OF ANY PARCELS SHOWN HEREIN. THOSE MAPS SHALL GOVERN FOR ALL DETAILS CONCERNING THE LINES AND DIMENSIONS OF SUCH PARCELS. EACH PARCEL IS IDENTIFIED IN SAID MAPS BY ITS DISTINCTIVE ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER.

SCI Consulting Group
4745 Mangels Blvd
Fairfield, Ca 94534
707-430-4300

**Pleasant Valley Recreation and Park District
Park Maintenance and Recreation Improvement District
Assessment Diagram**

APPENDIX A - 2019-20 ASSESSMENT ROLL

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.